James Norman, Head of New Transmission Investment
Tel: 020 7901 7420

Shetland Transmission Project: Consultation on Final Needs Case and Delivery Model

Dear Sir,

I would be obliged if you would accept this letter as my response to the above consultation.

Firstly my apologies for not responding in the manner which you are suggesting. I have no desire to respond to a consultation document which follows the same intractable politically motivated outpourings which has characterised the project from day one.

No amount of technical jargon and acronyms can disguise the fact that this project, namely Viking Energy Wind Farm (for that is what started all this nonsense), has been an utter fantasy from its inception in early 2007.

There is absolutely no way that a 600/800MW interconnector cable operating at a maximum energy efficiency of c50% (not the plated capacity as is so often quoted) can be value for money to the UK consumer at this cost. Not least to mention that this will also be a variable supply with all the problems that presents both operationally and economically vis a vis shutdown payments!

Further, when considering the supposed reasoning for this project to mitigate global warming this is also a complete fraud given that all onshore wind farms built in Shetland will be on peat moorland and blanket bog; the very habitat which we are now being told should be conserved and enhanced as one of the low hanging fruits in the fight against global warming. This is of course due to the significance these habitats have as carbon stores and sequesters, something which I am sure does not escape you should you care to consider the bigger picture.

I have opposed this project from the outset, it is too large for our small islands, it is proposed to be built on the wrong habitat and last but not least it will fail. This failure is due to the fact that the Viking Energy planning consent is a consent in name only. There are some 50 conditions attached the majority of which are most likely not achievable, certainly not without some imaginative interpretation from the regulatory authority!

Bearing this in mind and given your requirements for developers to have all the ducks in a row just to qualify for the tendering process I would have thought a very close look at these conditions would be crucial. After all you must only award contracts to projects which will come to fruition. These wind farms will not - Peel Energy's proposal sits in like vein with regard to conditions.

I believe you know what is best for the UK's future energy supply with regard to keeping the lights on in conjunction with best value. There is a real concern that an element of populist political pressure comes to bear in these matters, I would appeal to you to be true to your remit for best value to the UK consumer.

Yours faithfully