

Offshore Coordination project

Consultation feedback form

We launched our consultation on **30 September 2020** and it closes on the **28 October 2020**.

Please use this form to send in your written feedback. If you would like to feedback via this route. We are also working with stakeholders to receive verbal feedback. Please contact us if you would prefer to provide feedback verbally.

We would like to publish responses to our consultation following its closure. Please can you confirm whether you would like us to treat your response confidentially by selecting one of the options below: (delete those that do not apply)

- **Confidential - you can publish the feedback without our name but you are welcome to identify which sector we come from**

Throughout the consultation document we have asked some questions on our three reports that we would like your feedback on to shape our final documentation. These are below and do not need answering if you do not have views. If you would like to provide any other feedback, please feel free to do so.

Holistic Approach to Offshore Transmission Planning Report

Q1. Do you agree with our assessment of the key technology and system risk barriers coming from the Holistic Approach to Offshore Transmission Planning Report?

Q2. Do you have any proposals on how to most effectively bring the technology to market for when needed?

Q3. Do you have any additional evidence to inform the assessment we have made?

Q4. Do you have any further feedback on the report?

The report makes absolutely no mention of a potential of-shore ring main (ORM) as a suitable route for bringing electrical energy ashore with the minimum of damage to the local natural and urban environments. Currently we have an unsustainable situation developing (reflected by Figure O-1 (left) on page 8. The ORM has been proposed at the highest levels of Government but has not been considered here or incorporated into the cost-benefit analysis.

Cost-benefit Analysis Report

Q1. Do you agree with our assessment of the costs and benefits?

The general conclusion that an Integrated system would be cheaper and more efficient is not surprising. What is surprising, and deeply disturbing, is that the approach had not been considered ten years ago.

However clarity on the impact of such Integrated systems on the on-shore cabling is not sufficiently detailed, and poses much uncertainty. The Integrated approach should incorporate proposals such as the ORM discussed above.

Q2. Do you have any other evidence to support or challenge the assessment made?

The Impacts of current cabling on the environment should be carefully considered and Incorporated Into the study. The offshore element Is not the only aspect of this growing Industry.

Q3. What do you see as the potential impact on the environment of these proposals, particularly the reduction in the number of assets and landing points?

Potentially It could be beneficial. HOWEVER the actual details are missing. If an ORM was Included, It would be easier to judge. Also, the landing points are only one part of the onshore activity. The decisions on where cabling Is laid Is separate and still full of uncertainty.

Q4. Do you have any further evidence on the potential social and community impacts of these proposals? We would particularly welcome responses from local authorities on this question.

I am dismayed at the rollercoaster approach currently adopted by National Grid and the energy companies In relation to how and where onshore cabling will be laid, and the almost total lack of influence by residents in relation to damage to the local and natural environment. Consultations like this, and like the one recently carried out by Equinor seem to be paper exercises to justify decisions which the public have virtually no Influence over.

In addition, there is seemingly little, or no consideration given to the extraordinary disruption created during the laying of such cabling including increased construction traffic over very large distances, disruption to normal traffic caused by road blockages, noise etc.

Q5. Where do you see value for further work to build on and test these findings? Either from the proposed list or beyond?

Please consider the potential beneficial Impact of an ORM on reducing the number of landing points and onshore cabling requirements.

Please clarify the long term (and macro-)economic Impacts of delegating the responsibility for developing windfarms and cabling systems to overseas companies. What UK-based companies are Involved?

Offshore Connections Review Report

Q1. Do you think that if the areas we are highlighting were improved, that the ability to coordinate projects would be significantly increased?

Since there appears to have been little or no coordination beforehand, then hopefully there would be an Improvement.

Q2. Do you think we have missed anything in our offshore connections review that would add value and increase coordination?

Yes - Inclusion of an ORM to enable a long-term, environmentally less damaging Integration with onshore cabling activities.

Do you have any other feedback, if so please add below. Many thanks for taking the time to provide written feedback. When we publish our final documentation, we will let you know what we have done with the feedback and how it has shaped our work.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
<https://barfordpc.wixsite.com/home/cabling-update>

I was made aware of this National Grid consultation exercise by chance.

[REDACTED] However,
The PC received formal notification of the Equinor consultation on cabling well in advance of the deadline for submissions. Maybe National Grid could take a similar approach to ensure they consult with relevant stakeholders more effectively!