nationalgrid

Ince Submission Summary

National Grid Electricity Transmission
Eligibility Letter

May 2026

T3 - Ince SGT Extension

Executive Summary

Background

Ince SGT Extension is a load-driven reinforcement at Ince Grid Supply Point (GSP) to restore and maintain NETS Security and Quality of Supply Standard (SQSS) compliance and enable contracted strategic demand. The scheme is required to provide secure capacity at the transmission-distribution interface and support the timely connection of contracted demand.

Investment Drivers

Key drivers for investment are:

- Customer connections
- System security and compliance: address insufficient firm capacity and SQSS non-compliance under N-1-1 without reinforcement, restoring secure operation at the transmission–distribution interface.
- Operational resilience and optionality: improve operability by adding a third infeed and provide headroom to support potential future downstream low-carbon demand

Options

A structured optioneering process considered strategic options including do-nothing, market-based, whole-system (DNO) and transmission reinforcement options, including solutions sited both at Ince and alternative network locations.

We shortlisted options including:

- Option D-4: Three variant options of an Ince-sited SGT with hybrid 400 kV OHL/underground connection.
- Option D-5: Two variant options of an Ince-sited SGT with fully underground 400 kV cable connection.

Preferred option

The preferred option was a variant under Option D-4 – an Ince-sited SGT supplied by a hybrid overhead line and underground cable connection.

Scope and outputs:

- install a third SGT at the existing Ince 132 kV GIS substation, with a new 400 kV hybrid connection tee'd from the Frodsham–Capenhurst 400 kV circuit, delivering firm SQSS-compliant capacity for the contracted demand.

This option was selected due to its proportionate balance of cost, deliverability and risk. It makes effective use of existing operational land, avoids more complex interface constraints, and reduces exposure to land and consenting risks compared with alternative overhead line solutions, while remaining materially lower cost than full underground options.