The Price of Transition: Structural Inefficiencies and Systemic Costs in the UK Electricity Market

Executive Summary

The United Kingdom stands at a pivotal juncture in its energy transition. Over the past decade, the nation has successfully orchestrated a rapid decarbonization of its electricity supply, transitioning from a coal-dependent grid to one where low-carbon sources frequently provide over half of the daily generation. The deployment of offshore wind, in particular, has been a crowning industrial achievement, with the Levelised Cost of Electricity (LCOE) for new projects falling precipitously to levels nominally below that of pre-crisis fossil fuel generation. This trajectory has fueled a pervasive narrative among policymakers and industry advocates: that the transition to renewables is not only an environmental imperative but a deflationary economic force that will inevitably lower consumer bills.

However, a stark disconnect has emerged between this narrative and the lived reality of British households and businesses. Despite the proliferation of "cheap" renewables, UK electricity prices remain among the highest in Europe, decoupling from the falling costs of wind and solar generation. This report investigates the root causes of this paradox, validating the hypothesis that structural market mechanisms—specifically the marginal pricing system—and escalating system integration costs are masking the true economic picture.

Our analysis confirms the validity of critiques regarding the "archaic bidding system." The UK's wholesale electricity market operates on a Pay-as-Clear basis, where the most expensive generator required to meet demand sets the price for all. Due to the intermittent nature of renewables, flexible gas-fired power stations act as the marginal price setter approximately 85-98% of the time. Consequently, the wholesale price of electricity remains tethered to the volatile international price of natural gas, plus the UK's specific Carbon Price Support, regardless of how much zero-marginal-cost wind is on the system.[1]

Furthermore, this report interrogates the hidden costs of intermittency that are frequently omitted from standard LCOE comparisons. We find that the costs of balancing the grid—managing frequency, inertia, and reserve power—have surged from roughly £500 million in 2015 to projections exceeding £4 billion by 2025, with a potential to double again by 2030 without intervention.[4] The phenomenon of "backfilling" renewable dropouts with expensive flexible generation creates a flexibility premium that raises the effective system cost of variable renewables significantly above their generation cost.

Crucially, the report analyzes the spatial mismatch in the UK grid. The concentration of wind

generation in Scotland and demand in the southeast has created severe transmission bottlenecks. In 2024 alone, consumers paid nearly £400 million in "constraint payments" to turn off wind farms and turn on gas plants—a double inefficiency that effectively creates a "shadow price" for wind energy in constrained zones that is far higher than the strike prices agreed in auctions.[6]

In the nuclear sector, we identify a "sovereign regulatory premium" that creates a unique cost burden for the UK. The ballooning budget of Hinkley Point C (HPC)—now estimated at up to £46 billion—is driven significantly by UK-specific regulatory interventions, including over 7,000 mandated design changes to the standard European Pressurised Reactor (EPR). These interventions have necessitated 35% more steel and 25% more concrete than comparable projects, transforming a "Nth-of-a-kind" reactor into a bespoke, First-of-a-Kind engineering challenge.[8]

The report concludes that while the technological fundamentals of renewables are sound, the market architecture is obsolete. Without fundamental reform—such as the decoupling of renewable and fossil fuel markets or the introduction of locational pricing—and a wartime-scale mobilization of grid infrastructure investment, the UK risks locking in high energy costs for decades, effectively forcing consumers to pay for the inefficiencies of the transition rather than reaping its rewards.

---

1. Introduction: The UK Energy Paradox

The transformation of the United Kingdom's electricity system over the last fifteen years represents one of the fastest rates of decarbonization in the industrialized world. In 2010, coal-fired power stations provided nearly a third of the country's electricity; by September 2024, the final coal plant at Ratcliffe-on-Soar had closed, marking the end of a 140-year era.[10] In its place, the UK has cultivated a world-leading offshore wind sector, with renewable sources generating approximately 37% of the nation's power in 2024, and low-carbon sources (including nuclear) accounting for the majority of generation.[11]

This physical transformation was underpinned by an economic promise: that the precipitous decline in the cost of renewable technologies would translate into lower energy bills for consumers. The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) has repeatedly highlighted that the Levelised Cost of Electricity (LCOE) for offshore wind has fallen by around 70% since 2014, with recent auctions clearing at prices significantly below the wholesale market average.[13]

Yet, the economic reality for British industry and households contradicts this optimism. UK electricity prices have remained stubbornly high, consistently ranking among the most expensive in Europe. In late 2024 and 2025, while wholesale gas prices retreated from their crisis peaks, electricity bills did not fall at the same velocity. The "pass-through" of cheap renewable costs has failed to materialize in the retail market.

This divergence has given rise to a polarized debate. On one side, government and renewable advocates cite LCOE metrics to argue that the transition is deflationary and that high prices are solely the result of legacy fossil fuel dependence. On the other side, critics point to the rising "system costs"—balancing services, grid constraints, and levies—arguing that the true cost of a renewables-dominated grid is being obfuscated by simplistic metrics.

This report seeks to resolve this paradox through a rigorous, "deep dive" examination of the UK energy market's structure. It moves beyond the headline generation costs to analyze the *total system cost* of electricity. By dissecting the pricing mechanisms, the physics of grid stability, and the regulatory environment for baseload power, we aim to provide a comprehensive answer to the question: If renewables are so cheap, why is UK electricity so expensive?

---

2. The Price-Setting Mechanism: Anatomy of a Market

To understand the disconnect between generation costs and wholesale prices, one must first scrutinize the mechanism by which electricity is traded and priced in Great Britain (GB). The structure of this market, established following privatization and refined through the New Electricity Trading Arrangements (NETA) in 2001, was designed for a system dominated by firm, dispatchable fossil fuel generators. Its applicability to a system driven by near-zero marginal cost renewables is now the subject of intense scrutiny.

2.1 The Marginal Pricing (Pay-as-Clear) Model

The GB wholesale electricity market operates primarily on a "marginal pricing" or "Pay-as-Clear" model. In this system, the National Energy System Operator (NESO) accepts bids from generators to supply electricity for specific settlement periods (half-hour windows) to meet forecast demand. These bids are stacked in ascending order of price to form a "merit order."

The fundamental principle of the merit order is economic efficiency. Generators with the lowest Short-Run Marginal Costs (SRMC)—typically renewables like wind and solar, which have no fuel costs—bid at or near zero (or even negatively, if subsidized) and are accepted first. The System Operator then moves up the stack, accepting bids from nuclear, biomass, and finally fossil fuel plants until the demand is met.

The crucial mechanic is that the *clearing price*—the price paid to *all* successful generators—is set by the bid of the *last* generator accepted to meet the demand. This is often referred to as the System Sell Price (SSP) in imbalance settlement, though the principle applies across wholesale trading hubs.[1]

2.1.1 The Dominance of Gas as the Price Setter

In the UK context, the marginal unit—the plant that bridges the gap between baseload/renewable output and peak demand—is almost invariably a Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT). Because gas plants have significant fuel costs and must purchase carbon permits under the UK Emissions Trading Scheme (UK ETS), their SRMC is high.

Academic and industry analysis indicates that natural gas sets the wholesale electricity price in the UK approximately **85% to 98% of the time**.[2] This creates a high degree of correlation between the global price of natural gas and the UK price of electricity.

When gas prices spike—as they did following the Russian invasion of Ukraine—the clearing price for electricity rises commensurately. Crucially, this high price is paid not just to the gas generators, but to *all* generators that cleared the auction, including wind and solar farms that generated power at near-zero cost. This results in "inframarginal rents" or windfall profits for older renewable generators (supported by the Renewables Obligation) and nuclear operators, who receive the high gas-set price despite their costs remaining static.[1]

This mechanism validates Greg Jackson's assertion of an "archaic bidding system." The market structure effectively socializes the cost of gas across the entire electricity supply. Even if a consumer were theoretically powered 90% by wind, the price they pay for that electricity is largely determined by the cost of the remaining 10% generated by gas.

2.2 The Carbon Price Support (CPS) Multiplier

The UK's specific policy choices exacerbate this dynamic. The UK unilaterally introduced the Carbon Price Support (CPS)—a top-up tax on carbon emissions from electricity generation—to accelerate the coal phase-out. While successful in eliminating coal, the CPS increases the marginal cost of gas generation.

Since gas sets the clearing price the vast majority of the time, the CPS effectively acts as a multiplier on the wholesale electricity price. Unlike in neighboring markets where coal (with a lower marginal fuel cost but higher carbon intensity) might set the price, or France where nuclear sets the price, the UK's reliance on gas plus a high carbon tax establishes a high price floor for electricity. This structural "sovereign cost" renders UK wholesale prices consistently higher than the EU average, even when gas commodity prices align.[16]

2.3 Pay-as-Bid: A False Panacea?

Critics of the current system, including some consumer advocacy groups, have proposed moving to a "Pay-as-Bid" system. Under this model, generators would be paid exactly what they bid, theoretically allowing low-cost renewables to sell power cheaply directly to the market.[1]

However, detailed economic analysis suggests this would not necessarily lower consumer costs. In a Pay-as-Bid environment, rational generators would alter their bidding strategies. A wind farm operator, knowing the market will likely clear at a high price set by gas, would not bid at £0/MWh. Instead, they would attempt to forecast the marginal price and bid just slightly below it (e.g., bidding £99/MWh if they expect gas to be £100/MWh).

This behavior, known as "shadow pricing," means the average price paid by consumers would likely converge towards the marginal price anyway, but with added inefficiency due to forecasting errors and risk premiums priced in by generators. The consensus among market economists is that while Pay-as-Bid breaks the explicit link, it does not remove the fundamental economic reality that the most expensive unit required defines the scarcity value of the commodity.[14]

---

3. The Cost of Intermittency: Physics Meets Economics

While the marginal pricing mechanism explains the *unit price* of wholesale electricity, it fails to capture the escalating *system costs* required to integrate high volumes of variable renewable energy (VRE). The "cheap renewables" narrative often relies on LCOE figures calculated at the generator's busbar, ignoring the complex and costly engineering required to maintain a stable grid when the prime movers are weather-dependent.

3.1 The Balancing Mechanism: An Exponential Cost Curve

The National Energy System Operator (NESO) is tasked with balancing supply and demand on a second-by-second basis. Historically, when the grid was dominated by heavy, synchronous thermal generators (coal and nuclear), this was a relatively stable and low-cost exercise. Thermal plants provide natural inertia—the kinetic energy stored in spinning turbines—which resists changes in system frequency, providing a buffer against faults.

Wind turbines and solar panels, connected via power electronics (inverters), do not provide this natural inertia. As their share of the mix rises, the grid becomes lighter and more volatile. To maintain stability, NESO must actively procure "synthetic" inertia and faster-acting frequency response services, often at significant cost.

The financial impact of this shift is stark. In 2015, the net cost of balancing the GB system was approximately **£506 million**. By 2020, this had surged to **£1.3 billion**, a 157% increase in five years. Recent projections suggest that without significant intervention, balancing costs could peak at **£8 billion by 2030**.[4]

Table 1: The Escalation of UK Balancing Costs (2015–2030 Projections)

Year	Net Balancing Cost (£ Millions)	Primary Drivers

2015	£506m	Legacy thermal system, low VRE penetration.
2019	£794m	Rising wind capacity, decreasing thermal inertia.
2020	£1,300m	COVID-19 demand anomalies + high wind integration.
2021	£1,500m+	Rising gas prices increasing cost of balancing actions.
2024	~£2,000m - £3,000m	Chronic constraint payments, high reserve procurement.
2030 (Est)	£8,000m (Peak Scenario)	Massive offshore wind deployment outpacing grid build.

Source: Derived from NESO Balancing Costs Reports and Elexon Data.[4]

3.2 Backfilling and the Flexibility Premium

A critical driver of these costs is the need to "backfill" renewable dropouts. When wind output falls unexpectedly—a phenomenon known as a "dunkelflaute" in prolonged cases, or simply a forecast error in the short term—the System Operator must urgently call upon dispatchable capacity.

Because coal has been phased out and nuclear is inflexible (running as baseload), this response is almost exclusively provided by gas peaker plants or, increasingly, battery storage. However, these assets bid into the Balancing Mechanism at a significant premium. While the wholesale price might be £80/MWh, a gas peaker required to turn on at short notice might bid **£200-£400/MWh** or more to cover its start-up costs and capitalize on scarcity.

Batteries, while technically capable, also demand high prices to recover their capital costs over limited operational cycles. This creates a "flexibility premium": the more the system relies on intermittent sources, the more it must pay for the insurance policy of flexible backup. The cost of this backup is spread across all consumers via Balancing Services Use of System (BSUoS) charges, which have risen from a negligible fraction of the bill to over £3 per household per month, and substantially more for industrial users.[5]

3.3 Forecast Errors and Imbalance Volatility

The unpredictability of weather patterns introduces a new layer of financial risk. NESO relies on accurate forecasts to schedule the system. However, forecast errors are inevitable. In October 2023, during Storm Babet, high wind speeds led to significant deviations between forecast and actual generation. This forced NESO to take aggressive remedial actions in the Balancing Mechanism, driving costs up.

Data analysis shows a direct correlation between high wind forecast errors and spikes in balancing costs. For instance, wind forecast errors in Germany (a comparable market) have been shown to impact spot prices more severely than demand fluctuations. In the UK, the system operator must procure "headroom"—extra reserve capacity just in case the wind forecast is wrong. This is effectively a payment for energy that *might* be needed, further inflating the system cost per MWh of renewable generation actually delivered.[20]

---

4. Grid Constraints and Curtailment: The Spatial Mismatch

Perhaps the most visceral example of the inefficiency in the current market design is the phenomenon of curtailment. The UK's best wind resources are located in the North Sea and Scotland, while the bulk of electricity demand is located in the South of England. The transmission network connecting these two regions—specifically the B6 boundary between Scotland and England—has failed to keep pace with the rate of wind farm commissioning.

4.1 The Economics of Constraint Payments

On windy days, the cables transferring power south reach their thermal limits. To prevent physical damage to the grid, NESO must intervene. It issues instructions to Scottish wind farms to reduce their output (curtailment). Crucially, under the current market rules, these wind farms are compensated for the energy they *would* have sold, often at a premium.

Simultaneously, because the demand in the South still exists, NESO must pay gas-fired power stations in England to turn on and generate the electricity that the wind farms were prevented from supplying.

This creates a "double penalty" for the consumer:

1. Payment to wind farms to **stop** generating zero-carbon electricity.
2. Payment to gas plants to **start** generating high-carbon, expensive electricity.

4.2 Case Study: The Seagreen Wind Farm (2024)

The scale of this waste is staggering. In 2024, the volume of discarded wind energy rose by 91% to **8.3 TWh**—enough to power over 2.5 million homes. The direct cost of these constraint payments exceeded **£393 million**.[6]

A striking example is the **Seagreen Offshore Wind Farm**. Located off the coast of Angus, Scotland, it is a flagship renewable project. However, due to grid bottlenecks, it was responsible for a massive share of curtailed volume. In 2024:

- Seagreen received **£104 million** for electricity actually generated.
- It received **£198 million** in constraint payments for energy *not* generated.
- It charged an additional **£64 million** premium to reduce output.

When these costs are aggregated, the effective cost to the consumer for every MWh of electricity actually delivered by Seagreen was calculated at approximately **£270/MWh**. This is nearly five times higher than its CfD strike price of roughly £55/MWh. This case study starkly illustrates how grid constraints can transform a theoretically "cheap" renewable asset into an exorbitantly expensive one for the end user.[6]

---

5. Apples-to-Apples: Redefining Value in Power Generation

The prevailing metric for comparing energy technologies is the Levelised Cost of Electricity (LCOE). On this basis, renewables appear to be the undisputed economic winners. DESNZ figures for 2023 estimate the LCOE of offshore wind at roughly **£44/MWh** (2012 prices), while gas CCGT is estimated at over **£100/MWh** when carbon costs are included.[13]

However, energy economists increasingly argue that LCOE is a flawed metric for comparing intermittent and dispatchable technologies because it treats electricity as a homogeneous product, ignoring the *value* of when and where it is produced. A MWh of electricity generated on a windy night when demand is low is worth far less to the system than a MWh generated on a calm winter evening during peak demand.

5.1 Value-Adjusted LCOE (VALCOE)

To address this, the International Energy Agency (IEA) has developed the **Value-Adjusted LCOE (VALCOE)**. This metric adjusts the standard LCOE to account for:

- **Energy Value**: The wholesale price available when the plant generates. (Renewables often suffer from "cannibalization," where high output depresses prices, reducing their captured value).
- **Capacity Value**: The contribution of the plant to system adequacy (very low for wind/solar, high for gas/nuclear).
- **Flexibility Value**: The ability to ramp up/down to help balance the grid.

When VALCOE is applied, the cost gap narrows significantly. While the LCOE of wind might be £40/MWh, its VALCOE—representing its true cost to the system—increases as its penetration rises. The IEA notes that the system value of variable renewables decreases as their share of power supply increases, necessitating higher integration costs.[23]

5.2 The Storage Adder

A true "apples-to-apples" comparison with baseload nuclear or gas requires adding the cost of storage to the renewable generator to simulate firm reliability.

- **Battery Storage**: Costs have fallen dramatically (down 93% since 2010 to ~$192/kWh in 2024), making batteries viable for short-duration balancing (1-4 hours).[25] However, they remain prohibitively expensive for multi-day or seasonal storage required to cover a "dunkelflaute" (a prolonged period of low wind and sun).
- **Hydrogen**: Using offshore wind to produce green hydrogen for re-electrification is a potential solution for long-duration storage. However, analysis by the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult suggests that the "round-trip" inefficiency and capital costs would push the effective cost of this "firm wind" to over **£150/MWh**, potentially higher than the cost of new nuclear.[26]

Therefore, while the *marginal* MWh of wind is cheap, the *firm* MWh of wind-plus-storage remains structurally expensive, a cost that must be borne by the consumer either through capacity market payments or high volatility premiums.

---

6. The Nuclear Premium: Regulation, Policy, and Hinkley Point C

Nuclear power offers a solution to the intermittency problem, providing firm, low-carbon baseload. However, the UK's experience with new nuclear, specifically the **Hinkley Point C (HPC)** project, has been characterized by astronomical costs and delays, raising questions about the viability of the technology as a cost-effective partner to renewables.

6.1 The Cost Explosion of Hinkley Point C

When first proposed, HPC was estimated to cost roughly £18 billion. By early 2024, the projected cost had ballooned to between **£31 billion and £35 billion** (in 2015 prices), or up to **£46 billion** in current money. The start date has slipped from 2025 to 2029-2031.[8]

The project is supported by a Contract for Difference (CfD) with a strike price originally set at £92.50/MWh (2012 prices), indexed to inflation. By 2025, inflation has pushed this strike price to approximately **£128/MWh**. While this effectively hedges consumers against future gas price spikes, it is currently substantially higher than the wholesale market price and three times the strike price of recent offshore wind farms.[28]

6.2 The Regulatory "Sovereign Tax"

A comparative analysis reveals that the high cost of UK nuclear is not solely intrinsic to the technology but is driven by a unique UK regulatory burden. The UK's Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) is widely regarded as one of the strictest regulators in the world, enforcing a non-prescriptive, outcome-based regime that places the burden of proof on the developer.

EDF Energy, the developer of HPC, has revealed that it was required to make **over 7,000 design changes** to the standard European Pressurised Reactor (EPR) design to meet British regulations. These changes were not trivial; they resulted in the project requiring **35% more steel and 25% more concrete** than the reference plant at Flamanville, France.[8]

Specific examples of this "gold-plating" include:

- **Digital Control Systems**: Complete redesigns of safety control systems were mandated to ensure diversity and redundancy beyond international norms.
- **Civil Engineering**: The density of the concrete and the reinforcement of the foundation raft were altered, requiring re-engineering of the entire nuclear island.
- **Acoustic Fish Deterrent**: Environmental regulators mandated the installation of a complex acoustic fish deterrent system in the cooling water intakes. This requirement, which EDF argued was disproportionate to the environmental risk (saving a negligible biomass of fish), became a subject of years-long legal battles and re-design efforts, adding millions to the planning costs.[29]

These interventions effectively turned HPC from a "nth-of-a-kind" project (benefiting from learning curves) into a "First-of-a-Kind" (FOAK) bespoke engineering project. This regulatory premium is a policy choice that prioritizes infinitesimal risk reduction over economic efficiency.

6.3 Financial Innovation: The RAB Model

Recognizing that the CfD model places all construction risk on the developer—driving up the cost of capital (WACC) to ~9%—the UK government has introduced the **Regulated Asset Base (RAB)** model for the follow-up project, Sizewell C.

Under the RAB model, consumers contribute to the cost of the plant through a small levy on bills *during the construction phase*. This provides the developer with a revenue stream before generation begins, drastically lowering the risk profile and allowing financing at a lower rate (closer to 4-6%).

Estimates suggest that the RAB model could reduce the total cost of Sizewell C to consumers by **£30 billion** over its lifetime compared to the HPC CfD model. This would translate to a saving of roughly £10-£12 per year on the average household bill. However, it represents a transfer of risk: if the project goes over budget or is delayed (as is chronic in the sector), the consumer, not the developer, bears the cost.[30]

---

7. Historical Analysis: The Decade of Transition (2010–2025)

To fully contextualize the current pricing crisis, it is necessary to track the evolution of the UK electricity mix and the parallel trajectory of consumer costs.

7.1 The Evolution of the Fuel Mix

Since 2010, the UK grid has undergone a radical restructuring.

- **The Coal Collapse**: In 2012, coal generated ~40% of the UK's electricity. By 2019, this had fallen to <2%, and reached zero in 2024.
- **The Renewable Rise**: Wind, solar, and hydro grew from a niche ~7% in 2010 to a dominant ~37% in 2024.
- **The Gas Backbone**: Despite the renewable surge, gas has remained the critical balancing fuel, consistently providing 30-40% of generation.

Table 2: UK Electricity Generation Mix Evolution (2010 vs 2024)

Fuel Source	2010 Share (%)	2024 Share (%)	Trend
Coal	~30%	0%	**Phased Out**
Gas	~46%	~30%	Structural Decline but Critical for Flexibility
Nuclear	~16%	~14%	Stable/Aging Fleet
Wind & Solar	~3%	~37%	**Massive Expansion**
Biomass	~2%	~12%	Increased (Drax Conversion)

Source: Derived from DUKES and Ember data.[11]

7.2 The Cost Journey: Wholesale vs. Retail

Between 2010 and 2020, wholesale electricity prices were relatively stable, fluctuating between £40 and £50/MWh. However, retail bills rose steadily during this period. This divergence was driven by "Policy Costs"—levies added to bills to subsidize the early rollout of renewables (RO and FiT schemes) and energy efficiency measures. By 2020, policy costs accounted for nearly 15-20% of a typical bill.

The paradigm shifted in 2021/2022. The post-pandemic demand surge, followed by the Russian invasion of Ukraine, drove wholesale gas prices to unprecedented levels. Due to the marginal pricing mechanism, wholesale electricity prices tracked gas almost perfectly, peaking at over **£500/MWh** in August 2022.

Although prices have since retreated to the £70-£90/MWh range in 2024/25, they remain structurally higher than the pre-crisis norm. The "new normal" for UK electricity prices includes a permanent premium reflecting higher global gas floors, higher carbon taxes, and significantly increased network and balancing charges.

---

8. Future Market Reform: REMA and Beyond

The UK government has acknowledged that the current market arrangements are no longer fit for purpose in a renewables-dominated system. The **Review of Electricity Market Arrangements (REMA)** is the ongoing policy vehicle designed to address these structural flaws.

8.1 Zonal Pricing (Locational Marginal Pricing)

One of the most transformative options considered was **Zonal Pricing**. This would split the national wholesale market into regional zones (e.g., Scotland, North England, London), each with its own clearing price based on local supply and demand.

- **Theory**: Prices would be low in Scotland (abundant wind) and high in London (high demand). This would incentivize generators to build closer to demand and energy-intensive industries (like data centers) to locate near generation, reducing the £2bn+ annual constraint costs.
- **Impact**: Analysis by FTI Consulting suggested Zonal Pricing could save consumers £30bn over nearly two decades.
- **Outcome**: Despite the theoretical benefits, the government has largely rejected full Zonal Pricing in its 2024/25 updates. The decision was driven by the fear of creating a "postcode lottery" for consumer bills and increasing the cost of capital for developers, who warned that "volume risk" (uncertainty over local prices) would make investing in Scottish wind unbankable.[35]

8.2 Splitting the Market: The Green Power Pool

An alternative proposal, championed by academics like Professor Michael Grubb, is to split the wholesale market into two separate pools:

1. **Variable Power Pool**: For wind and solar, priced at their Long-Run Marginal Cost (reflecting their low LCOE).
2. **Firm Power Pool**: For gas and nuclear, priced at SRMC (marginal pricing).

Consumers would buy a weighted basket of power from both pools. This would effectively decouple the price of renewable energy from the price of gas. If 60% of power comes from the cheap pool and 40% from the expensive pool, the average price falls significantly. While this idea has strong support from energy-intensive industries like UK Steel, the government has deprioritized it due to the immense complexity of implementation and the risk of fracturing market liquidity.[37]

8.3 The "Big Build": Grid Infrastructure as the Key

With radical market redesigns like Zonal Pricing seemingly sidelined, the focus has shifted to physical infrastructure. The NESO's "Clean Power 2030" advice identifies grid constraints as the primary driver of system inefficiency.

The solution is a massive acceleration in transmission infrastructure—the so-called "Big Build." This involves new high-voltage pylons and subsea superhighways to transport Scottish wind to English demand centers. While this will increase the "Network Costs" portion of the bill in the short term, it is the only viable path to eliminating the billion-pound waste of constraint payments and unlocking the true value of the UK's renewable capacity.[5]

---

9. Conclusion

The high price of electricity in the UK is not a failure of renewable technology itself; wind and solar farms are performing largely as promised, generating power at costs that are deflationary in isolation. Rather, high prices are a symptom of a **market architecture** and **physical grid** that were designed for a different era.

The marginal pricing system acts as a ratchet, ensuring that the cost of electricity can never fall below the cost of burning gas, even when gas provides a minority of the power. Simultaneously, the "hidden costs" of the transition—balancing, inertia, and constraints—have been allowed to spiral due to a chronic lag in grid investment. The UK is currently paying a "double premium": paying for the expensive construction of new infrastructure while simultaneously paying for the inefficiencies of the old system.

Furthermore, the nuclear sector highlights a different kind of inefficiency: a regulatory culture that prioritizes absolute risk elimination over economic viability, saddling projects like Hinkley Point C with billions in compliance costs that are not seen in peer nations.

The path to lower bills does not lie in halting the transition, but in completing it. This requires:

1. **Reforming CfDs**: To decouple renewable revenues from gas prices more effectively.
2. **Accelerating Grid Build**: To eliminate the £1bn+ wasted on constraint payments.
3. **Regulatory Pragmatism**: To reduce the soft costs of nuclear and infrastructure development.

Until the physical grid and the financial market are realigned with the reality of a zero-marginal-cost generation fleet, the UK consumer will continue to face the paradox of abundant green power and expensive monthly bills.

Works cited

1. How does the UK break its power price linkage to gas?, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://ecotricitysmartgrid.co.uk/news-and-views/breaking-the-uk-power-price-linkage-to-gas/
2. Factcheck: Why expensive gas – not net-zero – is keeping UK ..., accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.carbonbrief.org/factcheck-why-expensive-gas-not-net-zero-is-keeping-uk-electricity-prices-so-high/
3. Why the UK's electricity costs are so high – and what can be done about it - The Guardian, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.theguardian.com/business/2025/apr/20/why-the-uks-electricity-costs-are-so-high-and-what-can-be-done-about-it
4. BSC Insight: Increasing costs for balancing the GB System - Elexon, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.elexon.co.uk/bsc/article/bsc-insight-increasing-costs-for-balancing-the-gb-system/
5. 2025 Annual Balancing Costs Report - National Energy System ..., accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.neso.energy/document/362561/download
6. Discarded wind energy increases by 91% in 2024, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.ref.org.uk/ref-blog/384-discarded-wind-energy-increases-by-91-in-2024
7. Curtailment - GB Renewables Map, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://renewables-map.robinhawkes.com/curtailment
8. U.K.'s Only New Nuclear Plant Faces Major Delays and Cost Hike, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.industrialinfo.com/iirenergy/industry-news/article/uks-only-new-nuclear-plant-faces-major-delays-and-cost-hike--327883
9. onrs-regulatory-influence-on-the-epr-design-in-the-uk.docx - Office for Nuclear Regulation, accessed on December 27, 2025,

https://www.onr.org.uk/media/qr2ifif4/onrs-regulatory-influence-on-the-epr-design-in-the-uk.docx
10. Britain's Electricity Explained: 2024 Review | National Energy System Operator, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.neso.energy/news/britains-electricity-explained-2024-review
11. UK low-carbon renewable power set to overtake fossil fuels for first time - Ember-energy.org, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://ember-energy.org/latest-insights/uk-renewable-power-set-to-overtake-fossil-fuels-for-first-time/
12. Chapter 5: Electricity - GOV.UK, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/688a28656478525675739051/DUKES_2025_Chapter_5.pdf
13. Wind and solar are 30-50% cheaper than thought, admits UK government - Carbon Brief, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.carbonbrief.org/wind-and-solar-are-30-50-cheaper-than-thought-admits-uk-government/
14. Electricity market | Institute for Government, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/article/explainer/electricity-market
15. Wind power found to lower UK bills, while, at a global level, renewables displace coal-fired power for the first time ever | Article Page - Energy Knowledge, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://knowledge.energyinst.org/new-energy-world/article?id=139903
16. The impact of higher energy costs on UK businesses - Office for National Statistics, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/economicoutputandproductivity/output/articles/theimpactofhigherenergycostsonukbusinesses/2021to2024
17. Pay-as-Clear vs. Pay-as-Bid in Power Trading | Definition - FlexPower, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://flex-power.energy/school-of-flex/pay-as-clear-bid-power-trading/
18. Explanatory Document - National Energy System Operator, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.neso.energy/document/236496/download
19. Managing Uncertainty To Forecast Supply & Demand Case Study - Smith Institute, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.smithinst.co.uk/case-studies/managing-uncertainty-to-forecast-supply-and-demand/
20. Winter Balancing Costs Report - 2023/24 - National Energy System Operator, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.neso.energy/document/318696/download
21. The impact of renewable energy forecast errors on imbalance volumes and electricity spot prices - IDEAS/RePEc, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/enepol/v134y2019ics0301421519304057.html
22. How cost-effective is a renewables-dominated electricity system in comparison to one based on fossil fuels? | Grantham Institute – Climate Change and the Environment | Imperial College London, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.imperial.ac.uk/grantham/publications/background-briefings/how-cos

t-effective-is-a-renewables-dominated-electricity-system-in-comparison-to-one-based-on-fossil-fuels/
23. Cost of electricity by source - Wikipedia, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cost_of_electricity_by_source
24. Projected Costs of Generating Electricity 2020 – Analysis - IEA, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.iea.org/reports/projected-costs-of-generating-electricity-2020
25. Renewable power generation costs in 2024 - Executive summary - IRENA, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.irena.org/-/media/Files/IRENA/Agency/Publication/2025/Jul/IRENA_TEC_RPGC_in_2024_Summary_2025.pdf
26. Written evidence submitted by the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult (POW0033) - UK Parliament Committees, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/123508/pdf/
27. EDF announces Hinkley Point C delay and rise in project cost - World Nuclear News, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/articles/edf-announces-hinkley-point-c-delay-and-big-rise-i
28. Hinkley Point C | Status, Delays, Costs & Ownership Guide - Business Energy Deals, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.businessenergydeals.co.uk/blog/hinkley-point-c/
29. Environmental permitting of Hinkley Point C: summary of proposed decision - GOV.UK, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/hinkley-point-c-water-discharge-activity-permit-variation/environmental-permitting-of-hinkley-point-c-summary-of-proposed-decision
30. Funding Sizewell C, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.sizewellc.com/building-sizewell-c/progress/funding-sizewell-c/
31. Decoding : Financing structure for the Sizewell C nuclear project, a risk-sharing model, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://sfeninenglish.org/sizewell-c-rab-financing-risk-sharing-model/
32. FINANCE What would the RAB model mean for Sizewell C? - Planning Inspectorate, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010012-004898-Stop%20Sizewell%20C%20-%20Written%20Representations%20(WRs)%204.pdf
33. United Kingdom - Countries & Regions - IEA, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.iea.org/countries/united-kingdom/electricity
34. Energy in the United Kingdom - Wikipedia, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Energy_in_the_United_Kingdom
35. Why the UK Abandoned Zonal Pricing (and Why It Matters) - Utility Bidder, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.utilitybidder.co.uk/energy-and-utility-guides/uk-zonal-pricing-abandoned-what-it-means-for-businesses/
36. Review of electricity market arrangements (REMA): Summer update, 2025

(accessible webpage) - GOV.UK, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-electricity-market-arrangements-rema-summer-update-2025/review-of-electricity-market-arrangements-rema-summer-update-2025-accessible-webpage
37. Government abandons electricity market reforms for steel: power pools, accessed on December 27, 2025, https://www.uksteel.org/steel-news-2024/government-abandons-power-pools
38. ELECTRICITY MARKET DESIGN DURING THE ENERGY TRANSITION AND THE ENERGY CRISIS - Cadmus (EUI), accessed on December 27, 2025, https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstreams/c0b5b557-2263-58a6-a7b2-29f643e58506/download