

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Deadline 8 Submission
Date: 24 September 2021 22:56:58

Dear Planning Inspector

My ref: 20025682

I write in light of EDF's recent proposal to build a water desalination plant in order to deliver sufficient potable water for Sizewell C. I find it incredulous that this fundamental issue remains unresolved at this (very) late stage. It was back in 2010 that the East Anglian Daily Times published a letter written by one of Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)'s members, highlighting that securing enough potable water for such a mammoth project as Sizewell C in famously dry East Anglia would be a gargantuan undertaking. And yet we find ourselves, eleven years later and at the eleventh hour, deep into the DCO process, with the Applicant only now seeking to find an answer to this huge problem and, in so doing, raising yet more questions as to both the expertise and the integrity of EDF in this process. This integrity is further brought into question by the timing of this submission, which is not only outrageously late in the process but is also timed for the peak holiday period when so many who would want to contribute their thoughts will be hard-pressed to do so in the hugely restrictive timescale.

There are also significant gaps in the information required to fully understand the impact of this proposal. The fact that 28km of new pipeline is not in the DCO means that it is not subject to any scrutiny, while the disruption and activity are not part of EDF's figures. To compound this, EDF give no indication of what this will add to the overall cost of the project. EDF's track record on delivering projects to budget is a very poor one, so I'm afraid that this only enhances my lack of confidence in their financial projections.

I would like to ask why EDF's apparently strong objections to desalination - as outlined in their Water Supply Update (Document AS-202) - have evaporated without apparent trace or acknowledgement. In that document EDF stated: 'This option has been discounted in favour of alternative options, due to concerns with power consumption, sustainability, cost, and wastewater discharge. The desalination process is typically energy intensive, and the discharge of brine water as a result of desalination may not be suitable for discharge through the combined drainage outfall (CDO)'.

Please tell me what has changed to cause the remarkable strategic u-turn that now sees EDF presenting water salivation as a pivotal part of their proposal.

In addition to the above, the prospect of a water desalination plant presents some very worrying concerns:

- water discharged will be 1.6 times more (brine) concentrated than natural seawater and will probably exceed screening thresholds for zinc and chromium. This will have a very concerning impact on fish and other marine life.
- the plant will take 4-6 months to build, with supply by road being the only viable

option as it has to be installed at the very beginning of construction

- drinkable water will need to be brought in by tanker for the first 9-12 months of construction (c.40 trucks per day, meaning 80 movements). I find it hard to accept EDF's assertion that this will not raise HGV 'caps'.

- The plant would operate 24/7 using diesel generators until onsite power is available. This will contribute to significant CO2, Nitrogen Oxides, and PM 10s and 2.5s. Atmospheric Ozone will also increase as a result of the combination of NOx and volatile organics which have health impacts.

I continue to be alarmed at the continued and repeated additions to EDF's planning submissions relating to Sizewell C, and the water desalination proposal in particular illuminates the poor planning and superficial consultation that has characterised this project from the start.

Yours sincerely

Paul Taylor

Paul Taylor

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and any text below it.