

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Re PD-050 Consultation for Temporary Desalination Plant
Date: 24 September 2021 22:46:03

Dear ExA

My Ref 20026173

I am really struggling with the fact that the ExA has decided to accept the Applicant's change 19 request so late in the day of the DCO process and my consultation response to EDF is below. Cooling water is such an important part of the construction and safe operation of a nuclear power station one would assume that a competent developer would make sure that what they are proposing for a particular site is sustainable from its infancy. The most infuriating thing here is once again local residents had warned EDF over ten years ago that this would be an issue. I personally believe the fact that the Applicant refuses to acknowledge this and other discrepancies in the consultation process shows their arrogant and indifferent attitude to local concerns.

The DCO process has been extremely frustrating especially when the Applicant's representatives are allowed to make sweeping claims which are left unchecked, which was the case with the desalination plant at ISH 11 when Mr Rhodes said words to the effect that desalination plants are not that polluting and their environmental impact should not be exaggerated. This contradicts their own documentation in the Applicant's January 2021 DCO AS-202 Appendix 2.2.D it states, in reference to installing a desalination plant, "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)"

I would also like to take this opportunity to say that I think the Applicant has under stated the impact their proposals have had on the mental health of residents and Interested parties. The fact that the Applicant, The ONR and BEIS are refusing to acknowledge that there are potentially serious issues with the EPR reactor design proposed for the Sizewell site, and that the French Govt do not plan anymore of this type of reactor to be built in France due to the issues at Flamanville, has added to my own personal frustrations and anxiety levels. The concern is that no one person or statutory body is ultimately responsible. To read that the ONR has not identified any reason so far as to why a site licence will not be issued when the proposals are for a flawed technology sited on an eroding coast, with no potable cooling water is quite frankly astonishing.

So we are now over 80% through the DCO process to site a flawed technology in an AONB on an eroding coastline, damaging a SSSI, impacting many national and international designations and there is still no potable water, no funding, no proven deliverable transport system, no proof that the site can be kept safe for its lifetime (and personally I think this should be indefinitely as we need to acknowledge that there is no GDF and quite likely never will be) and no design suitable to the AONB setting.

For the reasons set out above and many more I fully endorse what Jenny Kirtley from TASC said at ISH 12 that the Applicant's SZC project has caused anxiety and a sense of impending doom. The fact the Applicant's representative Mr Phillpot first reaction was to smirk at Jenny Kirtley comments highlights that they have no comprehension of what it has been like for residents for over 10 years who love, appreciate and want to protect the environment they live in.

Yours faithfully
Jennifer Wilson