

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Desalination Plant Consultation my IP no. 20026083
Date: 24 September 2021 23:59:10

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I write with reference to your decision to accept the Applicant's change 19 regarding their proposals for a desalination plant. I believe that it is totally unacceptable for the Applicant to introduce such a major change to the project so close to the end of the Examination period. This is either down to the Applicant's incompetence for not having resolved an issue that has been apparent for a decade or has been wilfully contrived to avoid maximum scrutiny of a controversial proposal. Neither answer paints the Applicant in a good light.

Having listened to the discussions about the water management strategy at ISH11, it is clear that even the initial proposals for the desalination plant have changed, in that it is clear that the Applicant has the intention to use the desalination plant throughout the whole period of construction. It is my belief that the Applicant will try to keep the plant as a permanent source of water.

Given the total absence of supporting environmental impact of assessments, there is little I can add to my consultation comments at this stage. This are set out below for your information.

Yours faithfully

Chris Wilson

From: Chris Wilson [REDACTED]

Sent: 27 August 2021 23:24

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Desalination Plant Consultation

IP no.20026083

Consultation Response regarding the Temporary Desalination Plant Water Supply Strategy Update

Having been engaged in the SZC DCO process for a number of years now, I firstly wish to advise that I am appalled that the Applicant now wishes to introduce such a major change so late in the DCO process. However, given the Applicant's abysmal track record throughout the whole pre-application consultation and during the period since the DCO application was submitted, I am not surprised. The fact that the consultation period is only for a short period during the busiest holiday period while trying to fully engage in the DCO process, is quite frankly intolerable. The Applicant seems to have made a habit of running consultations at times that make it difficult to respond, such as during main holiday times or the Christmas period. I would further add, I understand that the DCO process was established to fast-track large development projects, but this was on the proviso that projects were front-loaded. The SZC project has been anything but front-loaded and the panic that seems to have beset the Applicant with acceptance that they do not have a secure, sustainable potable water supply at the eleventh hour, must fall squarely on their own shoulders, having been told throughout the last decade by the local community that water supply was a major concern. Typically, the Applicant has ignored the voices of the local community and I suspect they will no doubt do so again with dealing with this proposal, However, in the hope that the Applicant will take cognisance of the concerns of local residents, I would like to make the following observations about the proposal for a desalination plant:-

1. Given the need for considerable amounts of potable water over the full 150-year+ lifetime of Sizewell C (SZC), from construction through to decommissioning, I believe the entire project is unsustainable, especially if water is sourced from anywhere in East Anglia. The intention to take water from the Waveney is not acceptable-it is a relatively small river which is notable wildlife-rich wetlands, and this should not be put at risk because of the SZC project. The issue of water shortages has been highlighted by the recent AR6 report from the IPCC which warns of likely shortages of drinking water in years to come.

2. The desalination plant (DP) will use considerable amounts of diesel during the first period of use and its operation will introduce airborne pollution to a very environmentally sensitive location as well as running the risk of diesel spills. The consultation document provides no assessment of the environmental impact.
3. The vast amounts of sea water passing through the system introduce an unacceptable risk from leakages into the surface water and groundwater, with the Sizewell Marshes SSSI and other linked wildlife sites being at particular risk.
4. There is no recognition within the consultation document of the carbon footprint (CF) of this proposal. This needs to be added to the CF of the entire project (as does the CF of the construction of the 28km pipe from Barsham).
5. The consultation document fails to provide an assessment of the likely impact on the marine environment resulting from the brine and chemical residues that will be dumped back into the sea, thereby adversely impacting marine biota.
6. The consultation document fails to provide an assessment of the marine biota that will be killed by entrapment in the water intake pipe.
7. The consultation document does not provide details of how and where the 'salt cake' will be dealt with and what its environmental impact will be.
8. The Applicant stated in January of this year [per table 1.2, Appendix 2.2D, page 11 AS-202] that, in respect of installing a modular DP *"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 believe the Applicant was correct with this assessment.

For the above reasons, I believe that the desalination plant proposal should be rejected. It is too environmentally damaging and not something that should be in an AONB as it will have adverse impacts on the attributes that gave the AONB its designation and on the marine environment.

Yours faithfully

Chris Wilson, [REDACTED]