

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Decommissioning of the desalination plant, comments on the ExA's proposed Requirement 8(3)" at Deadline 10.
Date: 12 October 2021 20:42:35

Dear ExA,
IP No 20026173

With reference to the ExA rule 17 letter.

While I understand that it is the intention of the ExA to make sure the DCO contains wording to ensure the Applicant's proposed desalination plant has to be removed before operation, I consider it inappropriate to put forward wording when the full environmental impact of siting a desalination plant in an AONB with many national and international designations has not been fully considered or thoroughly scrutinised. In fact, I struggle to understand how the siting of a desalination plant can be considered appropriate for an AONB and anyone who has been following this sorry saga will know that is precisely what the Applicant stated in their own documentation. I think it is imperative that the ExA and IP's have the opportunity to examine the Applicant's original environmental assessment discounting the credentials of the now proposed desalination plant.

I also have concerns regarding the following statement in the ExA rule 17 letter

"It is clear that the desalination plant is only required for the construction phase. It has been assessed on that basis. It has not been assessed for the operational phase"

The ExA authority may be clear that the proposed desalination plant is only required for the construction phase in its proposed location but this does not exclude an environmental damaging desalination plant being proposed for the 60 year operational and the decommissioning phase elsewhere on the Suffolk Coast. I also question on what bases has the proposed desalination plant been assessed as there appears to be a shortfall in the Applicant's information. Given the Applicant's track record at HPC for renegeing on matters agreed in the HPC DCO my concern is that if construction of SZC is allowed to start without a confirmed source of potable water for operation and decommissioning the SZC project will be deemed as too advanced to fail and a desalination plant will be sited elsewhere on the Suffolk Coast by default.

The Applicant's "water supply strategy" a strategy without any potable water, this late in the DCO process calls into question, once again, the competency of the Applicant. The need for a desalination plant for construction and potentially operation of the SZC project demonstrates that the SZC proposals are not sustainable for the site. With East Anglia being one of the driest areas in the UK and predicted climate change droughts, one would think the Applicant would have used this knowledge when assessing which site in their ownership would be most capable of satisfying their EPR designs insatiable thirst as it clearly is not capable at the proposed SZC site. I hope the ExA will take these and the many valid comments made by TASC, Stop Sizewell C and the many knowledgeable Parish Councillors at ISH 15 and recommend refusal of the Applicant's environmentally damaging SZC project.

Yours faithfully
Jennifer Wilson

The lack of

[REDACTED]