

**From:** [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]

**Sent:** Thursday, January 09, 2014 1:58 PM

**To:** Thames Tunnel

**Subject:** Thames Tideway Tunnel - Examining Authority - Second Written Questions and Requests for Information - Q26.2

Dear Jan Bessell

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions - a UK Government Obligation and a requirement of the National Policy Statement for Waste Water - is now demanded by the Treasury with their 'Infrastructure Carbon Review' report of November 2013, and this requires a full evaluation of the environmental benefits and costs of all feasible alternatives for new Infrastructure, but this was not undertaken properly for the planning of the proposed Central London drainage improvements, resulting in the incorrect statements on Alternatives in the Tideway Tunnel Application, since if done correctly it would demonstrate the environmental and cost advantages of established methods such as Separation, which by their nature will reduce waste water volumes and energy usage, and will be cleaner and cheaper to operate, in comparison to a giant sewer tunnel under the Thames which will greatly increase energy usage and emissions, does not meet the NPS requirements and is not a good thing to build for the future.

David Percival MICE  
Croydon