

## Reservoir Problems

### Comments:

- We note that you have more or less completely ignored the adverse comments against the Reservoir in your first round of consultation. Why? This is very revealing about your commercial aims to bring about a reservoir at all costs.
- You have not answered concerns on flooding risk. You have tried to hide the fact that your own consultants state there is insufficient flood compensation area within the proposed site for any reservoir above 75 million cubic meters
- Your recent application to increase the size of the reserved area for the Reservoir ignores recent new-builds and seems to interfere with the new Abingdon flood relief scheme. You give no reason for the increase. We believe this requested change is very unwise.
- Any resident of the area knows how close the water table is to the surface in the villages. The pressure of 150 Million tons of water on this area has not been properly assessed.
- Why have you chosen 6% emergency water storage in the UTR when all your other reservoirs are 15-20%? This will lead to water quality problems in the shallow pool remaining in the reservoir at the end of a long (15 month plus) drought. As you claim that you are trying to get better drought resilience, this is a cavalier attitude. It can only be motivated by the fact that you want the reservoir to appear to be as big a source as possible – for commercial positioning reasons. We support the GARD view that emergency storage should be 15-20%.
- The reservoir is being marketed as 'resilient' to droughts, but it is manifestly not, as it does not bring 'new' water into the Thames area, merely stores what is there – in competition with the London Reservoirs. The case for the reservoir's drought resilience rests on the prediction that it will always fill up in winter – yet you already struggle to fill the existing London reservoirs in dry winters
- The reservoir is being 're-branded' as a 'storage and distribution hub' and the whole network is being misleadingly labelled as a 'Water Transfer' solution. The National Infrastructure Commission has called for INTER-REGIONAL transfers. This scheme is clearly not such a scheme and should not be referred to as such
- You explicitly make reference to the costs of the reservoir being offset by sales to other water companies. However, we note that, since 2017, all potential south-east companies, except your co-promoters Affinity, have withdrawn their interest.
- We find your Environmental Assessments completely biased for the reservoir. You continually try to extract 'benefits' from the reservoir, but these are only hypothetical, and depend on third parties to implement them. In some cases, the benefits consist of restoration of amenities (footpaths, wildlife areas) that your reservoir construction has destroyed in the first place! On the other hand, the negative impacts of the construction – noise, traffic disturbance, transport of huge quantities of material to site by HGV and train movements (4 million tons of rip-rap alone) – will definitely happen and take years to end.