



www.saveourlandsandriver.org.uk

Chris Murray MBE
Chair
Water Resources South East

By email to contact@wrse.org.uk

16 June 2026

Dear Mr Murray

As the architects of the Regional Best Value Plan, we are writing to formally contest the continued selection of the Teddington Direct River Abstraction (TDRA) as the "preferred" Best Value option in Thames Water's plan.

At Gate 2, you sidelined other schemes like Mogden Recycling (priced at 132p in terms of average incremental cost (AIC)) in favor of Teddington (priced at 63p). At this point Thames Water focused on TDRA and this continues to be the case. The comparison made at Gate 2 was fundamentally flawed. The Mogden price was based validly on a proposed 365 day operation. The Teddington price was also based on 365 day operation but its role as an emergency asset means it will sit idle, on average, for 320 days a year. In addition, with Thames to Affinity Transfer (T2AT) now "indefinitely deferred" as of May 2025, TDRA's status as a "regional" asset has collapsed,

The corrected price of TDRA is 512p i.e 7.5 times the figure that drove its Best Value selection, facing customers with the most expensive scheme in RAPID's list of major projects and being asked to pay about 3 times the current price per litre of water delivered to their tap.

We would therefore be grateful if you could clarify the following questions;

- WRSE is responsible for quality assurance checks so did you miss or simply accept, and on what specific basis, a 700% plus discrepancy in the unit cost of a core scheme ?
- Why did you select TDRA when your own Final Plan explicitly states that schemes using environmental buffers (like the Mogden option you rejected) are "more suitable".



- Why does your June 2025 "Final" plan still include the T2AT as a core strategic scheme when the recipient company withdrew a month earlier. Did you update your Best Value model and what did it show because as currently stated it must be out of date and invalid.
- By accepting the "Capacity Phantom" in your least cost modeling, have you not effectively gamed your own best value selection process, favouring an expensive "fire extinguisher" over cheaper, more consistent alternatives. How did you reflect on this choice ?
- What discussion did you have on a scheme that treats and dumps 15 million litres of treated sewage a day—at customer expense—for zero water benefit in terms of meeting the WRSE objective of "making best use of available water resources".

We look forward to hearing from you and are, of course, more than happy to discuss any and all matters raised here over the phone to clarify anything that is not clear.

Yours sincerely

Ian McNuff

Founder Member, Save Our Lands and River (SOLAR)

C.C Munira Wilson MP, Sarah Olney MP