

From: RAPID
Subject: FW: Feedback re consultation on Strategic regional water resource solutions: accelerated gate two draft decision for water recycling

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 April 2022 16:50
To: RAPID <RAPID@ofwat.gov.uk>
Subject: Feedback re consultation on Strategic regional water resource solutions: accelerated gate two draft decision for water recycling

I write further to my feedback email of Wed 06 Apr that was re the Havant Thicket Raw Water Transfer.

This email is re the consultation on water recycling using Option B.5, the recycling solution comprising the treatment of final effluent from a wastewater treatment works via a water recycling plant (WRP) to an environmental buffer lake where it mixes with water from the River Itchen before being fully treated to potable standard at Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW) to provide a potable water supply.

The risks of delivering Option B.4 are very high because of the potential environmental impacts, so further consideration of Option B.5 must be maintained as a less risky option. I also question why the effluent recycling plant is proposed to be in Havant for B.5 when recycled water can just be pumped north from Peel Common (Fareham), why bring it another 10km east, then have to take the water back west, it does not make any sense and adds unnecessary pipeline costs and long term pumping costs for customers. Waste water from Budds Farm should be piped west to Peel Common where the WRP should be built and the combined Budds Farm and Peel Common output should then be piped to Otterbourne.

As the water in the bespoke environmental buffer lake at Otterbourne can be contained and is for the specific purpose of effluent recycling, with no need for discharges to existing stream/ rivers, it would be a better environmental solution than Havant Thicket Reservoir. Southern Water specifically flag in their Gate 2 Annex 5, Page 138/139 that there are potential benefits to the sensitive coastal waters of adopting Option B.5 rather than Option B4:

There are potential benefits on the water environment associated with B.5 as some flows would be diverted from the Peel Common WTW LSO which is a less well mixed environment than the Eastney (Budds Farm) Long Sea Outlet”.

Thus Option B.5 seems to be a preferred option suggesting that, as a matter of urgency, SW need to actively progress the actions set out on page 11 of their Gate 2 summary document where it stated;

“The following actions will be carried out to develop the Back-up Option B.5 beyond Gate 2:

- Investigate potential for storage at Otterbourne WSW via a new environmental buffer lake.
- Investigate potential alternative routes from the Water Recycling Plant to the Otterbourne environmental buffer lake; and
- Investigate whether additional storage capabilities would provide benefits in a 1-in-500 drought”.

Another concern is that in the Ofwat consultation on Option B5 it is mentioned on page 10, 12 & 27 approving Gate 3 funding that the funding for Option B.5 should be reduced as it is only a back up/ alternative option to B.4 (Havant Thicket Reservoir). This reduction should not be done and Option B.5 should be developed further.

Other things worth noting from the Option B.5 Ofwat consultation:

1. Page 6 identifies a number of risks associated with the effluent recycling Option B.5. These risks will be the same for Option B.4 (effluent recycling via Havant Thicket Reservoir) but they are not mentioned on page 6 of the Ofwat Havant Thicket Consultation, thus seemingly making the latter seem better. Example risks are;

- No approved reverse osmosis membranes being available for the water recycling plant.
- Customers do not consider recycled water to be wholesome and acceptable.

In addition the reverse osmosis membranes not having regulatory consent is referenced on page 6 and 15/16.

I suggest that Ofwat and Southern Water focus on the alternative Option B.5 (75 Megalitres/day (Ml/d) Recycled water from Budds Farm WwTW and Peel Common WwTW sent to an Environmental Buffer Lake and treated at Otterbourne WSW) as a more acceptable option in both environmental and long-term costs if there is a need (and an approved process) to use recycled effluent.

Yours

[redacted]

Resident of Rowlands Castle Parish

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
