Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) – Part 1
Date:	12 November 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

Simon Says

Transcript Export
https://www.simonsaysai.com

HW_12NOV_ISH1_PT1
Created on: 2026-11-12 15:15:36
Project Length: 01:32:26
Account Holder: Ryan Ross

File Name: HW_12NOV_ISH1_PT1.mp3
File Length: 01:32:26

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:24 - 00:00:42:28
Good morning, everyone. It's now ten o'clock and time for this hearing to begin. I'd like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing one on the water environment, which is being held in connection with an application for development consent made by Southern Water Services Limited for the Hampshire water transfer and recycling project. Before I go further, please can I check that everyone can hear me clearly? Thank you.

00:00:44:16 - 00:00:52:01
Can I also check with the case manager that the live streaming and recording of this event has begun?

00:00:57:15 - 00:01:15:09
Thank you. My name is Wendy McKay. I'm a bachelor of law non practicing solicitor, and I've been appointed by the secretary of state to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I'm now going to ask the other panel members to introduce themselves to you.

00:01:15:29 - 00:01:29:05
Good morning. My name is Maria Rokitska. I'm a chartered scientist and a chartered environmentalist, I and have also been appointed by the secretary of state to examine this application. I will be leading the main part of the hearing today.

00:01:30:04 - 00:01:40:21
Good morning. My name is Sharon Bennett Matthews. I hold an LLB. I am a non practicing solicitor, and I have been appointed by the secretary of state to examine this application.

00:01:41:17 - 00:01:59:01
Thank you. Together, we constitute the examining authority for this application. We also have one other planning inspector here today, Delphine Byford, who is attending the venue purely for training purposes and to observe the proceedings.

00:02:00:17 - 00:02:28:01

I'd also like to introduce the members of the planning inspectorate's case team who are supporting us here today. We have missus Norris, case manager for this project, and Lulu Pattellano here in the venue, whilst Ramiel Burnie is dealing with the virtual side of the event. The case team will be able to answer any questions you may have about today's event and the process in general.

00:02:30:07 - 00:02:44:19
I'll now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person. Please, can everyone turn off or set to silent all mobile phones and other devices so as not disturb speakers?

00:02:47:00 - 00:03:21:13
The toilets are located just outside this room. You turn left as you exit the room and then immediately right. There is no fire alarm scheduled for today. Therefore, if the fire alarm does sound, please leave the building by the nearest clear exit and do not reenter the building until instructed to do so by staff. The assembly point is in the rear car park by the wooden building. Is there anyone present who would like assistance in the event of a fire or other emergency?

00:03:24:09 - 00:03:44:28
As far as any breaks are concerned, we intend to take a short fifteen minute midmorning break at around eleven thirty and a longer break for lunch at a convenient point around one o'clock. Another short midafternoon break is proposed at about three thirty if we are not concluded by then.

00:03:47:01 - 00:04:03:18
Now this hearing will generally follow the detailed agenda published on the National Infrastructure Planning website on the twenty seventh of October. It will be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you, and perhaps this could also be displayed on the screen.

00:04:05:18 - 00:04:36:12
We have a series of questions to ask parties on each topic on the agenda. We will also ask for contributions from interested parties where relevant. Please be patient as we ask our questions as these are important to us to gain a full understanding of issues and the positions of the parties. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all our questions have been made, asked, and responded to, and all relevant contributions have been made.

00:04:37:21 - 00:04:59:11
If the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for us to prioritize matters and defer other matters to written questions or further hearings. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or require time to get information, then please can you indicate that you need to respond in writing.

00:05:01:21 - 00:05:24:23
Now today's hearing is being undertaken in a hybrid way, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue, and some of you are joining us virtually using Microsoft Teams. We will make sure that however you have decided to to attend today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate.

00:05:26:18 - 00:06:04:28

A recording of today's hearing will be made available on the Hampshire water transfer and water recycling project section of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as practicable after the hearing is finished. The event is also being live streamed. The only official record of the hearings will be the digital recording placed on the project page of the planning inspectorate's website. Any social media or similar communications arising out of the hearing will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of the application.

00:06:06:16 - 00:06:41:24
With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone stating your name and who you are representing each time before you speak. For those of you at a table with a microphone, please keep them muted using the on off feature when you are not speaking to avoid disturbing other speakers. If you are not at a table with a microphone, there is a roving microphone, so please wait for one of these to be brought to you before you speak.

00:06:43:19 - 00:07:14:14
Our link to the planning inspectorate's privacy notice was provided in the notification of this hearing. We assume that everybody here today has familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. Please speak to a member of the case team here today if you have any questions about this.

00:07:17:13 - 00:08:03:08
On another topic, we are aware of separate criminal proceedings involving Southern Water and former employees about environmental compliance matters. As the criminal proceedings remain ongoing, it is important that nothing is said during the course of this hearing that risks prejudicing those proceedings or their outcome. The examining authority must therefore ensure that submissions made during this public event do not create a risk of interfering with the proper administration of justice, and you should not make references to individuals involved in those separate proceedings.

00:08:04:12 - 00:08:34:29
You may still raise matters such as the question of when and where environmental data was collected and how it was checked if you think it is relevant to this examination. If you wish to do so, then at this stage, we request that you put any such comments in writing at deadline one, identifying the evidence you are referring to and explaining why you considers it matters to the issues under consideration.

00:08:36:07 - 00:09:08:05
We will then decide whether it is important and relevant and how to examine it. You should note the examining authority will intervene when necessary to ensure that a submission does not stray into ongoing criminal proceedings and may redact any references to them before publication. Now now ask my colleague, missus Rekika, to briefly explain the purpose of this issue specific hearing and how it will proceed. Thank you, miss Mackay.

00:09:09:07 - 00:09:27:24
This issue specific hearing is being held to examine matters relating to the water environment that the examining authority has identified through its review of the submissions received to date. Having regard to the relevant representations, the examining authority consider that those matters

00:09:29:12 - 00:10:01:00
would benefit from early questioning and oral submissions. The hearing will consider the scope of the applicant's assessments, interfaces with other assets and regulatory regimes, and the arrangements proposed to manage relevant effects. Its purpose is to ensure that those matters are clearly explained and understood. The hearing will be limited to the matters identified in the agenda. It will not consider in detail other effects of the proposed development.

00:10:01:21 - 00:10:31:11
There are likely to be further issue specific hearings on the specific effects of the proposed development as the examination progresses, along with the opportunity for written representations from any interested party and local impact reports from any local authority at deadline one on the twenty third of November twenty twenty six. As indicated in the agenda, questioning of the hearing will be led by a member of the panel supported by other panel members.

00:10:32:28 - 00:11:23:14
I would ask for those present not to interrupt while another person is giving evidence, even though you may disagree strongly with what is being said. It's important that everyone has a fair opportunity to put their case without interruption or destruction. The Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government guidance for the examination of applications for development consent explains that the examining authority may refuse to hear evidence, which is in its view irrelevant, vexatious or frivolous, relates to merits of a national policy statement, repeats other representations already made, or relates to compensation for compulsory acquisition of land or an interest in or over land.

00:11:24:00 - 00:11:47:19
Additionally, the examining authority may request any person behaving in a disruptive manner to leave the hearing or to remain only if that person complies with specific conditions. Now moving on to introductions, could I ask page three of the agenda to be displayed showing the list of invited attendees.

00:11:51:26 - 00:12:39:03
Higher up. Yes. That's perfect. So in terms of introductions, to help move proceedings along, I do not intend to go around everybody who may wish to speak in the traditional way. Instead, I will first invite the parties listed in the attendees section of the agenda to introduce themselves As we work through the agenda where other parties wish to make relevant comments, I will invite them to introduce themselves and contribute at the appropriate point. For each agenda item, I will generally invite the applicants to respond first, followed by those parties listed in the agenda from whom we are seeking a response on a particular matter, and then any other parties who may wish to make relevant comments.

00:12:39:29 - 00:13:18:11
That should avoid the need to go around the whole room at the outset while ensuring that everyone has an opportunity to contribute on the matters relevant to them. I hope everyone is happy with this approach. Please also be patient as it may not always be possible to come to you straight away, and under each agenda item, there will usually be several questions that we will wish to ask particular attendees before coming to other interested parties. It is also important to note that there is no need to

simply repeat points that have already been made in writing or to repeat points that have been made by others.

00:13:19:06 - 00:13:49:23
Representations made in writing carry equivalent weight to those made orally. I'm now going to invite parties listed in the attendees section to introduce themselves. Please also speak clearly into the microphone, and if you are not at the table with a microphone, wait for a roving microphone. For those with microphones at tables, please keep them muted when you are not speaking. And we start with the applicant, please.

00:13:52:07 - 00:14:27:06
Good morning, madam. My name is Robbie Owen, and I appear for the applicant Southern Water Services Limited. I'm a solicitor. I'm also a partner at the law firm Pinsent Masons. I appear today with two other colleagues to my left, and I would, in a moment, invite them to introduce themselves. In terms of evidence, we have potentially over ten witnesses today. So would it be more convenient to invite themselves to introduce themselves when they first speak in relation to the gender items

00:14:27:10 - 00:14:27:25
Yes.

00:14:27:27 - 00:14:33:15
Rather than now? I thought you might say that. So if I could ask Alison to introduce herself.

00:14:35:03 - 00:14:42:02
Good morning. My name is Alison Dablin. I am a senior associate at St Mason's, and I'm appearing on behalf of the applicant. Thank you.

00:14:43:24 - 00:14:49:17
Good morning, ma'am. My name is Charles Street, and I'm counsel for the applicant instructed by Pinson Masons.

00:14:51:27 - 00:14:55:12
Thank you. Now can we move to Portsmouth Water Limited?

00:14:57:19 - 00:15:27:29
Good morning, madam. My name is Harry Wood Philpot, King's Council. I'm instructed by Alastair Lewis, partner at Sharp Pritchard, who sits to my left, on behalf of Portsmouth Water Limited. We have a number of speakers who are available today depending on what it is the panel wishes to ask. And I think it's likely, though, that I will be calling upon at least one of them who I'll introduce now. The others I'll introduce as we go along. So sat to the left of Mr.

00:15:28:01 - 00:15:58:13
Lewis is Mr. James Henderson. James Henderson is the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Integration Manager at Portsmouth Water. So he takes the technical and operational lead on the interface between Portsmouth Water and Southern Water, which I was one of the matters

you wanted to ask about. And he's a chartered engineer and fellow of the Institute of Engineering and Technology. And if there are others, I'll introduce them as we go along.

00:15:58:18 - 00:15:59:12
Thank you.

00:16:00:27 - 00:16:03:29
Who will be speaking for the Environment Agency, please?

00:16:05:14 - 00:16:36:25
Good morning. My name is Sarah Clark. I am a partner at the law firm TLT, and I am appearing this morning on behalf of the Environment Agency. We have two representatives of the Environment Agency here to assist me in answering your questions this morning. I will introduce them given we've just got two. Sitting next to me is mister Richard O'Callaghan, who is a environment planning and engagement manager at the Environment Agency.

00:16:37:10 - 00:17:05:03
Mr. Callahan has been involved in the application and engaging with the applicants for a considerable period of time. And in addition, we also have Mr. Jeremy Greidan online. Mister Greedon is a senior lawyer within the environment agency who's involved in particular with license applications under the Water Resources Act and, in particular, obstruction and payment licensing regime. Thank you very much.

00:17:05:05 - 00:17:15:10
Thank you. Next on the list is the drinking water inspectorate. The drinking water inspectorate is not attending today's hearing. However,

00:17:17:07 - 00:17:41:29
they have provided a submission, PDA dash zero three eight, setting out its regulatory role and providing information to assist the examination. I will refer to that submission where relevant as we work for those matters. Now let's move on to an online attendees. I've got water services regulation authority,

00:17:44:18 - 00:17:58:26
Yeah. Hello there. I'm Kate Kendall. I'm a director director in the major projects team in Ofwat, I'm and my responsibility is to oversee the project from a regulatory perspective for Ofwat. Thank you.

00:18:00:07 - 00:18:08:03
Thank you very much. And now we've got the Regulators Alliance for Progressing Infrastructure Development, RAPID.

00:18:09:06 - 00:18:13:23
Yes. Hello, everyone. I'm Fiona Lobley, and I'm representing RAPID today.

00:18:16:18 - 00:18:25:15
Thank you. And finally, we've got local authorities. On my list, I've got Winchester City Council first.

00:18:31:09 - 00:18:33:19
Is there anyone representing the council?

00:18:33:21 - 00:18:42:22
Good morning, ma'am. My name's Henrietta Ansa. I'm representing Manchester City Council. I'm a principal planner. Thank you.

00:18:43:17 - 00:18:48:11
Thank you. Good morning. Now I've got Hampshire County Council.

00:18:50:11 - 00:19:17:18
Good morning. My name is James Hammond. I'm a solicitor on behalf of Hampshire County Council. To my left is my colleague, Sarah Rejif, who is the Flood and Water Manager. We're here today in respect of Hampshire County Council's interest as the local flood authority and as invited on the agenda. I don't think there are any particular items we wish to speak to, but we are available to answer questions, perhaps assistance to the examination.

00:19:18:00 - 00:19:18:26
Thank you.

00:19:21:11 - 00:19:25:11
Now I've got Portsmouth City Council.

00:19:30:28 - 00:19:37:12
Good morning, madam. Edward Cherenselton for Portsmouth City Council. I am... I'm not sure why it's...

00:19:40:07 - 00:19:55:11
I'm joined by my... By councilor Hugh Mason, portfolio holder for planning, and Ian Austin, solicitor. We are here mainly to observe, but happy to answer any questions if necessary. Thank you.

00:19:56:04 - 00:20:03:15
Thank you very much. I've got Havant Dorakansal now on my list.

00:20:03:27 - 00:20:16:01
Good morning. My name is David Jobbins. I'm a director at Luke and Beck Planning. I'm a charter town planner. And today I'm representing East Hampshire District Council and the Havant Borough Council. Thank you.

00:20:16:11 - 00:20:17:22
Okay. Thank you very much.

00:20:20:21 - 00:20:43:24

Some further points I would like to make. In terms of any action points, we propose that the applicant keeps a list of action points arising, which can be checked and agreed following the completion of item five. Generally, submissions following an action point should be submitted by deadline one on the twenty third of November twenty twenty six.

00:20:45:10 - 00:20:53:22
And before we move on to the substance of the agenda, does anyone have any questions about the agenda and how this hearing will be conducted?

00:20:57:08 - 00:21:03:15
I don't see any hands raised. We will now move on onto the substantive part of the agenda.

00:21:06:05 - 00:21:29:14
I'm turning to the applicant first asking for a high level explanation of the elements of the scheme. So using graphic three dash one on page eight in a p p dash zero eight two, that's chapter three of the environmental statement, description of the proposed development.

00:21:31:22 - 00:22:11:21
Using that graphic as an illustration, can the applicant provide a brief high level overview of the proposed development, explaining its principal components and how water moves through the from scheme Budd's Farm wastewater treatment works, through the recycling and transfer system, the Havant Thicket reservoir, and ultimately, water supply works, including the route for reject water. I just want to stress, I want this fairly high level contained to five, seven minutes, and the following question will focus on the recycling process itself, so we don't need to explain that in detail.

00:22:14:00 - 00:22:35:09
Thank you, ma'am. Robby Owen for the applicant. We'd be pleased to do that, and I would like to introduce our witness for that purpose, Mrs. Nina Campbell, who is a director of major infrastructure and environment at the consultancy StanTech. Missus Campbell, would you like to introduce yourself, please?

00:22:35:18 - 00:23:08:06
Hello. My name is missus Nina Campbell, and I am speaking on behalf of the applicant. Thank you for bringing up the graphic, which I think is a very useful schematic of the scheme. So you'll see there that the components of the proposed development are shown in the lighter blue, and the applicant's existing network is shown in the darker blue. Portsmouth Water's assets and developments are shown in black. So as you've asked, I'll give a brief overview, and I then think others I'll pass back to Mr.

00:23:08:08 - 00:23:51:00
Robby Owen in relation to more detail. So the project comprises the construction and operation of a water recycling plant with a maximum output of approximately sixty million liters a day of recycled water. It also includes the construction and operation of pipelines between the existing Buds Farm wastewater treatment works and the water recycling plant site. It includes the construction and operation of pipelines between the water recycling plant and Bedhampton Springs and the construction and operation of pipeline between the water recycling site and Otterborne Water Supply Works.

00:23:51:24 - 00:24:29:18
The pipelines would be supported by a number of above ground plant sites, which comprise pumping stations and brake pressure tanks. A full description of the project is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter three, which is at APP dash zero eight two and includes this graphic three one. The project is shown spatially in the environmental statement figure one point one, which is the APP dash two one zero, and on the works plans at a s dash zero zero seven, a...

00:24:29:20 - 00:24:38:04
A s dash zero zero eight, and APP dash zero one four. Thank you.

00:24:42:16 - 00:24:48:21
Robby Owen for the applicant. Did I understand you then to have some questions about the water recycling process, ma'am?

00:24:49:11 - 00:24:52:05
That's my follow-up question. Yes.

00:24:53:26 - 00:25:04:08
The intention is to set up a high level explanation of your project. Now moving on to the water recycling process using the same document,

00:25:06:16 - 00:25:41:09
a p p dash zero eight two graphic three dash seventeen water recycling plant site water recycling process. Using that as an illustration, can the applicant provide a clear and concise overview of the proposed water recycling process explaining the principal treatment stages from receipt of treated water from BOTS farm wastewater treatment works through to the production and transfer of recycled water to Bethampton Springs for onward transfer to Havant Fickett reservoir.

00:25:42:13 - 00:25:56:15
Robby Owens, the applicant. Thank you, ma'am. For that purpose, I'd like to introduce mister Jonathan Greenwell. Mister Greenwell is development development lead for waste and generation at Stantec. Mister Greenwell?

00:25:57:04 - 00:26:30:10
Yes, sir. Mister Jonathan Greenwell, I'm a chartered chemical engineer here representing the applicant. So if we start right at the the start of the system, so BuzzFarm wastewater treatment works is supplied from two silver catchments across the Eastney and Haven catchments. That wastewater treatment works comprises of a primary settlement stage where solids are separated from the incoming flows, and then it supplies a secondary biological treatment stage.

00:26:31:04 - 00:27:02:15
That treatment process is a biological nitrogen removal process. So it is an extended sludge age process, which adds the advantage of having enhanced decomposition of organics as well as nitrogen in the wastewater. And then there is a final stage of settlement, and then that flow passes to the Long

Sea outfall at Peace Near, that highly treated wastewater. So the water recycling plant will intercept that highly treated wastewater and redirect it to the water recycling plant site.

00:27:02:27 - 00:27:35:20
Then the treatment process is what's referred to internationally as a full advanced treatment process. So this is a multi barrier treatment approach, which starts with a microfiltration step. So what microfiltration is doing is it is removing valance and suspended solid matter that would foul the downstream processes. It's also providing a degree of removal of pathogenic organisms, that may be remaining in the highly treated wastewater.

00:27:36:17 - 00:27:47:25
The next step is reverse osmosis. So reverse osmosis is a highly effective broad spectrum barrier technology for removing

00:27:49:20 - 00:28:28:18
contaminants all the way down to the level of viruses and dissolved minerals as well. So that is providing nonselective broad spectrum removal for a lot of the dissolved trace contaminants that may well be remaining in the in the flow. Following that step, there is a process called UV advanced oxidation. So that uses hydrogen peroxide in tandem with a high dose of UV to decompose any residual organics that are carried through from the reverse osmosis process.

00:28:28:20 - 00:29:01:27
It also provides a very high rate of removal for a broad spectrum of pathogenic organisms, be that protozoa, bacteria, or viruses. That is a summary of the full advanced treatment paradigm. So we have then added a further post treatment step to that in the form of granular activated carbon absorption. So that's providing additional organics removal from that water that's coming from the UV advanced oxidation process.

00:29:03:05 - 00:29:35:20
So it's called a multi barrier process because the capability of the different stages overlap one another in order to provide a very, very robust process for providing highly purified water coming out of the water recycling plant. The reverse osmosis process, as I mentioned, is broad spectrum removal of including dissolved minerals. So the water that it produces is very, very low in alkalinity and hardness. So we have also provided a remineralization process.

00:29:35:28 - 00:29:46:12
And that process reintroduces hardness and alkalinity to the water so that it is of appropriate condition to be discharged to the environmental buffer.

00:29:49:18 - 00:29:51:27
Back to mister Oden.

00:29:53:23 - 00:29:54:09
Robbi Oden?

00:29:54:11 - 00:30:21:02

Sorry. Could I just ask? You may or may not have heard the open floor hearing yesterday, but a number of interested parties did raise concerns as to certain contaminants that might remain in the recycled water. Is there anything you want to say to address those specifically? I mean, I think PFAS were mentioned amongst other things.

00:30:24:00 - 00:30:54:22
I I wouldn't look to address individual concentrations that may or may not remain. All I can say is that the treatment approach that has been selected is widely proven internationally. It's been operated successfully for successfully a number of years in other regions around the world, including several installations that have been in operation in areas like North America and California, for example, and also in Singapore as well for about twenty five years now.

00:30:55:14 - 00:31:27:07
So they are recognized as being suitable treatment technologies for the application proposed and do provide very high rates of removal for a broad spectrum of different trace contaminants that may be of concern. Further to that, as part of the piloting trials that we undertook first at Peel Common and then at Buds Farm, we undertook a quantitative risk assessment process considering microbial risk and chemical risk associated with the recycled water.

00:31:27:11 - 00:32:04:13
And the conclusions of that were that the water was deemed to be... To not pro... Create a risk to public health, and that was in the context of using the pilot data, which did not include the additional GAC post treatment step. And it was using a modeled scenario that would... That had a much smaller environmental buffer incorporated. So to that end, it presented a a highly conservative case that could be considered, the worst case for the operational scenario that we would see in this in this configuration of the scheme.

00:32:05:20 - 00:32:37:17
Thank you. Following on from what you just said, I have a question that follows from yesterday's open floor hearing as well. There are multiple submissions by interested parties that the full monitoring results for contaminants of emerging concern at both farm wastewater treatment works and fluid... Through the pilot treatment plant have not been made available, and that only a summary of the monitoring and its findings is provided in the application.

00:32:39:03 - 00:32:45:05
Can the applicant explain why the underlying monitoring results have not been submitted into the examination?

00:32:49:10 - 00:32:50:28
Robby Owen for the applicant.

00:32:53:24 - 00:33:09:06
The application for the development consent order was accompanied by clearly a lot of supporting information, particularly what was required for a full and compliant environmental impact assessment process, the result obviously being the environmental statement.

00:33:10:29 - 00:33:36:28
The judgment was taken as to what was needed to provide that full assessment, and the result is the application that's before you. If there are additional details that you think it'd be helpful to ask for and obtain from us, then obviously you will do that. But we obviously have to make a judgment as to how much information to present because there's a... There's an enormous amount of it.

00:33:37:08 - 00:33:49:24
Thank you. I understand that. But following yesterday's submissions from multiple parties, I would ask the applicant to provide the underlying monitoring results at deadline one.

00:33:52:15 - 00:33:58:03
Thank you, ma'am. Sorry. Thank you. I was just gonna say we we we we will take that away and see what we can provide.

00:33:58:19 - 00:34:28:05
Thank you. Before we move on to the next part of the agenda, the examining authority acknowledges from applicants deadline A submission PDA-one that updated water quality modeling for Havant Fekke reservoir, together with revisions of their environmental statements documents is due to be submitted at deadline one. Therefore, detailed consideration of that updated evidence will take place following the submission.

00:34:30:05 - 00:34:39:28
Now I would like to focus on the Havant Thicket reservoir itself and a potential for harm from introducing recycled water into it.

00:34:43:14 - 00:35:21:01
ES chapter nineteen, APP dash ninety eight, table fifteen dash fifty four on page one hundred and five, assigns Havant Ficket Reservoir a high receptor value. I have not identified a commitment in the applicant's documents to monitor water quality within the reservoir itself. Portsmouth Water Limited and its relevant representation RR two dash five three also notes that the reservoir is not identified as a receptor in the Outline Water Monitoring Plan, APP dash two zero four.

00:35:21:18 - 00:35:52:01
I note that the environment agency in the representation RR dash one zero two confirmed that a new environmental permit will be required for discharge of recycled water from the water recycling plant into Havant Thicket reservoir, and that the outline monitoring plan provides for monitoring downstream and Ryder's Lane stream and Hermitage stream. I've got two questions in relation to...

00:35:52:03 - 00:36:41:16
Well, three in relation to that. Can the applicant, therefore, clarify what water quality monitoring is proposed within the Havant Thicket reservoir during post construction phase and once recycled water is introduced? If no routine monitoring within the reservoir is proposed, how will the applicant verify the modeled predictions of impacts on water quality within the reservoir? And finally, can the applicant explain how the potential persistence or bioaccumulation of contaminants or of emerging concern, including PFAS, will be monitored and whether any other operational or regulatory regime provides for monitoring of those contaminants within the reservoir.

00:36:45:18 - 00:37:16:08
Thank you, ma'am. Robby Owens, the applicant. I think an important point to make here is that Havant Thicket Reservoir, as you will be aware, is currently being constructed by Portsmouth Water and will be its operational asset, and Portsmouth Water will remain will be in charge of the operation and management of the reservoir. In relation to the impact of this project on the water environment in the reservoir.

00:37:17:14 - 00:37:25:26
And I think particularly your first question, I'd like to introduce Mr. Ian Dennis, who I think can help us with that in particular.

00:37:28:02 - 00:37:37:06
Mr. Dennis, would you like to introduce yourself, please? You are a Technical Director, Water Environment at Haskoning DHV UK Limited.

00:37:38:05 - 00:38:21:03
Yes, thank you. Yes, Ian Dennis speaking on behalf of the applicant. As you've noticed, we have considered the effects of releasing the recycled water into Havant Thicket Reservoir as an integral part of the environmental impact assessment presented in Chapter nineteen, Water Environment, that's APP098. Our assessments there, because the reservoir doesn't yet exist, we have worked the applicant has worked with Ports of Water and the Environment Agency to agree approach to how the effects of this should be modeled and looked at and considered within the assessment.

00:38:22:14 - 00:38:54:05
The main bulk of that is presented in ES appendix nineteen point one one, which is the haven't thicket reservoir water quality modeling report, that's APP two zero six. And that basically shows... To cut a very long story short, that shows that although there'll be some small differences in water quality within the reservoir following the introduction of recycled water, the changes are very small.

00:38:54:07 - 00:38:54:27
And at all times,

00:38:56:16 - 00:39:12:28
once things like stabilization effects have been taken into account in the past, water quality will remain consistent with high status, the definition of high status under the water environment regulations. And,

00:39:14:27 - 00:39:25:19
yeah, as as a result of that, that we we we have demonstrated... We we believe we demonstrated there hasn't been a significant adverse effect, which is what we conclude in the in in in the ES chapter.

00:39:26:14 - 00:39:46:18
I understand that. I'm trying to ascertain how are you going to validate that modeling if you are not proposing to monitor the reservoir itself, especially since we had representations pointing out towards bioaccumulation potential in the sediments and aquatic organisms.

00:39:47:15 - 00:40:09:07
Yeah. And I think also from what mister Ome was saying, perhaps it could also be clarified whether... Whose responsibility the monitoring of that reservoir water is gonna be. I think mister Owen may have suggested it's it's down to Portsmouth Water. But if I could have that point clarified as well.

00:40:09:12 - 00:40:15:24
Okay. I'm afraid I'm going to have to hand back to Mr. Owen on that one with regards to operational monitoring, sorry.

00:40:16:15 - 00:40:51:23
Ma'am Brobio of the applicant. These are matters currently being discussed between Southern Water and Portsmouth Water in the context of what's called a bulk supply agreement, which is currently under negotiation. It's a commercial agreement that would support delivery of the project and discussions have been underway on that for some time. And it's something that Ofwat are also to some extent involved in. But that agreement will cover all number of commercial issues and indeed operational issues in terms of the interface between the two projects and how that will work.

00:40:51:25 - 00:41:11:14
But as I say, that is currently a matter for discussion. I don't know whether Mr. Mark Winteringham can comment on the BSA discussions in that respect and perhaps more generally. Mr. Winteringham, you are the Project Director and an employee of Southern Water. Would you like to introduce yourself, please?

00:41:11:21 - 00:41:43:16
Yes. Mark Wintergum, on behalf of the applicant. In terms of book supply agreement, that's an agreement that will exist between the parties to determine how the reservoir will be used and also the payment of for the water that is within the actual reservoir itself. Those negotiations are indeed ongoing And we are moving through to try and get to a conclusion to enable us to incorporate that within these proceedings.

00:41:44:18 - 00:42:08:08
I think we are going cover to this a bit more under item five when we are talking about the interfaces with ports of water assets. I was trying to focus here on the impacts related to potential bioaccumulation and contaminants of emerging concern, specifically within the reservoir. So are those two issues linked at the moment? Is that what you're saying?

00:42:09:18 - 00:42:11:18
Robby, over the applicant, yes, they are linked.

00:42:14:07 - 00:42:19:15
I don't know if Portsmouth Water want to add anything at this stage on that point.

00:42:19:17 - 00:42:51:09
Madam, yes. Harriet with Philpot, King's Council on behalf of Portsmouth Water Limited. I appreciate your intending to come to us in due course, and we'll have an opportunity to discuss some of the

interactions in more detail later, but just by way of headlines at the moment. And the applicant has made two points, which directly engage the later items, and in particular, Article five. The first is saying, well, this is an asset that will be controlled by Portsmouth Water.

00:42:51:11 - 00:43:13:18
In other words, don't look to us. As you have seen from Article V, Article V provides provision for the applicant to direct how the reservoir is used and also with various step in rights to take direct control. And I won't go into detail with those at the moment. But Article V certainly

00:43:15:14 - 00:43:55:28
adds complexity to the answer that's just been given. It's certainly not a position where it's simply Portsmouth Water's asset for it to control, would that, that were the case. The second point, which is related, is to do with the reliance on the bulk supply agreement. And the bulk supply agreement is something that is being negotiated. We'll talk about it in more detail in due course. But what Article V seeks to do is to set up an arrangement that would arise and apply if the bulk supply agreement is either not in place or for some reason it's not in effect.

00:43:56:00 - 00:44:27:18
So the DCO makes specific provision for what should happen in the absence of an effective bulk supply agreement. So this is a matter that needs to be bottomed out because the DCO does make provision, which means it is not something that either can be left simply to my client or to the bulk supply agreement. Neither of those are a satisfactory answer in the light of Article five. Now we do have specific concerns about this, as it's been raised earlier.

00:44:27:20 - 00:44:34:23
I'm in your hands as to whether you want us to go into those now, to summarize them in due course, whatever is most helpful to you.

00:44:34:25 - 00:44:38:08
I think we'll hear on that later. You.

00:44:38:10 - 00:44:38:25
Very well.

00:44:43:07 - 00:45:07:20
Robbie Owen for the applicant. Ma'am, I think we can assist in this respect that our understanding is it has been agreed that Waterford Water will be responsible for monitoring the quality of the water in the reservoir. In terms of monitoring of the overall water recycling process, Mr. Greenwell can certainly assist further. Mr. Greenwell?

00:45:07:25 - 00:45:38:22
Mr. Jonathan Greenwell for the applicant. So in terms of what the applicant can and will measure in relation to your question, the highly treated recycled water itself will be subject to a discharge permit, and that is coming under the established regulatory framework and is in development in collaboration with the environment agency at the moment.

00:45:39:06 - 00:46:14:21
So a lot of the development there falls outside of the scope of what is discussed in the draft DCO. But if I sort of take a step back and talk about the the evidence that we've gathered and how that's been used to inform the proposal, The... I've previously referenced the the pilot plant that we we tested. In support of that, we we utilized international experience, engaging experts who have designed, built, and operated these kinds of facilities elsewhere.

00:46:14:23 - 00:46:51:13
And we've used their experience as well as knowledge of the the local catchment for the BUDS Farm wastewater treatment works to design the sampling program that the data that was referred to earlier in relation to the pilot plant was designed upon to represent a broad selection of different contaminants of emerging concern, including pharmaceuticals and personal care products, industrial chemicals, agricultural chemicals as well. And that gives us sort of broad representation of the performance of the facility in relation to those different groupings of substances.

00:46:52:26 - 00:47:30:17
Further to that, we have undertaken and are actively undertaking sampling program in relation to the established environmental quality standard substances. And at the request of the environment agency, we are also monitoring or sampling for the the list of... There was a hundred and thirteen substances under the chemical investigation program phase four. And that chemical investigation program is designed to be keeping track of the sort of highest risk contaminants of emerging concern as they are identified.

00:47:31:23 - 00:48:05:13
And so we have been undertaking that. And as part of the pre application process, that data has been submitted to the environment agency for assessment, it's it's within their remit to assess the potential for impact of those substances and to judge whether that would then require control under the environmental permit. So given that we are following that due process, that, in itself using the established regulatory framework provides that control on protecting the reservoir in the chemical status element under WFD.

00:48:06:02 - 00:48:11:22
Thank you. I appreciate that. I will turn into the environment agency in a moment.

00:48:13:14 - 00:48:28:17
I would like to reiterate my earlier point that it would be desired to get the results, the full results submitted into the examination, so other interested parties could also actively participate in reviewing those.

00:48:31:03 - 00:48:41:27
Could I just add as well that the the data that I referred to under the chemical investigation program is already available to everybody as it was submitted in full to the environment agency?

00:48:44:24 - 00:48:49:28
Okay. I will allow mister Newbury to make a comment at this stage.

00:48:52:00 - 00:49:18:11
Tracy Viney, Water Matters on behalf of the community. We recently did a environmental information request to the environment agency. It was answered only a few weeks ago, and they indicated they only had summary data. We've certainly only been provided with summary data, and that summary data gives lots of results to zero rather detection than limit. So that information is certainly not in the public domain as far as we're concerned, and we do continue to request it.

00:49:21:22 - 00:49:27:10
Robby, over to the applicant. As we committed to ten minutes ago, we will provide what we can at deadline one.

00:49:27:24 - 00:49:44:19
Thank you. I appreciate that. Turning now to the environment agency. I'll come back to the environment agency's wider regulatory role under the next agenda item four, but at this stage, I would like to ask specific questions related to monitoring and management of the reservoir.

00:49:46:04 - 00:50:02:26
Can the environment agency advise whether it anticipates that the environmental permit will include requirements for monitoring water quality within Havant Thicket reservoir itself as distinct from monitoring the quality of the discharge from the water recycling plant.

00:50:05:05 - 00:50:29:04
Rich DeCullahan, Environment Agency. So we're currently in pre application process for the discharge permit. So I'm probably not in a position to confirm exactly what would be in that permit. But I think all of those monitoring conditions, including the condition of any receiving water, would be part of those discussions as part of pre application.

00:50:32:10 - 00:50:45:23
Could the environment agency explain whether such monitored... And I appreciate that you can't state definitely at this point, but I'm looking to us... Ascertain if it's going to be regulated going forwards.

00:50:47:21 - 00:51:03:10
Could you explain whether such monitoring could include contaminants of emerging concern, including PFAS, and whether the permit would provide mechanisms for the monitoring requirements to be reviewed or varied should new contaminants or environmental risks emerge.

00:51:05:03 - 00:51:08:02
So in terms of emerging substances,

00:51:09:29 - 00:51:42:02
I think all our discharge permits are based on where we have environmental quality standards. We do not have environmental quality standards for every single substance. For emerging substances, as as, I guess, the the phrase suggests, the science is still evolving, and our understanding and our monitoring and information that we have around those substances is growing. We would reflect our current understanding and the current evidence base in any determination of any application that we receive.

00:51:43:15 - 00:52:15:17
I believe today, I think we're releasing a new report on emerging substances, which will be another step forward in terms of understanding how some of those substances exist in the environment and how long they may persist in some of those water environments. So it is a changing scientific area, but we would reflect in our permits what the evidence base is at that time. And in terms of the question around varying any of those permits, then we can consider whether or not there is a need to review or amend permits.

00:52:16:02 - 00:52:28:05
But is not that necessarily a normal thing to have in a discharge permit. But again, I think that would be part of our conversations around exactly what ends up in the discharge permit once we receive an application, which we have yet to receive.

00:52:30:14 - 00:52:57:14
I'm asking these questions questions because we had a request to consider novel adaptive monitoring provisions within the DCO itself, and I'm trying to understand whether the environmental permitting regime is going to already cover the emerging environmental quality, the emerging standards, and and whether you've got those mechanisms under your control that will allow you to deal...

00:52:57:16 - 00:53:12:08
So we we we have a list all the of substances where there are established environmental quality standards. That list is reviewed regularly. So if new substances come onto that, then they would come into scope for consideration with any new permits that we issue.

00:53:14:14 - 00:53:21:00
Okay. Thank you. Would Portsmouth Water Limited like to make a comment at this stage?

00:53:22:11 - 00:53:52:16
Adam, yes. My name is Harriet Philpott on behalf of Portsmouth Water. If I can just I'm going to turn the moment to Mr. Henderson to ask him to deal with some points. But just by way of context, Portsmouth Water is our relevant representations make clear. Don't object to the principle of recycled being stored water in its reservoir. We're satisfied that in principle that can be done in a way that's safe, both for the environment and our customers.

00:53:52:28 - 00:54:32:04
The concerns that we have are about the arrangements that need to be put in place to manage the interaction between the scheme and the reservoir, including what happens if something goes wrong. There are two specific concerns that go directly to the matters that you've just been asking about and water quality monitoring that I'm going to ask Mr. Henderson to address. The first is the protection of Bedhampton Springs. And the second is Portsmouth Water's ability to decide what water is admitted to its reservoir at commissioning and during operation and to take appropriate action if the quality of that water deteriorates.

00:54:32:09 - 00:54:36:07
Those are the two specific things I'd like Mr. Henderson to deal with now, if I may.

00:54:38:14 - 00:55:16:22
James Henderson, Portsmouth Water. I'll start with point two with regards to admission of water reservoir. And as Mr. Full Pot said, we have no objection to in principle to the reserve water entering into the reservoir. The acceptance comes after a period of three years of modeling, which one's taking with the applicant to determine the best advanced treatment process, which is to be installed at the water recycling plant. And the water quality parameters that were the result of those tests are something which is going to be forming part of the bulk supply agreement between the two organizations.

00:55:18:06 - 00:55:54:29
Our biggest concern is that the draft order as it contains at the moment, it does not refer to any of the water quality results that were part of that water quality modeling and also relies and when questioned with the applicant, the applicant has returned to say that they will be relying on the environmental permit, which is yet to be agreed. And so therefore, we have a concern that the eventual permit that is going to be issued to the applicant will necessarily not follow the three years of modeling that was undertaken between the two parties.

00:55:58:22 - 00:56:02:00
With regards to Point one and Bedhampton,

00:56:03:23 - 00:56:30:10
with the protection of Bedhampton Springs is slightly different from what we've been talking to, but it's a new point for us. And Bedhampton Springs is a critical source of supply for ports and forter. It's one of its primary sources, which helps to serve its seven hundred thousand people within its region. The applicant's pipeline that is proposed to run from the BuzzFarm

00:56:31:28 - 00:56:37:11
works to Bedhampton, which is shown on sheet four on AS eight,

00:56:39:01 - 00:57:19:07
runs directly through the Source Protection Zone one, which has been highlighted by the Environment Agency. There is a foundation work... A foundation works risk assessment that the applicant has undertaken. But unfortunately, during that assessment, a key screening measure with regards to the pipeline's vicinity to the source protection zone and the points of abstraction has been clearly marked as no with regards to the limitations with regards to the distances in relation to where that pipe is going to be in relation to the SPZ.

00:57:19:26 - 00:57:43:05
And so we would request that the applicant relooks at the risk assessments associated with that pipeline and then relook at the environmental risk assessment porting to it. And the second point at Bedhampton Springs is that the applicant has indicated that the pipeline after

00:57:44:25 - 00:58:07:21
rising from the reception pit from the tunnel boring machine exercise is going to be a mixture of open cut and aboveground pipeline installation. And that's right across the current source protection zone

area, which we would massively oppose, and we would request that all of that pipeline is to be installed above ground.

00:58:10:04 - 00:58:19:17
Thank you. I do have related questions to the environment agency, but before I go back, I would like the applicant to please respond to those points.

00:58:20:23 - 00:58:23:26
Thank you. I think there are two points we'd like to respond on.

00:58:25:19 - 00:58:26:20
The first

00:58:29:12 - 00:59:04:26
concerns what we touched on yesterday, known as the Gateshead principle, and we were saying yesterday that that is supported by the national policy statement. It's also supported by other planning policy, namely the National Planning Policy Framework, most recently reissued in September, I think it was this year. And there's also plenty of judicial authority on this. And I'd like to invite Mr. Streeton just to address you on this subject because it is an important one, and we feel that

00:59:06:21 - 00:59:17:18
various parties, including what Portsmouth Water have just told you, are in effect seeking through the DCO process to duplicate what is the environment agency's job. Mr. Streitman?

00:59:18:24 - 00:59:55:28
Yes, ma'am. So it's obviously very helpful to have heard from the agency that they condition permits and the nature of the conditions that they might impose. But I think what we want to be really clear about is that it's not the purpose of the DCO examination itself to go into what those conditions would or might be because the way in which the gate head... Gateshead principle operates is that it expects you to rely on the agency to do their job as they no doubt will competently and therefore to assume that the conditions that they impose on any permit will secure the environmental standards that they are required to.

00:59:56:00 - 01:00:37:07
And as the agency explained to you where there are changes, then they will take that into account when they issue a permit and make sure it's based on the most up to date scientific evidence. But I think what we want to be clear about is that the effect of the Gateshead principle is that you should take as read that the agency will do that. And that's obviously, as Mr. Owen has just said, enshrined in the NPS, WRA at paragraph at three point eight point three itself. So we just want to, make clear indeed when Portsmouth Water are talking to you about what they are concerned about in terms of what might be the subject of an environmental permit that really isn't within the scope of what you need to consider in the examination.

01:00:38:25 - 01:01:25:10
Thank you. I have not at this point. I am going to be referring to that NPS three point eight point three part later today. Turning to the environment agency, we've got the confirmation that the new

environmental permit will be required for the discharge of recycled water. Can... Could the environment agency clarify whether that permit would be expected to include contingency arrangements where monitoring identifies an unacceptable change in water quality? And in particular, would the permit be capable of requiring changes to restrictions on or suspension of the discharge where necessary to protect water quality within the Havant Fickett reservoir itself?

01:01:29:07 - 01:02:01:20
Thank you. I will hand over to mister O'Callaghan to address that point in just a moment. Just a couple of points from us. Firstly, in response to the comments that have just been made about the scope of the examination, We recognize, as the NPS does, that it is the scope of this panel to seek the views of the regulator on what will and will not be within the scope of the regulatory regimes. That's very much why we're here today and what we want to do. I guess it's not for now, but as you will be well aware, the draft DCO does seek to modify these regulatory regimes.

01:02:01:27 - 01:02:33:21
And therefore, we are giving views on the basis of what we would see as being the ordinary position. I appreciate, as mentioned yesterday, that there may be a specific heeding to look at those provisions, and that may well not be a matter for today. But I just wanted to put a bit of a mark in the sand that the normal approach and the regulatory position of the environment agency is affected by the provisions in the DCO. And I just want to put that mark in the sand down now. With that in mind, I'm just going to hand over to Mr.

01:02:33:23 - 01:02:37:05
O'Callaghan, who I hope can answer the specific question that you've posed.

01:02:39:22 - 01:03:23:13
Rich DeCullahan, Environment Agency. In terms of any specifics in the permit, I think it's maybe worth stepping back and considering what the purpose of the permit is. And the purpose of the permit is to protect the water quality of the receiving water. And so the conditions that will be set within that permit will be set at a level, and we'll set expectations on the operator to comply with those conditions. How the operator might choose to manage their operations to ensure that compliance is a matter for them, but we will be very clear on the standards that are required within those permits to protect the environment.

01:03:23:15 - 01:03:26:12
I hope that answers the question. We're happy to clarify if needed.

01:03:26:21 - 01:03:32:19
So the permit... The purpose of it will be to protect the Havant Pickett reservoir itself,

01:03:34:09 - 01:03:42:28
and they will... The applicant will have conditions put on them to stop the discharge if it's above a certain level of risk. Is that correct?

01:03:43:00 - 01:03:58:05

So that they will be expected to comply with their permit conditions If they... That the... If the way that they reach compliance is by... The only way they can reach compliance is by stopping discharging into the reservoir, then I would expect an operator to do that.

01:04:00:18 - 01:04:03:07
Thank you. Portsmouth Water Limited, please.

01:04:03:09 - 01:04:07:02
Great. Madam, Harry Wood Philpott on behalf of Portsmouth Water.

01:04:08:18 - 01:04:41:07
This is one of those areas, and there will, I'm afraid, be many of them, where the complexity and wide reaching nature of Article V come directly into play. And it comes into play in relation to this point that's just been made about the Gateshead principle. And as would have been I think has already been mentioned, the bulk supply agreement that is being negotiated would include standards that have to be met for the water coming in.

01:04:42:15 - 01:05:10:24
That is in part to do with protecting the environmental quality of the asset, but it also has significant implications potentially for the commercial side of the agreement because the quality of the water affects what has to be done to it and therefore the cost. That's one of the reasons why it's in the bulk supply agreement. This is where Article V comes in. Because if Article V operates effectively to provide

01:05:12:12 - 01:05:15:03
for the absence of a bulk supply agreement,

01:05:17:06 - 01:05:49:08
the fact that there is protection from the environment agency through the permit is dealing with one thing, but it doesn't deal with everything that would be in the bulk supply agreement. It doesn't give us the ability to control the water that comes into our asset, which has a direct impact on my client, not just in terms of the environment, but in terms of its commercial position. And that commercial position is a matter of public interest. My client has a public interest function. The cost of its services is a matter of public interest.

01:05:50:22 - 01:06:23:05
So whilst I endorse and echo the point that's been made by Ms. Clark on behalf of the Environment Agency, that when you're looking at where to draw the line in the application of the Gateshead principle, you need to be alive to the fact that the existing regulatory regime put in place by parliament is proposed to be significantly amended by Schedule eight. You will need to take very detailed care over the full implications of those potential changes to the existing regulatory regime.

01:06:24:18 - 01:06:55:11
There is also a need to consider the separate role that my client legitimate role that my client has in controlling the quality of the water that comes into its reservoir in order to protect its interest and also the public interest that is represented in it being able to operate efficiently, effectively and cost

effectively. So those matters can't be swept aside by reference to the Gateshead principle. Those two elements will need to be a central focus of this examination.

01:06:56:05 - 01:06:59:11
Thank you. That's well understood. Turning to the applicant.

01:07:01:14 - 01:07:36:11
Thank you, ma'am. Robby Owen for the applicant. Just some points in response, I'd like us to turn to just answering the point Mr. Henderson made about the protection of the water sources at Bethampton Springs. In terms of the Gateshead principle, it's important to be really clear that Schedule eight to the draft DCO, which does propose a number of modifications to abstraction licensing, impounding consents and discharge permits. None of those modifications relate to the issues we're discussing at the moment in terms of monitoring of the receiving water.

01:07:36:13 - 01:08:00:17
They don't deal with that at all. So let's not get these things confused. Clearly, we're going to be turning to Article V later, but essentially that is a backstop provision in the absence or failure of a bug supply agreement. And as I said earlier, the matters of monitoring are part of those overall discussions in the bulk supply agreement. And

01:08:03:11 - 01:08:43:29
if they are not successful for a reason I can't currently conceive, then the provisions of Article five will be there as a backstop and the scheme of operation elements of Article five would include potentially agreement as to monitoring and related operational interfaces. So that is where we are. So I think what Mr. Streeton said about the Gateshead principle fully applies on this point. You are entitled, and indeed, as per the national policy statement, you are directed in effect not to examine these matters because they are covered by a different environmental consenting regime.

01:08:47:19 - 01:08:48:18
Thank you.

01:08:48:20 - 01:08:50:18
I was going to go on to, if I may,

01:08:52:15 - 01:09:03:28
turn to the protection of the aquifers at Bethampton Springs during the construction process, and I'd like to invite Kate Wilson to deal with that issue.

01:09:05:18 - 01:09:14:22
Kate Wilson is a Southern Water employee, and she is a program design manager on this project. Miss Wilson?

01:09:17:25 - 01:09:19:22
Kate Wilson for the applicant.

01:09:21:29 - 01:09:22:28

I can

01:09:24:14 - 01:10:02:14
talk regarding the flexibility that we've retained within the draft order limits, but the applicant has done extensive engagement with Portsmouth over the past few years, including site visits. So with that being an operational site, just like interfaces with our own operational sites, there's a lot of constraints to be considered within those sites, including the groundwater springs, existing assets, access routes, environmental constraints, and public rights of way. And that's why we thought it was imperative that we'd maintain that flexibility within the draft order limits and the limits of deviation within...

01:10:02:23 - 01:10:32:12
As shown on sheet four, the works plans a s zero zero eight. So this retains that flexibility for the location of the pipelines to be determined at detailed design so that we can continue with that engagement and investigations to ensure that we... You know, any impacts are considered. I would have to pass to a colleague in terms of the foundation risk assessment and the auto environment chapter.

01:10:34:02 - 01:10:52:17
But, yeah, just to... I think there's still flexibility within that area of the scheme. We've actually stopped short of our trenchless construction, which sits outside of the source protection zone, and those conversations are ongoing to ensure we come up with a mutually acceptable solution.

01:10:54:24 - 01:10:55:09
Thank you.

01:10:57:12 - 01:10:59:29
Does Portsmouth Water have a point?

01:11:00:25 - 01:11:31:02
Harry Woodfelk, on behalf of Portsmouth Water. As I understood the point that was being made, and I'll be told if I miss Henson or I've got it wrong, the concern is not as to whether there is flexibility. We know this flexibility. That's what gives rise to the concern. The concern is that the assessment of the implications of that flexibility have been made on a flawed basis. So it needs to be properly assessed and then a decision taken as to whether the flexibility is appropriate.

01:11:32:08 - 01:11:38:25
Standard sort of PIA approach. And at the moment, we're articulating that concern because we think more work needs to be done.

01:11:39:18 - 01:12:15:16
Thank you. I appreciate this comment. Could I ask the applicant to take this as an action point to provide this information in writing? Why do you consider the flexibility you're looking for appropriate in the light of those comments we just had? Okay. Thank you. I've got one more question on agenda item three, and after that, I'm going to allow other parties to participate. So we are turning to drinking water quality and potential harm from a human health angle.

01:12:16:20 - 01:12:50:16
A p p dash zero nine six ES chapter seventeen, socioeconomics, tourism, and health, paragraph seventeen point eight point one hundred and forty four, acknowledges that safety concerns concerns relating to the effectiveness of the proposed water recycling process have been raised during consultation. Concerns have also been raised in relevant representations, including RR-fifty two, and concerns have been raised yesterday at the open floor hearing.

01:12:51:08 - 01:13:25:07
This is regarding drinking water safety and transparency about which areas could ultimately receive water derived from the scheme. The drinking water inspectorate's recent submission, PDA-thirty eight, identifies consumer acceptability as a regulatory consideration and expects appropriate engagement with consumers who may receive water derived from the scheme, to help address concerns associated with a change of source.

01:13:25:29 - 01:13:47:26
In that context, how and at what stage will consumers be informed that they may receive water derived from the scheme, including whether the areas or supply zones that could receive that water will be identified, And how will concerns about drinking water safety and the change in source be addressed?

01:13:53:02 - 01:14:15:00
Robby Owen for the applicant. I think we can answer those questions in two parts. First, on behalf of the applicant, I would invite Mr. Winteringham just to talk about how that transition will be managed. And then I would ask another witness, Mrs. Jenny Dunwoody, to talk about

01:14:16:16 - 01:14:22:04
the effects on health and well-being and those related issues that have also been raised. Mr.

01:14:22:06 - 01:14:51:13
Winteringen, would you like to make a general comment about how Southern Water will manage the transition to the new source? Yes, Mark Wintergatan. For the applicant, we would follow the standard DWI procedure in terms of change of source at the appropriate time when that comes to pass. So that will be at some point in the future when the source changes over that both for ourselves and also for Portsmouth as a water from the reservoir. So that's how that will be handled.

01:14:54:21 - 01:15:05:05
Thank you, Mr. Winchengam. And secondly, we have Jenny Dunwoody, who's an associate at the consultancy, AARP. Ms. Dunwoody, would you like to come in, please?

01:15:06:24 - 01:15:44:10
Good morning, Jenny Dunwoody for the applicant. Health assessment was undertaken as part of chapter seventeen of the environmental statement AP dash zero nine six, looking at any environmental, social, economic effects that could have implications for population health. The starting point in terms of water quality is that the regulatory framework and the permitting that's been discussed would ensure appropriate and healthy constant drinking water is provided to customers.

01:15:44:17 - 01:16:37:20
And therefore, the health assessment hasn't attempted to duplicate that process and assess any health effects arising from the change of source. The assumption is that that process will work and that drinking water will be wholesome and healthy. The assessment also has considered effects as a result of people's concerns and perceptions around the change of source and how that might affect behaviors and well-being and has identified a potential adverse effect on a minority of the population as a result of things like reluctance to drink tap water, financial burden of purchasing water, and potential anxiety around the change of source.

01:16:40:28 - 01:16:57:20
Thank you. Just just to be absolutely clear, you mentioned the permit will ensure that the quality of water is going to be up to standard, but the environmental permit doesn't deal with the drinking water supply itself. Is that correct?

01:16:59:18 - 01:17:06:15
Yes. And the thing relating to drinking water is drinking water inspector at REMIT rather than environment agency.

01:17:07:11 - 01:17:12:15
Got it. Thank you. I wanted just to clarify that it... That it's not environment agency.

01:17:14:22 - 01:17:29:21
In terms of my question, so I've got the answer that the standard drinking waters inspector procedure will be followed, but they have stated that engagement with customers

01:17:31:06 - 01:18:01:23
is one of the key considerations. So I'll ask again, how and at what stage will consumers be informed that they may receive water derived from the scheme, including whether the areas or supply zones that could receive that water will be identified, and how will concerns about drinking water safety and change in source be addressed? We have heard multiple submissions yesterday relating to using plastic water bottles, for example.

01:18:01:28 - 01:18:04:12
So I would like you to address those points.

01:18:04:29 - 01:18:35:15
Alright, Vikram. For the applicant, in terms of the drinking water quality, what was trying trying to describe is that when we come to do a source change, we will go through the official process with the DWI. What we have done already is talking to customers and community groups who have had a number of sessions to talk to them about water quality and their understanding around it and their acceptance or otherwise of of recycled water.

01:18:35:17 - 01:18:39:18
So that that has been has been completed and has been has been done.

01:18:41:07 - 01:18:52:18

And as we move through the process, getting closer to a point where we are actually going to change sources over, that will be the point where we will start to look at engaging with customers.

01:18:53:21 - 01:18:59:18
Could I get a more detailed timeline in relation to that engagement?

01:18:59:28 - 01:19:50:08
Robbie, I'm for the applicant. I can assist here, Ma'am, in that in addition to the regulatory processes we've been hearing about throughout the development of the project, the applicant has been engaging with customers and stakeholders across Hampshire on these matters. And we heard yesterday that as outlined in our WRMP twenty four position statement, that's PDA004 that we submitted at procedure deadline A, the permission to publish the WRMP letter received from DEFRA in August contains in Annex two a requirement to carry out certain actions within twelve months from the date of that letter, so by August of next year.

01:19:51:09 - 01:20:25:09
And those Annex II actions include, and I quote, provide additional details to address stakeholder concerns raised regarding the health and safety of water recycling, including the HWT WRP, so including this project. Southern Water would include signposting to additional information in the public domain and the regulatory frameworks in place, such as the replicated process, or commit to providing further public information when necessary for customers to find out how the company is addressing the concerns being raised.

01:20:25:11 - 01:20:52:27
So we are required to conclude that work within twelve months of August of this year. And therefore, that is a requirement on us that will be carried out through various means, including wide ranging awareness campaigns, ongoing educational campaigns. We can do a note on this if this would help in our post hearing summary.

01:20:53:04 - 01:20:56:19
Yes, it would help. That can be noted as an action point, please.

01:20:56:21 - 01:21:42:01
Yes. And the final point is that further engagement activity will commence about two years ahead of the new source becoming operational, in line with statutory guidance and requirements. So I think the point is both in relation to the WRMP requirement from DEFRA that I've mentioned, but also the whole process that is regulated by the drinking water inspectorate as in their very helpful letter that they submitted at procedural deadline that is all regulated and there's plenty of guidance to go along with it, which will mean that there will be full engagement on these issues, which we entirely understand and empathize with and attach a huge amount of importance to.

01:21:42:03 - 01:21:59:12
So I think you can be assured that not only are the regulatory arrangements in place for that, but also you've got the commitment from the applicant that this is something that they have been doing extensively for many years in relation to this project and will continue to do.

01:22:01:12 - 01:22:08:28
Thank you. I appreciate that. I'll take the opportunity to let Water Matters community make a representation on this point.

01:22:10:27 - 01:22:43:18
Thank you very much, Ma'am. Tracy Faini, on behalf of the Water Matters community, I think we would definitely disagree with the fact that there's been continual engagement throughout the process. Of particular concern is the that the fact consultation documents as part of the statutory consultation twenty twenty two and twenty twenty four failed to identify the fact that Portsmouth Water customers would be impacted across Hampshire and West Sussex. And despite the fact we challenged Southern Water on that several times, they failed to make that clear even when they republished in in the consultation in twenty twenty four.

01:22:44:00 - 01:23:16:24
The only information that they have given on when they will start to consult the public who will be impacted is in a document I read that said it will start in, two thousand and thirty four. Now this decision is being taken in the next year. And to suggest that you don't consult customers who are going to be so severely impacted by a change in their water supply until after the decision made just doesn't seem to be part of common justice to us. we And think there should have been full and proper engagement with not only Southern Water customers who will be affected, but also Portsmouth Water customers.

01:23:16:29 - 01:23:21:11
And we don't recognize what Southern Water is saying in terms of that engagement.

01:23:24:13 - 01:23:37:24
Thank you for this point. So I'm going to reiterate, I would like the applicant to submit some information in relation to that engagement, some further information to address the point that has just been made.

01:23:40:05 - 01:23:52:27
Are there any other parties who wish to comment on the issues related to water quality, monitoring, and contingency arrangements, or potential harm from introducing recycled water to the Havant Thicket reservoir?

01:23:58:00 - 01:24:00:05
Water matters community again, please.

01:24:01:01 - 01:24:34:04
Hello. Just to give you my background for those that weren't present yesterday, I'm Tracy Viny representing the Water Matters community as a technical adviser. Before I retired, my background was in environmental regulation. I was a drinking water inspector for both Portsmouth Water and Southern Water, and I was also working for Portsmouth Water as the Havant Thicket project manager. And in retirement, I've been very concerned by these proposals and have been helping the community to understand the proposals and articulate those concerns, hence my presence today.

01:24:34:29 - 01:25:08:21
Item three is about the scope and content of the applicant's assessment, and I wanted to highlight some of the examples of why the community is so concerned that there isn't been inadequate information provided on which to base a robust assessment of the risks. Risk assessment has not been provided for the sewer catchment draining to Buds Farm sewage works to demonstrate a clear understanding of what pollutants are discharged to the sewer, which then need to be considered and tested in the assessments and the modeling. The applicant has previously indicated that about sixteen percent of the sewage arriving at Bud's farm is from industrial and commercial sources.

01:25:08:28 - 01:25:39:07
That's very high compared to other international schemes that I've seen. The applicant does not make reference to a review... Sorry. The applicant does make reference to a review of their trade effluent permit register, but that does not provide a complete picture of the risks. Let me give you just two examples from our research. Appearance of a trade is dependent on the business choosing to register. Many businesses will not register as there are cost implications. We obtained a copy of the public register and cross checked a few trades.

01:25:39:14 - 01:26:17:22
Southern Water have fourteen plating metal finishes registered, But with little effort, we were able to find a further eleven unregistered in the Buds Farm catchment alone. This represents forty percent of just one trade category missing. An inquiry to the QA Hospital, the major reasonable hospital in the area, confirmed it disposes of blood, pharmaceuticals, chemotherapy drugs, mortuary, and laboratory waste to the sewer, which drains to Bud's farm, but has no southern water permit for disposal of that waste. They also confirm that prior to the discharge, there is no treatment of monitoring of that waste, which does occur in other countries using effluent recycling.

01:26:18:04 - 01:26:51:14
Having heard from Beth Horton, had to say yesterday about risks associated with pharmaceuticals, etcetera, we hope that this shows that a full assessment of the sewer catchment is necessary to understanding the risks and to determine an appropriate sampling program and modeling. There is no evidence supplied to demonstrate an understanding of the transformation products that conform during normal and advanced treatment, which need to be tested for. Think of it like a child's toy. The toy is safe to play with until the child drops it and it breaks into its component parts, batteries, wire, sharp plastic edges.

01:26:51:27 - 01:27:25:27
Then you would no longer want your child to play with it. In the same way, transformation products can be more toxic than the compounds from which they are derived and must be assessed. Details of screening have not been provided. There appears to be a reliance on dilution in the reservoir with no consideration of accumulation over time nor bioaccumulation of persistent compounds like pharmaceuticals and forever chemicals. There is a lack of testing with very few samples from the pilot plant tested for emerging contaminants of concern, and many of the parameters required in the guidance now issued by the EA were not tested for in the pilot plant.

01:27:26:00 - 01:27:58:19

For the one hundred and thirteen parameters that were mentioned earlier, just sixty six, sorry, sixty six listed were not analyzed in the final post pilot plant treatment water. We find no information on the quality of remineralization. Without that, you cannot assess the environmental impacts on water quality, ecology or carbon. There is a lack of information on how changes in salinity, temperature and geochemistry have been assessed and what impact that will have on the ecology. It's not even clear if they've assessed the modeling as a reasonable worst case scenario.

01:27:58:21 - 01:28:32:05
Think about when we've got an extreme drought, the reservoir is drawn down, there's less water for dilution, Sixty milliliters of, effluent... Recycled effluent will be going when there's least dilution. And what impact will that have? We've not seen that properly assessed. Monitoring is not mitigation. By the time you get sample results back from the lab to show there was a problem, the contaminants are already in the reservoir or downstream with no way of getting them out. Typically, provision of sample results can take twenty eight days, and that was confirmed by Southern Water.

01:28:32:20 - 01:28:49:24
There is currently no pollution risk in the existing reservoir catchment. Approval of this scheme would massively change the risk, and those risks need to be properly assessed. More information is needed to understand the risks, and we ask the Exceed seek to missing information in our submission on the second of November. Thank you.

01:28:50:26 - 01:28:57:00
Thank you for that. I've got a hand up online. Mr. David Jobbins.

01:28:58:10 - 01:29:29:12
Thank you, madam. My name is David Jobbins. As I said earlier, charter town planner. I'm acting on behalf of East Hampshire District Council and Hammond Borough Council. I just really wanted to thank you firstly for requesting information from the applicants in relation to that additional data because I think that goes to the heart of some of this discussion. And we welcome the applicants willingness to provide that on deadline, the deadline one. But I would like to touch on a number of things very briefly, the Gateshead principle that's been discussed.

01:29:30:09 - 01:29:44:25
And I would obviously acknowledge that that is an important consideration. However, nonetheless, Power three eighty three of the NPS does still require you to consider the impacts of this use. It doesn't displace... Sorry,

01:29:46:11 - 01:30:16:24
Gateshead principle doesn't displace or disapply the examinations task under power three point two five of the NPS of examining the environmental information and reaching a reason conclusion. So I just think it's important to remember that combined with the infrastructure EIA regulations, which will also require the examining authority to consider and come to a recent conclusion on significant effects. So Gateshead is acknowledged, but I don't think it it necessarily helps here.

01:30:17:15 - 01:30:49:10

In terms of the information itself, again, I'll refer to chapter nineteen. And as I've already said, we welcome the applicant's willingness to provide that additional information because some of the conclusions that have been reached, we're unsure how they've arrived at it. For example, Paris nineteen eight one zero four to one zero eight, they talk about the pilot plant, which you've already touched on. That suggests or says that sixty percent of CCs were reduced. But of course, that then means there's forty percent that were detected.

01:30:51:03 - 01:31:28:18
We're hoping obviously that that information will show how adaptive monitoring may also be necessary and required. Again, it's something that seems to be absent in all of this. And we're very interested to hear what the applicant has to say on that. So I think really, I'm reiterating what's already been said by a number of people yesterday and today, but our concerns remain as it stands in terms of CECs and PFAS. I don't know whether you've seen the BBC website and heard the news today in terms of the report that's been released by the environment agency with the gentleman touched on earlier.

01:31:28:20 - 01:31:51:15
But again, I'd I'd I'd invite you to to read that. It's quite interesting, And it's quite relevant in terms of the fact that we still don't know the full impacts of these contaminants on human health. So again, I think that reinforces the need for adaptive review and monitoring throughout this whole process. But we welcome that information to be submitted, and we'll need to review it once we've received it. Thank you.

01:31:52:26 - 01:32:12:11
Thank you very much. That's helpful. Now before I ask any more questions or allow further comments or turn to the applicant for reply. It's now eleven thirty two, and we are going to take this opportunity to adjourn. So we are going to come back ten to twelve. The hearing is now adjourned.