Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project

Draft Statement of Common Ground - Gosport Borough Council

VOLUME NUMBER: 5

PLANNING INSPECTORATE SCHEME NUMBER: WA010002

APPLICATION DOCUMENT REFERENCE: 8.12

APFP REGULATION: 5(2)(q)

23 November 2026

Version 0

from Southern Water

Document Control		
Title	Draft Statement of Common Ground – Gosport Borough Council	
Version History		
Version	**Date**	**Status/Reason for Issue**
Version 0	23 November 2026	Deadline 1

Contents

1 Introduction 1
1.1 Overview of the project 1
1.2 Purpose of this Statement of Common Ground 1
1.3 Parties to this statement 1
1.4 Terminology 1
2 Record of post DCO submission engagement 3
3 Statement of Common Ground 4
4 Signatories 10

Tables

Table 1-1: Status terminology 2
Table 3-1: Summary of matters 4

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) Response to the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Southern Water Consultation

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview of the project

1.1.1 Southern Water Services Limited (hereafter referred to as the 'Applicant') is developing proposals for the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project (the Project). The Project is a water supply scheme that will ensure the Applicant can maintain essential water supplies to customers, especially in a drought, while protecting the rare and sensitive River Test and River Itchen chalk streams.

1.1.2 The Project would use advanced treatment techniques to turn highly treated wastewater, that is usually pumped far out to sea, into purified recycled water at a new water recycling plant in Havant. This purified recycled water would be pumped via a pipeline to the Havant Thicket Reservoir where it would mix with spring water. Water from the reservoir would then be pumped along another pipeline to the Applicant's Otterbourne Water Supply Works where it would be treated to strict drinking water standards before being sent into supply.

1.2 Purpose of this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 The purpose of this Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is to set out the areas of agreement and disagreement between the Applicant and Gosport Borough Council (GBC) in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Project.

1.2.2 The role of GBC in the DCO process is to provide input on matters relating to local planning policy, land use, and the potential implications of the Project for the Borough and, through its membership of the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH), the wider South Hampshire area. This SoCG sets out the areas of agreement and those requiring further discussion in relation to those matters.

1.3 Parties to this statement

1.3.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Southern Water Services Limited as the Applicant and (2) Gosport Borough Council.

1.3.2 Collectively, Southern Water Services Limited and Gosport Borough Council are referred to as 'the parties'.

1.4 Terminology

1.4.1 **Table 1-1** outlines the terminology in the status column of **Table 3-1** provides a summary of the key matters discussed between the Applicant and GBC in relation to the DCO application for the Project. Each matter is categorised according to its status, as defined in section 1.4. **Table 3-1** aims to clearly present the areas of agreement, those still under discussion, and any unresolved issues. It is important to note that GBC's representation is based on the Partnership for South

Hampshire's (PfSH) response (dated 8th August 2022) to Southern Water. This letter is included in Appendix 1 for completeness.

1.4.2 **Table 3-1**. It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in **Table 3-1** provides a summary of the key matters discussed between the Applicant and GBC in relation to the DCO application for the Project. Each matter is categorised according to its status, as defined in section 1.4. **Table 3-1** aims to clearly present the areas of agreement, those still under discussion, and any unresolved issues. It is important to note that GBC's representation is based on the Partnership for South Hampshire's (PfSH) response (dated 8th August 2022) to Southern Water. This letter is included in Appendix 1 for completeness.

1.4.3 **Table 3-1** are not of material interest or relevance to the parties' representation and therefore have not been considered in this document.

Table 1-1: Status terminology

Term	Explanation
Matter agreed with other party	Indicates that both Southern Water and GBC have reached a consensus on the specific issue, with no disagreements.
Provisional agreement pending application evidence	Indicates that while consensus has been reached on certain issues, confirmation of agreement is contingent upon GBC reviewing and accepting the supporting evidence.
Matters subject to further discussion	Indicates that the specific issues are still under discussion, and no final agreement has been reached yet.
Matter not able to be agreed	Indicates that an agreement on the specific issue has not been reached, and it is unlikely that further discussions will resolve the disagreement.

2 Record of post DCO submission engagement

2.1.1 The Applicant engaged with GBC during the development of the DCO application. This engagement provided opportunities to discuss the Project and matters of interest to GBC, and has continued following submission of the application.

2.1.2 The Examining Authority's Rule 6 letter dated 6 October 2026 requested that a SoCG be prepared between the Applicant and GBC. The Applicant agrees with the merit of entering a SoCG to provide a clear record of the parties' engagement, identify matters agreed and outstanding, and support focused discussions aimed at resolving the issues raised by GBC.

2.1.3 As no draft SoCG was submitted with the DCO application, this is the first version of the SoCG and is submitted at Examination Deadline 1 (DL1). It has been prepared in response to the Rule 6 letter and reflects the engagement undertaken with GBC to date, where appropriate, and the current position of the parties. The SoCG is currently unsigned but has been reviewed and agreed by the relevant officer(s) at GBC. The Applicant confirms that it accurately reflects the matters discussed and the current position between the parties. Formal agreement and signing of the SoCG will be progressed as engagement continues during the Examination.

2.1.4 **Table 2-1** records the engagement undertaken between the Applicant and GBC following submission of the DCO application. Engagement remains ongoing and this SoCG is a live document, which will be updated and resubmitted as appropriate to reflect further engagement, progress in resolving outstanding matters and any changes to the parties' positions.

Table 2-1: Record of post-submission engagement

Name	Purpose	Date
Meeting with GBC SoCG	Meeting to discuss the merits of preparing a SoCG as requested by the Examining Authority in Annex F Rule 6 letter based on GBC Relevant Representations. The parties agreed to produce a SoCG based on GBC Relevant Representations [RR-114].	27/10/2026

3 Statement of Common Ground

3.1.1 **Table 3-1** provides a summary of the key matters discussed between the Applicant and GBC in relation to the DCO application for the Project. Each matter is categorised according to its status, as defined in section 1.4. **Table 3-1** aims to clearly present the areas of agreement, those still under discussion, and any unresolved issues. It is important to note that GBC's representation is based on the Partnership for South Hampshire's (PfSH) response (dated 8th August 2022) to Southern Water. This letter is included in Appendix 1 for completeness.

Table 3-1: Summary of matters

Row ID	Topic	Summary of GBC issue	Latest Position in Resolving the Issue	Application document reference	Status
Principle of development					
GBC-RR-114-5	Need case	GBC notes that the Southeast of England is now considered to be an area of 'serious water stress' and that SW has an estimated shortfall in the Hampshire water supply area of 192 million litres per day during drought periods.	The Applicant notes this comment. For clarity, the projected deficit of 192 megalitres per day (Ml/d) in the Hampshire water supply (also known as the Western Area) was identified in Water Resources Management Plan 2019 (WRMP19) during a 1 in 200-year drought up to 2029/30. The Applicant's emerging Water Resources Management Plan 2024 (WRMP24) is required to resolve an increased water supply deficit in the Western Area of 203Ml/d by 2040 during a 1 in 500-year drought (please refer to paragraph 2.1.5 of the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1)	Matter agreed with other party
GBC-RR-114-6	Need case	GBC both acknowledge and emphasise the urgency of SW's water supply position and the importance of resolving the supply deficit by bringing significant and sustainable new sources of water supply forward as soon as possible. This is required under an agreement signed with the Environment Agency under Section 20 of the Water Resources Act 1991 that commits the company to address this deficit at the earliest opportunity.	The Applicant notes this comment.		Matter agreed with other party
GBC-RR-114-7	Alternatives	The 2021 SW 'Water for Life' consultation earmarked a desalination plant at Fawley as the preferred option for addressing this shortfall. Partnership for South Hampshire's (PfSH) response to this consultation highlighted concerns regarding the energy costs and carbon intensity of desalination, as well as environmental and landscape impacts upon the New Forest National Park. GBC notes that this option has now been dropped, in favour of water recycling.	The Applicant notes this comment.		Matter agreed with other party
GBC-RR-114-8	Principle of development	In principle, GBC, as part of PfSH, is supportive of water recycling as a more sustainable and resilient option, subject to wider considerations, particularly impacts on water quality. This should be undertaken in tandem with efforts to reduce leakage from water pipes which accounts for a substantial loss of drinking water every year.	The Applicant notes and welcomes this comment. Demand side measures (reducing consumption / fixing leaks) are a crucial part of the solution but must be combined with new large scale supply options given the scale of the projected water supply deficit. The Project would provide a new sustainable source of water, delivering up to 90Ml/d of water into the Hampshire supply network. The Applicant directs the Council to the	Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party

Row ID	Topic	Summary of GBC issue	Latest Position in Resolving the Issue	Application document reference	Status
			Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1) for further details.		
GBC-RR-114-14	Project finance and cost	While recognising the need for additional water supply, details of the cost of the proposed water recycling and water transfer system, and the likely addition to customer bills that the works and ongoing maintenance will add, will also be beneficial to GBC to understand the full economic impacts of the project.	The Applicant notes the comment and directs the Council to Section 3 (Value for Money Statement) of the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1) for how value for money is considered through the water resources management planning process. As a regulated sector, Ofwat reviews water company spending plans and exists to protect the consumer by controlling costs that water companies can charge customers. Section 3 of the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4, Version 1) sets out the details for the Project funding.	Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1). Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4, Version 1).	Matters subject to further discussion
Design and construction					
GBC-RR-114-16	Location of the proposed pipeline routes	With regards to the range of possible pipe locations, GBC in general supports routes which reduce impacts upon Source Protection Zones and other environmental designations, such as Ancient Woodland.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has made considerable effort, through the iterative design of the Project, and informed by engagement and consultation, to avoid and reduce potential impacts on the environment and the local communities. The Project avoids all nationally designated ecological sites and ancient woodland. Where it has not been possible to avoid Source Protection Zones, there are secured mitigation measures in place to reduce and manage any impacts; please refer to design principle PL_4 Groundwater resources as set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1) and the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1). Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	Matters subject to further discussion
Land use and agriculture					
GBC-RR-114-13	Land use and agriculture	While such mitigation schemes are welcome in the Solent region and provide multiple other benefits including biodiversity gain and carbon storage, there is a finite supply of such sites with the local area. The loss of agricultural land has also come at a time of increasing national and global concern about food production and supply. The role of water recycling in helping to provide another mitigation option is therefore welcomed by GBC as part of a suite of measures to address the issue sustainably and in the long-term.	Paragraph 12.8.11 of the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture [APP-091] confirms that permanent losses of agricultural land are restricted to the Above Ground Plant (AGP) sites, the working areas of which amount to approximately three hectares in total. All other disturbance to agricultural land will be of a temporary and mostly short-term nature, with agricultural use able to resume shortly after installation. The assessment presented in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture [APP-091] concludes that the permanent loss of three hectares of agricultural land across four sites will have minimal impact on domestic food supply.	ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture [APP-091].	Matter agreed with other party
Flood risk and water environment					

Row ID	Topic	Summary of GBC issue	Latest Position in Resolving the Issue	Application document reference	Status
GBC-RR-114-9	The water recycling process	A frequent concern with water recycling relates to the potential for the process to recycle pollutants such as toxic compounds, pharmaceutical residues and microplastics back into drinking water. Assurances are therefore sought that the filtration process will be rigorous, consistent and will remove all known pollutants. A commitment to high standards of maintenance and independent monitoring and regulation of the quality of drinking water produced via water recycling is also sought. The Council maintains its concerns but defers the technical elements of this issue to industry experts on the suitability of the measures proposed by Southern Water in terms of water quality and impacts upon habitats.	As stated in section 19.8 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1), the Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated wastewater from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (Budds Farm WTW) (e.g. a representation of influent water quality to the Water Recycling Plant (WRP)) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. This considered a wide range of substances, including: • Pharmaceuticals and personal care products (PPCPs): Organic contaminants sourced from pharmaceutical products and their metabolites, cosmetics, soaps and shampoos, which can be found in trace levels in wastewater. • Industrial chemicals: Industrial chemicals: Substances such as per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and inorganic contaminants (including some trace metals). Although some specific compounds within these broad categories of chemicals have an established Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) (including some metals, PAHs and several PFAS compounds), this is not the case for the majority of these substances. • Agricultural chemicals: Substances such as pesticides and fertilisers that can be found in surface water runoff. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process. Although this does not include the Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP, the pilot plant included the multi-barrier treatment process that will be primarily responsible for the effective removal of contaminants from the source water. As some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of	Operational Environmental Management Plan [APP-422]. ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Matters subject to further discussion

Row ID	Topic	Summary of GBC issue	Latest Position in Resolving the Issue	Application document reference	Status
			the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. The results of the pilot plant investigation are described in an independent review produced by the University of Brighton (Mayor-Smith, 2024), as referenced in ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. Data from the Applicant's pilot plant trials has shown that the purified recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to meet the strict water quality standards required by the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI). The Applicant remains committed to transparency, rigorous monitoring and full compliance with all relevant regulations throughout the development and operation of the Project. The discharge from the WRP site and abstraction from Havant Thicket Reservoir will be subject to permits and licences that will be granted and enforced by the relevant regulator currently the Environment Agency. Water supplied to customers after treatment at Otterbourne Water Supply Works (Otterbourne WSW) will continue to meet the requirements of The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016 and any DWI expectations arising from its assessment of the Project. WRP site components and treatment process capability will be continually monitored, maintained and replaced throughout its lifecycle. The Applicant acknowledges GBC's further comments and confirms that will continue to engage with GBC during the Examination.		
GBC-RR-114-10	Water environment	The process for recycling water will produce 'reject water', which will be returned to Budds Farm WWTW for processing before discharge into the sea. GBC as part of the PfSH response seeks clarification that	The Applicant notes this comment and the feedback provided in relation to the environmental impact of 'reject water' on the Solent. The Applicant would like to clarify that, as set out in ES	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development [APP-082].	Matters subject to further discussion

Row ID	Topic	Summary of GBC issue	Latest Position in Resolving the Issue	Application document reference	Status
		this process will not lead to increased environmental impacts upon the Solent. The Council maintains its concerns but defers the technical elements of this issue to industry experts on the suitability of the measures proposed by Southern Water in terms of water quality and impacts upon habitats.	Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development [APP-082], reject water from the WRP would be transferred to Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) via Budds Farm WTW, where it would be diluted with existing wastewater flows from the WTW. There would not, however, be further treatment of the reject water at Budds Farm WTW. The Applicant has assessed the effects of changes to the discharge from Eastney LSO as a result of the addition of reject water from the WRP in ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). This assessment was informed by detailed far and near field dispersion modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney LSO dispersion modelling [APP-200] and ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX modelling for chemicals screened in via the surface water risk assessment process [APP-203], respectively. The model outputs show that the differences in salinity and concentrations currently consented water quality parameters are insignificant when the existing Budds Farm WTW release and the future release from Budds Farm (once the WRP is in place and reject water is combined) are compared. Furthermore, all modelled parameters are compliant with the appropriate Environmental Quality Standard within approximately 1m of the discharge point at Eastney LSO. The assessment therefore concludes that there are no likely significant effects associated with changes to the composition of the water being discharged from the Eastney LSO as a result of the addition of reject water from the WRP.	ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney LSO dispersion modelling [APP-200]. ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process [APP-203].	
GBC-RR-114-12	Water environment	Water recycling has the potential to help mitigate the impact of nitrate discharges from housing development on European designated sites in the Solent. The need to address this issue led to extensive housing development backlogs across the Partnership for South Hampshire region, and one that has only recently been unlocked due to newly-formed mitigation schemes - primarily the setting aside of high nutrient agricultural land and the creation of nutrient-absorbing wetlands. GBC agrees with this approach subject to the clarification of an outstanding query of where the nitrogen is likely to go.	The Applicant notes this comment and the feedback provided in relation to the potential for the Project to help mitigate the impact of nitrate discharges from housing development on European designated sites in the Solent. Section 3.4 of ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient assessment [APP-202] demonstrates that, once operational, the Project would deliver a net decrease of approximately 8,700kg of nitrogen per year, primarily due to reduced volumes of final effluent being discharged into the Solent via Eastney Long Sea Outfall. The Applicant acknowledges GBC's further comments and will continue to engage with GBC during the Examination.	ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient assessment [APP-202].	Provisional agreement pending application evidence

Row ID	Topic	Summary of GBC issue	Latest Position in Resolving the Issue	Application document reference	Status
GBC-RR-114-11	Use of Havant Thicket Reservoir for the storage of recycled water	According to figures provided in the consultation the water recycling plant could transfer 15 million litres per day to Havant Thicket Reservoir, while the water transfer pipe could shift up to 90 million litres per day to the Otterbourne WWTW, at the peak of a drought. Confirmation of how long this could be sustained, and whether the water transfer process could negatively impact water supplies in the Portsmouth Water area during drought periods, is requested.	As identified at Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development [APP-082], the water recycling plant could transfer up to approximately 60 megalitres per day (Ml/d) of recycled water to Bedhampton Springs ((for onward transfer to Havant Thicket Reservoir) and extract up to approximately 90 Ml/d of source water from Havant Thicket Reservoir to transfer to Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW). The duration for which such transfers at these levels could be sustained depends on a number of factors, including the drought severity, prevailing hydrological and weather conditions, reservoir storage levels, and the performance and availability of other water resources within the wider supply system. Regardless, modelling underpinning the Applicant's emerging WRMP24 ensures that sufficient water resources will be available to maintain supplies to customers in extreme drought conditions. Both the Applicant's and Portsmouth Water's WRMP24 were developed as part of the Water Resources South East (WRSE) Regional Plan. The regional planning approach ensures that each member water company is able to maintain supplies to its customers during drought conditions. The transfer of water from Havant Thicket Reservoir to Otterbourne WSW under drought conditions will therefore not negatively impact Portsmouth Water supplies. The project is intended to provide a new source of supply for SW customers, however under the already approved reservoir scheme, in drought or emergency conditions, Portsmouth Water could draw upon Havant Thicket Reservoir, which would change the source of supply to Gosport customers.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development [APP-082].	Matters subject to further discussion

4 Signatories

4.1.1 This SoCG is agreed between Southern Water Services Limited (the Applicant) and Gosport Borough Council on the date below.

Signed for the Gosport Borough Council
Name
Position
Date
Duly authorised for and on behalf of Gosport Borough Council

Signed for Southern Water Services Limited
Name
Position
Date
Duly authorised for and on behalf of Southern Water Services Limited

Appendix 1 - Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) Response to the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Southern Water Consultation

Partnership for South Hampshire
Office of the Executive Leader, Fareham Borough Council,
Civic Offices, Civic Way, Fareham, Hampshire PO16 7AZ
T: [redacted]
[redacted]@fareham.gov.uk

08 August 2022

By email to: HampshireWTWRP@SouthernWater.co.uk

Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) Response to the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Southern Water Consultation

Introduction

1. This response to the Southern Water 'Hampshire Water Transfer & Water Recycling Project' consultation[1] has been prepared by the Water Quality Working Group of the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH). PfSH is a strategic partnership of twelve local planning authorities around the Solent working co-operatively on strategic/sub-regional planning, development, and environmental matters.

2. PfSH welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation at this key stage. It is recognised that a Development Consent Order (DCO) will be sought for this project, which is a type of consent given by the Secretary of State for projects of national significance. Notwithstanding this, local planning policies and representations from relevant bodies such as PfSH can play an important role in the preparation of a DCO.

3. The consultation seeks views on three issues which are addressed below.

Water recycling as a new sustainable water resource for the Hampshire area and the process we went through to select it

4. We note that the Southeast of England is now considered to be an area of 'serious water stress' and that Southern Water has an estimated shortfall in the Hampshire water supply area of 192 million litres per day during drought periods.

5. PfSH both acknowledge and emphasise the urgency of Southern Water's water supply position and the importance of resolving the supply deficit by bringing significant and sustainable new sources of water supply forward as soon as possible. This is required under an agreement signed with the

[1] https://hampshirewtwrp.commonplace.is/

Environment Agency under Section 20 of the Water Resources Act 1991 that commits the company to address this deficit at the earliest opportunity.

6. The 2021 Southern Water 'Water for Life' consultation earmarked a desalination plant at Fawley as the preferred option for addressing this shortfall. The PfSH response to this consultation highlighted concerns regarding the energy costs and carbon intensity of desalination, as well as environmental and landscape impacts upon the New Forest National Park. We note that this option has now been dropped, in favour of water recycling.

7. In principle PfSH is supportive of water recycling as a more sustainable and resilient option, subject to wider considerations, particularly impacts on water quality. This should be undertaken in tandem with efforts to reduce leakage from water pipes which accounts for a substantial loss of drinking water every year. That aside, a frequent concern with water recycling relates to the potential for the process to recycle pollutants such as toxic compounds, pharmaceutical residues and microplastics back into drinking water. Assurances are therefore sought that the filtration process will be rigorous, consistent and will remove all known pollutants. A commitment to high standards of maintenance and independent monitoring and regulation of the quality of drinking water produced via water recycling is also sought.

8. The process for recycling water will produce 'reject water', which will be returned to Budds Farm WWTW for processing before discharge into the sea. PfSH seeks clarification that this process will not lead to increased environmental impacts upon the Solent.

9. According to figures provided in the consultation the water recycling plant could transfer 15 million litres per day to Havant Thicket Reservoir, while the water transfer pipe could shift up to 90 million litres per day to the Otterbourne WWTW, at the peak of a drought. Confirmation of how long this could be sustained, and whether the water transfer process could negatively impact water supplies in the Portsmouth Water area during drought periods, is requested.

10. Water recycling has the potential to help mitigate the impact of nitrate discharges from housing development on European designated sites in the Solent. The need to address this issue led to extensive housing development backlogs across the PfSH region, and one that has only recently been unlocked due to newly-formed mitigation schemes – primarily the setting aside of high nutrient agricultural land and the creation of nutrient-absorbing wetlands.

11. While such mitigation schemes are welcome in the Solent region and provide multiple other benefits including biodiversity gain and carbon storage, there is

a finite supply of such sites with the local area. The loss of agricultural land has also come at a time of increasing national and global concern about food production and supply. The role of water recycling in helping to provide another mitigation option is therefore welcomed by PfSH as part of a suite of measures to address the issue sustainably and in the long-term.

12. While recognising the need for additional water supply, details of the cost of the proposed water recycling and water transfer system, and the likely addition to customer bills that the works and ongoing maintenance will add, will also be beneficial to PfSH to understand the full economic impacts of the project.

The location for the proposed water recycling plant in Havant and the process we went through to select it

13. Site 72 appears to be a grassy area which may be part of Broadmarsh Open Space. Should this be the case we assume it is surplus to local recreational needs and would be suitably compensated for if developed.

The preferred corridor we have identified for the pipelines needed to transfer water between Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works, the water recycling plant, Havant Thicket Reservoir and our Otterbourne Water Supply Works, including the process we went through to select it and the sites and zones for the above ground plant.

14. With regards to the range of possible pipe location, PfSH in general supports routes which reduce impacts upon Source Protection Zones and other environmental designations, such as Ancient Woodland.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Chairman, Partnership for South Hampshire

www.push.gov.uk


WATER
for LIFE®
from
Southern
Water®