

Appendix 34: West Hanney Parish Council

1. West Hanney Parish Council		
1.1	Representation	West Hanney Parish Council wish to register their objections to Affinity Water's revised draft Water Resources Management Plan, which is badly thought out, lacks ambition and is unfair to customers.
	Our Response	We acknowledge your view but believe that our fWRMP19 is robust, meets the requirements and guidance set out by our regulators, meets the long term needs of our supply area and is well supported by our customers. Going forward we are eager to work with you to address your concerns through involvement in our Monitoring Plan.
	Summary of any change to our final WRMP	N/A
1.2	Representation	Plans to tackle leakage are below the target set by the water regulator and Affinity should bring leakage down to the industry average by 2050.
	Our Response	We fully support the ambitions to substantially reduce leakage by 2050. Our initial aim is to achieve a 50% reduction in leakage between 2015 to 2045. This 30-year programme to reduce leakage by 50% is planned to deliver five years earlier than most other water companies because we started the process in 2015, and will already have delivered a 14% reduction by 2020, followed by a further 18.5% reduction between 2020 and 2025. We will then aspire to achieve a higher level of reduction, to 57% from the 2015 position, which will allow us to reduce leakage by 50% from our 2020 position. Clarification of the 50% target and the ambition for 50% post AMP7 (i.e. 57% overall) is included in the fWRMP19 along with clarification of how we have handled mains renewals for leakage and trunk mains schemes. Explanation of how we will achieve leakage efficiencies and details of our leakage reduction strategy are provided in Technical Report 4.8: Leakage Strategy Report and referenced in the fWRMP19.
	Summary of any change to our final WRMP	Updated Technical Report 4.8: Leakage Strategy Report and referenced in the fWRMP19.
1.3	Representation	The future reservoir option at Abingdon is particularly badly thought out. Thames Water and Affinity have sought support for this by pushing the idea that it is needed to reduce abstraction rates from over-stressed chalk stream and rivers. Understandably, this has attracted much attention from the river protection and angling lobbies. Yet it is clear from this draft plan that Affinity expects to meet the need to reduce abstractions by using water from the existing Grafham reservoir and that this will be achieved by 2025, before the reservoir is even started.
	Our Response	The 'conjunctive use' system simulation modelling and hydrological analysis required to quantify the impact that our investment programme might have on downstream flows in the River Thames does not currently exist, so we have committed to supporting the Water Resources in the South East (WRSE) group to develop the relevant analysis in AMP7. We have, however carried out a qualitative analysis of the impacts of our investment programme on downstream flows in the River Thames. In the short to medium term (pre 2038) the impact will depend on the balance between reducing demand, and hence effluent returns, versus the reduction in abstraction and the Grafham imports. There is a risk that flows may tend to reduce as a result. In the longer term the introduction of strategic supply schemes will have a beneficial affect on flows, but this will need to be set against licencing and quality implications. The potential additional benefits from these increased flows will need to be considered against water quality implications and licencing arrangements, which will need to be accounted for in the regional economic analysis during AMP7.

1. West Hanney Parish Council		
	Summary of any change to our final WRMP	N/A
1.4	Representation	Despite being co-proponents of the Abingdon reservoir, it is clear that Affinity knows little about it. They have made no attempt to engage with the local communities or councils and have no understanding of the environmental effects, the problems of building over a floodplain or even its potential lack of sustainability.
	Our Response	<p>Engagement</p> <p>As residents in the Oxfordshire area are not our customers we did not engage with them directly.</p> <p>We met with Oxfordshire County Council and the Vale of the White Horse District Council and the Group Against Reservoir Development (GARD), on two occasions, to hear and discuss their concerns directly.</p> <p>The further consultation was open to all stakeholders and we received written representations from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oxfordshire County Council • Vale of the White Horse District Council • GARD. • Ardington and Lockinge Parish Council • East Hanney Parish Council • Garford Parish Meeting • Green Corridor Group • Group Against Reservoir Development (GARD) • 125 Individuals from the Oxfordshire area • Steventon Parish Council • Wantage and Grove Campaign Group • West Hanney Parish Council <p>Our further consultation online survey received 43 responses from the Oxfordshire area.</p> <p>Representatives from GARD and East Hendred Parish Council attended our Stakeholder Assembly.</p> <p>All the above representations and responses have been considered in the development of our final Plan and addressed in our Statement of Response.</p> <p>Flooding Risk of SESR</p> <p>A number of comprehensive flood risk studies regarding the SESR are available. A review of flooding and the provisions made to mitigate effects on flood risk due to the SESR has been undertaken, available in Thames Water’s Statement of Response No.2 Technical Appendix K. We have reviewed this and concur with the recommendations for further work, and also note that a Flood Risk Assessment for the SESR will be required to support the Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>SEA and HRA</p> <p>We have addressed the points raised across the various representations which relate to the Strategic Environmental Assessment (“SEA”) and Habitat and Regulations Assessment (“HRA”) within the SoR appendices in further detail, as well as revising the WRMP SEA/HRA documents where appropriate. We have included in the final SEA the second stage Egham to Iwer transfer and the small trading option on the River Thames.</p> <p>We recognise there are many stakeholders with a keen interest in some of the strategic options proposed in our plan which are covered under the SEA process, and we would like to continue to, or start to, engage with the relevant parties and stakeholders to help add to our knowledge base for each of these.</p> <p>Environmental Effects and Mitigation</p> <p>In order to generate the SEA and HRA we engaged separate consultants to Thames Water, who reviewed the information provided about environmental impacts,</p>

1. West Hanney Parish Council		
		<p>mitigation and amenity potential for the SESR option as part of their analysis. Their analysis, as described within the SEA report, generally concurred with Thames Water, and outlines the construction mitigation required for the scheme in a way that is cross-compatible with our other options. The SEA confirmed the potential for amenity improvements as part of the scheme assessment, along with the need to design these improvements as part of the planning application process.</p> <p><i>Resilience to Drought of the SESR</i></p> <p>We have reviewed the technical reports relating to the drought and climate resilience of the SESR provided to us by Thames Water, which were peer reviewed through their technical stakeholder working groups, and consider that these clearly demonstrate that the SESR can provide the quoted yield reliably across a wide range of drought severities. We note that drought severity within those documents is as measured for the Thames Water supply system. We have therefore also carried out an initial review of the yield that we can expect from 50Mm³ of storage (one third of the reservoir capacity) under our drought design condition and confirmed that this should provide us with the expected 100Ml/d benefit. However, more detailed modelling, which will need to account for the 'secondary benefit' provided by increased effluent returns to Thames Water's intakes (see response 0), plus the differences in timing and duration between our critical drought events and Thames Water's critical drought events, is required before we can confirm the benefits from the scheme. This modelling is included within our AMP7 joint working investigations and is due to report before the crucial 2023 decision point.</p>
	Summary of any change to our final WRMP	N/A
1.5	Representation	This plan should be completely rejected as being unfit for purpose.
	Our Response	<p>We acknowledge your view but believe that our fWRMP19 is robust, meets the requirements and guidance set out by our regulators, meets the long term needs of our supply area and is well supported by our customers.</p> <p>Going forward we are eager to work with you to address your concerns through involvement in our Monitoring Plan.</p>
	Summary of any change to our final WRMP	N/A