Lincolnshire Reservoir – Community Liaison Group
4 June 2024

Present:

Chair: Charles Campion (CC)

Anglian Water Project Team

Attendee name (initials)	**Role/Specialism**
Mark Malcom (MM)	Programme Director Major Infrastructure
Kelly Linay (KL)	Stakeholder Lead
Greg Phillimore (GP)	Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation
Isabella Norman (IN)	Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation
Imogen Asquith (IA)	Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation
Adam Robinson (AR)	Lincolnshire Reservoir Programme Manager
Simon Railton (SR)	Masterplanning Lead
David Bull (DB)	Design Lead
Kieron Hyams (KH)	Socio-economic Lead
Linda Elliot (LE)	Regional Affairs Manager

Attendees

Attendee name	**Organisation**
Michael Coy	Burton Pedwardine Parish Meeting
Sara Marchant	Burton Pedwardine Parish Meeting
Geoff Hotchkin	Helpringham Parish Council
Will Watts	Helpringham Parish Council
Keith Laidler	Lincolnshire Geographical Society
Lea Schofield	Lincs Rural Support Network
Russell Jackson	North Kesteven District Council
Luisa MacIntosh	North Kesteven District Council
Karen Sweeney	Scredington Parish Council
John Johnson	Scredington Parish Council
Elaine Penketh	Swaton Parish Council
Charles Campion	Swaton Parish Council
Helen Earley	Threekingham, Spanby and Stow Parish Meeting
Tony Lyon- Marrion	Threekingham, Spanby and Stow Parish Meeting

Time:	7pm-9pm
Location:	**Scredington Community Centre, Church Lane, Scredington, Sleaford, Lincolnshire, NG34 0AG**

Welcome and introduction	
CC opened the session and welcomed members to the third meeting of the Community Liaison Group.	**CC**
Review of previous CLG actions	
CC enquired as to whether the group had any comments on the minutes from the previous CLG meeting, which had previously been circulated for review. The group had no comments on the minutes for the last meeting and all actions had been completed.	**CC**
Project update	

KL provided members with a project update by mapping out and talking through the project's progress to date and future key milestones:
 	
• AW launched their second phase of consultation on 30 May
• In this second phase of consultation, AW is consulting on: the emerging design for the main reservoir site, areas of land in the vicinity of the reservoir site that AW could need for environmental mitigation and enhancement, construction, and wider uses, associated water infrastructure and other supporting information.
• In preparation for this second phase of consultation AW have:
  • Engaged with landowners
  • Engaged with local authorities
  • Published an updated voluntary Residential Property Support Scheme
  • Created an events programme
  • Published a suite of information on the AW website about the emerging proposals
• KL recapped on the project's timeline
	KL

Questions submitted in advance	
KL proceeded to review the questions submitted in advance by members, with the assistance of MM and DB.	

1. If any of your heavy construction machinery working near a property causes any damage to the property, are you covered for that liability? *MM confirmed that, as per good practice, the entity carrying out the construction of the reservoir would be covered by their liability insurance in the case that machinery working near a property caused damage.*	**MM**
2. There are some electricity pylons running north to south through the part of Spanby where your bund will be constructed. What plans are there for these, will they be put underground or be even more of an eyesore by being located on the higher ground of the new bund? *DB confirmed that AW is engaging with National Grid about the power lines within the reservoir site and that AW will work with them to come to a decision as to where the lines are placed. Members voiced that they would prefer the power lines to be placed underground. KL explained that feedback, such as this, is valuable and encouraged the group to feed information like this back via the feedback form.*	**DB**
A member of the group in response to this raised the following question: 3. How do comments and feedback get recorded? *GP answered this question and provided an explanation of the feedback review process, whereby every piece of feedback is reviewed, analysed, grouped into a topic or theme and then responded to. GP also noted that a feedback report will be produced at the end of this round of consultation.*	**GP**
Main Reservoir Site Design	
SR began by reflecting on the first CLG meeting with reference to the contextual drivers which have helped to inform the design such as cultural heritage, landscape character, geology and hydrology. SR noted that the design presented is an initial emerging proposal and that AW welcome comments and feedback on it, with few elements fixed at this stage. SR presented the vision for the proposed reservoir in Lincolnshire. The vision represents AW's ambition for the project which goes beyond the core objective to secure a resilient water supply; the vision has been informed by community feedback from the earlier consultation stage. The vision underpins the design evolution at each stage and will be scrutinised as part of the DCO examination process. It comprises three themes: water, people and nature. • Water - the proposed reservoir will help to secure a reliable water supply for future generations and reduce the need for groundwater abstraction, helping to protect precious chalk streams and rivers. Access to water can also deliver broader social, environmental and economic benefits. • People – the project aspires to deliver benefits and opportunity to the community providing access to nature and open green spaces and supporting healthy and active lifestyles. • Nature – the project will encourage biodiversity through creation of new habitats appropriate to the area. 4. What is meant by the phrase 'agricultural opportunities' used in the vision for the reservoir?	

AW has commissioned an agricultural opportunities study to identify potential ways in which agricultural practices/ activities/ land uses could be supported directly or indirectly by the project.

5. How will AW protect the biodiversity of areas which are already rich in diversity and will potentially house the reservoir?
   AW will be mandated to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity above the baseline and current condition. AW will look to incorporate a range of habitats including wetlands, grassland, hedgerow and tree planting to help promote biodiversity.

6. When will we know what will happen rather than what could?
   At this stage, AW is presenting emerging proposals as opportunities rather than a fixed design and is inviting feedback. The design will become 'fixed' at a later stage before the DCO is submitted and will be presented at a subsequent round of consultation.

7. Will the reservoir actually look like this? There is cynicism amongst the community that the reservoir will not look like the proposed plans.
   The proposals presented at this stage are not the final design and this will evolve before we submit final plans for approval. AW will be required to construct and deliver the design which is secured through the DCO.

The emerging design was then discussed, and SR talked through the main components and features of the masterplan:

- The design has responded to feedback from the first round of public consultation which included requests to sensitively integrate the reservoir and embankments into the landscape. This is reflected within the emerging design, which has a naturalistic shape, varied embankment profiles and a peninsula which makes best use of locally high ground.
- The crest of the embankments will be at a consistent height (yet to be fixed). The height difference between existing ground and the proposed crest will vary however due to local variations in ground level around the reservoir.
- Hedgerows and trees can be used to break up the scale of the embankments and the angle of the slopes around the reservoir can be varied to respond to local character and views.
- The emerging design includes three lagoons within the reservoir, which will hold water at a relatively consistent level, providing public access to the water and creating ecologically diverse spaces. The initial ideas show the southern lagoon as a space for recreation, whilst the western and northern lagoons are designed more intentionally for nature and wildlife.
- Recreational routes (walking, cycling, horse-riding) are proposed around the reservoir, with opportunity to provide connections to neighbouring settlements.

8. How much of the embankment will be constructed using materials not found on site?
   AW currently plan to use all material excavated at the site for the reservoir's construction to help limit the number of vehicle movements by road.

9. Will land taken for embankments always belong to AW or will it be given back to land owners once the reservoir has been constructed?

This is something we're looking into further, we believe at this stage that some acquisitions will be permanent, while others will be temporary. AW will be able to provide more detail on this as their proposals develop.

10. What is being done to stop parking by visitors for the reservoir becoming an issue for local communities?
    Further work is required to assess traffic impacts both during construction and operation phases and to understand what mitigation will be required. More information on this will be provided at the next round of consultation.

Members expressed concern that they foresee that visitors will still go through small surrounding towns, such as South Beck and Burton Pedwardine. Members suggest that signs would be useful to stop people going through these areas.

11. Once in operation how will access to the reservoir be managed?
    Access to the reservoir once it is in operation will be considered in AW's traffic and transport assessment, which will be submitted with the DCO application for the reservoir.

Suggestions from members as to how to manage potential disruption caused by the reservoir include:

- Having a 40mph speed limit on the A52 approaching Threekingham
- Offering parking opportunities elsewhere
- Using double yellow lines in villages to stop visitors parking in surrounding towns

12. Why have changes been made to the design since the first consultation?
In the first phase of consultation AW presented an area of land where the reservoir could be sited. AW's proposals at this time were very broad and since then AW has developed an initial and emerging design for the reservoir based on feedback and assessments for the community's comment.

13. Why is extra land required beyond what is needed for the reservoir itself?
Areas of land, in addition to the reservoir main site, which have been identified have many possible uses including:

- *Land needed for mitigation of impacts assessed in the Environmental Statement. This could, by example, include land needed to achieve biodiversity net gain or to provide visual screening*
- *Land needed for construction of the reservoir*
- *Land needed for the Water Treatment Works or other infrastructure such as pumping stations*

Additionally, not all the land identified will be needed on a permanent basis.

- Members raised that houses on the edge of the proposed reservoir site are struggling to sell.
- Members also requested a 3D model.

Action
AW to look into and consider other phrases instead of 'lost in decay' to describe opportunities for environmental benefits that have not yet be realised, as some members disliked the term.

	SR
Overview of associated water infrastructure	

DB led on this section and explained that the proposed scheme is part of creating a resilient supply by taking water from rivers when it is in excess and storing it at the reservoir for when it may be needed in the future.
 	
Key elements and sources for the scheme include:
• AW's most preferred source is the South Forty Foot Drain (SFFD). Water from this source would be transferred through an enlarged Helpringham South Beck.
• When the SFFD does not have excess water to draw from AW is proposing taking water from the River Witham and then the River Trent.
• To transfer water from the River Witham to the SFFD two potential options, a piped and combined option (using both pipes and existing open channels) are being considered.
  ◦ The piped option would require an intake, pumping station, transfer buried pipeline and potentially a water treatment facility.
  ◦ The combined option would make use of the open channels of the Kyme Eau, Holland Dyke and Skerth Drain and would have similar requirements for abstraction infrastructure and potential water treatment facilities. The Holland Dyke would also need to be upgraded.
• Water from the River Trent would be drawn at Torksey Lock and would require a pumping station, potential water treatment facilities, transfer infrastructure and modifications where necessary to transfer water to the Fossdyke.
• Water from the reservoir would be treated and then transferred to connection points at Wilsthorpe and Chesterton where it would then be connected into the supply network.
 	
14. How will areas near the identified water sources be affected when water is drawn down? Will this exacerbate flooding?
AW will only draw water when it is excess. This is not a flood alleviation project, however, we're looking to see how it could potentially reduce the risk of flooding.
 	
15. Will the Water Treatment Works be above or below ground?
This is an area AW would like feedback on. The group showed a preference for the treatment works to be below ground.
 	
16. Will smell or noise from the Water Treatment Works be mitigated?
This is something which will be assessed further as the project progresses.
 	
17. Are there plans for further solar of wind power generation?
AW has to meet their net zero commitments; however, the amount of solar and wind power generation at the reservoir site, and the location of this infrastructure, is still to be decided and is open to comment.
 	
18. Have other areas of land been considered for the Water Treatment Works?	

The proposed area for the Water Treatment Works (WTW), as indicated in AW's proposals, was identified as the best place for the WTW; however, the area identified is indicative and larger than needed. Where exactly the works will be located within this area has not been decided.	**DB**
How to get involved	
GP talked through the different ways to provide feedback and opportunities for members to join AW at events. It was also raised that due to the announcement that a General Election will be held on 4 July: • The events in Edenham and Swaton will now be held on Thursday 18 July and Friday 19 July respectively. AW will also now hold a 10 week consultation, instead of an 8 week consultation as previously planned	**GP**
Q&A	
Opportunity for final questions from members: 19. Can water not be brought from other areas like electricity can? *AW has considered this but the reservoirs are the best options. Buying water from places like Yorkshire is not the most beneficial and AW also need to consider the longevity of their plans.* *20.* Why could groundwater rise in one place but not here? In a response to the questions: 'It has been reported that Thames Water's proposed Abingdon reservoir could raise groundwater levels by one metre. Could the Lincolnshire reservoir have a similar impact?' *AW stated that groundwater levels are not expected to rise significantly due to the proposed reservoir because of the low permeability clay at the site.* However, members wish to understand more about this as they suggest that surely Thames Water also considered the site material? *AW is doing a geotechnical study inclusive of the hydrogeological impacts of the reservoir. In general terms and as stated before, low permeability clay of the foundation and embankment material has been confirmed from review of the ground investigations undertaken in 2023 and its properties will be included in these studies and analysis.* *The low permeability clay broadly isolates the reservoir from the existing ground water. In the meeting AW identified that it is not appropriate to comment on the technical aspects of another scheme in relation to the Thames Water, Abingdon Reservoir and impacts on ground water levels. Generic overviews would be the limitation of what could be provided in relation to other schemes. In this context geological and hydrogeological conditions do vary significantly across the UK.* **Action** AW is to provide feedback and update on groundwater impacts following completion of the geotechnical studies in relation to the Lincolnshire reservoir.	**DB**
DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING: W/C 30 September TBC	