

Water Resources Management Plan 2019 Annex 7: Summary of Rejected Options

December 2019

Version 1



from
**Southern
Water** 

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Executive summary | 3 |
| 2. Summary of rejected options | 5 |

1. Executive summary

This annex covers options that did not make it through to the feasible list of options. Table 1 shows unconstrained options that did not make it through to the constrained list of options. Table 2 shows constrained options that did not make it through to the feasible list of options. The process by which options were screened and filtered is set out in Annex 6. The criteria against which options were assessed are shown in Table 1 and Table 2, along with the results of these assessments for each rejected option. The option groups and categories used in the tables are given below.

| Option group | Option group code | Option category | Option category code |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|----------------------|
| Demand management | DM | Leakage management | LM |
| | | Metering/tariffs | MET |
| | | Water efficiency | WEF |
| Drought options | DO | Demand interventions | DI |
| | | Supply interventions | SI |
| New water | NW | Desalination | DES |
| | | Canal water abstraction | CWA |
| | | Groundwater abstractions (new) | GWA |
| | | Surface water abstractions | SWA |
| | | New technologies | NT |
| Storing water | STR | Aquifer storage and recovery | ASR |
| | | Reservoirs | RES |
| Water reuse | WR | Indirect potable water reuse | PWR |
| | | Industrial water reuse | IWR |
| | | Grey water reuse | GRE |
| Managing the water environment | ENV | Catchment management | CM |
| | | Conjunctive use | CU |
| | | Licence variation | LV |
| | | Supporting river flows | SRF |
| Trading water | TW | Bulk supplies | BS |
| | | Bulk export | BE |
| | | Inter-zonal transfers (between Southern Water Water Resource Zones) | IZT |
| | | Licence trading | LTR |
| | | Asset enhancement | AE |
| Managing existing assets | ASS | Water treatment works enhancement | WTW |
| | | Borehole rehabilitation | BR |

Other abbreviations used in the tables are as follows:

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------|
| ADO | Average Deployable Output |
| DO | Deployable Output |
| EA | Environment Agency |
| HA | Hants Andover |
| HK | Hants Kingsclere |
| HR | Hants Rural |
| HSE | Hants Southampton East |
| HSW | Hants Southampton West |
| HW | Hants Winchester |
| IOW | Isle of Wight |
| KME | Kent Medway East |
| KMW | Kent Medway West |
| MDO | Minimum Deployable Output |
| PDO | Peak Deployable Output |
| SB | Sussex Brighton |
| SH | Sussex Hastings |
| SN | Sussex North |
| SW | Sussex Worthing |
| WRSE | Water Resources in the South East |
| WSW | Water Supply Works |
| WSR | Water Service Reservoir |
| WTW | Water Treatment Works |
| WwTW | Wastewater Treatment Works |

2. Summary of rejected options

Table 1 Unconstrained options not proceeding to the constrained list of options

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | | Comments |
|----------------------|---|---|---------|-----------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output? | Include in constrained option list? | | |
| AE | Develop strategic trunk main in Brighton | Asset enhancement option to develop a strategic trunk main in Brighton, and thus facilitate the transfer of water between Sussex North WRZ and Sussex Worthing and Sussex Brighton WRZs. | Central | SB | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | The option for increasing water from Sussex North to Sussex Brighton is considered in the Pulborough Winter transfer option. | |
| AE | Development of the existing Ventnor dewatering schemes for potable supply | The limited and unreliable yield of the de-watering scheme will not provide additional DO, therefore this option has not been progressed. | Western | IOW | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | The limited and unreliable yield of the de-watering scheme will not provide additional DO and there have been no recent changes to make the scheme viable. | |
| AE | Duplicate trunk main to release locked in DO in Kent Thanet WRZ | This option looks to install approximately 10km of new main (incl. booster pumping station) between the existing main Sandwich WSW and Fleete Manston WSR. The aim of this scheme is to release DO from the groundwater sources in Kent Thanet whose combined DO far exceeds demand by approximately 12Ml/d. Transfer of this excess supply is currently restricted by pressure constraints in the Kent Thanet mains network. | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains justified: Limited yield and long term DO benefit is uncertain / likely to reduce with time due to climate change impacts - i.e. The DO drops below the constraint. | |
| AE | Connectivity increased – Pulborough covering Weir Wood | This scheme would increase connectivity within Sussex North WRZ to allow greater flexibility – for instance, with Pulborough able to cover Weir Wood (suggested in EA letter of 18/11/05). | Central | SN | No | Yes | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Reason for exclusion from AMP4 Phase 1: Option is an asset enhancement scheme already being undertaken by SWS. Issues surrounding the impact of connectivity between Pulborough and Weir Wood would be considered further during Phase 2 and Phase 3, but not as a standalone option. Reasons for exclusion from AMP 5 feasible list: Excluded because it asset enhancement. AMP5 exclusion reason remains valid | |
| AE | Develop new 'leakage sources' to capture groundwater flowing into tidal sites | This option reviews the potential for capturing groundwater flow into tidal sites in both the Kent Medway and Thanet WRZs. This is predominantly considered as an operational efficiency measure, in a similar manner to 'spread load' boreholes in that it would permit key groundwater sources to be rested. | Eastern | KMW, KME and KT | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Source enhancement (therefore does not form part of a strategic option). | |
| AE | Transfer to Midhurst | This was deferred under the PR04 options screening process (Nov. 2002 report). Deferment was a result of awaiting the outcome from dredging at Swanbourne Lake and a reduction in the Midhurst licence. | Central | SN | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | This option is an asset optimisation scheme as opposed to an option that provides an increase in available water. It will be considered as an integral part of the resource modelling process. | |
| AE | East Worthing alternative site and treatment capacity | Scheme to improve DO through additional treatment for East Worthing scheme. | Central | SW | No | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Option replaced by another licence variation option as source is currently licence constrained. | |
| AE | Develop new trunk mains Perry Hill to Tennants Hill | Develop new trunk mains Perry Hill to Tennants Hill | Central | SN | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Previous reasons for exclusion remain valid. This option is an asset enhancement option as opposed to providing additional water. | |
| AE | Develop new 'spread load' boreholes to increase DO | This option investigates developing sources in order to spread abstractions across an increased number of boreholes. This will result in making enhancements to a number of boreholes. Work was carried out under the 'Source Optimisation' programme during 2006 to investigate a number of opportunities in this area. | Eastern | KME and KMW | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: Source enhancement (therefore does not form part of a strategic option). | |
| ASR | Hampshire - Bagshot Beds | Hampshire - Bagshot Beds ASR | Western | HS | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Tertiary Bagshot Beds are unsuitable for ASR exploitation as the aquifer is semi-confined and the poorly consolidated fine sands are likely to result in clogging problems. | |
| ASR | Hampshire - Chalk | Hampshire - Chalk ASR | Western | HS | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | The Chalk source in central and northern Hampshire is largely unconfined and therefore not appropriate for the application of ASR. | |
| ASR | Pulborough Artificial Recharge | Artificial recharge and increased abstraction from the Pulborough Basin Folkestone Beds aquifer. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | It is not viable to operate this scheme unless the aquifer within the Pulborough Basin is allowed to be derogated by | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---------|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | abstraction during the summer. The scheme would have to result in increased impacts on the SPA wetlands during summer/autumn conditions compared with the current situation. |
| ASR | Isle of Wight - Bagshot Beds | Isle of Wight - Bagshot Beds ASR | Western | IOW | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR due to the close proximity to the outcrop or the potential hydraulic connectivity with the sea. |
| ASR | Isle of Wight - Chalk | Isle of Wight - Chalk ASR | Western | IOW | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR (either physically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Isle of Wight - Bembridge Marls and Limestones | Isle of Wight - Bembridge Marls and Limestones ASR | Western | IOW | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The option is not likely to be technically feasible due to insufficient hydraulic conductivities. |
| ASR | Isle of Wight - Upper Greensand | Isle of Wight - Upper Greensand ASR | Western | IOW | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is not likely to be technically appropriate for ASR (either physically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Kent Medway Chalk | Kent Medway Chalk ASR | Eastern | KME and KMW | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR. |
| ASR | Kent Medway - Thanet Sands | Kent Medway - Thanet Sands ASR | Eastern | KME and KMW | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR (either physically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Kent Thanet - Chalk | Kent Thanet - Chalk ASR | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR. |
| ASR | Kent Thanet - Jurassic Limestones | Kent Thanet - Jurassic Limestones ASR | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR (either physically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Kent Thanet - Lower Greensand | Kent Thanet - Lower Greensand ASR | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is not technically suitable for ASR (either technically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Kent Thanet - Thanet Sands | Kent Thanet - Thanet Sands ASR | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR. |
| ASR | Kent Thanet - Upper Coal Measures Sandstone Division | Kent Thanet - Upper Coal Measures Sandstone Division ASR | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is not technically appropriate for ASR (either technically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Medway Greensands | Medway Greensands ASR | Eastern | KME and KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. Investigation concludes that ASR at Kent Medway WRZ is not practically feasible as a strategic resource development option, due to water quality and hydrogeological constraints. |
| ASR | Sussex Coast - Ashdown Beds | Sussex Coast - Ashdown Beds ASR | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. No information is available for this formation but the depth of the aquifer would make the scheme very expensive. |
| ASR | Sussex Coast - Chalk | Sussex Coast - Chalk ASR | Central | SW and SB | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR. |
| ASR | Sussex Coast - Tunbridge Wells Sands | Sussex Coast - Tunbridge Wells Sands ASR | Central | SW and SB | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The option is not likely to be technically feasible due to insufficient hydraulic conductivities. |
| ASR | Sussex Coast - Upper Greensand | Sussex Coast - Upper Greensand ASR | Central | SW and SB | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The option is not likely to be technically feasible as the Upper Greensand is hydraulically connected with the Chalk. |
| ASR | Sussex Hastings - Ashdown Beds | Sussex Hastings - Ashdown Beds ASR | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR. |
| ASR | Sussex Hastings - Portland Sandstone | Sussex Hastings - Portland Sandstone ASR | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR (either technically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Sussex Hastings - Tunbridge Wells Sands | Sussex Hastings - Tunbridge Wells Sands ASR | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR because the siltation problems and the heterogeneous nature of the material. |
| ASR | Sussex North - Ashdown Beds | Sussex North Ashdown Beds ASR | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR (either physically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Sussex North - 5MI/d (Hythe Beds) | Sussex North - 5MI/d (Hythe Beds) ASR | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. ASR is theoretically possible for the area, but the Pulborough basin would be very high risk due to interactions with shallow aquifers and surface waters. |
| ASR | Sussex North - Portland Sandstone | Sussex North - Portland Sandstone ASR | Central | SN | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid. The aquifer is technically inappropriate for ASR (either physically or environmentally). |
| ASR | Sussex North - Tunbridge Wells Sands | Sussex North - Tunbridge Wells Sands ASR | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP4 exclusion remains valid. The option is not likely to be technically feasible due to |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---------|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|----|----|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | insufficient hydraulic conductivities. |
| BE | Transfer from Southern Water Bewl Reservoir to South East Water Bewl Bridge WTW | Selected in WRSE modelling in Jan 2013 and agreed between companies in discussions in Feb/March 2013. Further discussion between Southern Water and South East Water will establish the extent of bulk supplies required. | Eastern | KMW | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. Filter out from constrained list. May require investigation pending WRSE modelling and inter-company discussions. |
| BE | Southern Water Medway (near Rochester Works) to South East Water | 14.6MI/d transfer from near Rochester WSW to South East Water. Not now dependent on Honour Oak transfer. | Eastern | KMW | No | No | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. Filter out from constrained list. May require investigation pending WRSE modelling and inter-company discussions. |
| BE | Southern Water Medway (near Rochester Works) to South East Water | (1) 10MI/d transfer. Not now dependent on Honour Oak transfer. Constrained by near Rochester WTW capacity. Proposed route Southern Water near Rochester to South East Water Bleas (via Faversham4–Fleete main). (2) 14.6MI/d transfer. Not now dependent on Honour Oak transfer. Constrained by near Rochester WTW capacity. Proposed route Southern Water near Rochester to South East Water Bleas (via Faversham–Fleete main). | Eastern | KMW | No | No | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. Filter out from constrained list. May require investigation pending WRSE modelling and inter-company discussions. |
| BE | Increase bulk supply from Southern Water Darwell at peak | Increase bulk supply from SWS's Darwell Reservoir to South East Water at peak (reduction in Southern Water DO). | Eastern | SH | No | No | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | Extension of Bulk Supply from Southern Water (Deal High) | (1) This option considers increasing the current transfer from Southern Water to Affinity Water, to operate all year round. The new transfer would consist of a 2MI/d transfer between January and August, with a 4MI/d transfer between September and December (ADO: 2.67MI/d.) (2) Transfer from Southern Water to Affinity Water consisted of a 4MI/d transfer between September and December (ADO 1.33MI/d), with the agreement expiring at the end of December 2012. This option considers the extension of this contract. | Eastern | SH | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | Bulk supply Southern Water Darwell to from South East Water Eastbourne | 8MI/d Additional bulk supply from Southern Water Darwell to South East Water Eastbourne (RZ3) Folkington Service Reservoir. | Eastern | SH | No | No | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | Transfer to South East Water if licence variation for the River Medway Scheme is approved | Transfer to South East Water if licence variation for the River Medway Scheme is approved. | Eastern | KMW | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | Bulk supplies from Southern Water Kent Medway to South East Water | Bulk supplies from Southern Water Kent Medway to South East Water at 3MI/d. Various routes proposed in WRSE 2012/13. Original proposed route was Southern Water near Rochester to South East Water Aldington or Radfall reservoir (via Faversham4–Fleete main). This was then replaced by transfers from Hartlip (Southern Water KM) to Detling (RZ6) to Bleas (RZ8) to Aldington (RZ8). | Eastern | KMW | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Option reduces Southern Water DO as it is an export. Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | Southern Water Medway (Bewl) to South East Water | (1) 10MI/d transfer using existing spare capacity at Bewl WTW. (2) An additional 10MI/d transfer dependent on new capacity at Bewl WTW. | Eastern | KMW | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Option reduces Southern Water DO as it is an export. Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | A range of capacities for Sussex Brighton to South East Water Mid-Sussex transfer will be costed. | Sussex Brighton to South East Water Mid-Sussex export. | Central | SB | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | 4MI/d transfer, Southern Water Sussex Brighton to South East Water | Bi-directional transfer between existing South East Water Barcombe WSR and Southern Water Swan WSR. | Central | SB | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | 5MI/d bulk supply from Southern Water Kent Medway to South East Water via Faversham4–Fleete Main | 5MI/d bulk supply from Southern Water Kent Medway to South East Water via Faversham4–Fleete Main. 5MI/d transfer from South East Water Bleas WSR to connect to break pressure tank along the Faversham4–Fleete main/ Bulk supply from Southern Water via the Sheldwich main at Hartlip (Southern Water near Rochester to South East Water Hartlip). | Eastern | KMW | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|----------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|--|
| BE | Weir Wood Transfer-additional capacity (>5.4Ml/d) to SEW | An additional transfer option for transfers in excess of 5.4Ml/d. Capex would be required for pipeline reinforcement. Pipeline costs for up to 20Ml/d in increments of 5Ml/d could be developed. | Central | SN | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BE | Southern Water Sussex Hastings to South East Water | Southern Water Sussex Hastings to South East Water. Proposed in WRSE 2012 to possibly involve increased take from Bewl. | Eastern | SH | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Does not provide a WRMP benefit. |
| BR | Re-commissioning of Broadstairs source | This option involves the re-commissioning of unused Broadstairs source in Kent Thanet WRZ. The existing source at Broadstairs has not been used since 1989 when the source was contaminated with cyclohexane. Rehabilitation has occurred for many years but the licence has now been revoked. | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Excluded due to water quality issues. |
| BS | Increase the connectivity between Bough Beech (SES Water reservoir) and Weir Wood | Transfer of water from Bough Beech reservoir (SES Water) to an outlet into Weir Wood reservoir. The transfer would most likely be of raw untreated water from Bough Beech but it is also possible that water would first be treated at Bough Beech Reservoir Water Treatment Works. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Option is reliant on development of water resources by SES Water. Excluded from AMP 5 because option requires large-scale water resource developments and EA would not support an option that increases abstraction from the Medway catchment. Exclusion remains valid. |
| BS | Bulk transfer from Craig Goch Reservoir | Bulk transfer from Craig Goch Reservoir. The idea behind the scheme would be to supplement flow in the Severn from Craig Goch, allowing increased abstraction downstream, with a relatively small pipeline transfer from the Severn to the headwaters of the River Thames (probably in the region of 30 miles). Supplementary flow in the Thames could allow greater abstractions downstream, and it would be these additional abstraction volumes that would be used to increase water available to Southern Water. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Excluded during Southern Water Western Area Options investigation 2015 on grounds of practicality, technical feasibility, availability of water, costs of the infrastructure required, and the environmental impacts of transferring raw water from one catchment to another. Exclusion remains valid. |
| BS | Termination of Deal High reservoir supply to Affinity | Terminating the bulk supply from the Southern Water service reservoir at Deal to Affinity Water would mean an additional amount of water for Kent Thanet of 4Ml/d at peak and 3Ml/d at average operating between 1st September to 31st December annually. This may potentially reduce the reliance on the Faversham4-Fleete main. | Eastern | KT | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded from AMP 5 because the contract was not renewed after the previous end date of 2012/13. Option is therefore already included in the baseline. |
| BS | Water Grid | Construction of a UK Water Grid using pipelines and canals to transfer water long distances. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | The feasibility of a Grid was considered by the House of Lords Select Committee (2006), which found "a national water grid is not currently feasible because it would require huge amounts of energy and would cost too much". Due to the great uncertainties involved, the concerns regarding the practicality and reliability of the scheme, and the potential for significant environmental impacts, this option was excluded from AMP 4 Phase 1 and AMP5 unconstrained options. Exclusion remains valid. |
| BS | Bulk transfer from Kielder Reservoir | Construction of a new bulk transfer network from Kielder reservoir in the far north of England near the border of Scotland (Northumbrian Water) to Thames Water, for transfer onwards to Southern Water. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Excluded from AMP 4 Phase 1, Test Surface Water RSA and AMP 5 due to impracticality, costs and technical feasibility associated with the infrastructure required. |
| BS | Bulk supply from Norway or Iceland (Albion Water) | Shipping of glacial quality water via super tanker from Norway or Iceland through Albion Water. Oil super tankers are extremely large and, if it could be cleaned to a suitable level, then it would be possible to transfer up to 350Ml in a single tanker. Storage would not be needed, as the tanker could act as a floating reservoir, subject to an available and suitable berth being identified. Correspondence with Albion Water in November 2016 suggested delivery locations of Southampton and possibly Thamesport on the Isle of Grain. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Excluded from AMP 4, AMP 5 and Southern Water Western Area Options 2015 due to excessive and disproportionate costs, berth availability and limited DO due to limited number of ships. Correspondence with Albion Water in November 2016 confirmed that the option for bulk transfer via Super tanker would still be extremely expensive. |
| BS | Reduction of bulk import from Portsmouth Water | Southern Water receives a bulk supply from Portsmouth Water of up to 15Ml/d. In the event of a drought, the Company would hold discussions with this donor with regards to the resources position and their supply. | Central | SN | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Reduces Southern Water DO. |
| BS | Wey and Arun Canal transfer | Transfer using the Wey and Arun canals. The Thames region EA indicated that there was probably insufficient water available in either the River Wey, or in groundwater supplies, to run the canal, let alone | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Requires development of the Upper Thames reservoir and the refurbishment of the canal. Excluded from AMP 4 Phase 1 and AMP 5 due to technical feasibility, practicality and |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|
| | | provide additional water to Sussex. Any water would therefore have to be taken via a transfer pipeline from the Thames or existing Thames Water groundwater sources, which will only be available if Thames Water builds the Upper Thames reservoir. | | | | | | | | | | | | | reliability. Exclusion remains valid. |
| CM | Rother pilot: additional payments for ecosystem services to farmers / landowners | Rother Catchment - pilot using a model to change land management to reduce soil loss and link with HLS/Single farm payments. This needs to have very clear boundaries and has to have the extent, boundaries, what is being paid for regarding the ecosystem clearly defined. Reliant on EU policy to continue and deliver this. No point if the monitoring and analysis is not being done properly, need to check that the farmers are following protocol. Need all farmers in target area to be signed up to the scheme. | Central | SN | Yes | No | Yes | No | Excluded as replaced by another option. |
| CM | Pilot: River Rother Restoration instream | River restoration addressing over-widened over-depended river channel. Installing small weir, proper fish/eel passages. Allow reduction in MRF as more water available for abstraction. Providing benefit to Pulborough | Central | SN | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Would have no increase in DO as the changes would not allow for a reduction in MRF. Now superseded by another option. |
| CM | Western Rother Pilot Scheme-Sediment Traps | Roll out sediment traps for high risk areas across catchment. Subsidies. Additional benefits in pesticide and nutrient reduction. Benefit to Pulborough | Central | SN | Yes | No | Yes | No | It is unknown until a pilot study is undertaken as to whether this option is able to provide additional water resource. The adoption into the constrained option list should be dependent on whether there is the opportunity for a pilot study to be undertaken. Now superseded by another option |
| CU | Increase the connectivity between Ardingly reservoir and Weir Wood | This option is to increase connectivity between Ardingly Reservoir (SEW) and Weir Wood Reservoir to allow transfer of raw water at a capacity of 10 to 20Ml/day. The option to increase the connectivity between the reservoirs does not involve extension of the capacity of either reservoir or the water treatment works. Rather, this option aims to increase the volume of water held at the start of a drought event based on past hydrological experience. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: Option excluded in AMP5 as there was no water resource benefit. |
| CU | Stourmouth conjunctive use with near Canterbury ground water | Stourmouth conjunctive use with near Canterbury ground water | Eastern | KT | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: Will not form a separate option as the water resource model will ensure that schemes are operated in conjunctive way. |
| CWA | New abstraction from the Basingstoke Canal | Abstraction from the Basingstoke Canal, owned by Hampshire and Surrey County Councils and managed by the Basingstoke Canal Authority. | Western | HA | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Any abstraction from the canal is likely to affect navigation along the watercourse. |
| DES | Tidal River Adur Desalination | This option proposes a desalination plant abstracting from the Tidal River Adur. Shoreham Harbour has not been included in the search area as it is covered by another option. | Central | SB | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | AMP5 rejection remains valid. Most of the tidal stretch of the river is internationally designated. The Adur runs through the Sussex Downs AONB and is designated as a SSSI on entering Shoreham Harbour. Adur Estuary SSSI site also forms part of an RSPB reserve which supports a large number of wading birds and saltmarsh plants. |
| DES | River Brede Desalination, on the approach to Rye where it joins the Rother before entering Rye Harbour | This option would include construction of a desalination plant along the tidal River Brede on the approach to the Rye where it joins the Rother. The River Brede is only tidal for 800m and has low density residential dwellings. Any treated water would be used to supply the Sussex Hasting WRZ. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Excluded from AMP 5 because it was stated that a more suitable site is located to the south and considered in another option. |
| DES | Gosport and Lee-on-the-Solent (outside the company's supply area) | This option is to build a desalination plant along the coast of Gosport and Lee-on-the-Solent (outside the company's supply area). The coastline from Lee-on-the-Solent to Hill Head consists of a shingle beach and does not have any European designations. Residential dwellings and secondary homes cover most of the coast. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Excluded from AMP 5 due to inappropriate location and environmental impacts. Construction in a mainly residential area, discharges to environmentally designated area of coast and other options to meet demand in the area mean this option will not be looked at further. |
| DES | Offshore desalination | Desalination from a ship or platform. Either option would require a pipeline connection into supply from a suitable berth, power connection, delivery and storage of consumables on land or the ship/platform, and purchase or lease of an appropriate vessel along with mooring fees. In addition, recirculation of brine may become an issue at high production rates unless either the offtake or discharge is located at some distance from the ship/platform. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Excluded as a WRMP option. |
| DES | Desalination between | The stretch of coastline between Sandwich and Kingsdown on the | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Excluded in AMP 5 as site is unsuitable for desalination |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|----------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|---|
| | Sandwich and Kingsdown | East Kent coast was investigated for potential locations for a desalination plant. This stretch of coastline has been discounted as it subject to several designations (e.g. SSSI, Ramsar sites, SAC and SPA, Special Landscape area) and is either undeveloped or residential in nature. | | | | | | | | | | | | | proposals due to planning/environmental constraints. These reasons are still valid. |
| DES | Solar Desalination | (1) The use of solar cells to drive evaporation distillation. (2) Standard desalination powered by photovoltaic solar panels. Both these processes might be more efficient during a drought when in theory there would be more sunlight hours. | Southern Water | - | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as a specific option type, although, any new build option will give due consideration to the inclusion of renewable power sources during feasibility and design. It may be possible to include solar panels in the design and operation of a desalination plant. |
| DI | Temporary bans on water use | Drought Option to implement temporary bans on water use: Can be introduced relatively quickly and in a phased manner under powers created by the FWMA 2010 and can be applied on a WRZ basis. | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Demand savings from temporary use bans are already taken account of in the deployable output calculations used in the baseline supply demand balance. |
| DI | Emergency restrictions | Drought Option: Emergency Drought Orders allow water companies to restrict supplies to customers through the imposition of rota cuts and/or the introduction of standpipes. These measures exist to deal with the very remote possibility of a drought much worse than any seen in the last century or more in the UK. Emergency Drought Orders have not been put in place in the UK since 1976. Ministers have made it clear that such measures should be avoided at all costs and introduced only as a last resort. The Company will make full use of all other measures before considering whether the severity of drought conditions mean that Emergency Drought Orders might be required. The full range of measures available under Emergency Drought Order include powers: • To limit the use of water for such purposes as it considers necessary (i.e. further measures not specified in the Drought Direction 2011); • To introduce rota cuts; and • To set up, and supply water by means of, stand-pipes or water tanks. Level of intervention for this option: Unprecedented drought conditions. We intend the need for these to only arise in conditions of civil emergency and as such our emergency plan covers this in more detail. | Southern Water | - | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | This option has not been included in the investment modelling because it is not considered to be a WRMP option: before any consideration of such emergency events, Southern Water considers that there would likely be prior government designation of some form of national or regional emergency. |
| DP | Rest groundwater sources - Sussex Brighton | Drought Option - Brighton - Use any spare winter/spring water available from the Pulborough river abstraction to supply customers in Worthing and in Brighton via the Rock Road transfer. This allows groundwater to be rested in key 'storage' sources, which can improve drought resilience in those sources during the following summer and autumn, and help provide some protection against saline intrusion in sources down gradient | Central | SB | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Excluded as it would have only a small amount of indirect impact, if any, on Hove, Brighton A and Falmer, that supply the eastern part of Middle Level service. |
| DP | Rest specific sources during early stages of drought - Kent Thanet. | The overall strategy for the WRZ is to rest groundwater sources and maximise the use of surface water. In this respect, there is the potential to maximise the use of Stourmouth when there is sufficient surface water available. Within this strategy, there are a number of sources which are constrained by hydrogeological constraints such as the source yield or features such as adits. Priority will be given to resting these sources, over and above those that are simply constrained by the abstraction licence or pump capacity. Level of intervention: Impending drought. | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Excluded from constrained list as option is not considered viable. Stourmouth WSW is not operational. |
| GRE | Compulsory rainwater capture | Make rainwater capture part of planning/building regime for extensions/refurbishments as well as new build to provide grey water for domestic use | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Not a WRMP option. Southern Water could support any changes to planning legislation but are not responsible. |
| GRE | Dual supply system for households | Different charges for different quality of water. New housing to include soakaway (where applicable) and grey water storage. Individuals can sell stored water like solar energy. Existing housing to soakaway/grey water storage and then reclaim costs. Incentives to householders to stop putting water down drains | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Not a WRMP option. Southern Water could support any changes to planning legislation but are not responsible. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|----------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|
| GRE | Enhanced grey water usage - residential or industrial | Promotion of grey water usage to reduce clean water used in homes for non-consumption uses - e.g. gardens, toilet flushing etc. Support inclusion of facilities in 'new builds'- storage tanks, solar pumps. Reed beds for treatment of water-reduce water sent away for waste | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Not a WRMP option. Southern Water could support any changes to planning legislation but are not responsible. |
| GWA | Ashey WSW | Ashey is a disused groundwater source located on the east side of the Isle of Wight near Sandown. The option would involve bringing this source back online. This scheme consists of two sub-options, one which involves marginal treatment onsite and the other is to pump the raw water from Ashey borehole through a new dedicated raw water pipe to Newchurch WSW for treatment. | Western | IOW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Excluded due to limited additional DO (0.3MI/d average). Water treatment needed due to high Cryptosporidium risk. |
| GWA | New borehole at Rye | This source is currently used and has a Deployable Output of 2.26MI/d (average) and 3.8MI/d (peak). This option aims to increase the Deployable Output at the site to the licensed value. The current licence is for 2.26MI/d (average) and 8.73MI/d (peak). Hence it is only possible to increase the peak licence at this source. | Eastern | SH | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | The site is at its hydrogeological yield and cannot be increased further. The option is not viable as part of a strategic option and is not considered further. |
| GWA | Offshore freshwater drilling | Drilling rig offshore to abstract from freshwater aquifer with underwater pipeline to Shoreham docks for treatment. | Central | SB | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | The scheme could produce water quality issues due to saline intrusion and is likely to be prohibitively expensive. |
| GWA | Midhurst Licence Increase | Increase the licence capacity of the Midhurst abstraction | Central | SN | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | There is little or no scope for additional abstraction in Midhurst. |
| GWA | Broadstairs | This option involves the reintroduction of groundwater from the Broadstairs borehole. The site contains a 53m deep borehole, a small water treatment works and a covered reservoir. The site is licensed at 5.68MI/d (MDO and PDO). The current source is out of action due to a water quality incident at the site. The scheme is to refurbish the current borehole, install all necessary pumping infrastructure and new treatment works. | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Excluded due to water quality concerns. |
| GWA | Optimise the seasonal management of the North Kent chalk aquifer block at two groundwater locations | Optimise the seasonal management of the North Kent chalk aquifer block | Eastern | KME and KMW | No | No | First option is discounted as having already been largely investigated and implemented as far as possible. Second source has been removed, therefore is not considered further. |
| GWA | SPA Flow Augmentation | Use of treated water or effluent to augment flows in Arun Valley SPA ditches and allow further groundwater abstraction in the Pulborough Basin | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Because of the environmental sensitivity of the site the water quality for the irrigation water would have to be at least as good as an indirect re-use scheme for the River Rother. Given the fact that the indirect re-use scheme would provide a direct benefit to DO and would not require the extensive pipework needed for an irrigation scheme, then there is no real benefit from this option compared with indirect effluent re-use. |
| GWA | Development of a new groundwater abstraction | Investigation to identify possibility of the development of a new groundwater abstraction | Southern Water | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | The CAMS identifies these Chalk aquifers as being under stress from abstractions as they are over licensed. The current licensing strategy is that there is a 'presumption against' the granting of licences for abstraction from the Chalk for consumptive use |
| GWA | North Worthing Borehole | New Groundwater Source near North Worthing | Central | SW | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | The aquifers within this area are assessed as over-abstracted or 'no water available'. |
| GWA | Twyford WSW | Increase output. | Western | HSW | No | No | As permission for a further abstraction licence is unlikely there cannot be acceptable confidence that this option would be implemented and that there would be any output. |
| GWA | West Sussex New Groundwater Sources | Develop new groundwater sources in either Sussex North or Sussex Coast areas. | Central | SN | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | The aquifers within this area are assessed as over-abstracted or 'no water available'. |
| IZT | Transfer from Bewl to Weir Wood | Transfer of 10MI/d raw water from Bewl to Weir Wood via a pumping station at Bewl with additional treatment and mains at Weir Wood to permit 20MI/d into supply at peak and maximum drought periods. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: Would require large scale water resource development at Bewl so that water would be available for the transfer. |
| IZT | Supply from Darwell | (1) Bulk supply from Darwell (2) Raw water supply from Darwell | Central | SH | No | No | - | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | AMP 5 exclusion remains valid: For sub-option (1) it was concluded that transfer from Bewl is more cost effective than from Darwell. For sub-option (2) it was concluded that any raw water transfer from the Bewl-Darwell system would be more cost effective |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | and reliable coming from Bewl rather than Darwell. |
| IZT | Hampshire Andover to Hampshire Winchester | Transfer any surplus from Hampshire Andover to Hampshire South | Western | HW | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Exclude as it is a security of supply option. Not a water resources option |
| IZT | Hampshire Kingsclere to Hampshire Andover | Transfer any surplus from Hampshire Kingsclere to Hampshire Andover | Western | HA | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Exclude as it is a security of supply option. Not a water resources option |
| IZT | Optimise Medway – Rother transfer | This option is to use the existing Bewl-Darwell transfer main to transfer water from Darwell to Bewl. This would re-use the existing pipeline but would require a new pumping station, together with bypass valves on the existing main and potentially additional air valves or other infrastructure along the pipeline route. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | The system yield of the scheme was considered very low (less than 2Ml/d) and it was not considered a strategic water resource development. |
| IZT | Itchen WSW to Pulborough transfer | This pipeline option would be operated at critical summer periods and the pipeline would then be drained over the winter when supply from the River Rother was adequate. The proposal was to transfer 20Ml/d (peak and average) from Itchen WSW to Pulborough | Central | SN | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded from AMP 5 feasible list as the Itchen Habitats Directive found significant environmental impacts would remove excess water availability. |
| IZT | Connect Powdermill and Darwell | This option would see the construction of a new raw water transfer main between Darwell and Powdermill Reservoirs. The proposed transfer route would have a length of approximately 8.2 km. The main would be pumped to a high point of around 80 mAOD north of Sedlescombe from where it would continue under gravity to Powdermill reservoir. The pipeline is designed with a maximum capacity of 10Ml/d. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Option rejected as it provides very little water. |
| IZT | Strategic Trunk Mains | Develop a better strategic trunk main system to allow water to be distributed more easily | Central | SN | No | - | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as it is an asset enhancement option. |
| IZT | Second stage transfer to/from Sussex Coast | Second stage transfer to/from Sussex Coast | Central | SW | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP5 Water resource modelling showed that there is insufficient spare capacity to justify such a transfer without further resource development. Previous exclusions remain valid. |
| IZT | 10Ml/d Bi-directional transfer between Sussex Worthing and Sussex Brighton | 10Ml/d Bi-directional transfer between Sussex Worthing and Sussex Brighton | Central | SW | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: assume that Southern Water continue to supply South East Water through the planning period |
| IZT | Test Surface Water to Blackfield Booster Station | This option increases the capacity for transfer of water from Test Surface Water WSW in the Hampshire region to the Isle of Wight via the Blackfield booster pumping station. This option also involves the construction of a new high-lift pumping station at Test Surface Water WSW. | Western | IOW | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Considered within another option. |
| IZT | Increased capacity of the transfer main to Bewl Water | The River Medway is of a 'flashy' nature, with high flows following rainfall events, even during 'dry' conditions. This proposed option duplicates the existing pipeline, including the construction of a new pumping station and rising main. This would also require a new abstraction licence from the EA, which would be expected to be above the existing MRF plus abstraction capacity (i.e. above 500Ml/d). In summary, the option would require: - New intake and pumping station. - Power supply, surge protection and other works. - New rising main, 1200mm diameter 19.9km long, together with air valves, washouts and thrust blocks. - One railway crossing, and two major rail crossings. - Outfall structure for delivery of water to the reservoir. | Eastern | KM | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | AMP 5 exclusion remains valid: Option was excluded from AMP 5 feasible list because it was concluded that a similar benefit could be achieved by varying the existing licence. |
| LM | District meter zoning | Review of district meter areas (DMAs) to identify potential re-zoning | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Limited feasibility for further re-zoning with insignificant savings as a result |
| LV | River Arun Tidal Licence derogation | Application for derogation for the licence on the Tidal abstraction, which is currently attached to a cut-off clause if flow in the Upper Arun is not supported by flow from a sewerage works. | Central | SW | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no DO benefit. |
| LV | Arundel Licence Increase | Increase in licence | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | The option is environmentally unacceptable and the EA specifically said that increased abstraction from sources around Arundel will be unacceptable. |
| LV | Rookley | Reduce or remove the MRF which controls the abstraction from this source | Western | IOW | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | There is an immediate impact on flows in the Sheat stream for a small DO benefit. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|--|
| LV | Long Furlong A Licence Increase | Increase in licence | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | This option is environmentally unacceptable and the EA has said that the Chalk and Lower Greensand aquifers are not going to be further exploited. |
| LV | Darwell licence variation | As part of the license for Darwell Reservoir, the EA maintain 500MI of storage for use as 'freshet' release during periods of poor water quality in the River Eastern Rother. This option involves temporarily removing the "Freshet condition" applicable to the reservoir, whereby Southern Water is required to reserve 500M of water in the reservoir for release to the River Rother. The removal of this requirement would enable an extra 500MI of water to be made available for public water supply from the reservoir. Although the 500MI is reserved for use by the EA, it is understood that the volume has not been used and there is no infrastructure in place to allow this to occur. The removal of this storage would increase DO in the WRZ (equivalent to 1MI/d at MDO and 1.1MI/d at PDO). Could also be considered as a Drought Option | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | It has been confirmed that this environmental condition has been removed from the licence (31/03/18) and Southern Water are no longer required to reserve this 500MI of storage. Therefore this option is no longer feasible and is removed from the list of options available. |
| LV | Pulborough Licence Separation | Separation of the Pulborough Surface and GW licences to allow greater flexibility (up to 100MI/d abstraction) and possible benefits from conjunctive use | Central | SN | - | - | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: Infeasible as a standalone scheme and included in Pulborough option. |
| LV | Powdermill Compensation flow reduction | | Eastern | SH | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | No | Excluded as it is considered instead as a Drought Option. |
| LV | Sandown | Reduce the MRF near Alverstone which controls the abstraction at Sandown | Western | IOW | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Not being considered as a separate drought order/permit therefore excluded from constrained list. |
| MET | Smarter metering of all HH metered customers AMP8 start | Introduction of smarter meter technology which can provide daily meter reading data to customers and Southern Water. Implementation during AMP8. | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | 0 |
| MET | Smarter metering - longer term programme | Introduction of smarter meter technology which can provide daily meter reading data to customers and Southern Water. Implementation over a longer period of time: during AMP7 and AMP8. | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | 0 |
| MET | Meter remaining NHH customers | Meter remaining unmetered NHH customers (c.5000), where feasible to do so. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Under market reforms, NHH demand management measures are the responsibility of retail companies not Southern Water as the wholesale water provider. Demand management will be a key way in which retail companies retain and attract new customers because it will allow them to offer cheaper bills linked to lower consumption. There is an incentive for retail companies to be innovative in this respect and offer various services to help customers reduce their consumption. |
| MET | Water efficient appliance tariff | Link tariffs to water efficiency of key water using appliances - e.g. toilet cisterns, dishwasher, washing machine, etc. Requires product labelling proof. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | The cost to obtain customers' product/appliance information, and keep it up-to-date for all households would be significant. Additionally, it would be difficult to model what the demand savings would actually be as it would all be based on frequency of use. It may also discriminate against people who perhaps cannot afford to install a new washing machine, or do not have a dishwasher. For these reasons, this tariff option is not considered further in this WRMP. |
| MET | Resource availability tariff | Daily tariff set according to resource availability (i.e. approaching drought - possibly linked to Southern Water's drought trigger levels) and or climatic conditions (e.g. xx number of days below xx mm rainfall). Meter readings would need to be taken and analysed at least daily, requiring a smart or networked-AMR system of meters to be in place | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | It is expected that a permanent tariff linked to resource availability may produce bill volatility in excess of that which would be acceptable to customers, the regulator, and Southern Water. Furthermore, customers may lose focus on the reason for the resource availability tariff (i.e. to reduce discretionary consumption during drought events) if it is in place permanently - the message may be stronger if implemented only during times of drought |
| MET | Carrier bag charge equivalent tariff | Equivalent to the 5p plastic carrier bag charge, but applied to water efficiency. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | After having been explored during the options appraisal process, a means of structuring or implementing such a tariff has not become evident. This tariff option is |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | therefore not considered further in this WRMP. |
| MET | Community reward tariff | "Tariff to encourage community to reduce water use, by providing a reward in the form of a Southern Water funded community reward. If the community reduces its combined water use during a defined period of time then they get rewarded with a Southern Water funded community reward. This option has the potential to reduce both average and peak period water consumption, but primarily targeting reduced discretionary use. | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | No | No | Southern Water's trial of this tariff scheme is in the early stages of operation. It is not at this stage possible to estimate the potential savings or costs of this scheme. Therefore it cannot be included as a standalone option for this WRMP, although Southern Water will review the results of the trial with a view for inclusion within option T100. |
| PWR | Aquifer recharge using treated effluent for ASR | This option is associated with investigations to identify if they are any locations where recharging the aquifer with tertiary treated effluent may offer a water resources benefit as part of an ASR scheme | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | ASR and ARS type schemes will not be investigated further, specifically that indirect reuse through a river would likely be cheaper and incur less loss during the process. If both effluent reuse and ASR schemes are used more often in the UK, then these types of scheme may become more feasible based on increased knowledge. |
| PWR | Direct Effluent reuse scheme for Test Lake and into Test Surface Water WSW | Provide tertiary treatment on the backend of Test Estuary WTW to then discharge into Test Lake. This water would then be abstracted by Test Surface Water WSW for further treatment and supply. | Western | HSE | - | - | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | If the scheme was operated in conjunction with other Test Surface Water WSW abstractions then the reuse water could be diluted low enough to be considered an indirect reuse scheme. However, as the water would be required during a period of reduced or no abstraction from the River Test this scheme would be a direct reuse scheme which have been discounted at this stage due to the risk of adverse public reactions. In the future, if the public become more used to indirect reuse schemes in general then this scheme could be reconsidered. |
| PWR | Small scale catchment natural wastewater recycling | Use of reed beds and other biological methods to provide community based wastewater recycling with lower costs. This would be applicable in rural settings where there is expected to be land available for reed beds. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Where there are customers who could make use of effluent reuse water, the supply from small waste treatment works will be investigated and the applicability of different treatment types including reed beds. Therefore, schemes of this nature or similar will be investigated as part of another option. |
| PWR | Wastewater reuse direct into supply system | Investigate acceptability, treatment requirements, legislation and public health risk of direct effluent reuse. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | The high risk of public perception issues mean that direct reuse will not be investigated further. It is possible that as the public becomes more used to reuse schemes, direct reuse would be less risky. |
| RES | Development of new reservoir at Broadoak, inclusive of new treatment works and mains | The scheme is for a new surface water storage reservoir - capacity 15,000MI - located to the west of the A291, along the valley of the Sarre Penn stream just to the north of the village of Broad Oak in east Kent. The option is being developed by South East Water, but would potentially be a joint scheme, with Southern Water sharing the yield and the development costs. The outline of the scheme is as follows: • Abstraction from the River Stour. • Abstraction works and pumping station. • A new raw water pipeline from the abstraction location to the reservoir and the construction of inlet and offtake towers. • A new impoundment dam across the Sarre Penn valley and all associated works. • A new water supply works to treat water abstracted from the reservoir and all associated underground infrastructure • Various roadworks and landscaping works associated with the reservoir. | Eastern | KT | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | The scheme has high environmental and planning risks and is likely to have disproportionate costs. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Burton Mill Pond | Construction of new reservoir at Burton Mill Pond with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000 MI. (Enlargement of current waterbody) | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded due to environmental impacts, water quality issues and economic feasibility. The scheme would not provide a good enough water resource to justify the environmental impacts and would be unlikely to get planning within an AONB. |
| RES | Rookley Reservoir | This option involves the construction of an impounding reservoir across the River Medina near Rookley on the Isle of Wight with a capacity of 1500MI. Water would be treated at a new water | Western | IOW | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | The scheme has very significant environmental impacts. These would also make planning difficult to get which would either stop implementation or increase the |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|---|
| | | supply works (WSW), which would be constructed just downstream of the proposed site for the dam, and then pumped to the Alvington High Level water service reservoir (WSR) to enter distribution. | | | | | | | | | | | | | costs so they become disproportionate. |
| RES | New surface water storage site at Colden Common | This option consists of constructing a new surface water storage reservoir in Hampshire South region near Colden common. The reservoir would be largely pump filled from a new abstraction on the River Itchen. A previous study indicated that a maximum storage capacity of approximately 1400MI would be dependent on a 10m high embankment as well as two small impoundments on the upstream side of the reservoir to prevent flooding of roads and housing. However, the impoundments would not be feasible as they would block the rivers from entering the reservoirs and so the capacity of the reservoir is reduced to 700MI. The reservoir does also have a catchment of approximately 28km ² . The reservoir would be used as storage to supply additional water for treatment at Itchen WSW, approximately 3km away. | Western | HSW | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Very significant environmental and planning impacts and limited yield with high costs. |
| RES | Community scale small surface water reservoirs | Small scale reservoirs that take surplus run off and rainfall in small scale catchment - could be linked to rainwater harvesting | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | This option was excluded due to practicality, reliability and deliverability but may form part of a Catchment Management option. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Coneyhurst | Construction of new reservoir at Coneyhurst. Involving an embankment dam across the River Adur. The capacity of the reservoir would be 1500MI | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Although the scheme is technically feasible, the impoundment required may not be acceptable to the EA. It was excluded in AMP4 due to practicability and reliability issues and in AMP5 due to it being environmentally unacceptable. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Cornerhouse | Construction of new embankment dam reservoir at Cornerhouse with a capacity of 2000 MI | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Although the scheme is technically feasible, the impoundment required may not be acceptable to the EA. It was excluded in AMP4 due to practicability and reliability issues and in AMP5 due to it being environmentally unacceptable. |
| RES | Enlargement of Darwell Reservoir | This option involves raising the embankment of Darwell Reservoir. The proposal is to raise the embankment by up to 10m to provide increased storage, and therefore increase supplies. The additional capacity would be 14,000 MI. Darwell reservoir falls within an AONB and there are also various environmental designations: parts of Darwell wood are designated as SSSI and the majority of the reservoir and surrounding area is designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (the Darwell Reservoir Complex SNCI). | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | This scheme is unlikely to be given permission. It also has a high AISC and low DO and so would not avoid disproportionate costs or deliver an appreciable water resource. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Dunsfold | Construction of new reservoir at Dunsfold with a capacity of 5000MI. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | The scheme is not considered for further investigations due to limited refill capacity and high costs of infrastructure. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Goose Green | Construction of new bankside storage reservoir at Goose Green with a capacity of 4500MI. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | There is low refill potential and so a probable low DO and disproportionate costs. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Habin | Construction of new embankment dam reservoir at Habin with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000MI. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | The scheme has adverse environmental impacts including to a Trout Fishery, it is also unlikely to be given permission unless it can be proved to be an exceptional circumstance. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Hammer Pond | Construction of new reservoir at Hammer Pond with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000 MI. (Enlargement of existing waterbody) | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Due to environmental impacts, water quality issues and economic feasibility. The scheme would not provide a good enough water resource to justify the environmental impacts and would be unlikely to get planning within an AONB. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Hawkins Pond | Construction of new reservoir at Hawkins Pond with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000 MI. (Enlargement of existing waterbody) | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Due to environmental impacts, water quality issues and economic feasibility. The scheme would not provide a good enough water resource to justify the environmental impacts and would be unlikely to get planning within an AONB. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Horsfold | Construction of new reservoir at Horsfold with a capacity of 2000MI | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | The environmental impacts are likely to be high, it is not technically feasible without high costs and engineering works and permission is unlikely to be given. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Ingrams Green | Construction of new embankment dam reservoir at Ingrams Green with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000MI. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Due to environmental impacts, water quality issues and economic feasibility. The scheme would not provide a |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|
| | Ingrams Green | | | | | | | | | | | | | | good enough water resource to justify the environmental impacts and would be unlikely to get planning within an AONB/National Park. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Kirdford | Construction of new embankment dam reservoir at Kirdford between 1000 and 3000MI. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | This scheme is not considered for further investigation due to environmental, water quality and economic feasibility issues. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Kneppmill Pond | Construction of new reservoir at Kneppmill Pond with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000 MI. (Enlargement of current waterbody) | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Due to environmental impacts, water quality issues and economic feasibility. The scheme would not provide a good enough water resource to justify the environmental impacts and would be unlikely to get planning within an AONB. |
| RES | Leigh Barrier flood storage reservoir | The Leigh Barrier is an impounding flood storage reservoir, which is used to attenuate peak flows in the Upper Medway catchment and hence reduce the risk of flooding downstream. The barrier is currently 6m high and has a storage capacity of approximately 5,500MI although the EA may be increasing the capacity. | Eastern | KMW | No | No | Analysis has revealed that water would not be available at the barrier for the years when Bewl Water Reservoir fails to fill. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Mill Pond | Construction of new reservoir at Mill Pond with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000 MI. (Enlargement of existing waterbody) | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Due to environmental impacts, water quality issues and economic feasibility. The scheme would not provide a good enough water resource to justify the environmental impacts and would be unlikely to get planning within an AONB. |
| RES | Mine working storage | This option represents the storage of raw water in disused mine workings. Involves abstracting the water from existing licences during winter periods and then storing it in the mines for re-abstraction during dry periods. | Southern Water | - | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | This option is rejected due to practicability and water quality as in AMP4 and AMP5. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at New Pond | Enlargement of an existing online reservoir at New Pond to a capacity of between 1000 and 3000MI. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Due to it being unlikely that planning permission will be given. The environmental impacts, impacts on the tourism and economic feasibility. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Nyewood | Construction of new bankside storage reservoir at Nyewood with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000MI. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | There would be high environmental impacts by either option. Also, it is unlikely that development within an AONB/National Park will be given permission. Therefore, there cannot be acceptable confidence in the implementation. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Petersfield | Construction of new bankside storage reservoir at Petersfield with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000MI | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | There would be high environmental impacts by either option. Also, it is unlikely that development within an AONB/National Park will be given permission. Therefore, there cannot be acceptable confidence in the implementation. |
| RES | Enlarge Powdermill Reservoir and increase abstraction from the Eastern Rother to refill during winter period | This option involves raising the embankment of Powdermill Reservoir by up to 13m to provide increased storage and subsequently increase supplies to Southern Water. The scheme would consist of the following: • Raising the reservoir embankment by 13m; • Increasing the storage from 856MI to 7200MI; and • Improvements to a 5km road section of the A21 in order to improve access to the reservoir site. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | This scheme is unlikely to be given permission. It also has a high AISC and low DO and so would not avoid disproportionate costs or deliver an appreciable water resource. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Pulborough | Construction of new bankside storage reservoir at Pulborough with a capacity of 4000MI | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | This option is not considered for further evaluation due to it not being technically feasible, having disproportionate costs and environmental impacts. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Rotherbridge | Construction of new reservoir at Rotherbridge with a capacity of 1000MI to 3000MI. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid. This scheme is not investigated further mainly due to planning issues |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Slinfold | Construction of new embankment dam reservoir at Slinfold with a capacity of 2500MI. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Due to environmental impacts, water quality issues and economic feasibility. The scheme would not provide a good enough water resource to justify the environmental impacts and would be unlikely to get planning within an AONB. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Small Dole | Construction of new bankside storage reservoir at Small Dole with a capacity of 4500MI | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid. There would be high levels of cost with the excavation of the alluvial material and disposal as well as with the compensatory storage. |
| RES | Storage reservoir network | Winter storage reservoir network across Southern Water supply areas to provide direct benefit to agriculture and indirect benefit to environment and abstractors. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Duplication of other suggested options and may form part of a Catchment Management option. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|
| | | Potential to help to maintain MRFs in river systems over local stretches, enabling more downstream river abstraction | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RES | Storrington Sand Pits | Develop Storage in Storrington Sand Pits | Central | SN | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid. The option is now being used as a construction waste landfill and so is not available for use as a reservoir |
| RES | Support / grants to farmers for local reservoirs | Help farmers to secure water supplies on farms (i.e. reducing demand/water use so more available for others) by developing relatively small reservoirs on site. Potential to capitalise on natural ponds/seasonal dips in land (i.e. soft rather than hard engineering) | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Duplication of other suggested options and may form part of a Catchment Management option. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Trotton | Construction of new embankment dam reservoir at Trotton with a capacity of between 1000 and 3000MI/d | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | The scheme has adverse environmental impacts including to a Trout Fishery, it is also unlikely to be given permission unless it can be proved to be an exceptional circumstance. |
| RES | Construction of new reservoir at Vachery Pond | Construction of new reservoir at Vachery Pond with a capacity of 2000MI. (Enlargement of an existing structure.) | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Due to environmental impacts and economic feasibility. The scheme would not provide a good enough water resource to justify the environmental impacts. |
| RES | Build New Reservoir on Coast (Woodgate) | The option would involve the construction of an earth embankment reservoir and associated treatment works that would allow up to 10MI/d of treated water to enter the distribution mains and supply the Sussex Coastal block. The reservoir would be filled with water pumped from the river Arun at Houghton, which could only realistically be pumped during low tides and may be constrained to periods of relatively low flow during the winter because of turbidity constraints during higher flows. Because of this, the treatment works has been sized at a relatively low capacity (10MI/d). Approximate reservoir storage would be around 3,500 MI. | Central | SW | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | This option has not been considered further due to significant cost associated with the option and the significant local opposition. |
| RES | Construction of bankside storage near Maidstone | This option proposes bankside storage of 250MI capacity near Maidstone, which would capture and store water from the River Medway at high flow events. At times of need, this would allow the existing pipeline to Bewl pipeline, which only abstracts during high flow events, to transfer water over an extended time period i.e. when river levels have fallen below the normal cut off level. | Eastern | KMW | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | The costs would be too high and not proportional to the DO provided. There are also issues with environmental risks. |
| SI | Targeted abstraction licence trading | Option to purchase abstraction licences upstream of Southern Water abstraction sites. Level of intervention: Severe drought conditions. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | This Drought Plan option is not appropriate for inclusion in the WRMP due to the lack of specific schemes having been identified. |
| SI | Tankering | Tankering water from adjacent WRZs or other water companies would be considered in severe droughts. Can be applied on a WRZ basis. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Drought Plan option, not easily scalable to WRZ-wide resource shortfall. |
| SWA | River Adur Abstraction | Direct abstraction from the Adur all year round without associated storage. It is considered that the eastern branch of the Adur is the only one that is potentially suitable for abstraction due to the very low flow rates in the western branch. Abstracted water from the River Adur would be treated directly and then supplied up to a rate of up to 5MI/d. This is considered to be the maximum realistic upper limit, as flows within this branch of the Adur regularly fall as low as 12MI/d during low flow years (the majority of which is formed from artificial discharges). The Option has two alternatives, one is to send the water into supply at the Coltstaple WSR, the alternative is to send the water into supply via the Rock Road transfer main. | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Excluded due to significant concerns over water quality in the Adur at low flows. |
| SWA | New abstraction and WTW on the North and South streams, Hacklinge | The aim of this option is to develop the water resources in the North and South Streams area. The North and South Streams are two streams that run parallel to each other in the Hacklinge Water Resource Management Unit (WRMU) of the Stour catchment. | Eastern | KT | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | On the basis of the current environmentally poor condition, the limited resource and the environmental designations, it is unlikely that any increased abstraction from this area will be possible. |
| SWA | River Ouse Abstraction | New river abstraction on River Ouse | Central | SB | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded from AMP 5 feasible list based on social and environmental impacts. CAMS assessment stated, 'no water available'. |
| SWA | Utilising Water from Rock Common Sand Pit | Proposed transfer of water discharged from Rock Common sand pit operation for treatment and conveyance to supply. | Central | SN | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | This site is now being used for general landfill purposes so is no longer viable as a reservoir option. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|----------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|--|
| SWA | Weir Wood Winter Refill (Medway) | This option refers to the refill of Weir Wood reservoir by the abstraction of water downstream in the Medway during dry winters (effectively this significantly increases the catchment size for the reservoir). This option does not involve extension of the capacity of Weir Wood reservoir or the water treatment works, rather it increases the volume of water held at the start of a drought event based on past hydrological experience. The abstraction will need to be sufficiently far downstream of Weir Wood so that its catchment area will be likely to have flows high enough to abstract from, without adversely impacting on the hydrology and ecology of the river. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | There are significant doubts over resource benefits under certain drought conditions, including the 'design scenario' |
| WEF | Water butts | Free or subsidised provision of water butts to customers who apply for one on Southern Water's website. | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Southern Water have undertaken initiatives to provide discount on water butts, so may be limited uptake as campaigns have previously taken place. Storage available during dry summers cannot be guaranteed |
| WEF | Non-household and commercial water efficiency | Non-household and commercial water efficiency audits (CWA) at e.g. public buildings and council-owned leisure centres, hospitals, water efficiency offset scheme for businesses/organisations. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Under market reforms, NHH demand management measures will be the responsibility of retail companies not Southern Water as the wholesale water provider. Demand management will be a key way in which retail companies retain and attract new customers because it will allow them to offer cheaper bills linked to lower consumption. There is an incentive for retail companies to be innovative in this respect and offer various services to help customers reduce their consumption. |
| WEF | Household water efficiency kit | (1) Customers are offered a household water efficiency kit containing (for example): CDDs, tap inserts, shower timers, tea towel, trigger/twist hosepipe devices and booklet containing advice on water efficiency. (2) Manned audit with retrofit of free devices (as outlined under sub-option 1). | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Already forms part of current AMP6 baseline water efficiency activity, with limited scope for further uptake |
| WEF | Media campaigns to influence water use | (1) Campaigns to raise public awareness can be carried out in a number of ways using a variety of different types of media. The central message is to urge all customers to conserve water, especially during periods of drought. This message must be underpinned by explanations of the background to the prevailing conditions and how the drought might continue to intensify. In addition, the Company may promote enhanced uptake of its water efficiency programmes. The option could be a Drought Option. (2) Build on the interest and responsiveness of the parish councils to promote water demand management issues. If possible incentivise them to take local action, perhaps with target challenges | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Important part of drought response. However, more limited as a WRMP measure, as it is very difficult to assign costs and water saving benefits to media campaigns. Furthermore, customer communications around water saving, particularly in the lead up to and during drought events, already form part of Southern Water's baseline water efficiency promotion activity. |
| WEF | Household reward scheme | Manned audit with retrofit of free water efficient devices where appropriate. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | There is insufficient confidence in the potential savings from this option to take it forward into the feasible as a standalone option for this WRMP, although it will be considered for inclusion within option T100. |
| WEF | Subsidised water efficient products | Options could include: (1) A flat rate subsidy offered to customers who purchase a new water efficient washing machine on replacement of their old one. The subsidy would cover the expected additional cost of purchasing an efficient machine over a less efficient machine. (2) Replacement of existing WCs in girls' facilities, with low dual flush WCs (4/2 litre). For schools to adopt this strategy, it is likely that Southern Water would have to pay for the whole cost of the replacement WC, rather than offering a subsidy. (3) Southern Water would offer a flat rate subsidy towards the replacement of customers' single flush WCs with a 4 1/2 litre dual flush WC. Installation would not be funded by the company, the cost of which is expected to be met by customers when replacing their bathrooms. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Baseline demand forecast based on micro-components approach and implicitly assumes that water using devices are replaced approximately every 10 years. Therefore, inclusion of these options would lead to double counting. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---------|-----|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|
| | | (4) Scheme would offer a flat rate subsidy to customers who purchase a new water efficient dishwasher based on replacement of their old one. The subsidy would cover the expected additional cost of purchasing an efficient appliance over a less efficient machine. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WTW | Upgrade treatment capacity at Beauport WSW | Treatment works can act as strategic constraints within the supply system. They do not provide additional water, but can make water available from options if they act as a constraint within the network. The current capacity of Beauport WSW is 25Ml/d but it is subject to an AMP4 scheme to increase the treatment capacity to 30Ml/d. Network constraints and their impact on any schemes to increase DO within Sussex Hastings WRZ will be looked at. | Eastern | SH | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Exclude as AMP5 review did not identify Beauport WSW capacity as a constraint. |
| WTW | Increase turbidity capability at South Arundel WSW | The South Arundel groundwater supplies regularly experience increased turbidities during Spring tides. An investigation to determine the optimal operation regime with the existing treatment facilities is currently ongoing, but this will still involve shut down of the works during high turbidity flows. It is thought that the introduction of a more sophisticated treatment works would enable the sources to be pumped through the peak turbidity periods, allowing the sources to produce an additional 5Ml/d. | Central | SW | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded from AMP 5 feasible list because this option would not increase the DO beyond the daily abstraction licence, so is duplicated by the asset enhancement scheme. This exclusion remains valid. |
| WTW | Upgrade treatment capacity at Rye WSW | Treatment works can act as strategic constraints within the supply system. They do not provide additional water, but can make water available from options if they act as a constraint within the network. The current capacity of Rye WSW is 15Ml/d. Network constraints and their impact on any schemes to increase DO within Sussex Hastings WRZ will be looked at. | Eastern | SH | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | AMP5 rejection remains valid: Review did not identify this treatment works as a strategic constraint |
| WTW | Increase in treatment and mains capacity at near Rochester WSW | This option seeks to increase the treatment and mains capacity at near Rochester. Treatment works can act as strategic constraints within the supply system. They do not provide additional water, but can make water available from options if they act as a constraint within the network. The current capacity of near Rochester WSW is 65Ml/d. The effect of constraints within the network on any schemes to increase DO within the Kent Medway WRZ will be looked at. | Eastern | KMW | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: Not selected by WRSE and not agreed between companies. |
| WTW | Newchurch WSW | Newchurch is an existing groundwater source and water treatment works. Newchurch consists of a Lower Greensand and a Chalk borehole. The waters from the chalk borehole go through a treatment process of super and de-chlorination as well as phosphoric dosing; as such there are no process losses which could be recovered. The waters from the Lower Greensand however undergo a process of aeration cascading, then 10-minute retention in a redox tank and then following by filtration through 3 rapid gravity filters. The treatment losses for the LGS water amounts to 0.17Ml/d and therefore the volume of water which could be recovered from treatment losses would be somewhat less than 0.17Ml/d. As the DO is source constrained there would be no extra DO available from lowering of pumps or increase of pump capacity. | Western | IOW | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: Insignificant increase in DO through recovery of process losses from limited treated |
| WTW | Test Surface Water WSW | Washwater recovery Increased treatment capacity to 120Ml/d Maintain existing treatment capacity at 105Ml/d Increase treatment capacity to 136Ml/d Conjunctive use of Test Surface Water with Lower Itchen sources Increase treatment capacity to 160Ml/d | Western | HSW | - | - | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Licence currently under review |
| WTW | Worthing Turbidity Treatment | The original justification for this option was that there were a number of disparate sources in the Worthing area that were constrained by turbidity issues. It was considered that DO could be improved if these were treated, perhaps at a central location. However, AMP4 investigation and treatment schemes at sites such as South Arundel, Arundel etc have limited any potential only to North Worthing and Long Furlong B. The | Central | SW | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid: Unstable source |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>2005/06 drought then promoted further investigations at those sites. This has resulted in ongoing works at North Worthing and a realisation that turbidity at Long Furlong B is also linked to potential adit stability issues, which means pumping and treating for turbidity would carry a high risk of compromising the structure and hence yield of the source.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Table 2 Constrained options not proceeding to the feasible list of options

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|---|----------------|----------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| AE | Chilbolton nitrate scheme | Chilbolton UGS is currently disused due to high nitrates (concentrations in breach of the DWS). This option comprises implementing a nitrate scheme so that the source can be reconnected to network and brought back into supply at licensed rate of 0.5MI/d. | Western | HA | - | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 0 | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Not sufficiently progressed to include as a feasible option |
| AE | Increase transfer capacity at Gover Road | Increase or utilise transfer capacity of Gover Road from 6.9MI/d to 9.8MI/d | Western | HSE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | No | No | - | No | Option to be considered in AMP7 |
| AE | Kings Sombourne | Scheme to increase DO of the Kings Sombourne groundwater source from 1.5MI/d to 5MI/d by removing infrastructure constraints. | Western | HR | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Uncertain potential until pump tests performed, too risky to assume DO benefit therefore exclude at the stage |
| AE | Newington Booster Pump | Booster pump. | Eastern | KME | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Locked in DO would require very minor works and will be released by leakage team; not a WRMP option |
| AE | Outage scheme (generic) | Generic option to allow review of measures to reduce outage at specific sources | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Specific schemes will be identified as appropriate for feasible list - no need for generic "placeholder" any more |
| AE | Resilience scheme (generic) | Generic option to allow review of measures to increase resilience at specific sources or within the supply system. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Specific schemes will be identified as appropriate for feasible list - no need for generic "placeholder" any more |
| AE | Sandown WSW | (1) Flood resilience scheme (no DO benefit) (2) New WSW near Newchurch (3) Process Loss recovery - 1MI/d | Western | IOW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | WRMP is not a suitable vehicle to pay for any resilience enhancements; no potential to increase yield |
| AE | Increase industrial main capacity to Bournemouth supply to 60MI/d. | Increase industrial main capacity to Bournemouth supply to 60MI/d. This option was developed to consider an increase in transfer capacity from Test Surface Water WSW to the Isle of Wight via the Bournemouth supply main to the Blackfield booster. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Not required as a stand-alone option. Included within specific desalination schemes |
| ASR | Hampshire - Greensands | Hampshire Greensands ASR | Western | HR, HA, HW, HSW, HSE | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | Limited environmental benefit; highly unlikely to justify revision to licence |
| ASR | Sussex Coast – Lower Greensand | Because of the uncertainty over the scope for development within the Lower Greensand in a given area, two alternative schemes have been assessed under this option; a 4MI/d output using two boreholes (scheme 1) and an 8MI/d output using four boreholes (scheme 2). The option will take potable mains water and inject it into the aquifer within the Lower Greensands formation during winter and abstract it over the summer months. The abstracted water is then treated and then sent into supply via Tennants Hill WSR | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 1 | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Kent Medway schemes are unviable and are removed from the Drought Options list |
| BR | Recommission Petworth groundwater source | Recommission Petworth groundwater source | Central | SN | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Excluded as not viable following internal investigations and discussions with Regulatory bodies |
| BR | Bewl Water increased filling | Scheme to reinstate DO. | Western | IOW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Confirmed that there is a scheme in AMP6 that will ensure the DO can be maintained, so no write down |
| BS | South East Water to Kent Thanet | South East Water to Kent Thanet | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded following WSRE negotiations |
| BS | Bulk supply to Southern Water Kent Medway from South East Water | Bulk supply to Southern Water Kent Medway from South East Water. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No options identified following inter-company discussions |
| BS | Abingdon–Basingstoke–Itchen WSW | Construct a pipeline from Thames Water’s proposed UTMRD to Basingstoke then another pipeline from Basingstoke to Itchen WSW for treatment and distribution to Hampshire. | Western | HSE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Significant uncertainty with respect to the development of the UTMRD & South East Water requirements. Excluded in RDWRMP as South East Water no longer require a bulk supply |
| BS | Amalgamation of water supply companies | To improve water sharing across the region. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Outside scope of WRMP. Regional solution is being covered by WRSE work. Practicality, reliability and deliverability - it is out of the remit of the WRMP to consider water company consolidation. |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| BS | Termination of Sheldwich scheme to SEW | SW currently has an agreement to supply South East Water with water from a group of boreholes in the Sheldwich area, known as the Sheldwich scheme. The agreement is for a transfer of approximately 22% of the yield of three sources. Terminating the bulk supply to Mid Kent Water allows more water to be abstracted from the Sheldwich boreholes for use within the Medway WRZ. The current contract ends on 31st March 2023. | Eastern | KME | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Bough Beech (SES Water) via R. Medway | A change to the MRF licence condition for Bough Beech of 10MI/d. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Additional extraction from Bray WTW | Bulk import into Sussex North from SEW's Bray WTW. Additional abstraction from Bray WTW in South East Water's northern supply area (as a result of Thames Water Thames Water resource development such as Abingdon reservoir). From here, transfers to Southern Water's Western (Hampshire) and Central (Sussex) Areas should be feasible. A previous assessment by Halcrow (2004) indicated that a transfer in the order of 58MI/d may be feasible. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | South East Water to Southern Water Sussex Brighton | New transfer. 4MI/d bi-directional transfer between SEW's Barcombe Reservoir and Southern Water Swan WSR (Sussex Brighton). | Central | SB | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Clay Hill reservoir transfer | South East Water development of a new reservoir at Clay Hill, which may enable a transfer from South East Water to Sussex Hastings. It might also enable South East Water to reduce their current dependency on Weir Wood, so freeing additional water for Southern Water to use. The status of Clay Hill reservoir is unknown. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded because the status of Clay Hill reservoir remains unknown. |
| BS | Terminate Darwell reservoir supply to SEW | (1) Terminate Darwell reservoir supply to South East Water. This would save 8MI/d of water, which would then be available for Sussex Hastings WRZ. This in turn reduces reliance on Bewl Water. (2) Drought Option: In the event of a drought the Company would hold discussions with a commercial customer (transfer from Bewl to Darwell providing a bulk supply to SEW) with regards to the resources position and their supply. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Reduce industrial supply to Bournemouth supply | (1) Southern Water holds an existing contract to supply a reserve supply of water to the Bournemouth supply oil refinery in the event that the main supply from Bournemouth Water is not available, although this reserve is rarely called upon. Reducing this supply would make more water available to SWS. The supply of water to the refinery, including a reserve supply, is considered to have a national significance to ensure continued operation of the refinery. (2) Drought Option: In the event of a drought, Southern Water would hold discussions with the commercial customer (Bournemouth supply refinery) with regards to the resources position and their supply. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Excluded following internal discussions |
| BS | Bi-directional transfer between Gatwick (SES Water) and Crawley | Bidirectional transfer with SES Water involving joint operation of Pulborough and Bough Beech WTWs using the major infrastructure that already exists in each company (Sussex Coast to Pulborough to Crawley/Horsham and Bough Beech to Horley) which could have significant conjunctive use benefits. A new transfer link would be required between the Horley area (SES Water) to Crawley/Horsham (Southern Water). | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Thames Water Guildford transfer to Southern Water Sussex North | Thames Water Guildford transfer to Southern Water Sussex North. This option was not investigated by Southern Water in AMP4 but was requested to be | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|---|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | reconsidered in 2012. Option was investigated in WRSE but excluded from Phase 2a. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BS | Bulk supply to Hants Andover from neighbouring Co. | It may be feasible to transfer water from Portsmouth Water to Hampshire Andover. It is unlikely that other water companies will have sufficient surplus to allow this transfer, however a transfer from Portsmouth might be feasible. | Western | HA | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Option replaced with another option |
| BS | Bulk supply to Hants Kingsclere from neighbouring Company | Bulk supply to Hampshire Kingsclere from a neighbouring water company, such as Portsmouth Water. This is most likely to be a bulk transfer Import from Portsmouth Water WSW to Southern Water Itchen WSW, dependent on additional import from Portsmouth Water (Havant Thicket reservoir development). | Western | HK | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Additional supplies from Portsmouth would go directly to HSW WRZ distribution up to 30MI/d, with anything over this going to Itchen WSW. There is then an internal transfer option from Itchen WSW to HA/HK. |
| BS | South East Water to Southern Water Sussex North | New transfer. May be required following Sustainability Reduction. This option considers a 5MI/d bi-directional transfer from SEW's Tilmore WSR (South East Water) to SW's Pulborough WTW. The transfer uses the existing mains system between Pulborough and Petersfield and would permit a domino transfer to South East Water Whitely Hill WSR. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Supply from Portsmouth Water following construction of a Havant Thicket reservoir | Supply from Portsmouth Water following construction of Havant Thicket reservoir. | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Option replaced by another option. |
| BS | Kennet (TW) transfer to Southern Water Hants Kingsclere. | Kennet (TW) transfer to Southern Water Hants Kingsclere. Transfer reliant on the development of the Abingdon Reservoir, Upper Thames Major Resource Development (which is not currently a part of Thames Water's plan). | Western | HK | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded from AMP 5, WRSE and Western Area Options 2015 because there is no deficit in Kingsclere, and there is also an option for a transfer between the Upper Thames Reservoir and Itchen WSW, which should cover any deficit in Hants South. |
| BS | Reduce transfer to other commercial customers | Drought Option: In the event of a drought the Company would hold discussions with a commercial customer with regards to the resources position and their supply. | Southern Water | - | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Operational drought option, not a WRMP option |
| BS | Increase the existing Portsmouth Water transfer Littleheath to Pulborough | (1) Upgrades to Portsmouth-Pulborough transfer infrastructure by 15MI/d to a total 90MI/d (i.e. from 75MI/d to 90MI/d). These upgrades include improvements to the PS at Pulborough. (2) Maximise the use of the river abstraction at Pulborough in order to rest the available groundwater resources in the Pulborough basin. Increase transfer of water from Portsmouth Water in order to alleviate abstraction from Pulborough Groundwater. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Portsmouth Water supply to Sussex Worthing (North Arundel to Littlehampton main) | 15MI/d bulk transfer from Portsmouth Water's near Arundel to Sussex Worthing. The scheme will be a duplication of the main from near Arundel to North Arundel with 15MI/d of new pump capacity at near Arundel. The existing transfer is currently restricted by the North Arundel constraint. This option considers a new 15MI/d main (500dia HDPE 9.25km long) between North Arundel WSW and the Littlehampton mains, where it will tee in and use existing capacity in the mains network to enter supply. It is assumed that this transfer will only be used in times of deficit within the Sussex Worthing area, when there is spare capacity in the mains. Improvements to North Arundel infrastructure would be required. | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | AMP5 exclusion remains valid and not agreed between companies. |
| BS | Transfer from South East Water Northern North to Southern Water Hants (Bray to Itchen WSW via Whitedown TR3) | Construction of a new bulk transfer from South East Water Northern North WRZ (Bray) to Hampshire (Itchen WSW) via Whitedown TR3 WSR. Transfer reliant on the development of the Abingdon Reservoir, Upper Thames Major Resource Development (which is not currently a part of Thames Water's plan). | Western | HSE | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Identified as a resilience for normal years only not drought years so not suitable for WRMP. |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|---|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| BS | Portsmouth Water near Arundel WTW to Pulborough via Whiteways Lodge | (1) Rehabilitation and improvement of the existing Portsmouth Water to Southern Water transfer between PW Eastgate and Pulborough WTW. (2) Duplication of the existing Portsmouth Water to Southern Water transfer between PW Eastgate and Pulborough WTW. New pipeline follows the route of the existing main in order to take advantage of existing easement. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/a | N/a | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Rest Weir Wood reservoir source during early stages of drought | Drought Option: Maximising pumping from Pulborough WSW through the distribution network into Crawley in order to displace water normally supplied by Weir Wood, resting Weir Wood reservoir for use in later stages of a drought. Sources could be rested immediately provided that there is headroom available. | Central | SN | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Operational changes only as part of this drought option – it is not a WRMP option |
| BS | Bournemouth Water and Bournemouth supply refinery | A reduced Bournemouth Water supply to a large industrial user allowing an import into Southern Water. Bournemouth Water currently supplies around 40MI/d of water to the large industrial user. It may be possible for a desalination plant to be built to supply water at peak periods (if this is an acceptable source of supply for refinery use) while water at average periods continues to be supplied by whichever water company wins the contract. This would mean that there would be around 40MI/d of additional water available to Bournemouth Water at peak periods, some of which may be available to transfer to Southern Water Western Area. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Option excluded as it is reliant on the separate provision of desalinated water to the nearby large industrial user to allow import from Bournemouth Water; however, it is supplier of last resort such that it is highly likely that Bournemouth Water would be able to release the spare water |
| BS | 10MI/d bulk supply to Kent Medway from South East Water (via Faversham4 Fleete Main) | 10MI/d transfer from South East Water Blean WSR to connect to Dunkirk break pressure tank along the Faversham4-Fleete main. | Eastern | KME | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Bulk import from South East Water | (1) Bulk import from South East Water. There are no specific details for this scheme. (2) In the event of a severe drought, the company would investigate the possibility of receiving bulk supplies from South East Water in the event of more severe drought conditions. | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Purchase of Portsmouth Water's source near Arundel | Purchase of Portsmouth Water's source near Arundel and transfer of water to Sussex Coast or Sussex North. | Central | SN | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Water trading (3rd parties) - large abstraction licence holder | Southern Water to contact large abstraction licence holders to establish whether these 3rd parties were willing to trade some or all of their licence | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Only potential option is now its own option which is DS Smith in Sittingbourne so this option is no longer needed. |
| BS | Additional extraction from the Thames | Additional extraction from the Thames | Central | SN | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | This option is already covered by other options in the WRMP. |
| BS | Thames abstraction and transfer to SES Water, then to SWS | Transfer from Thames Water to Southern Water, via the North Deal and East Surrey Water (South East Water) system. South East Water currently have no water available for transfer to Southern Water. However, they share boundaries with both Thames Water and Southern Water. This option investigates reducing the supply of potable water from Bough Beech (South East Water) to their North Deal WRZ and replacing this with a dedicated supply from Thames Water to the North Deal WRZ. This will allow release from Bough Beech into the River Eden, which feeds into the Medway. Water would then be available for abstraction. | Eastern | KMW | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Terminate Weir Wood reservoir bulk supply to South East Water | Terminate Weir Wood reservoir bulk supply to SEW. This would save 5.9MI/d of water, which would then be available to Sussex North WRZ. The agreement runs until March 2020. Southern Water is legally bound to continue the supply until 2020 and/or a time when South East | Central | SN | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | The current contract expires in 2020. Continuation is assumed but at a new charging scheme. |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|---|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | Water agree to termination having had sufficient notice to develop its own additional resources. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BS | Upper Thames Reservoir to Test Surface Water WSW | Upper Thames Reservoir to Test Surface Water WSW. AMP 4 Phase 2 stated the transfer would involve a pipeline approx. 94.92 km long. In AMP 4 and AMP5, transfers of between 10 and 80Ml/d were considered. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Reduce transfer to other water companies | Drought Option: In the event of a drought the Company would hold discussions with neighbouring companies with regards to their resources position and their supply. There are three main bulk transfers to the South East: its entitlement to 25% of the yield of the River Medway Scheme, the Sheldwich Scheme, and the Bewl-Darwell transfer. This option considers reduction of the transfer from Affinity Water to Southern Water Kent Thanet. The trigger for this would be when rainfall and groundwater level trigger is exceeded and/or if Affinity Water is not affected as much as Kent Thanet WRZ. | Southern Water | - | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Waller's Haven transfer from SEW | This option represents a transfer of water from SEW's Waller's Haven abstraction to Darwell Reservoir. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Imports from other water companies outside south-east region & Thames Water | Imports from other water companies outside south-east region & Thames Water. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | This is a generic option and there are now specific options that cover this scheme. |
| BS | South East Water Whitely Hill to Pulborough (Southern Water) transfer (bi-directional) | 5Ml/d bi-directional transfer from Whitely Hill Service Reservoir (South East Water) to Pulborough WTW (Southern Water). | Central | SN | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Excluded as no options identified during inter-company discussions |
| BS | Bulk import from Wessex Water to Hampshire Andover | Construction of a new bulk transfer from Wessex Water to Hampshire Andover WRZ. | Western | HA | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Reliant on Blashford Lakes which are an SR risk. The preferred option is from Bournemouth. |
| BS | Portsmouth Water to Sussex Worthing | (1) Portsmouth Water to Sussex Worthing. Requires Southern Water removing North Arundel constraint. (2) Portsmouth Water to extend current supply to Sussex Worthing spur link past 2015 (3) Portsmouth Water to Sussex Worthing, independent of Pulborough WTW | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | N | No | No | No | No | No | No | This option delivers resilience benefits but does not deliver an enhanced DO. |
| BS | Change of bulk supply to Wessex | (1) Terminate bulk supply to Wessex. The termination of this small supply would save 0.19Ml/d of water, which would then be available to Hampshire Andover WRZ. (2) In the event of a drought, Southern Water would hold discussions with Wessex Water with regards to the resources position and their supply. | Western | HA | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Option 1 excluded due to insignificant DO and option 2 excluded because it provides a very small saving. |
| CM | Nitrate Option – South Arundel | Nitrate removal. | Central | SW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Excluded as treatment has now been installed |
| CM | Brighton Block Pilot Scheme - Further implementation of CHAMP actions | Brighton Block Pilot Scheme - Further implementation of CHAMP actions | Central | SB | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | CHAMP work already underway and this WRMP has source specific nitrate options included instead |
| CM | Broadlands Fish Farm Carrier | Divert or revise operation of the Broadlands Fish Farm Carrier to provide more water at Test Surface Water WSW | Western | HSW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Superseded by overall River Test catchment management option |
| CM | Generic scheme - Cryptosporidium risk reduction at surface or groundwater water source. | Pending outcome of At Risk investigations in Feb | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Other uses for effluent reuse | For example, use as compensation water downstream of abstractions or used by farmers or industry. Benefit that WQ has already paid for improvements in treatment | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Has been assessed as part of other effluent reuse options |
| CM | Enhancing natural recharge | Expansion of area of chalk grassland in North Downs to enhance aquifer recharge. Needs some investigation first, but could provide positive environmental benefits. Done through agreements with land owners or land purchase. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No specific locations/DO benefit identified. Option to be flagged as further development for 2024 plan |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? | |
| | | Potential benefit to chalk aquifer blocks and local groundwater dominated abstractions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CM | Nitrate Option – North Worthing | Option to address nitrate risk by 2016-17, using both conventional treatment and catchment management together to ensure successful reduction of nitrates in limited time frame | Central | SW | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | | Excluded as treatment has now been installed |
| CM | Flood storage / wetland creation | Slow down run off into rivers and provide storage of water to be released later on | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | | No specific locations to implement this type of option have been identified. To be flagged as further development for 2024 plan. |
| CM | Revise existing fishing practices | Increased resources to tackle illegal exploitation in Southampton Water and the rivers to enable the salmon population to reach its Conservation Limit, and to increase salmon migration for spawning etc. Measures could include; re-introduction of bollards to prevent vehicles, re-writing byelaws to make salmon fishing/spinning illegal, additional patrols/wardens, CCTV. | Western | HSW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Superseded by overall River Test catchment management option |
| CM | Nitrate Option – Hove | Nitrate removal. | Central | SB | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | | Excluded as treatment has now been installed |
| CM | Nitrate Option – Hartlip Hill | Option to address nitrate risk by 2016-17, using both conventional treatment and catchment management together to ensure successful reduction of nitrates in limited time frame | Eastern | KME | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | | Excluded as treatment has now been installed |
| CM | Generic Scheme: In-stream measures to complement WR AMP7 NEP (March 2017) sustainability reductions and sustainable catchment options | The EA will release its first iteration of the AMP7 NEP in March 2017. For the sources with sustainability reductions and at risk of deterioration - catchment management including in-stream measures will be identified and appraised. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Intelligent Irrigation | Work with Agriculture sector to improve water use efficiency and so reduce private abstraction, allowing potential diversion of aquifer supplies for public use | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Linked to catchment management advice which has been incorporated into the site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Identify and implement sediment reduction measures, e.g. Pulborough, Rye, Test Surface Water | Roll out sediment traps for high risk areas across catchment. Subsidies. Additional benefits in pesticide and nutrient reduction. Benefit to Pulborough | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | No site-specific locations/Do benefits identified. To be flagged for further development for 2024 plan |
| CM | Modify, Remove and revise Operation of structures controlling flows on the River Test River management (Itchen) | Consider all of the options identified during the 2015 Investigation into the Western Supply Area covering the removal, modification or revision to operation of structures controlling flow on the River Test to identify if there is a water resource benefit | Western | HSW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Superseded by overall River Test catchment management option |
| CM | New Borehole compensation in River Test headwaters in low flows | A scheme whereby any water abstracted downstream during low flow periods is offset/compensated for, by the pumping of groundwater from the underlying aquifer and transferred back into the River Test upstream in order to maintain the same river flow volume. | Western | HSW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Superseded by overall River Test catchment management option |
| CM | Generic scheme: Nitrate reduction at groundwater source via advice and training. | Advice and training: Farmer visits to advise on management. Southern Water paid training for nutrient management and nutrient management planning. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Generic scheme: Nitrate reduction at groundwater source via incentives for land management. | Incentives for better land management: incentive payments for different crop rotations, cover crops, undersowing, overwintering stubbles, lower nitrogen applications | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Generic scheme: Nitrate reduction at groundwater source via capital funding for precision farming. | Capital funding to improve precision farming: Southern Water funding for precision farming technologies | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Generic scheme: Pesticide reduction at surface water | Advice and training: advice on pesticide risks and management and generic pesticide management farmer | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|--|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | source via advice and training. | visits. Southern Water paid training for pesticide handling, application and pelleter calibrations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CM | Generic scheme: Pesticide reduction at surface water source via incentives for land management. | Incentives for better land management: Product substitution incentives, reduced dose, payment for ecosystem services (PES) at a catchment scale. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Generic scheme: Pesticide reduction at surface water source via capital funding for precision farming. | Capital funding to improve precision farming: 50:50 funding for farm yard drainage, biobeds, biofilters etc | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Generic scheme - Pesticide reduction at surface water source via smart abstraction | Use of triggers to pause abstraction at times of high pesticide risk | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Generic scheme - Pesticide risk reduction at groundwater sources | Pending outcome of AMEC NEP investigations in Feb | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Superseded by site-specific catchment management options |
| CM | Generic scheme: Water quality risk reduction at surface or groundwater water source for at risk or emerging substances. | Pending outcome of At Risk investigations in Feb | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Pending outcome of At Risk investigations in Feb, therefore not progressed |
| CM | Re-circulate water down Great Test during drought | The construction of a pumping station located before the River Test tidal limit, and associated infrastructure required to transfer the water to be re-circulated to an upstream location and put back into the main River during drought events. This would have the effect of maintaining flows in the main channel allowing abstractions to still occur. | Western | HSW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Superseded by overall River Test catchment management option |
| CM | Hampshire Southampton East WRZ River Itchen catchment mgmt. options & river restoration pilot | Catchment management solutions can contribute to making our water environment more resilient to changing climatic conditions, and in delivering permanent environmental improvements in our rivers. Catchment management solutions have, to date, proved difficult to quantify in sufficiently robust and certain terms that can meet the requirements of a WRMP process that focuses on achieving a supply demand balance. However, Southern Water is committed to exploring with other stakeholders the potential for catchment management not only as part of the Western Area strategy needed to meet the challenges posed by the notified River Itchen sustainability reductions, and/or in response to any potential future sustainability reductions that may be considered, but also as part of more integrated management of the water environment. The Company believes that such solutions may well provide the best outcomes for both customers and the environment. | Western | HSE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No definitive Deployable Output benefit, although Hampshire Rural and Hampshire Andover WRZ options are being considered |
| CM | Nitrate Option – Shoreham | Option to address nitrate risk by 2016-17, using both conventional treatment and catchment management together to ensure successful reduction of nitrates in limited time frame | Central | SB | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Excluded as treatment has now been installed |
| CM | Nitrate Option – Sompting | Option to address nitrate risk by 2016-17, using both conventional treatment and catchment management together to ensure successful reduction of nitrates in limited time frame | Central | SB | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Excluded as treatment has now been installed |
| CM | Sediment reduction catchment measures. Additional payments for ecosystem services to farmers / landowners. E.g., Rother. | Land management to reduce soil loss and link with HLS/Single farm payments. This needs to have very clear boundaries and has to have the extent, boundaries, what is being paid for regarding the ecosystem clearly defined. Reliant on EU policy to continue and deliver this. No point if the monitoring and analysis is not being done properly, | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No Specific locations/DO benefit identified. To be flagged for further development in 2024 plan |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? | | |
| | | need to check that the farmers are following protocol. Need all farmers in target area to be signed up to the scheme. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CM | Sediment reduction in-stream measures. E.g. Rother. | River restoration addressing over-widened over-depended river channel. Installing small weir, proper fish/eel passages. Allow reduction in MRF as more water available for abstraction. Providing benefit to Pulborough | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No specific locations/DO benefit identified. To be flagged for further development in 2024 plan |
| CM | Using SUDS to replenish aquifers | Using SUDS to replenish aquifers in upper parts of catchments | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No Specific locations/DO benefit identified. To be flagged for further development in 2024 plan |
| CM | Nitrate Option Brighton B | Nitrate removal. | Central | SB | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Excluded as treatment has now been installed | |
| CM | Thanet & Lyden - Stour IDB | Retain higher levels (& water volume) in winter for subsequent pumping to treatment and supply. Utilise existing water level control structures. Water currently going to waste. Could purchase farming land for storage & purchase abstraction rights. May allow resting of groundwater sources | Eastern | KT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded, pending scheme identification | |
| CM | Nitrate Option – South Arundel A | | Central | SW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Excluded as treatment has now been installed | |
| CU | Change in level of service to reduce deficit | A change to level of service (LoS) could be considered to reduce a SDB deficit. A change in level of service could result in increased DO and thus help to reduce a given deficit. It would need to be supported by customer preferences | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as customers are not willing to accept a lower level of service | |
| DES | Coastal Aquifers | Investigation into desalination from coastal aquifers | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Investigative work has identified sites where coastal aquifer abstraction could support a surface water abstraction, but did not identify sites that could be fully supported by abstraction. It is advised that coastal aquifer boreholes are investigated during feasibility studies of those options if chosen by the optimisation modelling. | |
| DES | Deep Groundwater | Abstraction of deeply confined aquifers with poor water quality is carried out in conjunction with desalination technology. | Southern Water | - | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | The cost of investigating the potential for deep groundwater exploration would be prohibitive for the expected maximum yields. This type of scheme could be reconsidered in the future if further studies completed by third parties reveal potential locations where deep groundwaters could be economically and sustainably exploited. | |
| DES | Fawley | This option involves construction of desalination plant on the site of the now disused Fawley power station. The power station has a large intake structure (nominally 5,500MI/d) and corresponding outfall which could be used by a desalination plant. With distribution enhancements treated water could be supplied to the following customers/areas: 1. Nearby large industrial user, currently Southern Water confirm supply of 10MI/d but could be increased to 36MI/d; 2. The Isle of Wight is supported by transfer through the Cross-Solent main, currently up to 18MI/d, but it is proposed to increase capacity to 30MI/d; 3. Test Surface Water WSW currently supplies approx. 105MI/d (proposed increase to 160MI/d) but is at risk of low flow reductions to 0MI/d; 4. Itchen WSW currently supplies approx. 90MI/d, but is at risk of low flow reductions to 0MI/d, the Test Surface Water to Itchen WSW Link Main is currently proposed to supply 45MI/d. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | 10MI/d sub-option excluded, although larger capacity options are being considered. | |
| DES | Tidal River Itchen | This option proposes the construction of a desalination plant at the River Itchen Industrial Estate north of the Itchen Bridge on the eastern side of the estuary was identified as a potential area for a desalination plant. The industrial area consists of densely packed large | Western | HSE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Exclude from optimisation model due to difficulties distributing significant volumes of water and poor outfall modelling. | |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|--|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | warehouse buildings and there are small pockets of undeveloped land. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DES | Tidal River Medina and Eastern Yar Desalination | Out of the three potential options (Cowes power station, West Medina Mills, Grain store/ aggregate sites) the site adjacent to the Cowes power station is preferred as the planning allocation leaves the best opportunity for a desalination plant. | Western | IOW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Exclude from optimisation model due to issues with dispersion, river navigation and distribution limitations. |
| DES | Millbrook desal - Southampton urban area, docks and terminal | This option proposes installation of a seawater desalination plant at Southampton Water, which would be capable of producing up to 200MI/d. It is envisaged that it would be located within the land of the existing Millbrook Waste Water Treatment Works and it would be connected into supply via the trunk main close to the site. If the plant produces 25MI/d or less, the water can be pumped into the trunk main (18" diameter) parallel to the railway line just north of the site. If the plant capacity is 30MI/d a connection is required into the 24" diameter trunk main 200 m further west. Further distribution enhancements are anticipated to be required to produce more than 30MI/d. | Western | HSE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Significant engineering issues associated with transfer and distribution pipelines. Locating a desalination plant in the Millbrook area would require constructing new transfer and distribution pipelines beside railways, motorways and protected areas. Potential planning risks. For this reason, this option has been excluded. |
| DES | Test Estuary Desalination | Construction of a 10MI/d or 20MI/d desalination plant. Depending on the capacity, the water could be pumped into supply at one of two locations. Both connections would supply water to the Test Surface Water zone. Further mains enhancements could allow supply of treated water to Test Surface Water WSW for onward distribution to the wider WRZ. There is also potential to supply the nearby large industrial user, between 10 and 36MI/d depending on negotiations. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 0 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 10MI/d and 20MI/d sub-options not included |
| DES | Test Estuary Desalination | This option is similar to other Test Estuary Desalination option but differs in that for this option, the hyper-saline waste flow would be discharged at the north end of Southampton Water, while for the other option the discharge would be pumped to the Solent for discharge. | Western | HSW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | The Fawley discharge option provides the same amount of water without having as great an impact on salinity levels in Southampton Water. Therefore, it is considered that this option would be less acceptable on environmental grounds and has therefore been excluded from the optimisation modelling. |
| DES | Tidal River Ouse Desalination | The option has the potential for brackish water desalination. The area with most potential was identified as the industrial and business area located within Newhaven (Denton Island and North Quay Road industrial estate) which is within easy access of the river. Additionally, there may be room at Newhaven East WwTW to construct a desalination plant. The treated water would then be transferred to Longridge Telscombe WSR for distribution to the Sussex Brighton WRZ. Discharge of hyper-saline waste would be through Newhaven East WwTW's existing long sea outfall | Central | SB | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Option excluded from optimisation model due significant engineering and planning difficulties for a low output scheme. |
| DES | Sandown Coastal desalination IOW | Installation of a new coastal seawater desalination plant at Sandown on the Isle of Wight which would be capable of producing a range of outputs between 3MI/d and 22.5MI/d. The proposed location is at the site of the Sandown WwTW. Outputs above 8.5MI/d (local demand) require the construction of a transfer pipeline to High Alvington WSR for distribution to the rest of the island. Due to the extensive coverage of designated areas on the Isle of Wight, Sandown WwTW was identified as the only industrial site with potential for a coastal desalination plant. For this option to be technically viable, a pumping station would need to be located on the seafront. Sensitive location selection and design of this facility would be necessary. | Western | IOW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Some sub options excluded |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|--|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| DES | Desalination plant at Sholling | This option would see a desalination plant constructed to the east of Southampton near Sholling and would supply potable desalinated water to Southampton. | Western | HSE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | The environmental risk of discharging to Southampton water is considered too great compared to other large desalination schemes that can provide the same volume of water while discharging to the Solent. |
| DES | Desalination on the Western Yar | This option would see a desalination plant constructed on in the west of the Isle of Wight and would supply potable desalinated water to the Isle of Wight. | Western | IOW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | 3 | 0 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Rejected due to planning and environmental risks of location within a SINC and area of Ancient Woodland, the proposed river intake and discharge pipes being from a SAC, and pipeline routed through the AONB. |
| DES | Coastal Desalination – Shoreham Harbour | A site in Shoreham Harbour was identified as a the most feasible location for a coastal desalination plant that could supply the Central Area WRZs. The new desalination plant would be constructed within the site of an existing power station and make use of its abstraction and discharge structures. The treated water would be supplied to the Sussex WRZ distribution network. | Central | SB | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 10 and 30MI/d sub-options not included |
| DES | River Stour Desalination | This option would be to abstract brackish water from the tidal River Stour. Much of the River Stour is subject to environmental designations, however two locations for a desalination plant have been identified: at land next to Sandwich WTW; and, land next to Ramsgate WwTW. In either case an abstraction structure and raw water pipeline would be required from the River Stour, and it is assumed possible to dispose of the hyper-saline discharge through the existing long-sea outfall that serves Sandwich WTW. Treated water would then be transferred to Fleete Manston WSR for distribution to the Kent Thanet WRZ. | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Option considered to have too great an environmental impact from dispersion of hyper-saline waste to the designated reach of the River Stour compared to less environmentally sensitive options available in the WRZ. |
| DP | East Worthing - licence variation | East Worthing PS is located within SWS's Sussex Worthing Water Resource Zone. The source is located in Worthing, approximately 2 km north of the coast, with the source of supply being the Chichester-Worthing-Portsdown Chalk Block. It is part of the Worthing group licence and is subject to this group's aggregate constraints. The annual group licence is 26,000 MI, whilst the daily abstraction limit from East Worthing PS is 7MI/d from January-September. This is reduced to 4.5MI/d between October and December. The purpose of this seasonal constraint is unclear, but it may have been to protect flows at the end of the groundwater recession into cress beds. These no longer exist, but used to be located on the southern boundary of the East Worthing PS site. This option is a GW Drought Permit to remove the seasonal restrictions between Oct and Dec and enable the daily abstraction to increase from 4.5 to 7MI/d (can operate at 7MI/d for the remaining months). Southern Water would only consider applying for a Drought Order / Permit at this site in a severe drought, such as a third dry winter (with an assumed drought action duration of 92 days). | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | No | - | No | Drought option, not WRMP |
| DP | Rest groundwater sources – Isle of Wight | IOW – Drought Intervention Option. Operational strategy to limit the use of indigenous groundwater sources (such as Newport) as much as possible during the early stages of drought so that these groundwater supplies are available as a last resort as surface water recesses during extended drought periods | Western | IOW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | No | - | No | Drought option, not WRMP |
| DP | Rest groundwater sources – Sussex Worthing | Drought Option – Worthing – Use any spare winter/spring water available from the Pulborough river abstraction to supply customers in Worthing and in Brighton. This allows groundwater to be rested in key 'storage' sources, such as North Worthing and Worthing, which can improve drought resilience in those sources during the following summer and autumn, and help provide some protection against saline intrusion in sources down gradient | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | No | - | No | Drought option - operational change in drought - not WRMP |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|--|----------------|-------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| DP | Rest specific groundwater sources during early stages of drought - Kent Medway | Drought Option - Kent Medway - During a drought where recharge of groundwater is reduced, the overall strategy for the Kent Medway WRZ is to rest groundwater sources and maximise the use of the River Medway Scheme. Within this strategy, there are a number of sources which are constrained by hydrogeological constraints, such as the source yield or features such as adits. Priority will be given to resting these sources, over and above those that are simply constrained by the abstraction licence or pump capacity. | Eastern | KME and KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Kent Medway schemes are unviable and are removed from the Drought Options list |
| DP | Rest groundwater sources – Sussex North | Drought Option. Use any spare winter/spring water available from the Pulborough river abstraction preferentially over the Pulborough Groundwater sources. This allows the groundwater to be rested to improve its drought resilience during the following summer and autumn, and help to provide some protection against saline intrusion in sources down gradient. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | No | - | No | Drought option - operational change in drought - not WRMP |
| DP | Shalcombe – licence variation | Relax groundwater level constraint to increase abstraction. New Drought Option identified Southern Water meeting 17/11/16. | Western | IOW | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | - | - | - | No | - | No | Drought option - operational change in drought - not WRMP |
| GWA | Re-commission existing or old licences | Investigations to identify sources to be considered for re-commissioning | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Excluded pending test pumping with characterisation of sediment to inform filtration plant design and to ascertain sediment loading. |
| GWA | River Yar augmentation boreholes | On the Isle of Wight there is an existing scheme where the river Eastern Yar is augmented with flows from groundwater sources within the same catchment, as well as ground and surface water from an adjacent catchment. The scheme is to improve the effectiveness of this augmentation. | Western | IOW | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | This option has been excluded from investment modelling pending further investigation of DO benefit achievable. |
| IWR | Ashlett Creek WWTW Industrial Reuse - 3Ml/d | Treated effluent from Ashlett Creek WwTW could be used to reduce demand in a planned housing development or to supply boiler feed water to Bournemouth supply oil refinery. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | The low output of this scheme would make it uneconomic to implement. |
| IWR | Agricultural Treated Effluent Recycling | To re-use effluent from WWTW by farmers and agriculture uses | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No specific locations for this option have been identified to turn this into feasible option. |
| IWR | Peel Common WWTW Industrial Reuse - 40Ml/d | The combined demand from the Bournemouth supply industrial site is circa 55Ml/d, with 40Ml/d supplied by Bournemouth Water. This option seeks to replace this Bournemouth transfer with effluent reuse in order to free up the 40Ml/d of potable supply from Bournemouth. Peel Common WwTW is on the eastern side of Southampton Water and to transfer the water to Bournemouth supply a tunnel will be required. | Western | HSE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Issues with tunnelling and planning constraints have excluded this option - no further Level 2 assessments progressed. Not taken forward to optimisation model. |
| IWR | Sittingbourne 1 Industrial Water Reuse | This option is to use the reuse scheme to free up additional volume in borehole licence to increase the scope of the licence trading. Company utilises the groundwater in its paper/board making processes. It has been assumed at this stage that the RO wastewater can be discharged through Sittingbourne 1 WwTW existing outfall. . | Eastern | KME | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Excluded as covered by combination of licence trade option and another option. |
| IWR | Woolston WWTW Industrial Reuse -15Ml/d | Woolston WWTW is on the opposite side of Southampton Water to Bournemouth supply but has the advantage that tertiary treatment in the form of MBR is already being implemented. As such, this option benefits from the fact that it does not include the cost of tertiary treatment installation and operation, but requires the construction of a pipeline beneath Southampton Water. The DWF of Woolston WWTW is circa 15Ml/d and this flow could be used to either provide the back-up supply to Bournemouth supply or be substituted for some of the Bournemouth supply (as full treatment will be occurring all of the year). | Western | HSE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Constructing a pipeline across Southampton Water would be prohibitively expensive, and therefore this option has not been investigated further. |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? | |
| IZT | Andover reservoir to Hampshire Kingsclere WRZ | This scheme is dependent upon Crabwood Reservoir to Andover Reservoir transfer. The transfer pipeline for this scheme branches off the Andover to Whitchurch pipeline. The scheme involves the construction of a pipeline to transfer from the Andover- Whitchurch pipeline to Hampshire Kingsclere WRZ. In addition, the scheme includes a further pipeline to near Basingstoke for distribution the Basingstoke area and Bishops Green WSRs. | Western | HK | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | This scheme has been assessed as part of other options |
| IZT | Enhance Bewl transfer to 45MI/d | The Bewl to Beauport WTW transfer scheme option proposes to increase the existing transfer capacity between the Bewl and Beauport WTW with the construction of a new raw water transfer main. This effectively allows increased transfer from the Kent Medway WRZ to Sussex Hastings WRZ. The option originally considered an increase in transfer capacity between Bewl and Darwell reservoirs (35MI/d to 45MI/d). However, this has since been removed following SWS/EA consultation (25/09/12) due to concerns regarding invasive species (white clawed crayfish). The concerns regarding invasive species have led to a requirement for the water from Bewl to bypass Darwell Reservoir and be transferred directly to Beauport WSW. After treatment, the flows will enter supply using the existing network. The Stage 2 report (April 2003) detailed assessment noted that an enhanced Bewl transfer is only feasible once the capacity of Bewl is raised to 40,000MI. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Screened out until Southern Water have clarity on new Rye-Beauport pipeline. This should be designed to meet future needs |
| IZT | Crabwood reservoir to Andover reservoir | This option involves the construction of a pipeline between Crabwood water service reservoir (WSR) and Andover WSR in Hampshire South and Hampshire Andover WRZs. The scheme includes a short spur off the main pipeline to feed Chilbolton WSR (water tower). The WSR at Andover would also be connected to the WSRs to the East of Andover via new pipelines. | Western | HA | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Scheme assessed as part of another option. |
| IZT | Cross Solent Main to 20MI/d | This option incorporates the additional assets required to utilise the spare capacity of the two most recent 300 mm diameter Cross-Solent mains. The new mains have been constructed between the Lepe on the Hampshire coast and Gurnard on the IOW to replace two slightly smaller mains that had reached the end of their design life. The scheme includes refurbishment or replacement of Broadfield and Newport pumps along with a new 450 mm diameter main between near Cowes and High Alvington WSR. The capacity of High Alvington WSR would also be increased with an additional 10MI service reservoir to accommodate the increased transfer. | Western | IOW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No longer required as Southern Water are enhancing the Blackfield and near Cowes PS capacities in AMP6 and the pipeline restriction will be removed in another option |
| IZT | Pulborough Winter transfer | During the winter there is surplus water available at Pulborough WSW. Pulborough Winter Transfer involves four stages, each of which provides cumulatively increasing benefit in terms of DO. Implementation of all stages would enable transfer from Pulborough WSW to Tenants Hill WSR in Sussex Worthing, which would then gravitate to Sussex Brighton. This option considers the potential for excess surface water that may be available within the River Rother during the winter to be used (either within the existing licence, or using an extended winter licence at Pulborough WSW) to supply Sussex Coast. This would allow coastal groundwater sources to be rested, which would help Southern Water's Source Drought Management Strategy (SDMS) and hence increase groundwater capabilities during the summer and autumn of a drought year. (1) This stage addresses turbidity and sludge handling issues at Pulborough which would otherwise constrain the | Central | SB | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | excluded as Pulborough to Weir Wood has been built |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | DO that can be achieved following the implementation of the transfer. Improvements at Pulborough WSW would allow increased transfer capacity to 7MI/d, providing a DO benefit of 2MI/d for the Brighton Block (SB). Constrained by V6 Worthing-Brighton transfer main. To achieve further DO benefit to Brighton, it would be necessary to alleviate pressures in the V6 main. (2) New main between Shoreham WSW/North Shoreham WSW and Brighton A WSR. This would allow 7MI/d to be pumped via a different route and relieve pressure issues in the existing V6 main. Additional water from Pulborough is only available during winter, so the benefit comes from resting groundwater sources in the Brighton Block during winter. The 7MI/d capacity increase would only result in a 4MI/d DO increase. (3) New main between Tenants Hill WSR and Shoreham WSW. This would allow an increase of the winter supply and resting strategy (resting the Brighton groundwater sources). (4) Pulborough to Sussex Brighton transfer – 4MI/d. Details unknown at this stage. Introduced following WRSE meeting 17/10/11. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IZT | Hampshire Rural (Romsey/Kings Sombourne) locked in DO scheme | Remove constraint by installing booster stations (~5MI/d) at Woodside transfer (increasing inter-zonal transfer to HSE) and Broadlands (increasing inter-zonal transfer to HSW). | Western | HR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Scheme now assessed as part of other IZT schemes |
| IZT | Faversham4–Fleete | (1) Conditioning of existing Faversham4–Fleete main to enable bi-directional transfers (and specifically from Kent Thanet to Kent Medway). It is not thought that any additional pipeline would be required, although this is dependent on the existing main being structurally sound. A new 25MI/d pumping station is required at Fleete WSR along with a possible booster pumping station to reduce the pressure head along the main. (Option TT3 in AMP 5). Minimum engineering requirements: new 25MI/d pumping station at Fleete Reservoir, modifications to pipework at Dunkirk Break Pressure Tank or alterations to pipework and construction of a new Dunkirk Break Pressure Tank, installation of energy dissipation measures at Faversham4. (2) The Kent Medway to Kent Thanet transfer scheme option proposes to increase the existing transfer capacity by 10MI/d between the Sheldwich boreholes and Fleete service reservoir. This would be achieved by duplicating the existing transfer main and a new pumping station at Faversham4. (Option TT1 in AMP 5). Main elements of scheme are: modification of borehole pumps at Sheldwich to allow additional 10MI/d to be pumped to Faversham4 through the new main, pumping main from Sheldwich to Faversham4 (approx. 6.5km), booster PS at Faversham4 and a disinfection unit, break pressure tank at Dunkirk, gravity main from Dunkirk to Fleete reservoir – 31.5km of main and phosphate dosing at Fleete reservoir for 10MI/d (3) The operational transfer is limited to the output from Faversham4. This option enables flows from the Faversham3 source to be directed, via an existing main, towards Faversham4 WSW. A soakaway is installed at Faversham4 to allow for reconditioning of the existing main and the addition of UV treatment at Faversham4 permits disinfection of the Faversham3 flows. (Option TT1a in AMP 5). Main scheme components are: 13MI/d soakaway at Faversham4, increased pumping capacity at Faversham4, new UV treatment at Faversham4 WSW. | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 1 | 0 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Excluded following NE comments 14/06/17 |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|---|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| IZT | Sandown to High Alvington transfer | High lift pumping station at Sandown WSW and a transfer pipeline to the High Alvington WSR above Newport. (1) 10MI/d Transfer from Sandown WSW to High Alvington WSR and construction of a new WSR at High Alvington. Likely to be used in conjunction with IWD1 (Sandown Desal). (2) 2.5MI/d Transfer from Sandown WSW to High Alvington WSR and construction of a new WSR at High Alvington. Likely to be used in conjunction with IWD1 (Sandown Desal). (3) 20MI/d Transfer from Sandown WSW to High Alvington WSR and construction of a new WSR at High Alvington. Likely to be used in conjunction with IWD1 (Sandown Desal). (4) 5MI/d Transfer from Sandown WSW to High Alvington WSR and construction of a new WSR at High Alvington. Likely to be used in conjunction with IWD1 (Sandown Desal). | Western | IOW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Not required as a stand-alone option. Included within specific desalination and reuse schemes |
| IZT | Transfer between Sussex Hastings WRZ and Sussex Coast WRZ | Transfer between Sussex Hastings WRZ and Sussex Coast WRZ. No specific details available at this stage. | Central | SH | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Screened out as replaced by consideration of options sharing resources with South East Water (RZ 2 & 3) |
| IZT | Sussex North to Sussex Worthing | (1) Sussex North to Sussex Worthing dependent on Pulborough winter transfer. (2) Drought Option - As part of the activities undertaken during the previous drought, the Company has completed a scheme to allow part of the Portsmouth Water Company transfer to Sussex North WRZ to be diverted to Sussex Worthing WRZ in the Arundel area. (3) Details unknown at this stage. | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Removed from feasible list as duplicated by other schemes |
| IZT | Weir Wood Winter Refill (Western Rother/Arun treated water) Stage 1 of the Pulborough to Sussex Brighton Transfer | This option involves the transfer of water to Weir Wood for storage from sources other than the Medway. The only feasible option for transfer from these sources is a treated water transfer from Pulborough to Weir Wood using existing infrastructure. The option would rely on using excess surface water capacity at Pulborough during the winter (which exists in even the most severe droughts) to treat and transfer water to Weir Wood. The option involves a new main installation between Pulborough WTW and Stopham (on the northern bank of the River Arun) to overcome pressure issues in the current main. This allows surplus water at Pulborough during the winter to be utilised by increasing transfer capacity by 2-5MI/d. The scheme does not actually transfer the water to Weir Wood, rather it supplies the areas of demand that would otherwise have to be fed by Weir Wood. This allows Weir Wood to enter a 'non- consumptive mode' during the winter and spring, which ensures that it can be filled even during severe drought events. Alternatively, Weir Wood may continue to be used and flows may be transferred towards Worthing (Pulborough Winter Transfer option), but this is not considered in the DO calculation for this option. This option was option N4 in AMP 4 (Weir Wood Winter Refill Western Rother/Arun), which was then excluded as a single option in AMP 5 as it became part N8a of option N8 (Pulborough Winter Transfer). | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Removed as scheme has been completed |
| LM | Fixed link pressure reduction valves | Leakage reduction options focused on pressure management, including potential future dynamic pressure management | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 1 | 1 | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Limited scope for further pressure reduction given number of PRV's installed as part of previous pressure management scheme |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|--|----------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| LM | Supply pipe leakage reduction associated with option MET_MAMR3 | This option accounts for the supply pipe leakage reductions that are assumed to result from the enhanced AMR meter reading strategy for existing metered households, moving to monthly meter readings. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 1 | 1 | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | MET_MAMR3 has been excluded from the RWRMP feasible options list as a standalone option because it now forms part of the Target 100 option. Its associated SPL option is therefore not required. |
| LM | Supply pipe leakage reduction associated with option MET_MSM1 | This option accounts for the supply pipe leakage reductions that are assumed to result from the installation of a smarter metering network to allow daily meter readings of existing metered households. This option starts in AMP7. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | MET_MSM1 has been excluded from the RWRMP feasible options list as a standalone option because it now forms part of the Target 100 option. Its associated SPL option is therefore not required. |
| LM | Supply pipe leakage reduction associated with option MET_MSM1b | This option accounts for the supply pipe leakage reductions that are assumed to result from smarter metering of all HH customers. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Option no longer required as MET_MSM1b not included in options appraisal |
| LM | Supply pipe leakage reduction associated with option MET_MSM2 | This option accounts for the supply pipe leakage reductions that are assumed to result from a long-term smarter metering programme. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Option no longer required as MET_MSM2 no longer included in options appraisal |
| LM | Telemetry | Use of appropriate telemetry to improve repair times | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Replaced by acoustic loggers option LM_ACL |
| LTR | Sittingbourne licence trade | Sittingbourne licence trade | Eastern | KME | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 1 | 0 | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Would need a commercial agreement with DS Smith and subsequent WQ surveys to determine ultimate treatment requirements |
| LTR | Purchase Groundwater licences: Brighton/Worthing Blocks | This option involves purchasing existing licences from other abstractors within the Worthing or Brighton Blocks in Sussex, where it is believed that there is significant excess capacity in the licence for the summer period. | Central | SW and SB | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | No specific locations/licences have been identified that would be suitable for Southern Water to purchase. |
| LTR | Water trading (3rd parties) - Kimberly-Clark Limited | Water trading (3rd parties) - Kimberly-Clark Limited. Kimberly-Clark Limited have 6 abstraction locations within SWS. This option would involve discussions between Southern Water and Kimberly-Clark Limited for Southern Water to determine whether Kimberly-Clark Limited are willing to trade some or all of their licence with SWS. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No further discussion between Southern Water and Kimberley Clark therefore significant uncertainty as to cost, available water and other key determining factors. This option can be reconsidered following further discussions with Kimberley Clark. |
| LTR | Water trading (3rd parties) - Lafarge Cement UK PLC | Water trading (3rd parties) - Lafarge Cement UK PLC | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No further discussion between Southern Water and Lafarge therefore significant uncertainty as to cost, available water and other key determining factors. This option can be reconsidered following further discussions with Lafarge. |
| LTR | Water trading (3rd parties) - large abstraction licence holder | Obtain data on holders of abstraction licences >1MI/d for Southern Water to contact to establish whether these 3rd parties were willing to trade some or all of their licence. This option concerns The Property Manager. Southern Water to contact The Property Manager to discuss trading all or part of their licence. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/a | N/a | No | No | No | No | No | No | No locations or suitable large abstractors of water identified. |
| LTR | Purchase under-utilised licences from industry | This option considers the feasibility of purchasing the use of existing large industrial abstraction licences by Southern Water that have not been used either in part, or in their entirety. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Additional work undertaken as part of this options appraisal, no other feasible options identified. |
| LV | Lukely Brook MRF | Drought Option: This Drought Permit is concerned with borehole abstraction from Lower Chalk in Lukely Brook Valley. The proposed drought option involves relaxation of the minimum flow requirement (Minimum Residual Flow, MRF) at Sheep Dip Weir in Plaish Meadows, through the application for and implementation of a Drought Permit, to enable continued abstraction from Lukely Brook. | Western | IOW | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 1 | 0 | - | - | - | No | - | No | 0 |
| LV | Caul Bourne | Drought Option: Reduce or remove the MRF which controls the abstraction from this source. Drought Order. Level of intervention: Severe drought conditions. | Western | IOW | No | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | - | - | - | No | Yes | No | 0 |
| LV | Pulborough MRF Seasonal Variation including river restoration | Work carried out during drought permit applications in the 2005 and 2006 drought permits indicated that the MRF (Minimum River Flow) could potentially be reduced by 10MI/d without unacceptable environmental impacts, | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Excluded as no DO benefit identified |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|--|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | particularly if this is done outside of the summer critical period when river temperatures are at their highest. Currently the licence at Pulborough is 75MI/d (combined surface and groundwater), but surface water abstraction is constrained by a requirement that the flow over Pulborough Weir should be no less than 63.64MI/d (daily average). River restoration measures have been included to compensate for any environmental / ecological damage that may otherwise be caused as a result of increased abstraction. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MET | Enhanced AMR meter reading strategy for existing metered households: monthly meter readings | Enhanced AMR meter reading strategy for existing metered households: monthly meter readings | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | This option has been incorporated into and therefore superseded by the Target 100 option for the RWRMP therefore has been excluded from the feasible options list as a standalone option. |
| MET | Smarter metering of all HH metered customers | Introduce smarter meter technology which can provide continuous meter reading data to the customer and Southern Water | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | This option has been incorporated into and therefore superseded by the Target 100 option for the RWRMP therefore has been excluded from the feasible options list as a standalone option. |
| MET | Seasonal tariff | Seasonal tariffs provide incentives to reduce discretionary water use at peak times. This tariff option would see customers being charged more in summer months (June to September inclusive) and less during the rest of the year (October to May inclusive). Relies upon smarter metering being in place. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | This option has been incorporated into and therefore superseded by the Target 100 option for the RWRMP therefore has been excluded from the feasible options list as a standalone option. |
| MET | Rising block tariff | Tariff that increases as customers use additional water. Does not require smart meter technology although may be more effective if it was in place. Issue around benchmarking and occupancy to avoid social implications of tariff. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | This option has been incorporated into and therefore superseded by the Target 100 option for the RWRMP therefore has been excluded from the feasible options list as a standalone option. |
| MET | Drought awareness reward tariff | This reward-based tariff would be designed to encourage customers to use less water during times of drought. The level of the benchmark below which customers would need to reduce their consumption, as well as the level of the reward would require development and a high level of analysis by Southern Water. Communications relating to this tariff could be aligned with Drought Plan communications that Southern Water would already be undertaking. In this way, the tariff could form one of Southern Water's drought management actions. Issues around assessing the potential demand saving associated with the tariff from a WRMP perspective. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | This drought tariff is to be discussed as something Southern Water is 'keen to explore' in the WRMP Technical Summary, but due to the following issues, it is henceforth excluded from the optimisation process: - Mechanism for cross-subsidy of revenue loss/the cost of rewards resulting from these tariffs is not clear at this stage - Drought triggers are WRZ-based - difficult to communicate this to customers who would potentially be subject to different tariffs as a result of WRZ-specific drought triggers bring breached - Potential double-counting of TUBs savings/delay of TUBs as a result of these tariffs - would need to be reflected in the SDB as TUBs savings are included in baseline DO for many sources |
| MET | Drought levy | Additional tariff applied during droughts to discourage water use - based on the principle of the rising block tariff but only applied when the resource state falls below Southern Water's impending drought trigger levels. As with the seasonal tariff, customers may not support this tariff; issues around affordability and protecting vulnerable customers would need to be considered. This option could be best linked to the Rising Block tariff (MET_Tar2) so customers are already used to the concept of volumetric 'block' charging, but to draw attention to the specific need to reduce consumption during a drought event, customers could see an additional charge for the 'discretionary' block of water to discourage use of water during a drought. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 1 | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | This drought tariff is to be discussed as something Southern Water is 'keen to explore' in the WRMP Technical Summary, but due to the following issues, it is henceforth excluded from the optimisation process: - Mechanism for cross-subsidy of revenue loss/the cost of rewards resulting from these tariffs is not clear at this stage - Drought triggers are WRZ-based - difficult to communicate this to customers who would potentially be subject to different tariffs as a result of WRZ-specific drought triggers bring breached - Potential double-counting of TUBs savings/delay of TUBs as a result of these tariffs - would need to be reflected in the SDB as TUBs savings are included in baseline DO for many sources |
| MET | Individual reward tariff | This tariff would be designed to encourage individuals to reduce their year-round water use, therefore targeting annual average and peak period demand savings. The | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Until such time as the trials have been carried out and the demand savings and associated reward levels and costs are assessed, it is not possible to assign a meaningful cost |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|--|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | option could be structured in a similar way to MET_Tar8 - the community reward tariff scheme. Similarly to that option, one or more trials would be required to inform the level at which the reward should be set to achieve a meaningful reduction in demand. Customers could be offered a financial reward for reducing their consumption below the identified threshold level (e.g. money off their next water bill) or alternatively could be offered reward points to redeem. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | or demand saving to this option for this WRMP. Hence this option is not being taken forward as a standalone option, but Southern Water will review the outcomes of the community reward tariff when available and re-consider this option within T100 at an appropriate stage. |
| NT | Water from Air | New Technology which extracts water from the air using a wind turbine to drive a heat exchanger to cool and condense water | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | N | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Initial desktop studies revealed that this option would be prohibitively expensive to run on a large scale. Academic literature suggests that operating costs for this technology are much higher than for desalination which itself is already considered an energy intensive technology. Using wind powered turbines as the cooling mechanism would reduce the energy requirements considerably, however, the volume of water produced by this type of device is low, and it would be cost prohibitive to install enough devices, treat the water and distribute to customers. This type of approach is much more suited to small communities in extremely water scarce environments. |
| PWR | Medway WWTW Indirect Potable Water Reuse – Medway | This option involves the transfer of approx. 18MI/d of treated effluent from Medway WWTW to the River Medway upstream of Springfield abstraction. This would be used to supplement flows within the Medway during low flow periods, thus reducing the releases from Bewl Water and conserving storage. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Excluded as 18MI/d option is the only one taken forward. |
| PWR | Medway water reuse pumped to near Maidstone and onwards to Bewl | This scheme involves tertiary treatment of waste water effluent at Medway WTW, and pumping through a new discharge pipeline to the River Medway upstream of the abstraction near Maidstone. The extra water would then be re abstracted near Maidstone and pumped up to Bewl Reservoir for storage. A raw water supply pipe would be constructed directly from Bewl Reservoir to near Rochester WSW to be used when there would be a risk of Metaldehyde contamination by releasing water to the River Medway. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | This option is among a number that increase supply to near Rochester WSW using treated wastewater from Medway WTW. This variation includes constructing at least three times as much pipeline as the other variations with little or no gain additional DO. The reasoning behind investigating this option is that it would enable the direct supply of metaldehyde free water from Bewl to near Rochester when metaldehyde would otherwise be a risk. However, another variation of this scheme would reduce the metaldehyde risk without requiring as much pipeline to be constructed. This option has therefore been rejected on the grounds of disproportionate costs. No detailed L2 assessment undertaken on the grounds outlined. |
| PWR | Hastings WWTW effluent to augment storage in Darwell Reservoir | This option proposes the transfer of treated effluent from Hastings WTW, currently being discharged to sea at Pebsham Gap, in order to augment storage in either the Darwell reservoir. This option includes tertiary treatment of Hastings wastewater, this may include Membrane Bio Reactors and Reverse Osmosis. Additional GAC and UV treatment may be required at Rye WSW. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | The size and the volume of turnover of Powdermill reservoir mean that the once the reuse scheme is running treated wastewater would make up a large proportion of the reservoir's volume. As the reservoir supplies water directly to Rye WSW via pipes there would be no further in river dilution making this in effect a direct reuse scheme with greater levels of treatment required and additional public perception issues. Additionally, treated wastewater from Hastings WwTW could be used to augment Darwell Reservoir without the above issues. Therefore this option has not been carried forward on grounds of suitability. |
| PWR | Portsmouth Harbour WTW Indirect Potable Reuse | There is significant wastewater resource at Portsmouth Harbour WTW that could be treated for reuse, up to 85MI/d DWF. This option looks at tertiary treatment at Portsmouth Harbour WTW then pumping to Ambersham 30 km away for downstream abstraction by Pulborough. | Central | SN | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | This option includes construction of a long pipeline to supply Pulborough WSW. There is another option to supply Pulborough WSW with treated wastewater. This option has therefore been excluded on grounds of disproportionate costs, however could be revisited if it is determined that Pulborough WSW requires significantly more water during drought periods. On this basis no detailed L2 assessment undertaken. |
| PWR | Chickenhall WwTW Indirect Potable Water Reuse | This options transfers 30MI/d of treated effluent to a site immediately downstream of Itchen WSW abstraction. | Western | HSE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Excluded from optimisation model as discharge is used by Portsmouth Water as part of the Gater's Mill abstraction |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|---|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | When sustainability reductions are imposed on Itchen WSW abstractions the treated effluent will be used offset the abstraction restrictions. No further treatment capacity at Itchen WSW is required to enable this scheme. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | licence therefore this option has been rejected on grounds of the water not being available for use. This option could be revisited if some form of sharing agreement could be developed that would be beneficial to Portsmouth Water and Southern Water. No detailed L2 assessment on grounds outlined |
| PWR | Medway WWTW Indirect Potable Water Reuse – Eccles Lake (18MI/d) | This option involves the transfer of 18MI/d of treated effluent from Medway WWTW to near Rochester WSW's raw water storage reservoir Eccles Lake. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Replaced by another option |
| PWR | Littlehampton WTW Indirect Potable Water Reuse | This scheme proposes the transfer of treated effluent from Littlehampton WTW to a new discharge point to the western River Rother upstream of the Pulborough WSW abstraction. This would support flows over the weir as the MRF is approached, therefore prolong production at Pulborough during a drought. 20MI/d represents the upper end of the reliable flow that could be expected from Littlehampton WTW. Once abstracted at Pulborough WSW this water would be used to meet demand in the Sussex North WRZ. | Central | SN | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Only 10MI/d and 20MI/d options taken forward |
| PWR | Generic Water Reuse Schemes | The generic investigation into effluent reuse possibilities will focus on a number of areas: 1. Identify potential opportunities to substitute either treated water or private abstractions with reuse water to large industrial water users. In the former this would reduce demand on Southern Water supply; in the case of the latter this may free up the licence for use by SWS. Where possible, this information will also be sourced outside of Southern Water water supply region but within the sewerage supply area with a view to examining the options for utilising reuse from Southern Water wastewater treatment works to reduce demand on other water supply companies' systems – this may also be considered within the context of water trading. 2. Large agricultural water users, primarily those with their own abstraction licences, may also provide an opportunity to reduce agricultural abstraction which may allow Southern Water to take up the slack existing licences. 3. Identify locations where large population growth is forecast as the additional flow generated could provide an opportunity to augment flows upstream of an existing abstraction and/or support agricultural reuse. 4. Map existing Southern Water discharges with water treatment works abstractions (Southern Water and neighbouring water companies) to identify additional reuse options over and above those already considered in the WRMP14 options to be examined. Typically, this will include WWTWs with lower DWF as than previously considered financially viable. | Southern Water | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | No | Any identified schemes will be assessed in their own right in their own factfiles. No specific L2 assessments undertaken here. |
| PWR | Millbrook WwTW Indirect Potable Water Reuse | This option involves the transfer of up to 40MI/d (consented DWF) of treated effluent from Millbrook WwTW to the River Test upstream of Test Surface Water abstraction. This would be used to supplement flows within the Test during low flow periods, thus maintaining abstraction periods of low flow. | Western | HSE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | No | Exclude from optimisation model due to significant engineering/planning issues associated with constructing a transfer pipeline through/alongside a motorway and dual carriageway. Environmental issues associated with CSMG requirements bring high level of uncertainty and there are better options. No detailed L2 assessment undertaken on these grounds. |
| PWR | Medway estuary WTW | Medway estuary WTW has a consented DWF of 44MI/d which is currently discharged to the sea. This option proposes advanced treatment and transfer of this effluent | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Excluded due to concerns that instream dilution will not be sufficient for this volume of water. |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|--|---|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | to support the flows in the River Medway upstream of the Springfield Abstraction that supplies near Rochester WSW with raw water. Two alternative locations for the discharge location have been identified, both of which are small streams that flow into the River Len, a tributary of the Medway. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PWR | Effluent re-use & transfer from the Sevenoaks area | Sewage within the Sevenoaks area is collected by Thames Water and transported to their Crossness WWTW. This represents water 'lost' from the Medway catchment. This option relates to the use of any increased discharge as a result of expansion in the Sevenoaks area, by a transfer to the headwaters of the River Medway. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | No | Exclude from optimisation model due to significant engineering/planning issues associated with constructing a transfer pipeline through/alongside a motorway and dual carriageway. Environmental issues associated with CSMG requirements bring high level of uncertainty and there are better options. No detailed L2 assessment undertaken on these grounds. |
| PWR | Sandown WwTW Indirect Potable Reuse | This option proposes the transfer of treated effluent from Sandown WwTW (currently discharged to sea), to support flows in the Eastern River Yar upstream of the Sandown WSW abstraction at Alverstone. Treated water in excess of the local demand will be transferred through a new transfer pipeline to the Alvington High Level WSR, near Newport, for supply to much of the island. This option is reliant on the WSR enlargements carried out in IZT_CSM Cross-Solent upgrade. (2) Option 2 also includes upgrades to Sandown WSW to achieve the extra flow. | Western | IOW | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Covered by other options |
| PWR | Weir Wood Reservoir augmentation with treated effluent | Discharge highly treated effluent from neighbouring WWTWs into Weir Wood Reservoir. Potential WwTW include Tunbridge Well South WwTW, East Grinstead WwTW, and Scaynes Hill WwTW. There are smaller WwTW which could also contribute. Effluent would be treated to a very high quality either at the WwTWs individually or collectively at a new tertiary treatment site near Weir Wood Reservoir for transfer and discharge to the reservoir. The extra water would be used to prolong how long Weir Wood Reservoir can support flows during a drought. | Central | SN | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | No | Exclude from optimisation model as option requires removing water permanently from the WwTW catchments and transferring to another, there is a high risk that the EA would not accept this on the grounds of reduced flows into those rivers previously accepting discharges. On these grounds no further L2 assessment work undertaken. | |
| RES | Bowl Operational Control | Bowl Water fills from three sources: (1) Its own small natural catchment; (2) Water from the River Teise catchment pumped from intake; and (3) Water from the River Medway catchment pumped from intake near Maidstone Currently, the River Teise intake is used preferentially for filling the reservoir, and the intake near Maidstone is only used when the reservoir falls to defined critical levels. There are operational control curves in place which are used to determine the operation of both of these supplies to the reservoir. There is a balance between increasing the deployable output during worst-case drought events by raising the control curve, and incurring additional year-on-year operational expenditure through increased use of the abstraction near Maidstone to fill Bowl. This option would entail investigating these operational control rules to explore the relationships between security of supplies and operational expenditure. Initial investigations will explore a limited number of alternative control rules. If the option is taken forward, more complex optimisation routines are available to select the best control curve. If found to be of benefit, the implementation of the scheme | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Operational changes to the control rules are already included in the DO assessment | |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|--|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | would be through the use of different operational control rules. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RES | Blue Lake | Blue Lake is a former quarry, located close to Northfleet, which is owned by Blue Circle. It is reported to have flooded during the 1930s while being worked. It is thought that this is due to the quarry intercepting a fissure. There are a number of current abstraction licences around the site. There are a number of constraints that would influence the ability to develop a new source at Blue Lake. The main constraint is that of water quality as this is understood to be poor. It is reported that the site is contaminated by flue dust. There is also the potential for saline intrusion and there is a cemetery close to the lake. | Eastern | KMW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Blue Lake would not be suitable for strategic water resource development because of water quality problems and high cost |
| RES | Raise Bewl Water 3000mm plus licence variation | Bewl water fills from 3 sources: its own small natural catchment, River Teise catchment (pumped) and the River Medway catchment (pumped). There are operational control curves in place to determine the operation of both the pumped supplies to the reservoir. The Teise is used preferentially with the Medway only used when the reservoir falls to critical levels. To increase DO during drought events the control curve could be raised depending on the relationship between security of supplies and operational expenditure. This will be explored in 5 sub-options all of which include the major works: Investigate operational rules; Raise the dam crest and build new wave wall; Raise overflow and valve chamber shafts; and many ancillary works around the perimeter of the reservoir. For sub-option 5 this will also include licence variation M10. The sub-options involve raising Bewl water by: 0.4m, 1m, 2m and 3m. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | Licence variation has already been applied for and is assumed to be in place | |
| RES | Blue Water | This option would utilise dewatering flows from Blue Water (a former quarry). The option would include ozonation/GAC treatment, and include a pipeline to Singlewell Reservoir. DO would be half of the discharge consent. | Eastern | KMW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | No discharge consent held by the Agency for Blue Water so a Deployable Output benefit cannot be quantified |
| RES | Reservoir at Pulborough | 3,500Ml bankside surface storage reservoir at Pulborough with Rother and Arun abstractions of 30Ml/d and 20Ml/d to provide additional resources to Pulborough WSW when the flow in the river Rother is low. | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 0 | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Potential WFD risks and associated impacts of reservoir construction |
| RES | Abstract from fluvial flow captured and stored around the Medmerry realignment scheme and on Adur and Arun flood plains | Medmerry captures coastal waters. Bund stops fluvial water getting into the sea. Store and abstract it, same for Adur and Arun floodplains. Increase capacity of Appledram STW and recycle waste water | Central | SN | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | No | - | No | Excluded from feasible list as scheme lies in Portsmouth Water supply area. Same as AMP5 exclusion. |
| RES | Raise Bewl Water by 1.00 m | The scheme involves the raising of Bewl Water to increase storage and yield. The major works for raising Bewl to higher TWL levels will include: • Raise the dam crest and build new wave wall; • Raise overflow and valve chamber shafts; and • Many ancillary works around the perimeter of the reservoir. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 0 | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Only 0.4m option taken forward following comments from EA and NE. Difficult to mitigate flooding of ancient woodland. |
| RES | Raise Bewl Water by 2000mm | The scheme involves the raising of Bewl Water to increase storage and yield. The major works for raising Bewl to higher TWL levels will include: • Raise the dam crest and build new wave wall; • Raise overflow and valve chamber shafts; and • Many ancillary works around the perimeter of the reservoir. | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 0 | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Only 0.4m option taken forward following comments from EA and NE. Difficult to mitigate flooding of ancient woodland. |
| RES | Raise Bewl Water by 3000mm | The scheme involves the raising of Bewl Water to increase storage and yield. The major works for raising Bewl to higher TWL levels will include: • Raise the dam crest and build new wave wall; | Eastern | KMW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | 0 | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Only 0.4m option taken forward following comments from EA and NE. Difficult to mitigate flooding of ancient woodland. |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|--|----------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raise overflow and valve chamber shafts; and Many ancillary works around the perimeter of the reservoir. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RES | Investigate and develop other new reservoir sites | Assess the broad potential for other reservoir sites within south-east England with a capacity greater than 2000MI. | Southern Water | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | This generic option has been replaced by site-specific options |
| RES | Capture surplus river flow | Flood meadows and pump water to works/ or reservoir. Capture water before it flows out to sea in times of high flow. Potential flood alleviation benefits | Central | SB and SW | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Excluded as it is a duplicate of other schemes and it is not a specific option. |
| RES | Convert Test Surface Water Lake into a surface water storage site | Little Test Surface Water Lake is a fully operational reservoir. It is filled by water abstracted from the River Test when the water is not directly pumped to the Test Surface Water WSW. It is proposed that Test Surface Water Lake, previously developed as a nature conservation and recreation resource, be used as a reservoir. The exact volume of the existing Test Surface Water Lake is unclear but is assumed to be in the region of 500MI much of which would be required to provide emergency storage. Permission, which lasted until 2010, allowed for the capacity to increase to 1750MI, half of which would be used for emergency storage. | Western | HSW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | This option has been replaced by an option that is thought to be more feasible |
| SI | Pulborough – reduce MRF | <p>Drought Option: This Drought Permit is concerned with the surface water off-take from the River Rother. The Permit allows a reduction in the MRF at Pulborough, which effectively allows greater abstraction from the Pulborough Surface water intake once abstraction in the river becomes constrained by the existing licensed MRF. Typical Permits are in the order of 10–30MI/d reduction in MRF, although larger Permits may be sought under more extreme conditions.</p> <p>This option allows both increased supplies and can also be used to maintain storage in Weir wood and groundwater sources during drought conditions. This remains a viable option for both summer and winter conditions, as it allows more water to be taken from the river when abstraction is constrained by the MRF</p> | Central | SN | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | Yes | - | No | Drought options not WRMP |
| SI | North Arundel – increase abstraction | <p>Drought Option: Under more severe droughts, where resources in Sussex Coast themselves are under threat, and drought measures in Sussex North (such as the Pulborough MRF reduction) are not sufficient or suitable to address the situation, then a Drought Permit/order may be sought to increase licensed abstraction at North Arundel. The proposed drought option involves increasing groundwater abstraction at North Arundel PS through the application for and implementation of a Drought Order. This source typically pumps at 4.5MI/d and is constrained by the licence. The drought action would seek to increase the daily abstraction rate by 2.5MI/d to 7MI/d, which is the peak deployable output of the source.</p> <p>Increasing the abstraction from North Arundel will provide additional supply for Sussex Coast and possibly support bulk transfers to Sussex North. However, this is only a severe drought option due to the sensitivity of Swanbourne Lake.</p> | Central | SW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | - | - | - | No | - | No | Drought options not WRMP |
| SI | Test surface water abstraction | Reduce or remove the MRF which controls the abstraction from this source | Western | HSW | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | 0 | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Replaced by other options following changes to the abstraction licence |
| SI | Weir Wood – reduce compensation flow | Drought Option: The Company can apply for a Drought Permit or Order to reduce the compensation flow from Weir Wood reservoir to maintain water levels. This is a possibility for both summer and winter conditions but typically will only be sought when a specific drought issue is affecting the integrity of the reservoir. This Drought Permit is concerned with a reduction in compensation flow | Central | SN | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | No | - | No | 0 |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? |
| | | from Weir Wood Reservoir and Weir Wood WSW to maximise available resources for public water supply | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SRF | Candover Augmentation | Emergency drought option: Conjunctive operation of the Candover augmentation scheme and Alresford BH and WSW. | Western | HSE | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | No | - | No | Superseded by another option |
| SWA | New abstraction from the River Brede and transfer to Powdermill Reservoir | This option would require the construction of a river abstraction on the River Brede close to the existing abstraction, from where the water would be pumped through a new transfer main to Powdermill Reservoir. | Eastern | SH | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Option excluded pending investigation of the achievable DO from the scheme. |
| SWA | Relocation of Portsmouth Water abstraction to saline limit | Relocating the GM river intake downstream would mean that water would be kept in the River Itchen for longer (approximately 1.4 km until the tidal limit) thereby the benefits to the river flora and fauna would be in excess of those achieved by the sustainability reductions from Itchen WSW and Portsmouth Water abstraction alone. To minimise the loss of deployable output this option initially considered a 75Ml/d surface water abstraction just upstream. This would allow Portsmouth Water to continue to supply 45Ml/d and also allow Southern Water to utilise the maximum capacity of the Moor Hill WSR with an additional 30Ml/d bulk supply from Portsmouth Water. | Western | HSW | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Option excluded pending investigation of how this scheme would interact with the planned Sustainability Reductions on the Itchen |
| SWA | Tidal barrage on Medway estuary | To put in place a tidal barrage in the Medway Estuary downstream of Allington Lock. Flood water to be stored in this estuarine area for abstraction to Eccles Lake during drought periods. | Eastern | KME | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Option excluded as likely to breach the WFD requirement of 'No Deterioration' for water habitat. |
| SWA | Stourmouth WSW | There is an existing 10Ml/d capacity WSW at Stourmouth which is constrained by an MRF in the summer. It was constructed in the 1970s as a temporary measure and in AMP5 was reported to be in disrepair but may be operable if required in a drought. The last recorded use was during 2006. This scheme comprises the construction of a new water treatment works at Stourmouth including two days' worth of covered storage to replace the existing temporary works in a location c. 2.5 km to the north, outside of the 1 in 100 yr. floodplain. Sub-options 2 and 3 include additional open, raw water bankside storage which would be filled during winter (Oct-Mar) from the Great Stour. Sub-option 4 comprises abstraction of water at Stourmouth and transfer to a new 'super WSW' located near the existing Ramsgate B source. (Note that this options does not include water (effluent) reuse from Sandwich WTW) | Eastern | KT | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Sub-option (1) included in optimisation model Sub-options (2) and (3) excluded based on concerns from Kent International Airport regarding potential bird strikes, Sub-option (4) excluded as only a single new WSW option is required. Ramsgate B water will be pumped to the new works for blending with lower nitrate water. Sub-option (5) included in optimisation model. |
| SWA | Relocation of abstraction point | This option involves the relocation of an existing surface water abstraction for SWS's Itchen WSW to a new abstraction further downstream, closer to the tidal limit. It is assumed that the new abstraction would meet the imposed Sustainability Reductions on the Lower Itchen as the scheme would lead to increased flow volumes along the length of the River Itchen between the two sites. The new abstraction would replace the entire surface water abstraction at Itchen WSW (45Ml/d) plus 11Ml/d to compensate for the Sustainability Reductions (SR) imposed on Portsmouth Water Company. With the provision of additional water treatment infrastructure to account for a comparative reduction in raw water quality, flows may be treated by the existing supply works at Itchen WSW, or alternatively, an Import from Portsmouth | Western | HSE | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Option excluded pending investigation on how this would interact with planned sustainability reductions on abstractions from the River Itchen |

| Option category code | Option name | Option description | Area | WRZ | Screening criteria: unconstrained to constrained | | | | | | | | | Screening criteria: constrained to feasible | | | | | | Comments | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | Beneficial environmental outcomes? | Increased resilience? | Phased/Modular implementation? | Technically feasible? | Addresses water resources planning problem? | Meets customer and regulator expectations? | Avoids disproportionate costs and/or delivers appreciable water | Confidence in implementation/output | Include in constrained option list? | Scheme SEA grade: risk of adverse effects | Scheme SEA grade: opportunity for beneficial effects | Mitigation measures to address potential impacts? | Dependencies / mutual exclusivities with other options or third parties? | Is option at risk of climate change impacts or future uncertainty? | Can option be implemented in a phased/modular way? | | Does option contribute to overall resilience? | Include in feasible option list? | |
| | | Water following expansion of the existing water treatment works | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WEF | Household water efficiency audit | Manned audit with retrofit of free water efficient devices where appropriate. | Southern Water | - | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 0 | 1 | - | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | This option has been incorporated into and therefore superseded by the Target 100 option for the RWRMP therefore has been excluded from the feasible options list as a standalone option. | |
| WTW | Generic nitrate removal scheme | Consider applicability across all sources to address those at risk of nitrate threshold exceedance over the planning horizon. Nitrate removal plant to be installed or blending to be undertaken. | Southern Water | - | - | - | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | No | No | No | No | No | No | Replaced by site-specific options | |
| WTW | Southampton Link Main | This option is a transfer from Test Surface Water WSW to the areas served by Itchen WSW. The option involves a 21.5 km 60mm HPPE pipeline and a new high-lift pumping station at Test Surface Water WSW. | Western | HSE | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | 0 | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Raw water sub-option has been excluded. Potable water transfer of additional water resource created by desalination in HSW retained | |