



LWR RAPID Gate 3 Query Tracker

RAPID Gate 3 Query number	RAPID Query (responses are located within each respective document)
LWR 001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guidance requires the board to clearly set out the evidence, information and external and/or internal assurance that the Board has considered in providing the assurance. • Thames Water has not set out any information relating to the external assurance or who provided the service. Please provide a copy of the external assurance letter or additional information such as the extract or summary of the external assurance.
LWR 002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide further details of the main ways local councils, and all relevant statutory bodies are being engaged with in 2025/26 to assist with the planning of the application to the Planning Inspectorate for the development consent order. • Can you please confirm if you are planning to engage directly with London MPs? • Can you please explain what engagement you have had or plan to have with the Planning Inspectorate prior to the DCO submission?
LWR 003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The London Water Recycling scheme has generated significant interest from the public due to environmental and water quality concerns. Please provide further details on how you plan to address these issues with customers and local communities.
LWR 004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you please describe how representations on the draft decisions at gate two had been addressed at gate three or will be addressed at future gates?
LWR 005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide a list of all parameters (not just the limiting hazards) as per A.2 in Annex B, split by sampling location. • Annex B details that other limiting hazards have been assessed as a red or amber residual risk based on the information in the DWPSs and that these risks are being mitigated via the current Thames Water DWSP. Will the scheme either increase the flow above the current operational maximum or will any additional risks that the scheme may present be able to be treated within the post-mitigated operating envelope of the works, or will any further additional mitigations be required? • How has the SWQRA considered the water quality in low river flow conditions (especially in consideration of the operation of the scheme in drought conditions and upstream wastewater inputs) and please provide a summary of the impact on the expected raw water quality at Teddington. • How has the SWQRA considered any blending from other inputs into the chain of raw water reservoirs and any impact this may have on the limiting hazards and other WQ parameters.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CECs, section 9.1.3 states that there will be advanced water treatment processes at Mogden and Beckton to mitigate the risk, what treatment is available at Coppermills and the other receiving works? Please provide details of what advanced treatment is being considered, should it be needed, and confirm that there is sufficient space to enable the construction at these sites. • Please confirm the units for PFOS and PFOA in Annex B p30 & 31.
LWR 006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please can the SRO provide evidence of consideration of the requirements of regulation 15 and how this will be further / continually developed prior to the submission. • Does the SRO have any plans for water quality monitors at Teddington and any additional monitoring at the intakes to Coppermills and Chigwell works • The SRO is proposed for use every 2 years; how will the SRO prevent stagnation of water in the short piece of connecting pipework from Teddington weir abstraction point to the TLT. Will the raw water abstraction element of the SRO have a startup procedure? • Do the SRO have a plan for engagement with consumers regarding changes to water quality, for instance, taste / odour / feel and alkalinity / hardness?
LWR 007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide a diagram to show the various abstraction points for the treatment works up stream of Teddington (and the ones listed in 4.3.1 of Annex B - Walton, Hampton, Coppermills, Chingford and Chigwell). • Please confirm which treatment works will be receiving the Teddington water and provide a diagram which shows the chain of reservoirs and downstream conveyance arrangements feeding the treatment works and how this feeds the distribution network.
LWR 008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide further details for Q3 of query response LWR005 on the identified mitigations for the three limiting hazards that have been found to be statistically significant, nitrate, <i>E. coli</i> and alkalinity. If mitigation is to be at the treatment works, please provide sufficient detail as to which different processes will be used to mitigate the risk and that these are sufficient for any increased risk. • We note in response to query LWR005 that the SWQRA utilised water quality data that represent the worst-case scenario. Can you please provide details as to how this analysis was completed to provide the

	<p>worst-case scenario, e.g. was this only water quality during periods of low flow conditions so that normal flow conditions did not mask any other limiting hazards that may be seen otherwise.</p>
LWR 009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note in response to the query LWR007 that this scheme will only supply Coppermills WTW. Can you please provide an explanation as to why Chigwell WTW has been referenced in the DWSP and in the Drinking Water Quality Annex B of the submission. Please confirm whether there would be any circumstances where this works could receive a supply of the Teddington water?
LWR 0010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you confirm that the scheme will not operate during high tide events that overtop Teddington weir?
LWR 0011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have reviewed the gate report and Annex 2 and have been unable to identify any information on costs included in relation to environmental and water quality mitigations as stated in the Gate 3 guidance in Section 8. Please can you direct us to where this information has been included.
LWR 0012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please clarify the application of Water Resources South-East (WRSE) Best Value Assessment to the solution progression of the Teddington Direct River Abstraction (DRA) scheme. How were WRSE best value metrics integrated into the Teddington DRA best value assessment? What trade-offs were made between cost, environmental benefits, and operational resilience? How were these weighted for the best value assessment between the strategic resource options; Teddington DRA, Beckton and Mogden Water Recycling schemes? Did stakeholder and public consultations affect metric scoring, weight adjustments or preferred solution selection? How has financial cost been considered and how will this achieve overall benefit to customers, the wider environment, and overall society?
LWR 0013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have reviewed the gate report and Annex A2 and need further clarification on the key risk mitigation measures and the costed risk values. The post-mitigation RAG rating for some risks remain unchanged. Could you direct us to where we can view the RAG-rating methodology/rationale to help us understand the post-mitigation RAG rating for each risk?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the key delivery costs outlined in Table 4.8, in section 4.5.1 of Annex A2, could you direct us to where we can view the estimates for each individual risk?
LWR 0014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development on Open Space/Metropolitan Open Land Identify the types and amount of Special Category Land within the proposed Development Consent Order (DCO) limits as at 1 January 2025. Outline the worst-case scenario works for the Special Category Land and what is proposed to be permanent or temporary works. For each type of Special Category Land (SCL), outline how it is intended to satisfy the various legal requirements for the inclusion of such land in the DCO, including where relevant, the identification and provision of suitable land as exchange land or justification for not providing exchange land. Detail the results of the engagement with respect to that land carried out to that date including with affected local authorities, the Greater London Authority and the community; and how conflicts with existing land uses on the SCL are being progressed towards resolution. Current progress on proposals for replacing the land used with equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location should be set out. Outline the very special circumstances case which, in your opinion, will justify development on the Metropolitan Open Land. Outline the alternatives considered during scheme evolution to the use of the designated sites, and why the proposed Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) were considered to be the most suitable sites when assessed against reasonable alternatives.
LWR 0015	<p>Environmental Impact and Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain any residual concerns from discussions with the nature organisations with an interest in the Hams Lands Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and functionally linked special areas of conservation. Provide more detail on the proposed use of <i>...exclusion zones around suitable habitat and/or translocation of deadwood habitats. It is considered that this mitigation would be sufficient to avoid adverse effects to the integrity of the site.</i> Please detail how this is currently proposed to work in practice.
LWR 0016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have reviewed the gate report and Annex A2 and have been unable to identify any specific information relating to cost scalability and tipping points for project costs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please can you direct us to where this information has been included.
LWR 0017	<p>Following the response to LWR013, we note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monte Carlo analysis was used to run simulations. Each simulation had 10000 iterations. • The methodology and how the input values were developed (min and max values as well as the probability distribution for the costs) is hard to follow/confusing. <p>Please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enough details to understand how Monte Carlo analysis was conducted • The methodology and how Thames derived the inputs including min and max values as well as the probability distribution for the costs
LWR 0018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your Efficiency of Expenditure table, expenditure for the activity "Project Manager" is £471,238. From what appears to be a single role, this activity accounts for almost 15% of the overall spend in the "Programme & Project Management" category. Can you please provide an explanation as to why the expenditure for this activity is so significant. • In your Efficiency of Expenditure table, the expenditure for the category of "Option benefits development and appraisal" is £0. Can you please confirm that there has been no expenditure related to this category and confirm that the expenditure for this category has not been included elsewhere. • Can you outline the relationship between the following three activities as we can see the potential for there to be degree of overlap and we want to ensure that costs are being allocated appropriately between activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scheme design and build procurement management ○ Gate 3 and TP procurement activities ○ Procurement Strategy