Gate one query process

Strategic solution(s)	LTWLR
Query number	LTW006
Date sent to company	27/02/2026
Response due by	03/03/2026

Query

1. Please provide details of when the full monitoring plan and parameter suite will be available.
2. What sources will be used to compile the parameters list? For example, will the ACWG Strategic WQ Risk Framework report list be used?
3. Please provide details of when the timeline and plan for developing the DWSP will be available.
4. How will regulation 31 considerations be taken into account?
5. PFAS or other emerging substances are not listed in the table 10.7. Have these been considered?

[redacted]

   a. What monitoring is available / proposed [redacted]?
   b. This location is not included in paragraph 10.8, in the graphs, and Laleham has been used as the main comparison site; is there a reason why [redacted] has not been used?
   c. Does the [redacted] ever supply [redacted]?

7. [redacted]:
   a. The abstraction [redacted]. Is this frequently utilised?
   b. Please provide details of the current abstraction, for the last two years, including min, max and average.

Solution owner response

1. Please provide details of when the full monitoring plan and parameter suite will be available.

TW Response

The monitoring plan will be developed by LTWLR's new Technical Partner (TP), which will commence onboarding during late Spring 2026. The monitoring plan will be one of the TP's first tasks, therefore, the water quality monitoring plan and parameter suite should be developed during Summer 2026. Once complete, we will share the monitoring plan and parameter suite with the DWI for review and comment.

2. What sources will be used to compile the parameters list? For example, will the ACWG Strategic WQ Risk Framework report list be used?

TW Response

The parameter list and monitoring plan will be developed in line with all relevant best practice and current guidance from the ACWG, consistent with the approach undertaken for previous SROs. As noted above, both would be shared with DWI for review and comment.

3. Please provide details of when the timeline and plan for developing the DWSP will be available.

TW Response

In accordance with RAPID guidance for gate two (v2, Jan 2026), the gate two submission will provide an updated assessment of drinking water quality considerations, and potential risks to drinking water quality and supply issues/resilience. As required, this will include *"a plan for future work to develop Drinking Water Safety Plans."*

In accordance with RAPID guidance for gate three (v4, Jan 2026), the gate three submission will build upon this, to produce "*well-developed Drinking Water Safety Plans."*

Currently, the gate two submission is programmed for October 2027, which will include the plan for developing the DWSP. The gate three submission is provisionally scheduled for Q4 2029, for when the DWSP will be developed.

4. How will regulation 31 considerations be taken into account?

TW Response

Regulation 31 of The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016 (as amended) implements Article 10 of the Council of the European Union Drinking Water Directive (DWD) in England and Wales for all chemicals and construction products used by water undertakers, from the source of the water, up to the point of delivery to the consumer's building. It sets out how approvals can be given to construction products and materials so that they do not prejudice water quality and consumer safety[1].

Such considerations will be taken into account as the design of the scheme develops in the next stage, aligning proposals with the requirements of Reg. 31. Any required specifications for chemicals or construction materials can then be captured within the risk register for the project and taken through into later design stages and the procurement of the mains works contractor, as required.

5. PFAS or other emerging substances are not listed in the table 10.7. Have these been considered?

TW Response

At gate one, PFAS or other emerging substances have not been assessed in the preliminary water quality risk assessment. These substances will be addressed in the forthcoming monitoring plan, as required, and within the updated assessment of drinking water quality considerations and potential risks to drinking water quality and supply issues/resilience required for gate two.

[redacted]

a) What monitoring is available / proposed [redacted]?
b) This location is not included in paragraph 10.8, in the graphs, and Laleham has been used as the main comparison site; is there a reason why [redacted] has not been used?
c) Does the [redacted] ever supply [redacted]?

TW Response

[1] Drinking Water Inspectorate. *What is Reg31?* Available here.

a) For the gate one assessment, water quality monitoring data was not analysed for the [redacted]. Water abstracted at this location is primarily used to supply the Lea Valley reservoirs. The need for further monitoring at this location will be considered as part of the development of the monitoring plan for gate two (see responses to Q1 and Q2 above).

b) The existing intake near Laleham [redacted]. The additional raw water that would be abstracted from the River Thames at Surbiton through the LTWLR scheme would be transferred directly to this same reservoir. The comparison of Laleham to Surbiton was, therefore, felt to be the most relevant for the assessment of any additional risks posed from by the indicative solution at gate one. In this regard, the water quality [redacted] would not be as relevant or as indicative of the water quality for the proposed new abstraction and, hence, a less meaningful indicator of changes to water quality risk.

   Importantly, Surbiton is also downstream of the confluence of the River Mole and the River Thames, and [redacted], so Surbiton is a better indicator of the potential water quality risks at the proposed new abstraction point.

c) No.

7. Surbiton intake:
   a) The abstraction [redacted]. Is this frequently utilised?
   b) Please provide details of the current abstraction, for the last two years, including min, max and average.

TW Response

a) [redacted] is operationally used [redacted] to assist with taking resource over the Teddington Target Flow. [redacted] Typically, it has been used [redacted]

b) [redacted], it's more useful to look at statistics for a period of use. For example:

- During the 2025 drought, [redacted]

- During 2024, [redacted]
- During the 2022 drought, [redacted]

Date of response to RAPID	[redacted]
Strategic solution contact / responsible person	[redacted]