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Introduction

Water is currently supplied to homes and businesses in West Cumbria by two principal sources, Ennerdale Water and Crummock Water. These are both natural lakes with man-made weirs at their outlet to provide artificial storage for water supply purposes. These lakes are important water sources for the people of West Cumbria and they have high ecological value because they contain rare species, many of which are legally protected. This is also the case for the rivers that flow downstream of these two lakes (River Ehen and River Cocker).

United Utilities has a statutory duty to produce a Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) under the Water Act 2003. The plan describes in detail an assessment of the available water supplies and the demand for water over the 2015 – 2040 period. The plan also sets out the proposed strategy for water resources and demand management to ensure that an adequate water supply is available to serve the region. The forecast for the West Cumbria resource zone supply-demand balance shows a deficit of water due to the revocation of Ennerdale Water abstraction licence through the EU Habitats Directive in order to protect England’s largest population of freshwater mussels (in the River Ehen below the lake). The revocation of other water sources in West Cumbria (Crummock Water, Chapel House, and Overwater) has also been agreed as part of a compensatory measures package (due to on-going abstraction until revocation of the Ennerdale Water abstraction licence can be implemented) with the Environment Agency and Natural England. United Utilities has addressed the loss of the Ennerdale Water abstraction licence, and the compensatory measures package, through the development of a scheme to transfer water from Thirlmere reservoir to West Cumbria.

We play an important role in the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of the region, and as such, we have a diverse range of stakeholders – from local authorities to charities, environmental groups to investors.

We are committed to engaging stakeholders in our planning and strategic development, to make sure our business direction reflects their priorities, and the customers they represent.

Engagement needs to be a continual process, rather than a one-off exercise. Our processes ensure views and opinions are sought from a wide range of organisations and individuals across the whole of the region.

We use a wide range of methods to reach our stakeholders, including focus groups, workshops, formal research and the myriad of conversations which take place between our employees, partners and customers on a daily basis.

Working closely with our stakeholders helped shape our Strategic Direction Statement – an outline of our investment priorities and service standards for the next 25 years. This document provides a roadmap for the business, and involving stakeholders in the process underlines our commitment to allowing a diverse range of groups to help shape our future plans.

This Statement of Community Involvement explains how we have consulted extensively with key stakeholders and the local community on the preparation of our proposals for the West Cumbria Water Supplies Project – Thirlmere Transfer. This consultation and engagement commenced at a very early stage with consideration of a wide range of alternative options for safeguarding water supplies to West Cumbria. Since then, we have continued to involve the local community throughout the planning and development of the scheme for which planning permission is now being sought. This Statement of Community Involvement also sets out how we will continue to engage extensively with stakeholders and the local community once the planning application for the scheme has been determined.
Proposed West Cumbria Water Supplies Scheme: Overview

Key
- Proposed raw water aqueduct
- Proposed treated water trunk main
- Slip lining through existing pipe
- Service reservoir (Existing)
- Service reservoir (Proposed)
- Water treatment works (Existing)
- Water treatment works (Proposed)
- Water treatment works (To be decommissioned)
Our approach to community involvement and communication

Summary of our approach

Community involvement and stakeholder engagement has been central to the development of our water supply strategy for West Cumbria and development of the proposed scheme. In line with our commitment to community involvement, we were very clear from the outset that local communities and stakeholders would be encouraged to have their say on any plans. This has been achieved by creating the time and a wide range of different opportunities for local people and local groups to provide ideas, give their views and be able to raise concerns to help us develop proposals that will bring benefit to the local community and environment.

Our engagement began in 2013 with consultation activities on our long-term Water Resources Management Plan which continued throughout 2014. In parallel, we carried out customer and stakeholder consultation during 2013 and 2014 as part of the 2014 Price Review process to understand their priorities and willingness to pay for improvements to water and wastewater services, customer service and the environment. Through this early consultation, we sought feedback on potential options to secure the future reliability of water supplies to homes and businesses in West Cumbria whilst also achieving environmental enhancement requirements.

These initial wide ranging consultation activities helped to shape and inform our long-term plans for water supplies in West Cumbria. This culminated in the development of a proposed solution based on the transfer of water from Thirlmere reservoir via a new pipeline to West Cumbria. This was reported in our Draft Water Resources Management Plan in 2013 with an accompanying formal consultation on the draft Plan and the proposed solution for West Cumbria.

Comments and feedback on the draft plan were generally supportive of the proposed pipeline from Thirlmere reservoir to West Cumbria as the best overall option. However in view of the strategic nature of the proposals and the associated important environmental considerations, the Secretary of State decided to hold a local Examination in Public of the Water Resources Management Plan in September 2014, specifically focused on the proposals for West Cumbria.

Water Resources Management Plan stakeholder engagement

- United Utilities Price Review 2014
- Examination in public by independent planning inspector
- Phase 1 - Raising awareness and explaining the need; feedback on pipeline routes and treatment works location options
- Phase 2 - Engagement on assessment of pipeline route and treatment works location
- Phase 3 - Consultation on detailed scheme design of preferred option
- Phase 4 - Post-planning permission consultation on final approved scheme details
- Phase 5 - Scheme construction consultation (pre-mobilisation to scheme completion)
- Phase 6 - Post-construction consultation, e.g. re-instatement, landscaping and community fund activities (ongoing consultation until scheme completion)


Design Build
process enabled further representation to be made by stakeholders and the local community to the independent Planning Inspector and/or to make representation at the hearing in Workington. Several representations were made in writing and two members of the public provided representation at the hearing, along with the Environment Agency and Natural England.

The Planning Inspector recommended that the Secretary of State should require amendments to the draft Water Resources Management Plan taking account of the representations received and the evidence provided by the company, Environment Agency and Natural England. The draft Water Resources Management Plan was subsequently approved by the Secretary of State.

Following the completion of the Examination in Public, there have been three phases of consultation and community engagement in the period up to the application for planning permission. Phase 1 focused on raising awareness and explaining the need for the proposed scheme within the local community, as well as obtaining feedback on potential pipeline routes and water treatment works locations. Phase 2 involved engagement with the local community on the assessment of pipeline routes and treatment works location, whilst Phase 3 has involved consultation on the design of the preferred solution. Through these three phases of engagement, we have been able to take account of the feedback from the local community to help shape and develop the design of the scheme as well as any required mitigation measures.

If planning permission is granted, we are fully committed to further phases of ongoing consultation with the local community. This will not take place until after the determination of the planning application. For Phase 4, the focus will be on engaging with the local community and stakeholders on the detailed scheme design and mitigation measures, the construction methods and processes and timescales for each part of the construction programme. We will also be discussing re-instatement, restoration and landscaping works, as well as the details of the proposed Legacy Fund.

Once construction work timescales are confirmed, we will be engaging with the local community from the pre-mobilisation activities in advance of construction works commencing and throughout the construction period (Phase 5). Discussions with the local community will also be held during this period in relation to the Legacy Fund.

Finally, Phase 6 of our engagement will be focused on delivery of the agreed post-construction reinstatement and landscaping activities as well as any other mitigation measures.

Summary of our consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation stage</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Reporting to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Inspector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Raising Awareness and Explaining the Need; Feedback on Pipeline Routes</td>
<td>West Cumbria Water Supply Scheme, Phase 1 Public Consultation Feedback Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Treatment Works Location Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Engagement on assessment of pipeline route and treatment works location</td>
<td>West Cumbria Water Supply Scheme, Phase 2 Public Consultation Feedback Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Consultation on detailed scheme design of preferred option</td>
<td>Summarised in this document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Post-Planning Permission consultation on final approved scheme details,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>detailed design, final mitigation measures and the Community Fund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>Post-construction consultation (e.g. re-instatement, landscaping and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community fund activities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>Post-construction consultation (e.g. re-instatement, landscaping and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community fund activities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who we have involved

We have engaged widely with the local community and stakeholders, including:

- residents,
- businesses,
- farmers and landowners,
- parish councils, local and national interest groups,
- local MP s,
- local authorities

This has taken many forms, from individual meetings to workshop events, email and telephone contacts, as well as formal consultation activities.

Planning policy context

Our approach to community involvement described above is also fully consistent with national and local planning guidance.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

In 2012, the Department for Communities and Local Government published the NPPF setting out the Governments planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied. A key aspect of the framework is to encourage more community engagement ensuring new development meets the needs and priorities of local communities.

“Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area” (paragraph 155).

The NPPF places a large emphasis on the benefits of engaging the local communities and how it improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system. It states, that “good quality engagement in the pre-application process enables better coordination between the public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community” (paragraph 188).

The NPPF states that local authorities should encourage parties to take advantage of the pre-application stage, and although they cannot require a developer to consult them before submitting an application they can encourage them to take up any of their pre-application services. They should also encourage applicants to engage with the local community where it is not already required they do so by law (paragraph 189).

In addition, to increase their effectiveness, statutory planning consultees also need to take the same early, proactive approach and provide timely advice throughout the planning process. This will assist planning authorities also making timely decisions and reduce unnecessary delays and costs (paragraph 190).

The NPPF requires the participation of other consenting bodies in the pre-application stage to enable the consideration of fundamental issues relating to whether a particular development is acceptable. Wherever possible, parallel processing of other consents is encouraged to speed up the application process and resolve issues as early as possible (paragraph 191).

Local Planning Policy

The local councils in Cumbria - Allerdale Borough Council, Cumbria County Council, Copeland Borough Council and the Lake District National Park - are committed to ensuring meaningful community engagement in the planning system. Each council has a policy relating to engagement of the public in the development of planning policy, however no specific Local Plan policies relate to the requirement for community engagement in the development of projects other than Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.

Engagement and consultation outcomes

Draft Water Resources Management Plan Consultation

During the initial Draft Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) public consultation, which took place in spring 2013, we sought views on over 50 potential options to maintain water supply reliability in West Cumbria. During this consultation process, many Cumbrian stakeholders expressed views that we needed to take a strategic long-term view of the overall water resources situation in West Cumbria. These stakeholders included the Lake District National Park, Friends of the Lake District, The Derwent Owners’ Association and the West Cumbria Rivers Trust.

Taking account of the feedback received, we developed three alternative strategic scheme options that could meet the challenges in West Cumbria over the longer-term:

- Thirlmere transfer into West Cumbria-transfer of treated water from the Integrated Resource Zone into West Cumbria;
- Build a number of new water sources in West Cumbria including a pipeline from...
Wastwater, another natural lake which is used by another party for industrial water supply; and
- Kielder reservoir transfer to West Cumbria – transfer of treated water from Northumbrian Water Integrated Resource Zone into West Cumbria.

These strategic alternatives were presented in our draft Water Resources Management Plan for further consultation, enabling the local community, stakeholders and regulators to express their views in writing to us and to the Secretary of State. We also conducted further customer research to inform the final plan. We received a total of 55 responses to the draft plan, 16 of which were in response to the West Cumbria options. Ten respondents were in favour of the West Cumbria water supply scheme involving the Thirlmere reservoir option, with other respondents expressing preference for the Kielder alternative and the lowest cost alternative. These views were all published in our Statement of Response which detailed the reasons why the Kielder option could not remain in the draft Water Resources Management Plan. The Statement of Response explained that due to the fact the majority of representations expressed a clear preference for the Thirlmere option, we retained this option as our preferred plan.

**United Utilities Price Review Stakeholder Engagement**

During 2013 and 2014, we carried out extensive consultation with our customers and wider stakeholders in preparation of our business plan as a core component of the 5-yearly water industry price review process. This engagement activity comprised specific research to gather customer views and insights, including their priorities for water company investment over the next 25 years and their willingness to pay for a range of different service improvements. Stakeholder workshops were also held across North West England, including in Cumbria, to discuss future water service improvement priorities.

The consultation activities in Cumbria included collation of views on strategic options for meeting the environmental improvements required in West Cumbria while maintaining reliable water supplies to customers. These were used alongside the views obtained from the Water Resource Plan consultation activities to inform the development of our preferred option for West Cumbria.

At the consultation events in Cumbria stakeholders stressed the importance of providing a resilient water supply whilst recognising that the environment is central to the socio-economy of Cumbria, and every effort must be made to protect the County's sensitive and internationally important environments. Our business plan addresses those issues with the inclusion of the West Cumbria supplies project.

**Draft Water Resource Management Plan – Examination in Public**

The preferred option of building a pipeline from Thirlmere Reservoir to West Cumbria to maintain reliable water supplies to homes and businesses was subject to an Examination in Public called by the Secretary of State. Representations were made by local residents, with one respondent expressing concerns that the Ennerdale licence revocation could be due to the possibility of nuclear waste being stored in Cumbria. Both the EA and UU responded that the decision to revoke the licence was solely on the basis of the Habitats Directive requirements. One resident suggested that the decline in mussel population was due to poor local water quality, and another local resident questioned the level of understanding regarding the health of the mussel beds, however UU presented convincing evidence of a decline in the mussel population, and evidence of general excellent water quality.

The Inspector’s recommendations and the Secretary of State’s final decision confirmed the strategic need for a water supply scheme for West Cumbria as soon as practicable and also confirmed that the Thirlmere transfer option was the right long term solution to meet this need.
Phase 1 Consultation

Following the Secretary of State’s decision in 2014 we commenced Phase 1 of our consultation process to support the development of the planning application. This focused on raising awareness of the need for a water supply scheme for West Cumbria and gathering views from the local community. Additionally, we sought opinions on the Thirlmere water supply scheme solution, including seeking specific views on three alternative locations for the new water treatment works, potential pipeline routes and alternative locations for water pumping stations and storage tanks (‘service reservoirs’). The three alternative locations for the treatment works were:

**Option A:** Proposed new Water treatment works in the Thirlmere area

**Option B:** Proposed new Water treatment works in the Cockermouth area

**Option C:** Proposed new Water treatment works in the Bothel Moor area

**Engagement activities**
During Phase 1, we consulted with local residents, local interest groups and interested parties, statutory bodies and other stakeholders by:

- Attending approximately 75 meetings with key community groups and stakeholders in Cumbria, ranging from:
  - One-to-one meetings with planning authorities
  - Presentations to parish councils and local community groups
  - Held eight public exhibitions and attended eleven country shows which were widely publicised throughout Cumbria using leaflet drops, radio and newspaper advertisements, twitter feeds and on our website
  - Posted out a spring and summer newsletter to over 40,000 properties in the area

- Established and maintained a dedicated website to provide information and enable the local community and stakeholders to feedback their views and opinions. A ‘MyView’ mailbox facility was established to enable the public and stakeholders to ask questions and request information.

- Answered over 20 specific queries that came in via My View, email or letter.

### Public exhibition and country show locations

#### Locations and dates of public exhibitions and country shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public exhibitions</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>21 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>18 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workington</td>
<td>19 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>20 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigton</td>
<td>17 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothel</td>
<td>14 July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassenthwaite</td>
<td>15 July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirlmere</td>
<td>16 July 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country shows</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Cockermouth Show</td>
<td>2 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowther Show</td>
<td>9/10 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosforth Agricultural Show</td>
<td>16 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick Show</td>
<td>25 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennerdale Show</td>
<td>27 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millom &amp; Broughton Agricultural Show</td>
<td>30 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loweswater show</td>
<td>7 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland County Show</td>
<td>11 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egremont Crab Fair</td>
<td>20 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskdale Show</td>
<td>27 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasdale Head Show</td>
<td>11 October 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We produced a consultation questionnaire for respondents to complete at events, or by post or online. We also recorded any verbal feedback we received at the events and country shows. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

The Phase 1 consultation process was documented in the West Cumbria Water Supply Scheme Phase 1 Public Consultation Feedback Report, a copy of which is provided as Appendix B. In addition, a summary leaflet which also prepared and made publically available via the dedicated West Cumbria website, a copy of which is provided as Appendix C.

A summary of the Phase 1 consultation activities and responses is provided below.

**Phase 1 response**
Over 700 people attended the Phase 1 public exhibitions. In total, 168 specific responses were received from the questionnaires completed at the public exhibitions, country shows and online (see Appendix B). The key feedback received from the Phase 1 consultation is summarised below:

- 24% of respondents questioned the need to cease abstraction from Ennerdale Water for public water supply and/or that UU should continue to use its water sources in West Cumbria
- 39% of respondents thought other options for water supply should be explored. Some respondents suggested other sources of water supply, including other reservoirs, rivers, and boreholes. Others suggested building new reservoirs rather than piping water from Thirlmere Reservoir.
- Traffic and public transport disruption was of a major concern to local people, not only for their day to day living but for the impacts this would have on businesses and tourism.
- 33% of respondents favoured Option C (Bothel Moor) as their preferred location for the water treatment works. They felt this would be the best engineering solution and cause the least disruption to the environment and traffic. Option A and B were preferred by 8% of respondents each, with many respondents not expressing a preference.
- Some respondents felt there was not enough detailed information about the project design, cost and the potential impacts.
- Some people thought that we should use the scheme as an opportunity to help reduce flood risks, install green infrastructure and maximise use of cleaner, greener technology.
The Phase 1 report (see Appendix B) provided UU’s responses to the concerns and questions raised through the various engagement events and questionnaires.

Phase 1 summary
The Phase 1 consultation activities served an important role in improving understanding of the need for the West Cumbria Water Supplies Project – Thirlmere Transfer, by providing formal and informal opportunities for questions to be raised. Following on from establishing the need for the scheme, this phase of the consultation provided Cumbrian residents (and visitors) with the opportunity to influence the scheme design.

The most important issue for those who responded was minimising traffic disruption, followed by minimising landscape damage particularly in the National Park; and minimising impact on tourism and livelihoods. Many people commented that disruption to the main roads should be avoided given their importance for access to and from West Cumbria.

One third of those who responded favoured the Bothel Moor area (Option C) for the location of a new water treatment works, considering it to be the best overall solution with the lowest traffic impact and the potential for a largely gravity solution to transport the water making a more sustainable solution.

With a few potential locations for the WTW to be examined; the avoidance of significant impacts on traffic along the A66 corridor; and the potential to locate pipelines in agricultural land to further avoid disruption to the local highways whilst minimising the impact on environmentally sensitive areas, Option C was selected as the preferred option to take forward for more detailed assessment.

Based on this feedback and more detailed engineering work we were able to narrow our options down to one proposal, which:

- **Customers said:** They liked Bothel Moor because it minimised pumping  
  **Our response:** The new route utilises gravity for the majority of the pipeline
- **Customers said:** They wanted a sustainable system  
  **Our response:** The treatment works was proposed in the Bridekirk area due to it being located at the optimum elevation for water to flow through the works by gravity
- **Customers said:** They wanted minimal disruption  
  **Our response:** The pipeline is now mostly in land, minimising the disruption to traffic
- **Customers said:** They wanted us to use clean energy  
  **Our response:** The solution has the potential to utilise green technology
Phase 2 Consultation

The second phase of the consultation focussed on gathering the views of the local community on the preferred route which was designed with the phase 1 feedback in mind. We sought feedback on concerns, ideas for improvement and any mitigation measures that might need to be considered.

Engagement activities

From December 2014 to May 2015, UU engaged with the local community and stakeholders by:

- Holding 11 public exhibitions which were advertised through leaflet drops, social media, radio and newspaper advertisement
- Presenting to 19 local councils (from parish council to County Council)
- Attending 6 stakeholder meetings to address specific concerns
- Holding 11 tours of the pipeline route
- Regularly updating the dedicated UU West Cumbria website to enable the local community to keep up-to-date on the evolution of the scheme and stakeholder feedback

Table 3. Location and date of stakeholder meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public exhibitions</th>
<th>Local council meetings</th>
<th>Stakeholder meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirlmere</td>
<td>Keswick Town Council</td>
<td>Landowners – Cockermouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassenthwaite</td>
<td>Underskiddaw Parish Council</td>
<td>Forestry Commission – Bassenthwaite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>Threkeld Parish Council</td>
<td>Landowners – Blindcrake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspatria</td>
<td>Cumbria County Council - Allerdale reps</td>
<td>Landowners – Bothel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigton</td>
<td>St Johns and Castlerigg Parish Council</td>
<td>Business owner (rental cottage)– Bothel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleator Moor</td>
<td>Allhallows Parish Council</td>
<td>Keswick Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorton</td>
<td>Cleator Moor PC</td>
<td>10 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>Bridekirk Parish Council</td>
<td>12 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindcrake</td>
<td>Cockermouth Town Council</td>
<td>18 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton</td>
<td>Embleton &amp; District Parish Council</td>
<td>18 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workington</td>
<td>Great Clifton Parish Council</td>
<td>19 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorton Parish Council</td>
<td>4 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumbria County Council –County Councillors</td>
<td>5 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamplugh Parish Council</td>
<td>18 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blindcrake Parish Council</td>
<td>23 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keswick Town Council</td>
<td>16 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bothel &amp;Threapland Parish Council</td>
<td>12 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolton Parish Council</td>
<td>19 May 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Phase 2 consultation process was documented in the West Cumbria Water Supply Scheme Phase 2 Public Consultation Feedback Report, a copy of which is provided as Appendix D. A summary of the Phase 2 consultation activities and responses is provided below.

**Phase 2 response**

Over 450 people attended the various meeting and events. The comments/concerns were quite similar across locations and ranged from concerns about the impact on the environment to technical queries about construction of the scheme. UU also met with individual local landowners and business owners to discuss more specific concerns about the proposed scheme in relation to their specific interests and activities. The Phase 2 consultation was generally well received and the concerns or comments raised were consistent across all of the events. UU representatives collated the feedback received at the events, along with enquiries sent via the UU West Cumbria website and concerns raised at stakeholder meetings. The main concerns and feedback are summarised below:

- Many people felt that there was not enough information provided about the scheme and that the plans were not detailed enough
- Some people were concerned about the resilience of Thirlmere as a long term solution to the water supply problem (e.g. due to climate change)
- Major concerns were raised about the disruption to traffic, local businesses and tourism as a result of increased road traffic and road closures
• Land owners and tourism driven businesses were concerned with the visual impact of the pipeline during and post construction
• Most people were concerned about the environmental impact of the pipeline construction particularly on wildlife and farmland
• Many councillors were interested to understand how and who was funding the scheme and whether there would be employment opportunities for local people
• Attendees at the parish council meetings wanted to know what the arrangements for Ennerdale Water where after the abstraction licence is revoked.

Although many of the people or groups that we engaged with during Phase 2 did not raise any issues with the proposed scheme, there was still a reasonable amount of uncertainty about the scheme design and requests for more detailed information relating to the construction of the scheme.

In the Phase 2 report (see Appendix D), UU responded to the concerns raised during this consultation phase by the local community and stakeholders. In addition to scheduled meetings and events with the public and with Council members, we also scheduled meetings with those members of the local community (particularly landowners and local business owners), who wished to raise specific concerns regarding the consequences of the construction or operation of the scheme on their land and/or their activities. We held meetings with all of the affected landowners, with most of their concerns resolved onsite or subsequently through further investigations.

Phase 2 summary
The Phase 2 consultation allowed local residents, landowners and interested parties to feed in to the detailed design of the route. This phase of the consultation provided an opportunity for more specific concerns to be raised and for solutions to be integrated into the scheme design. These included siting of the route to avoid locally important environmentally sensitive areas, and amendments to the construction programme to minimise the disruption to local residents and visitors to West Cumbria.

Following Phase 2 consultation we had a better understanding of some of the constraints at a local level from farmers land and impact on businesses through to ecologically sensitive areas. We ensured those concerns were fed into the design of the scheme and we have done the best we can to avoid any of these areas. We have subsequently rerouted the pipeline on several occasions to suit both landowners and to avoid any sensitive areas.
Phase 3 Consultation

In responding to the concerns and views provided by local communities and stakeholders regarding the construction and operation of the scheme, the aim of this phase of the consultation was to gather and address the specific concerns about the proposed plans and allow all those likely to be affected to offer views and ideas on the scheme design. As the scheme design progressed, we were able to work closely with those specific landowners and stakeholders likely to be directly affected by the project, in addition to holding public exhibitions to continue the engagement with the local community. During this phase of the consultation we provided stakeholders with the opportunity to view detailed maps of each section of the pipeline route and to discuss details regarding the construction of the scheme, for example how we intend to construct the pipeline across rivers and streams. The aim was that any affected stakeholder could look at a detailed map and understand exactly where the pipeline was going to be in relation to them and what if any the effect would be. To enable us to do this we developed a bespoke interactive using google earth that stakeholders could utilise to help them identify where they lived in relation to the proposed route. We also launched a Cumbria microsite with all of the information available that we used in the exhibitions.

Engagement activities
During this phase of the consultation, we engaged with stakeholders and the local community by:

- Holding 8 public exhibitions advertised through leaflet drops, social media, radio and newspaper advertisement
- Answering 14 enquiries received via My View, email, letter and telephone
- Holding 16 tours of the proposed pipeline route for interested stakeholders
- Contacting 565 landowners inviting them to exhibitions and providing updates on the pre-planning consultation
- Attending 45 stakeholder meetings to address specific landowner, business owner and stakeholder concerns
- Holding an exhibition over two days for landowners and farmers
- Non-statutory stakeholder workshop held at Lodore Falls Hotel (see Appendix E)
- Regularly updating the UU West Cumbria website
Phase 3 response

Public exhibitions
The Phase 3 exhibitions provided information regarding the detailed route of the pipeline and the construction of the scheme. We asked attendees what should we consider in the design of our works and if there was anything else we should be considering in the design.

We provided feedback forms for members of the local community to complete at the exhibitions (Appendix F). 18 people provided feedback through these forms with their main concerns summarised below:

- Most respondents were concerned for wildlife and habitat protection
- Some people were concerned about flood risk increasing as a result of the abstraction revocation at Crummock Water
- Impacts on business and traffic were still a major concern
- Most respondents felt they had received a good level detail about the project; however some wanted more detailed plans and maps.

Overall the exhibitions were very well received and attendees were pleased with the information received at the events.

Numbers of people attending each local exhibition

Specific enquiries
We provided responses to 13 specific enquiries received from members of the local community via the My View mailbox, letters and emails. These enquiries related to customers and landowners requiring further information on the pipeline route.

Stakeholder meetings
UU representatives attended a range of one-to-one meetings, interest group meetings and tourism group meetings. Concerns raised about the proposed scheme were consistent across these meetings. We also met individually with landowners where the pipeline will either be crossing their land or access to their property is required during construction. The main concerns raised at these meetings were:

- Most stakeholders were concerned with the work that would be carried out after the construction works are complete, one stakeholder was particular keen to ensure any temporary fencing and equipment is removed immediately (and others wanted reassurance that temporary fencing would be removed as soon as practicable).
- Many stakeholders were keen to understand what will happen to the old water treatment works and also any effects that may be experienced as a result of the abstraction revocation at Ennerdale Water
- Some stakeholders were still concerned about the ability of Thirlmere Reservoir to supply enough water reliably and some continued to question the need for the scheme in the first place
- Many farmers and landowners had concerns about the pipeline route, although most of these were resolved during the meeting while others suggestions were taken away for further consideration
- Many tourism groups and local businesses expressed concerns about traffic disruption. Tourism groups in Keswick were particularly keen to ensure that promotion took place to publicise that ‘Keswick remains open for business’
- Some business groups requested more information on how loss of profit would be addressed during construction works and requested an extra presentation/exhibition to understand the process for making a claim for loss of profit
- Many stakeholders also requested more detailed timescales for the construction work and assurance that impacts on ecology and fish would be minimised
- At the non-statutory body workshop held in July, local river interest groups wanted to ensure that UU took advantage of the opportunities the pipeline could bring, including improving public access alongside

Composition of our engagement activities during Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public exhibitions</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder meetings</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal pipeline tours</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External pipeline tours</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and landowners</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public feedback</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific enquiries</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of people</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
water courses and lakes, creating cycle tracks and educating the local community on water resources/flooding management issues (see Appendix E)

Most stakeholders were keen to ensure that the level of communication between them and UU continued going forward. In one meeting, people asked that the communications messages change focus from protecting the mussel population to the resilience and economic growth the scheme will bring to the area. UU is committed to the communications and engagement with local communities and will take this forward for the next phases of the consultation strategy.

All events were well received by the attendees and a lot of positive feedback on communication, environmental consideration and staff knowledge was received. Continuing dialogue will be welcomed to keep the local community informed.

**Phase 3 summary**

The Phase 3 consultation focused on the detailed proposals for the pipeline route and for the construction. This allowed interested parties to comment on ways in which we could amend specific details of the scheme to minimise the impact of the pipeline construction (e.g. a more preferable route across a specific field, or around particular trees) or to further enhance a positive outcome for the scheme, for example by amendments to our plans for land restoration following the construction in order to provide further ecological benefits.

The overwhelming response was that communities now accepted the need for the scheme and could see where we had developed the route to incorporate feedback and concerns. Most stakeholders were pleased to see that where they had requested a route amendment and it was a viable one we had changed it. We had also accommodated the landowner wishes in terms of exactly where we site the pipeline in relation to their land.
We’re not just about pipes, we’re also about people. We’re a highly visible service provider in the North West, working in the heart of local communities. We try to be a good neighbour, and give something back whenever we can. Our volunteering activities are an essential part of a wider programme of community investment. Our schools programme delivered more than 200 water efficiency workshops in primary schools reaching 10,500 children; getting them thinking about the water cycle, how water is treated and delivered, and the perils of flushing the wrong things down the loo! We raised around £150,000 for our official charity partner, the North West Air Ambulance, through a wide range of fundraising activities – from cake sales to ballroom dancing. Many thousands of customers made use of the access land around our reservoirs, for walks and recreation. To keep the public safe, we continued with a hard-hitting campaign to dissuade people from swimming in our reservoirs. In all these ways, we used our expertise and the energy of our employees to make a positive difference to the communities we serve.

We work at the heart of local communities, and are always keen to support worthwhile grass roots initiatives, when our budgets and time commitments allow. For example, through our support, volunteers in Windermere have been able to renovate forgotten and dilapidated benches, many donated to the area by families in memory of loved ones.

And across Cumbria, we’ve been helping ‘first responder’ groups purchase lifesaving defibrillators. These groups, run by community volunteers, use the defibrillators in emergencies, while the ambulance is still en-route. The groups are especially important in Cumbria, where the ambulances often have to travel longer distances to reach patients. Grange and District Community First Responders, one of the most recent beneficiaries of our funding, recently saved a man’s life by using their defibrillator, after he had a heart attack on a golf course. The group’s swift actions saw them receive an award from the North West Air Ambulance.

More recently we recognised the need to fully engage with the Cumbrian community as part of our consultation process for the West Cumbria supplies project. We want to do what is right for Cumbrian communities and as such have chosen to target our investment into areas that will benefit the community as a whole. We are also keen to help the
The economy of Cumbria were we can and this has led to support for events and activities such as:

- **Tour of Britain**: we sponsored the stage winner’s jersey for Stage Five (Prudhoe - Hartside on 10 September). This involved school children around Cumbria getting involved and designing the winning jersey. We were delighted by how much interest and enthusiasm the design competition generated.

- **Community heroes**: We partnered with Cumberland News group to support the first Community Heroes Awards to recognise and reward people of Cumbria who work in the communities from carers to community projects, sports people to school workers, to ensure they get the recognition they deserve. Categories included good neighbour, young achiever, sporting hero, unsung hero and volunteer of the year.

- **Business connector**: We have seconded one of our employees to work for Business in the Community to help pair businesses with third sector organisations that need assistance. That might involve lending marketing, planning or project management expertise, providing speakers to talk to school children or offering work experience to those who have never had a job.

- **Kendal calling**: we were one of the sponsors of the festival as a way of getting our message to a wider population by way of giving out water bottles and literature about our scheme.

- **CBI Dinner**: we were the main sponsor of the annual Cumbria CBI dinner bringing together businesses and stakeholders from across Cumbria.

- **CN News Business awards**: we sponsored the award evening recognising those small businesses in Cumbria.

- **Go Herdwick**

### Legacy fund

We recognise that we are a large organisation based across the whole of the North West and as such we don’t have the in-depth knowledge of what communities require across Cumbria. However as part of the West Cumbria project we are keen to set up a fund that leaves a lasting legacy in Cumbria and reflects what communities want. To help us do that we have started a process to understand what those needs may be. The gathering of this information has been led by the Lake District National Park in collaboration with Allerdale and Copeland district councils and Cumbria County Council.

To help us cement this we also held an evening for parish councils to come along and present to us their ideas for this fund. We have now got a draft list of projects and it has helped us understand the breadth of support required in Cumbria and how best we can help that happen. This list is not exhaustive and we are still collating the wishes of parishes in Cumbria and are still open to ideas and suggestions.

We are pulling together our thoughts on how this scheme could be run and administered and will communicate the next steps to communities affected by the scheme in due course.
Post submission of planning application communication

We will continue to communicate with our stakeholders and communities throughout 2016 in particular answering any queries that may arise as part of the formal planning process. Once we have consent to build the scheme we will consulting on such things as construction mobilisation and how we move forward with making awards as part of the legacy fund.

We will maintain communications all the way through the life of the project keeping communities up to date with progress and importantly such issues as road closures and moving big plant around Cumbria. To do this we will utilise traditional media as well as social media including our Cumbria specific website.

Summary and conclusion

We feel we have carried out an extensive programme of consultation with the residents of Cumbria. We have gained a real insight into Cumbrian communities and have been very careful to incorporate feedback, issues and concerns into our design and planning. We understand the sensitive nature of the environment we are working in not only the wildlife and archaeology but how tourism is very often the life blood of Cumbria.

Taking this into account we have been very careful to preserve and protect were possible these areas. In terms of tourism we have located 90% of the pipeline in agricultural land to keep the roads clear and residents and tourists moving. We have also designed the route to avoid where possible those sensitive areas such as Special Areas of Conservation or historical sites. We have worked extensively with stakeholders, landowners and communities to make sure we get this right and those groups have played a key role in the final design.

The engagement activities we have undertaken throughout the development of our plans for the project have also enabled us to work with local residents in Cumbria to create a solution to the water supply issues in West Cumbria. Our preferred plans will enable us to continue to provide essential water supply to residents and visitors.

We hope that in delivering the scheme and providing funding to tackle a diverse range of community needs we can leave a lasting legacy in Cumbria that will span generations.
Appendices

Appendix A  Blank copy of the Phase 1 questionnaire

Appendix B  Phase 1 Summary Report (planning facing report)

Appendix C  Phase 1 Leaflet (public facing report)

Appendix D  Phase 2 Summary Report (planning facing report)

Appendix E  Lodore Falls Workshop summary report

Appendix F  Blank copy of Phase 3 questionnaire
Appendix A

Blank copy of the Phase 1 questionnaire
1. Do you think the three options being reviewed are the right ones?  
   Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   If not why?

2. Are there other options we should be exploring?  
   Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   If yes what?

3. Which option would be best from your perspective?  
   Please tell us why

4. Is there anything else we should be considering in the design of the scheme?
5. **Is the level of detail given to you today sufficient at this stage?**
   
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   
   If not, what else would you like to know?

6. **We have a series of public engagement events planned and have all this information available online. Is there anything else we could do to gather views and opinions on the proposals?**
   
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   
   If yes what?

7. **How would you prefer to be contacted about the project as it progresses?**

   Additional comments

---

Are you a member of a local group or charity and would like us to come to a meeting and talk about our proposals? Then please fill in your details below and we’ll be in touch.

- **Contact name:**
- **Telephone number:**
- **Email:**
- **Name of group/charity:**

Once completed you can had it in to a member of the team or post it to:

**Planning for the Future, United Utilities, Haweswater House, Lingley Mere Business Park, Lingley Green Avenue, Great Sankey, Warrington, WA5 3LP.**

Alternatively you can visit [unitedutilities.com/cumbria](http://unitedutilities.com/cumbria) and fill in the questionnaire online.
Appendix B

Phase 1 Summary Report
(planning facing report)
WEST CUMBRIA WATER SUPPLY SCHEME: BACKGROUND

Water Supplies in West Cumbria
West Cumbria is known for its stunning landscape and areas of almost pristine environment. All the main sources of water supplies for homes and businesses in West Cumbria contain rare species, many of which are protected by European law. Atlantic salmon, charr and many rare aquatic plants are present both in lakes and rivers. The area also hosts England’s only viable population of the internationally protected freshwater mussel species *Margaritifera margaritifera*.

The two principal sources of water supplying West Cumbria are Ennerdale Water and Crummock Water, both natural lakes with man-made weirs at their outlets to provide artificial storage for water supply purposes. As the water supplier for the area, United Utilities is only licensed to take water from the top part of each lake.

UK and European Law protects the environment in West Cumbria. Ennerdale Water is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and, downstream of the lake, the River Ehen is both a SSSI and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) under the EU Habitats Directive. Crummock Water and the downstream River Cocker are both part of a SSSI and SAC. Overwater is also a SSSI and is also used for public water supply. All three sites are located in the Lake District National Park, giving additional legal protection including for their visual amenity and landscape value.

Changes to abstraction from Ennerdale Water
In view of the sensitive and protected status of the West Cumbria water sources, extensive investigations have taken place over the past 10 years to assess the impact of water abstraction by United Utilities on the lakes and rivers. These have concluded that abstraction from Ennerdale Water should cease in order to protect the rare and endangered freshwater mussels in the River Ehen. This action is required to help ensure that this species does not become extinct in England. We will have to stop using Ennerdale Water as a source of water by 2025 in line with the Environment Agency’s decision to withdraw our abstraction licence.

Providing future supplies from Thirlmere Reservoir
We are committed to safeguarding water supplies in West Cumbria in a responsible and sustainable manner, ensuring we have sufficient water available for homes and businesses in the area and support the local economy. To meet this commitment, we plan to link West Cumbria to our integrated regional water supply network by building a major new pipeline from Thirlmere Reservoir to West Cumbria, along with a new water treatment works and associated pumping stations and water storage tanks (“service reservoirs”). With careful planning, we will make sure there is minimal long-term environmental impact arising from this new supply link. Our plans will mean we no longer need to take water from environmentally sensitive water sources in West Cumbria, including Ennerdale Water, Crummock Water and Overwater.

Extensive consultation and engagement with the public
We plan to hold three phases of public consultation and engagement prior to submitting our planning application for the West Cumbria water supply scheme in early 2016. Phase 1 of our programme was undertaken in spring and summer 2014 where we sought views on the overall scheme as well as three options which were under development for the location for the new water treatment works and associated pipelines.

This report provides an overview of the Phase 1 consultation process, the comments and views received, and our response to those comments.
OUR PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN CONSULTATION: SPRING 2013

In our 2013 Draft Water Resources Management Plan public consultation, we presented the option appraisal process that we carried out involving consideration of over 50 potential options to maintain water supply reliability in West Cumbria. During the consultation process, many Cumbrian stakeholders expressed views that we need to take a strategic long-term view of the overall water resources situation in West Cumbria. These included the Lake District National Park, Friends of the Lake District, The Derwent Owners’ Association and the West Cumbria Rivers Trust.

From the option appraisal process and stakeholder consultation, our plan identified three alternative schemes that could meet the challenges in West Cumbria:

- Build a new water treatment works and a pipeline between Thirlmere Reservoir and West Cumbria (our preferred option);
- Build a number of new water sources in West Cumbria including a pipeline from Wastwater, a water source owned by another party for industrial water supply;
- Build a new pipeline from Kielder Reservoir (Northumberland) for supply to Cumbria, with water purchased from Northumbrian Water.

Having presented these alternatives in our draft plan, we listened carefully to views expressed in the consultation responses. We also conducted further customer research to inform our final plan. We received a total of 55 responses on the draft plan, 16 of which were in response to the West Cumbria options. These were published in our Statement of Response which explained how we took them into account in revising our Water Resources Management Plan. Ten respondents were in favour of the West Cumbria water supply scheme involving the Thirlmere reservoir option.

As a result of our optional appraisal and consultation activities, our preferred plan is to link West Cumbria to Thirlmere Reservoir by a major new pipeline and a new water treatment works. This was set out in our Revised Draft Water Resources Management Plan submitted to the Secretary of State in November 2013. Aspects of this plan have recently (September 2014) been explored through an Examination in Public process led by a Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. The Inspector’s findings and the Secretary of State’s final decision on our Water Resources Management Plan is anticipated by December 2014.

PHASE 1 CONSULTATION

Prior to commencing our formal Phase 1 consultation programme, we carried out a series of local customer focus groups. These were designed to gather views from customers in West Cumbria on the alternatives for their future water supply and help shape the consultation programme.

The initial phase of our consultation process focused on gathering views on the overall proposals for the Thirlmere reservoir to West Cumbria supply scheme, as well as specifically seeking views on three alternative locations for the new water treatment works (Figure 1) and associated pipelines, pumping stations and storage tanks (‘service reservoirs’). The three alternative locations for the treatment works are:

- Option A: Proposed new Water treatment works in the Thirlmere area
- Option B: Proposed new Water treatment works in the Cockermouth area
- Option C: Proposed new Water treatment works in the Bothel Moor area

PHASE 1 CONSULTATION APPROACH

We consulted with local residents, interested parties and other stakeholders by a wide variety of methods:

- We attended around 75 meetings with key stakeholders in Cumbria, ranging from one-to-one meetings with planning authorities through to presentations to parish councils and local community groups
- We posted out a spring and summer newsletter to over 40,000 properties in the area
- We established and maintain a dedicated website to provide information and enable stakeholders to feedback their views and opinions

We have answered over 20 specific queries that have come in either via email or letter.

A series of public meetings: we held eight public exhibitions throughout the region (Figure 2) at which our staff provided information and answered questions from the public.

These events were held at:

- Keswick (21st March 2014)
- Cockermouth (18th March 2014)
- Workington (19th March 2014)
They were widely publicised throughout Cumbria using leaflet drops, radio and newspaper advertisements, twitter feeds and on our website.

Figure 2. Location of events held in support of the Phase 1 consultation

We also provided staff on hand to answer questions about the pipeline project at information stalls at the following country shows in Cumbria (Figure 2):

- 2nd Cockermouth Show (2nd August 2014)
- Lowther Show (9th/10th August 2014)
- Gosforth Agricultural Show (16th August 2014)
- Keswick Show (25th August 2014)
- Ennerdale Show (27th August 2014)
- Millom & Broughton Agricultural Show (30th August 2014)
- Loweswater show (7th September 2014)
- Westmorland County Show (11th September 2014)
- Egremont Crab Fair (20th September 2014)
- Eskdale Show (27th September 2014)
- Wasdale Head Show (11th October 2014)
At each public event and country show, we provided a consultation questionnaire which respondents could fill out and return either at the event or by post at a later date. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A. The questionnaire was also available on our website. Additionally, we took notes of all verbal feedback that we received throughout the events.

OVERVIEW OF PHASE 1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

PROCESS FOR HANDLING RESPONSES
Structured consultation feedback was provided on the paper questionnaires and through electronic feedback forms. We also recorded verbal feedback from stakeholders on a standard response form. All this information was entered into a central database which recorded stakeholder feedback using a unique and anonymous code for each respondent.

FEEDBACK RECEIVED
The number of attendees at all our Phase 1 public exhibitions across West Cumbria (8 events) exceeded 700 people. In total, 168 responses were received (Figure 3) from the questionnaires completed at the public exhibitions, country shows and through the structured online surveys.

Figure 3. Number of questionnaire responses received at each event or online

The majority of people heard about the public exhibitions through newspaper adverts or through our mailshot letters (Figure 4). Some individuals heard about the events through multiple sources. The key ‘other’ sources through which people heard about the events included local radio (Radio Cumbria), television (BBC Look North) and through information provided to Parish or Town Councils.
ANALYSIS OF FEEDBACK

An anonymised log of all consultation feedback is provided in Appendix A. Our response to each of the comments or questions posed is also provided in Appendix A. The following sections provide a synthesis of consultation feedback for each question on the questionnaire and outlines how we have responded to this feedback.

Q1: Do you think the three options being reviewed are the right ones?

We received 167 responses on this question, with approximately 33% of individuals providing written feedback alongside their answer. The consultation feedback indicates that about half of the respondents agree that the three options for the water treatment works are the right ones to consider (Figure 5). The feedback included positive comments, concerns about specific locations and other suggestions. These responses are summarised in Table 1.

Respondents generally indicated agreement that the three options being considered are the right ones (52% of respondents). 27% of respondents chose neither of the two options and instead suggested other locations or otherwise considered that no new scheme was required. In total, 21% of respondents expressed concerns with the proposed options.

Positive comments reflected an understanding of the need for alternative water supplies in West Cumbria and the possibility to use development of the scheme as an opportunity for application of new technologies and for United Utilities to be recognised as leaders in green, sustainable technology. Others raised the potential benefits that might be achieved in relation to a reduction in flooding in the Keswick area.

Many respondents voiced concerns about the need for the new scheme and questioned the environmental justification for ceasing abstraction from Ennerdale Water and stating that water sources in West Cumbria should continue to be used for public water supplies.
Table 1. Summary of main points raised by stakeholders in response to Question 1: Do you think the three options being reviewed are the right ones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of main points raised in community responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme provides secure water supplies for West Cumbria and could potentially help to reduce flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme could provide an opportunity to use new technologies and for United Utilities to be recognised as leaders in the application of green technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong> 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy versus environment – general feeling that the environmental justification for the scheme is not sufficiently strong to warrant the economic costs and disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The justification for ceasing abstraction from Ennerdale Water was questioned, noting that a reduction in industrial water demand has left more water available in the lake for domestic use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Thirlmere for supply to West Cumbria questioned because the reservoir is often observed to be at low water levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The options are not very different and/or too little information was provided to make an informed decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Suggestions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of natural rivers to transfer water to West Cumbria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to other water sources, especially outside the Lake District National Park, including from Kielder Water Reservoir in Northumberland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise use of existing water sources in West Cumbria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Response to Question 1: Do you think the three options being reviewed are the right ones? (numbers on chart indicate number of responses)
Many respondents suggested that the environmental justification for the scheme does not warrant the expensive, disruptive large-scale scheme. Our legal permission to abstract water from Ennerdale is changing and will eventually be removed altogether by the Environment Agency to meet the requirements of the EU Habitats Directive. We have to plan ahead now to respond to these changes to ensure we continue to provide reliable water supplies to homes and businesses in West Cumbria. The environmental justification focuses on the damage arising from our abstraction on the rare and endangered freshwater mussels that live in the River Ehen downstream of Ennerdale. They are an internationally and nationally protected species which are considered to be England’s only viable population. Consequently, if we do not protect them, they could become extinct in England. The River Ehen is also designated for other internationally important species, including salmon. Extensive investigations have been carried out to explore ways to improve the River Ehen to help the freshwater mussel. These have concluded that ceasing use of the lake for water supply will help ensure the future survival of this sensitive species.

We considered a wide range of options in reaching the decision on our preferred scheme to connect West Cumbria to Thirlmere Reservoir. Our proposed scheme will remove the impact of abstraction on very delicate natural environments in West Cumbria. It provides environmental improvements at Crummock Water and the River Cocker, which are also designated under the Habitats Directive, along with various tributary streams of the River Derwent and Overwater Lake. Ceasing our abstraction at these sensitive sites will help return them to a more natural state for the benefit of internationally and nationally important species.

Some respondents queried why there was not enough water in Ennerdale to continue to abstract given the recent decline in industrial water use in the local area and consequent reduction in abstraction from Ennerdale. Industrial demand and abstraction from Ennerdale has indeed reduced and for much of the time there is plenty of water for both wildlife and water supply. Unfortunately, in drier periods river flows fall below the levels needed to sustain the rare wildlife living in the River Ehen. To avoid this happening so frequently, abstraction needs to completely cease from the lake.

Some people questioned whether or not Thirlmere is truly a viable option because the reservoir is often observed to be at low water levels. We have thoroughly investigated the water storage available at Thirlmere Reservoir as part of our long-term Water Resources Management Plan which sets out how much water our customers will need in the future and how much water will be available from our water sources over the next 25 years. Our assessments have taken a range of uncertainties into account, including potential effects of climate change, regulatory changes and local economic growth forecasts. Our assessment demonstrates that there is sufficient water available to meet the future requirements of homes and businesses in the north-west, including sufficient capacity at Thirlmere Reservoir to supply West Cumbria in the future. Connecting to Thirlmere Reservoir will improve the reliability of water supplies for homes and businesses in West Cumbria during times of drought due to the much larger water storage capacity at Thirlmere compared to the existing water sources.

Several respondents believed that the options presented did not appear to be very different, and suggested use of other supplies, such as rivers and other reservoirs in Cumbria as well as sites outside of the Lake District National Park, including Kielder Water in Northumberland. As part of our draft Water Resources Management Plan in 2013, we investigated and appraised over 50 different options to replace water supplies from Ennerdale Water. These included measures to reduce customer demand for water, provision of new water sources locally and the transfer of supplies into West Cumbria from existing water sources. Our appraisal led to the consideration of three principal options. One option was to replace Ennerdale Water with a number of alternative small local water sources within West Cumbria itself. Another was to connect the area to the large Kielder Water Reservoir in Northumberland. However, we consider that the option to connect West Cumbria to Thirlmere Reservoir is the best overall solution. These options were presented in the public consultation on the draft Water Resources Management Plan. There were 16 responses on the West Cumbria options in total, with ten in favour of the Thirlmere Reservoir option. Our proposed scheme will provide West Cumbria with a reliable, resilient water supply and would cost less than piping water in from sources further afield, such as Kielder Water.

A few respondents indicated that there was not enough information available to make an informed decision as to whether the proposed options were the right ones. We will be providing more information to the public and stakeholders as our investigations progress, but we wanted to gather initial views as early as possible to help our planning.
Q2: Are there other options we should be exploring?
Feedback indicated that 38% of respondents agreed that there are no other options that we should be exploring (see Figure 6). Some respondents had a variety of concerns with proposed options. These responses are summarised in Table 2.

![Figure 6. Response to Question 2: Are there other options we should be exploring?](numbers on chart indicate number of responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summary of main comments in community responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 24%</td>
<td>Ignore the EU Directive and keep Ennerdale as a water supply source. Raise Ennerdale lake level by 1 metre to provide more water storage. Reduce the transfer of water from West Cumbria to other regions (such as Manchester) and keep Cumbrian water in Cumbria. More information is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 38%</td>
<td>It is OK as it is. The options considered appear sensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Suggestions</td>
<td>Move the mussels to other rivers to protect them. ‘Top up’ supplies from elsewhere such as boreholes, river water, and other reservoirs Build more reservoirs. Use existing waterways instead of pipelines. Use the most direct route for the pipeline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those who thought that there were other options that we should be exploring, comments mainly centred on continuing to use Ennerdale as a water resource, reiterating concerns about the justification of ceasing this abstraction, and noting the reduced water supply demand on Ennerdale Water in recent years compared to in the 1970s and 1980s.
OUR RESPONSE

Many respondents felt that the EU legislation should be ignored or that abstraction should continue from Ennerdale. UK and European Union law protects the environment in West Cumbria and the government, Environment Agency and United Utilities are all required to comply with the legislation. The Environment Agency has confirmed that, to ensure the legal protection of the freshwater mussels in the River Ehen is achieved, it will need to withdraw our water abstraction licence for Ennerdale. It will therefore be unlawful for us to continue to abstract water from Ennerdale once the licence is withdrawn.

Several respondents suggested that the freshwater mussels could be moved to alternative sites in order to allow abstraction to continue at Ennerdale Water. The freshwater mussels in the River Ehen are considered to be England’s only remaining viable population. If we do not protect them, they could become extinct in England. Disturbance and relocation of the mussels from their natural habitat would be extremely detrimental to their survival and is highly unlikely to be permitted by the environmental regulators. Since introducing measures to protect the mussels in recent years, monitoring suggests that the mussels’ habitat and health has shown some improvement, but there are not enough young mussels in the population to ensure their long-term survival. Experts advise that restoring the natural river flow conditions will help improve the habitat for the species, providing a healthier environment in which to live and reproduce.

A few respondents were concerned that water is being redirected out of West Cumbria to supply other places such as Manchester, reducing the amount of water available locally. West Cumbria’s water sources have never been used to supply water anywhere else but to local homes and businesses. Over recent decades, we have connected many other parts of Cumbria to the major water supply sources in central Cumbria to improve the quality and reliability of our service to customers. This has reduced the amounts of water supplied from Cumbria to Lancashire and Manchester – this has been made possible by major reductions in water demand since 1990. The need for the West Cumbria supply scheme is due to the environmental protection requirements rather than a lack of local water availability.

Several respondents stated that they required more information on the location of the water treatment works, the pipeline routes and the criteria being used to make decisions. We are currently investigating possible pipeline routes and locations for the water treatment works. Our decisions will take into account a range of factors, including maximising use of gravity for water transfer to minimise energy use and operational costs, potential effects on land and water ecology, the need to protect archaeology and consideration of landscape impacts. More information on the proposed site for the water treatment works and the pipeline routes, and how they have been selected, will be available as the project progresses.

Several respondents raised the possibility of utilising other sources, such as boreholes, other rivers or reservoirs within West Cumbria. Suggestions included using local watercourses, such as Ben Gill, to top-up Ennerdale Water. Other respondents suggested raising the outlet weir at Ennerdale by up to one metre to increase the storage capacity in the lake. We investigated and appraised over 50 different options in our draft Water Resources Plan. This included an assessment of local source options, but this showed there were too many uncertainties to guarantee that they would be able to reliably provide sufficient water supplies in the longer term. Some of these sources are themselves environmentally sensitive and also vulnerable to short-term drought conditions.

Ben Gill is a natural stream flowing from the Ennerdale fells to the River Ehen but which was diverted from its original course into Ennerdale Water in the 1970s. Ben Gill has recently been restored to its original course straight into the River Ehen. This will increase the amount of water available to the river and also restore the supply of natural gravels, which are an important contribution to the habitat of the freshwater mussels and for salmon spawning.

Raising the level of Ennerdale Water has been previously considered in earlier decades but the proposals were rejected through two public inquiries primarily due to unacceptable impact on the environment. Impounding more water in the lake is also not consistent with the objective of returning the lake and the River Ehen to natural conditions to help sustain the freshwater mussel population and improve the salmon population.

Several respondents suggested that we build new reservoirs. Construction of new reservoirs in West Cumbria is likely to lead to significant environmental impacts as well as social impacts. We believe that there are better options available that have fewer adverse environmental and social effects. Our preferred
option makes use of an existing reservoir which has the capacity to provide reliable supplies to West Cumbria.

Some respondents asked why supplies from Thirlmere could not be transferred to West Cumbria via the natural river system to avoid the need for a pipeline. There are a number of concerns with transferring water via the river system, including the water losses that occur within the rivers and lakes as well as the reduction in water quality during the transport down the river (requiring more extensive and expensive water treatment processes). The River Derwent and Bassenthwaite Lake are sensitive water environments and are also designated as a Special Area of Conservation. Changing the flow regime in this river has the potential to negatively impact the river and lake. Our proposed pipeline transfer scheme will provide a more efficient, reliable, secure and environmentally sustainable solution.

Q3: Which option would be best for the water treatment works from your perspective?
Feedback indicated that 33% of respondents favoured Option C (water treatment works in the Bothel Moor area), primarily because they believed it represented the best overall solution with the lowest impact on traffic and the environment (Figure 7). The other two options for the location of the water treatment works in either the Thirlmere or Cockermouth areas attracted 8% support each. 19% expressed no view whilst 27% had other suggestions or did not consider a scheme was required. We received both positive comments and concerns about each option as well as the proposed scheme as a whole. These responses are summarised in Table 3.

Figure 7. Response to Question 3: Which option would be best from your perspective? (numbers on chart indicate number of responses)

For those who preferred Option A (Thirlmere area), many said that it made the most sense to have the water treatment works close to the water source as it will enable use of existing pipelines as much as possible and minimise the disruption caused by laying additional pipelines. Concerns raised in relation to Option A included potential effects on the Lake District National Park and potential for disturbance to the local osprey bird population arising from construction works required along the A66.

For those who favoured Option B (Cockermouth area), respondents said that they thought that it would be likely be the most efficient option because it would maximise gravity flow and require the least amount of pumping. For these reasons, they considered this would be the most cost-effective solution.

Of those who committed to an option, Option C (Bothel Moor) was the favoured choice of 33% of respondents who suggested this would be the best engineering solution and cause the least disruption to the environment and traffic. The potential for lower energy use associated with this option was also seen as...
an advantage. However, some respondents cited concerns over potential traffic disruptions, including disruption to major bus routes during pipeline construction.

Table 3. Key points raised by stakeholders in response to Question 3: Which option would be best from your perspective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of main comments in community responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option A</strong> 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use existing pipelines as much as possible and treat water near to the source at Thirlmere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use existing water treatment site at Bridge End near Thirlmere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns raised in respect of disruption within the Lake District National Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B</strong> 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most straightforward and logical site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less pumping needed as using gravity flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option C</strong> 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best engineering solution and lowest energy usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least impact on the environment and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most cost-effective solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>None of the Options</strong> 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue using Ennerdale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the money saved to improve road infrastructure in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other suggestions and concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base decision on the option causing least disruption to traffic and the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the best engineering solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep using all existing sources of water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUR RESPONSE

We are currently investigating a number of possible pipeline routes and treatment works locations. Site selection will take into account factors including maximising use of gravity to minimise energy use and operational costs, and many other environmental factors including ecology, archaeology and landscape impacts. We will also be considering the temporary effects on traffic and transport routes, as well as disruption to local communities.

A few individuals noted that they favoured **none of the options**, questioning the justification for ceasing abstraction at Ennerdale and suggesting using the money saved to improve local road infrastructure. As explained in our responses above to Questions 1 and 2, we are required to cease abstraction from Ennerdale Water and find alternative water supplies for West Cumbria. We have reviewed a wide range of options and consulted on these in our draft Water Resources Management Plan. Our preferred scheme provides a reliable and sustainable supply solution for West Cumbria.

**Q4: Is there anything else UU should be considering in the design of the scheme?**

51% of respondents provided no response, or indicated that there were no other considerations to take in to account (**Figure 8**). Those who responded voiced several considerations, most of which were concerned with minimising disruption as much as possible. These responses are summarised in **Table 4**.

Traffic disruption during construction was a key concern for many respondents, who stated that the scheme should avoid impacts to traffic. Temporary disruption to major traffic and bus routes was cited by respondents as having potential impacts on both daily life of local residents and on tourism in the area.
Figure 8. Response to Question 4: Is there anything else we should be considering in the design of the scheme? (numbers on chart indicate number of responses)

Table 4: Key points raised by stakeholders in response to Question 3: Is there anything else we should be considering in the design of the scheme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Concern</th>
<th>Summary of main comments in community responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimise traffic disruption</td>
<td>Avoid A591 – disruptive and would cut off access to local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Avoid A66 – main route to West Cumbria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep works off roads by using verges and adjacent land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise landscape damage</td>
<td>Use landscaping to reduce any visually intrusive operations once works are complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Tunnel as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise impact on tourism and livelihoods</td>
<td>Use local firms and workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Compensate land owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggestions and concerns</td>
<td>Incorporate flood alleviation measures into scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Reduce CO₂ emissions during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider renewable energy opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No fluoride to be added to the water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lay a cycle track on top of the pipeline route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take into account future demand by industry and people in Cumbria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUR RESPONSE**

*The temporary disruption to traffic and transport in the local area was seen as a significant concern.* We will work closely with local people and businesses to make sure there is as little impact on their day-to-day lives as possible during the construction period. We will make sure construction is carried out safely and keep the disruption to local roads and communities to a minimum.

Construction works will unfortunately generate extra traffic for a temporary period. We fully understand the traffic concerns and we will be working to minimise disruption, as well as giving as much advance warning
Potential impacts on the landscape character of the Lake District National Park and on the environment were raised by some respondents. Protecting the landscape and environment of Cumbria is an essential part of our planning process. We are investigating this in great detail to help us design a scheme that limits the amount of land that will be disturbed and ensures no lasting impact. Most of the new infrastructure will be buried out of sight once construction has finished. As we continue our planning, we will be looking for opportunities to provide benefits for the environment, including green infrastructure and landscaping. Our proposals will also mean that we can return rivers and lakes in West Cumbria back to more natural conditions.

Other respondents highlighted that it was important to minimise the impact on local communities by compensating landowners if their land is damaged or used and tapping into the local workforce. We will work with any affected landowners to minimise disruption to their land and protect their land from any long-term impacts. During the construction period, around 500 people are likely to be employed throughout the supply chain, with approximately 200 of those anticipated from local companies. Furthermore, the construction work will generate demand for a range of local commercial services.

Some respondents considered that flood alleviation measures should be incorporated into the scheme design and that any flood risk consequences of the scheme should be considered. We will assess the implications of our proposals on flood risk and ensure we continue our existing operational actions at Thirlmere Reservoir to reduce flood risk at Keswick and further downstream along the River Derwent. We will also continue to work with local flood action groups as our plans progress.

A few individuals expressed a view that fluoride should not be added to water supplies. Decisions on water fluoridation in West Cumbria remain the responsibility of public health authorities in accordance with national legislation. Water supplies in much of West Cumbria have been fluoridated for many years under historic decisions made by the local health authorities. No changes are anticipated to these historic arrangements.

Other suggestions included reducing CO₂ emissions during construction and the utilisation of renewable energy during operation of the scheme. We are very keen to design and deliver a sustainable water supply scheme, including during construction and keeping operational energy usage as low as possible. That means avoiding the need to pump water wherever possible and exploring options to generate renewable energy. We are currently investigating a number of possible pipeline routes and treatment works locations. Site selection will take into account factors including maximising use of gravity to minimise energy use and operational costs.

Several individuals suggested that a cycle track associated with the new pipeline route would be a lasting green legacy. As we continue to develop the scheme design, we will consider ways in which we can provide local benefits working with the communities that may be affected by the scheme.

Q5: Is the level of detail given to you today sufficient at this stage? If not, what else would you like to know?
Feedback indicated that the majority of respondents were satisfied with the level of detail provided at this point in the consultation process (Figure 9). Those who asked for additional details primarily requested more information on the precise routes and pipeline options, as well as clearer information as to the costs and benefits of the three water treatment works options. These responses are summarised in Table 5.
Figure 9. Response to Question 5: Is the level of detail given to you today sufficient at this stage? (numbers on chart indicate number of responses)

Table 5. Key points raised by stakeholders in response to Question 5: Is the level of detail given to you today sufficient at this stage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of main comments in community responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other concerns and requests</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUR RESPONSE**

At this stage, we are still carefully assessing the details of the alternative pipeline routes and water treatment work locations. We are also waiting for the conclusions of Defra’s Examination in Public into our Water Resource Management Plan, which was held in September 2014.

The majority of the requests for further details mirror the issues raised in earlier questions, for which our responses have already been set out above.
Details on the construction effects and pipeline size will also be made available as the design work progresses. Many people were interested in learning more about the associated costs of the proposed scheme. Our current assessment is that costs will be of the order of £250m-£300m. However, these costs will be refined as decisions are made on the pipeline route and water treatment works location, and more detailed design work takes place. The cost of the scheme will be spread over a number years and this will partially be offset by reduced costs for those water supplies being closed down. We are committed to keeping water bills affordable for customers and that’s why we have pledged that average bills for households will reduce by £8.91 before inflation during 2015 to 2020. This means household water bills will rise by less than inflation across the decade from 2010 to 2020.

Those who agreed that enough detail had been provided at this stage generally expressed the view that they would like to be kept up-to-date in the future as the plans develop and progress. We will continue to consult with local communities and the public over the coming months.

Q6: Is there anything else UU could do to gather views and opinions on the proposals?
Feedback indicated that 36% of respondents were content with the methods used, whilst 35% suggested additional methods in which views and opinions could or should be gathered (Figure 10). The responses are summarised in Table 6.

Figure 10. Response to Question 6: Should we be doing anything else to gather views and opinions on the proposal? (numbers on chart indicate number of responses)

Those respondents who were satisfied with the methods used to gather views and opinions requested that they be kept informed as decisions and the scheme design progresses.

OUR RESPONSE
In the next phase of our consultation programme, we will take account of the feedback and use other methods to provide information and seek views from the local community. Our next phase of consultation will also be able to provide additional details that many people have requested. We plan to hold further public engagement events and will specifically contact schools, town and parish councils, local community groups, and those who commute through the area on a regular basis.
Table 6. Key points raised by stakeholders in response to Question 6: Should we be doing anything else to gather views and opinions on the proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summary of main comments in community responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No 36%</td>
<td>Would like to be kept informed with regular updates as the scheme progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 23%</td>
<td>Leaflets/mailshot targeted to communities that will be affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles or adverts in the local press, along with maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link to schools – engaging young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consult with those who commute through the area on a daily basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires could be sent out with water bills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggestions</td>
<td>Engage with local Town and Parish Councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage with local community groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remember local broadband connections are slow when using internet to communicate or seek views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short slot on local radio and television to explain options and scheme development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7: How would you prefer to be contacted?
Feedback indicated that about 48% of respondents preferred email communication with links to website updates whilst some respondents gave multiple answers (Figure 11). These responses are summarised in Table 7 and will help guide our next phase of consultation, as set out in the Next Steps section below/

Figure 11. Response to Question 7: How would you prefer to be contacted?
(numbers on chart indicate number of responses)
Table 7. Primary responses provided by stakeholders in response to Question 7:
How would you prefer to be contacted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summary of main comments in community responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Would like to be kept informed with regular updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post; mail; letter</td>
<td>Via post but with more time to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through local newspaper</td>
<td>Progress report in ‘Keswick Reminder’ to include address, telephone number and name of person to speak to, as well as website address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Another open day or public engagement event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUR RESPONSE**

We will actively take account of the responses and suggestions received in planning the next phases of our consultation programme. We will continue to use a variety of methods to ensure that we reach as many people as possible in the community and make it as easy as possible for comments and views to be made to us.

**Additional comments**

Respondents provided a wide range of additional comments and a complete listing of all comments and our responses are provided in Appendix A.

20% of respondents stated that they were pleased with the events, the informative exhibitions and presentations, as well as appreciating the opportunity to provide feedback.

One individual was concerned that the proposed scheme was related to the new nuclear plant being built in Sellafield and several others believed that the need for the scheme was being driven by nuclear waste storage proposals. In response, we can categorically confirm that this is not the case and the scheme is required in response to environmental decisions to withdraw our abstraction licence at Ennerdale Water to protect rare and endangered species living in the River Ehen.

Several individuals requested provision of water-saving devices (such as save-a-flush cistern devices), to which we have responded already.

Others requested more information such as pipeline route maps, construction and design data, details on the costs of the scheme, and discussions on possible opportunities for flood alleviation measures. We will be able to address these in the next phase of consultation and through ongoing dialogue as appropriate.

A few individuals recommended other organisations to consult with. We are already consulting with a large number of organisations, both statutory bodies (e.g. the local planning authorities, Highways Agency, Environment Agency, Natural England), NGOs such as West Cumbria Rivers Trust and Friends of the Lake District, and local community groups. We will be targeting further relevant NGOs and local community groups in the next phase of our consultation programme.

Many people expressed frustration with European Union Directives. As previously explained, these are laws that the government, Environment Agency and United Utilities must comply with. The Habitats Directive aims to protect the most rare and endangered species in Europe, including some species that live in rivers in West Cumbria. Our proposals respond to the decision to withdraw our abstraction licence at Ennerdale Water to protect these species.

Several respondents offered information on other areas to consider in assessing potential impacts to the environment and the community, including caravan parks, the Cumbria Wildlife Trust nature reserve, and Dubbs Moss. We will be considering the potential impacts as part of our planning activities and Environment Impact Assessment.
One individual was concerned as to what would happen to the outlet weir at Ennerdale. In the long term, the aspiration is to return Ennerdale Water to a more natural state and this would probably include removal of the weir. However, no decisions have yet been made as to the long-term plans for the weir and further detailed assessments are required as to the implications for the lake and River Ehen.

**KEY CONCLUSIONS**

We have carried out a range of consultation and engagement activities with the public, stakeholders and community groups on our plans for West Cumbria water supplies throughout 2014. This has included consultation with local residents, interested parties and other stakeholders by attending meetings with key stakeholders (from meetings with planning authorities through to presentations to parish councils and community groups), mailing out newsletters, creating a dedicated website to present our plans and allow online feedback, and answering questions at public exhibitions and country shows.

We received 168 responses to a questionnaire we distributed to attendees at public exhibitions, country shows and via our dedicated website. The key feedback received from the questionnaire responses is summarised below:

- Many people were generally unsure about the need to cease taking water from Ennerdale Water for public water supply.
- Some people felt that the scheme was not necessary and that we should continue to use the water sources in West Cumbria.
- There are major concerns over the potential for temporary construction impacts in affected areas and traffic disruption on the major trunk roads and in local towns.
- Of the three options proposed for the new water treatment works location, the Bothel Moor area was the preferred location with 33% of people responding being in favour.
- Some people would like more detailed information about the project design, cost and the potential impacts.
- Some people consider we should use the scheme as an opportunity to help reduce flood risks, install green infrastructure and maximise use of cleaner, greener technology.

We will actively consider and respond in more detail to the points that have been raised through the initial consultation activity during the next phase of consultation and engagement as we continue to progress our investigations in more detail. We will be looking at ways in which we can minimise the potential for disruption to communities and local environment, as well as exploring opportunities for benefits, such as green infrastructure.

**NEXT STEPS**

We are committed to ongoing consultation and dialogue, and we already organising further opportunities for the public and stakeholders to find out more about our developing plans, ask questions and provide views and opinions. We will be holding further public events and will also be specifically contacting local schools, Town and Parish Councils, local community groups and getting the views of those who commute through the area on a regular basis.

We are aiming to submit a planning application in 2016, and start construction from 2017 onwards.

We will continue to keep our dedicated website updated at [www.unitedutilities.com/cumbria](http://www.unitedutilities.com/cumbria).

**UNITED UTILITIES WATER PLC**

**NOVEMBER 2014**
Appendix C

Phase 1 Leaflet
(public facing report)
West Cumbria water supplies project

In spring and summer 2014, we asked you for your views on our proposals to safeguard water supplies for West Cumbria. Here’s a summary of what you’ve said…and our response. We also set out how we’ll ensure you’re kept fully informed as our plans take shape.

Why is a change necessary?

• The Environment Agency have told us that we will have to stop using Ennerdale Water as a source of water, so we need to find an alternative supply.

• We are committed to safeguarding water supplies to our customers in West Cumbria. We need to ensure we have sufficient water available to support the everyday needs of homes, farms and other businesses – both now and in the future.

• We plan to link West Cumbria to the rest of the North West’s water supply network by building a major pipeline from Thirlmere Reservoir across to West Cumbria. We will also need to build a new water treatment works, pumping stations and large storage tanks. With careful planning, we can make sure this is delivered with minimal environmental impact.

• Our proposals would mean that we no longer need to take water from environmentally sensitive lakes and rivers in West Cumbria, including Ennerdale Water and Crummock Water.

Gathering your views and comments

Throughout 2014 we asked for your views and comments on our proposals. We provided details of what we need to build and location options. We also presented information on three potential routes for the new pipeline and locations for the new water treatment works: near to Thirlmere reservoir, in the Cockermouth area or in the Bothel Moor area.

To make sure as many of you as possible had the opportunity to have your say, we’ve used lots of different approaches to enable you to tell us what you think.

• Spring and summer newsletters posted to over 40,000 properties.

• 75 meetings with different organisations, including planning authorities, parish councils and a range of community groups.

• Dedicated website to enable online feedback: www.unitedutilities.com/cumbria

• Eight public exhibitions in March and July 2014 providing information and enabling discussions with our team. The exhibitions were advertised through leaflet drops, social media, radio and newspaper advertisements.

• Attendance at 11 country shows in Cumbria between August and October 2014, with our team on hand to answer questions.

• Consultation questionnaires for completion online, at public events or by post.
Many thanks for all your feedback!

In total, 168 completed questionnaires were returned, either at our public events, via post or online. We’d like to thank everyone for taking the time to respond and helping us understand your views and opinions. They are really valuable in shaping our plans for West Cumbria.

What you said…and our response

You said: **On our overall project proposals….**

Over half of the people who responded to the questionnaire agreed that our overall proposals were an appropriate response to the supply issues facing West Cumbria. Some people had concerns for a variety of reasons, whilst others did not consider the proposals were necessary or appropriate. Some felt that the proposals could provide additional benefits.

“Possibly will need additional water supplies in extreme drought and as local towns and cities expand”

“Disruption and impact of scheme is too great”

“Potential to reduce flooding in Keswick”

Our response:

To protect the rare wildlife and habitat in the River Ehen we are due to have our licence to take water removed. To continue to provide West Cumbria with a water supply that meets the future demands, we need to develop an alternative reliable source of water.

Our proposals to tap into Thirlmere Reservoir and pipe water across to West Cumbria would enable us to stop taking water from ecologically important local lakes and rivers – including Ennerdale Water, Crummock Water, Dash Beck and Overwater. It will also improve the reliability of water supplies for people in West Cumbria in times of drought.

We appreciate there are a large number of people who live or work in the area where the new supply project would be constructed. We’ll work closely with you, local communities, and businesses to ensure we minimise any temporary disruption and continue to help life flow smoothly…and safely.

You said: **Are there other options we should be exploring?**

There were mixed views on this issue. Many of you asked why we cannot continue to use Ennerdale Water. Others questioned why the rare wildlife should have priority over water supplies. Suggestions for using alternative water supplies or building new ones were also made.

“Keep Ennerdale in service; no good reason given why this cannot be done”

“We need to put our foot down with these environmentalists and say enough is enough - common sense must prevail”

“Stop the supply to Manchester and divert to us”

Our response:

Extensive investigations have been carried out to explore ways to improve the River Ehen to help protected wildlife such as the freshwater mussel and salmon. These have concluded that stopping use of the lake for water supply will help ensure the future survival of these sensitive species.

Our legal permission to take water from Ennerdale will be removed and so we have to find a replacement source of water. The rare wildlife in the River Ehen is internationally protected, but current river flow conditions are preventing the wildlife from flourishing as it should. By stopping use of Ennerdale for water supply, river conditions will be improved for the benefit of the wildlife.

This is the right thing to do for the environment and our customers too.
You said: **Your views on the location of the water treatment works and pipeline route...**

One third of you who responded favoured the Bothel Moor area for the location of a new water treatment works, considering it to be the best overall solution with the lowest impact on traffic and the ability to utilise gravity to transport the water. The Thirlmere and Cockermouth options attracted 8% each. 19% expressed no view and 27% suggested other locations or felt that no project was needed.

Many people commented that disruption to the main roads should be avoided given their importance for access to and from West Cumbria.

Some people felt that there was not enough information about our plans at this stage to provide a view on the options presented.

“Most economic; low lifetime costs; lower bills”

“Using the A591...would cause a lot of disruption to the residents”

“There is no information on how or why these options were chosen”

Our response:

We’ve been investigating a number of possible pipeline routes and water treatment work locations based on your feedback. We have now got a preferred solution detailed at the end of this document. This final selection took into consideration a range of factors, including energy use, costs and impacts on the public, landscape and ecology. Your feedback helped inform this decision.

You said: **Is there anything else we should be considering in the design of the project?**

Minimising traffic disruption was the most important issue for those who responded. Other concerns, such as minimising landscape damage and any impact on tourism and livelihoods, were also raised.

“Minimise disruption; less traffic disruption; keep work off roads; use verges/adjacent land”

“Minimise (permanent) landscape damage, especially in National Park”

“Minimise impact on tourism/livelihoods – avoid towns”

Our response:

We have taken this feedback on board and most of the pipeline route will now be across land rather than in the road. Our construction work will unfortunately generate extra traffic for a temporary period. We fully understand the traffic concerns and know these are a pain. The new preferred route will help minimise this disruption, as well as giving as much advance warning as possible. We’ll work closely with you, local communities and businesses to minimise any adverse effects on tourism and livelihoods.

Protecting the landscape and environment of Cumbria is an essential part of our planning process. We’re looking at this in great detail to help us design a project that limits the amount of land that will be disturbed and ensures no lasting impact. Most of the new infrastructure will be buried out of sight once construction has finished.

As we continue our planning, we’ll be exploring opportunities to enhance the local environment where we’re carrying out our work, including green infrastructure and landscaping.
Our response: We want the project to be sustainable, including keeping energy usage as low as possible and in the preferred solution we’ll use gravity where ever possible to move water around so we don’t need to pump it. We are also looking for ways to generate renewable energy.

The cost of the project will be spread over a number years. We are committed to keeping water bills affordable for customers and that’s why we have pledged that average bills for households will rise by less than inflation across the decade from 2010 to 2020.

You said: Has the level of detail provided been sufficient at this stage?

Most people thought that they were given sufficient information about our proposals. A number of additional questions, ideas and concerns were raised, from possible changes to drinking water quality to concerns about the costs of the project to ideas for renewable energy opportunities.

“Excellent presentation, well prepared”

“Would green measures like wind turbines be used as a source of power for the Bothel pumping station?”

“Consider opportunities to incorporate flood alleviation measures e.g. “Slow the Flow“ techniques to smooth out peak water flows”

You said: Can we improve communications further? Is there anything else we could do to gather views and opinions on our proposals?

We received a number of comments about how we’ve carried out our communications so far, including ideas for improvement.

“Link to schools - engage young people”

“Leaflet mailshot to houses and local people with information and questionnaire. Include those who commute through the Lakes daily”

“Need to be kept informed - regular updates; transparency”

“TV programme to explain options: this would raise awareness and result in more response”

Our response: Many people requested to be kept informed as the project progresses - preferably by email with links to the website or by post. Others asked not to be contacted again.

Some of you felt we needed to communicate more widely, for example with schools and more local community groups. Others asked for much greater information to be provided on project details, costs and potential impacts.

We have listened to your feedback and appreciate that we need to continue to raise awareness and keep you up to date.
Summary of what you told us

• Many people questioned the need to stop taking water from Ennerdale.
• Some people felt that the project was unnecessary and that we should continue to use the water sources in West Cumbria.
• There are concerns over the potential traffic impacts our work would cause on main roads and in local towns.
• Of the three options proposed for the new water treatment works location, the Bothel Moor area was the preferred location with 33% of people favouring this option.
• Some people would like more detailed information about the project design, cost and the potential impacts.
• We should use the project to explore opportunities to help reduce flood risks, install green infrastructure and maximise use of cleaner, greener technology.

Our preferred solution

Based on all of your feedback and more detailed engineering work we have been able to narrow our options down to the Bridekirk area.

This preferred option:

• utilises gravity for the majority of the pipeline
• has a treatment works proposed in the Bridekirk area due to it being located at the optimum elevation for a gravity solution
• has most of the pipeline across land, minimising the disruption to traffic
• has the potential to utilise green technology.

Please see our website for a map of the preferred option.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

Although we now have a preferred route we still have a long way to go and a lot more consultation before we are ready to start building. It’s really important to use that we keep you updated as we progress. We are already organising further opportunities for you to find out more about our developing plans, ask questions and give us your views. We will be holding further public events in the new year and will also be specifically contacting local schools, town and parish councils, local community groups and getting the view of those of you who commute through the area on a regular basis.

We are aiming to submit a planning application in 2016, and start construction from 2017 onwards.

You can keep up to date by visiting our website: unitedutilities.com/cumbria
WEST CUMBRIA WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

Background
The two principal sources of water supplying homes and businesses in West Cumbria are Ennerdale Water and Crummock Water, both natural lakes with man-made weirs at their outlets to provide artificial storage for water supply purposes. These lakes are important water sources for the people of West Cumbria and they have high ecological value as they contain rare species, many of which are protected by national and international law. Ennerdale Water is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and, downstream of the lake, the River Ehen is both a SSSI and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) under the EU Habitats Directive. Crummock Water and the downstream River Cocker are both part of a SSSI and SAC. In addition, these lakes are both located within the Lake District National Park, giving further legal protection including for their visual amenity and landscape value.

Changes to abstraction from Ennerdale Water
The River Ehen downstream of Ennerdale Water supports England’s only remaining viable population of the internationally protected freshwater mussel species *Margaritifera margaritifera*. In view of the sensitive and protected status of the freshwater mussels, as well as other species in the River Ehen and Ennerdale Water, extensive investigations have taken place over the past 10 years to assess the impact of water abstraction by United Utilities on the lake and river. These investigations have concluded that abstraction from Ennerdale Water should cease, primarily to protect the rare and endangered freshwater mussel population in the River Ehen and help ensure this species does not become extinct in England. We will have to cease using Ennerdale Water as a source of water by 2025 in line with the Environment Agency’s decision to withdraw our water abstraction licence.

Providing future supplies from Thirlmere Reservoir
We are committed to safeguarding water supplies in West Cumbria in a responsible and sustainable manner, ensuring there is sufficient water available for homes and businesses in the area and to support the local economy. To meet this commitment, we plan to link West Cumbria to our integrated regional water supply network by building a major new pipeline from Thirlmere Reservoir to West Cumbria, along with a new water treatment works and associated pumping stations and water storage tanks (“service reservoirs”). With careful planning, we will make sure there is minimal long-term environmental impact arising from this new water supply link. By taking a strategic, long-term view, our plan will mean we no longer need to take water from all of the environmentally sensitive water sources in West Cumbria. In addition to Ennerdale Water, we will also cease water abstraction from Crummock Water, Overwater, River Ellen and Dash Beck.

OUR PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Draft Water Resources Management Plan Consultation: Spring 2013
We have already carried out several phases of consultation with the local community and stakeholders. As part of our Draft Water Resources Management Plan consultation activities in spring 2013, we sought the public’s views and opinions on over 50 potential options to maintain water supply reliability in West Cumbria. Based on that feedback and further consultation activities, we developed our preferred plan to link West Cumbria to Thirlmere Reservoir via a major new pipeline and a new water treatment works. This preferred solution was subject to an Examination in Public called by the Secretary of State. The independent Planning Inspector recommended to the Secretary of State that the Thirlmere option represented the best overall solution to providing reliable water supplies to West Cumbria.
Phase one consultation on our preferred plan

This first phase of consultation on our preferred plan included a series of local customer focus groups. These were designed to gather views from customers in West Cumbria on the alternatives for their future water supply and help shape the consultation programme. We then sought views from the local community and stakeholders on the Thirlmere reservoir scheme, including specifically seeking views on alternative locations for the new water treatment works and associated pipelines, pumping stations and storage tanks (‘service reservoirs’).

The phase one consultation programme took place during the spring and summer of 2014. We consulted with local residents, interested parties and other stakeholders by a wide variety of methods to ensure we reached all those who would be affected by the proposed construction and obtain feedback to help guide our decision process on the proposed water supply scheme.

We used a questionnaire targeted to get specific views from the public in West Cumbria. We had a good response with 168 respondents. From the feedback received, it was clear that there were a range of questions and concerns about our proposals which have framed the subsequent phase of consultation.

Based on all the feedback we received and our ongoing investigations, we were able to narrow down our options for the proposed pipeline route and the site for the new water treatment works. The pipeline route selection has been particularly guided by consideration of the need to minimise disruption to traffic, to make maximum use of gravity flow for the majority of the pipeline route and the potential to utilise green technology. The preferred site for the water treatment works in the Bridekirk area has been chosen due to its location at the optimum elevation for a gravity flow pipeline (Figure 1).

![Preferred pipeline route (raw water aqueduct & treated water trunk main) and site for new water treatment works](image)
PHASE TWO CONSULTATION

Our second phase of consultation has focused on gathering views on the preferred route and location of the water treatment works and understanding any concerns of the local community and stakeholders.

Public exhibitions

Throughout March 2015 we held a number of public exhibitions across West Cumbria to obtain feedback on our preferred route, the proposed new water treatment works in the Bridekirk area and the additional smaller pipeline routes. These exhibitions were held at:

- **Thirlmere.** Tuesday 3rd March
- **Bassenthwaite.** Wednesday 4th March
- **Keswick.** Thursday 5th March
- **Aspatria.** Wednesday 11th March
- **Wigton.** Thursday 12th March
- **Cleator Moor.** Tuesday 17th March
- **Lorton.** Wednesday 18th March
- **Cockermouth.** Tuesday 24th March
- **Blindcrake.** Wednesday 25th March
- **Seaton.** Monday 30th March
- **Workington.** Tuesday 31st March

Local council presentations

As well as engaging with the public, we made presentations on our proposals to the local councils throughout the West Cumbria region. The presentation outlined the decisions made so far as well as our future plans.

These council meetings were held as follows:

- **Keswick Town Council.** 18th December 2014
- **Underskiddaw Parish Council.** 20th January 2015
- **Threkeld Parish Council.** 20th January 2015
- **Cumbria County Council - Allerdale representatives.** 22nd January 2015
- **St John’s and Castlerigg Parish Council.** 29th January 2015
- **Allhallows Parish Council.** 4th February 2015
- **Cleator Moor Parish Council.** 10th February 2015
- **Bridekirk Parish Council.** 12th February 2015
- **Cockermouth Town Council.** 18th February 2015
- **Embleton & District Parish Council.** 18th February 2015
- **Great Clifton Parish Council.** 19th February 2015
- **Lorton Parish Council.** 4th March 2015
- **Cumbria County Council – County Councillors.** 5th March 2015
- **Lamplugh Parish Council.** 18th March 2015
- **Blindcrake Parish Council.** 23rd March 2015
- **Keswick Town Council.** 16th April 2015
- **Bothel &Threapland Parish Council.** 12th May 2015
- **Bolton Parish Council.** 19th May 2015

Other stakeholder meetings

We also held additional meetings with various stakeholders who wished to discuss specific issues or concerns. These additional stakeholder meetings were with:

- **Landowners – held at Cockermouth.** 24th March 2015
- **Forestry Commission – held at Bassenthwaite.** 20th April 2015
- **Landowners – held at Blindcrake.** 21st April 2015
- **Landowners – held at Bothel.** 21st April 2015
- **Business owners – held at Bothel.** 15th May 2015
- **Keswick Tourism – held at Keswick.** 20th May 2015
OVERVIEW OF PHASE TWO CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Public Exhibitions
The total number of attendees at our public exhibitions across West Cumbria exceeded 450 people (Figure 2). Attendance numbers varied with location; however, there was no obvious bias in attendance numbers with location. This indicates a broad level of interest regarding our proposals across the local area. In total, 6% of attendees across all exhibition venues approached us with specific comments about our proposals (Figure 3). The comments were broadly consistent across the venues and ranged from concerns about the impact on the environment or seeking greater detail on the scheme components to technical queries about construction methods for the pipeline (Table 1). A complete list of all comments and our responses are provided at Appendix A.
Table 1. Summary of the types of comments from attendees at our public exhibition events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Type of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thirlmere</td>
<td>03/03/2015</td>
<td>Request of land survey reports/pipeline route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for more detailed information about the pipeline route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassenthwaite</td>
<td>04/03/2015</td>
<td>Request for land survey reports and more details on the pipeline route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about impact on businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about impact on wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>05/03/2015</td>
<td>Request for more detailed information about the pipeline route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspatria</td>
<td>11/03/2015</td>
<td>Request of land survey reports/pipeline route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Happy with the level of information provided about the pipeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns/interest in connecting to the public water supply network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletchertown</td>
<td>12/03/2015</td>
<td>No specific comments or concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleator Moor</td>
<td>17/03/2015</td>
<td>Concern/interest in connecting to the public water supply network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorton</td>
<td>18/03/2015</td>
<td>Request for more information about the pipeline plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>24/03/2015</td>
<td>Mixed views about the level of information provided about the pipeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for details about road closures during the pipeline construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindcraike</td>
<td>25/03/2015</td>
<td>Concerned about impact on farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern/interest in connecting to the public water supply network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical query about pipeline and its construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton</td>
<td>30/03/2015</td>
<td>Request more information about the pipeline plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkstile</td>
<td>31/03/2015</td>
<td>Concerned about traffic issues during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical query about pipeline and its construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our responses to the comments received

Several people requested access to survey reports and updates on pipeline routes or plans. We have a range of events planned for Phase 3 of our consultation during which we will present further details of the proposals. We will also be responding to specific requests for information.

Some people wanted more detailed information to be provided to them about the pipeline plans. We are striving to keep the local community informed to the highest degree on our plans and decisions as swiftly as possible. Our dedicated website (www.unitedutilities.com/west-cumbria-proposals) contains a wealth of information regarding our plans for the West Cumbria water supply scheme. We are also using other media sources to report progress with the project. We are planning to hold further public meetings so that information can be conveyed and people can ask questions or raise their concerns directly to our planning team.

Some people were concerned about the impact on the environment especially wildlife. In the long-term building a new, more resilient and sustainable source of water will benefit people and businesses in West Cumbria, but also very much so for wildlife because it will return some of our most precious places back to nature. The Environment Agency, Natural England and the West Cumbria Rivers Trust are just a few of the organisations that we are working with to protect wildlife and improve the water environment of
West Cumbria. We are carrying out extensive environmental surveys to ensure we design the construction work very carefully to minimise any short-term detrimental effects to wildlife and that the environment is restored following construction.

Concerns were raised about the impact on farmland. Where we need to construct the pipeline on farmland, we currently estimate that this typically involve the loss of two growing seasons to enable time for top soil restoration and re-seeding following installation of the pipeline section. However, where possible we aim to be quicker by using a specialist reinstatement contractor to follow behind the pipe laying contractor. Our larger pipes are laid with typically laid with 900mm of ground cover. The large diameter trunk main which is gravity fed may require some sections which are deeper (up to 3-4 metres) - these sections should be relatively short in length. Generally the smaller diameter water distribution mains will be laid with 900mm of cover and some sections may be “sliplined” which is where we use the existing pipe as a sleeve.

Regarding land drainage systems on farmland, we follow the Code of (best) Practice established under the Water Industry Act 1991. In accordance with this, we will try to plan the specific pipeline route to avoid farm drainage systems but this will not always be possible. As part of our detailed planning of the pipeline construction, we aim to identify existing drainage systems through consultation with the landowner. Where it is known that we will affect a system of lateral drains, our specialist advisors (ADAS) will prepare a drainage plan which may involve the installation of a cut off drain. The cut off drain will be installed by a specialist agricultural contractor as part of the preliminary works and will typically be laid outside the working area. Where individual drains are encountered, these will be cross-connected with the work photographed and where possible witnessed by the landowner or representative. Accurate records and “as laid” plans of all works will be maintained. We will inform the landowner of any drains not previously known to exist.

We will also employ ADAS to prepare a technical Land Condition and Drainage Report. The United Utilities Land Agent will also complete a Record of Condition for future reference following reinstatement. Our intention is to engage a specialist agricultural contractor to erect the temporary fencing needed and any agreed accommodation works (crossing points, etc.), including the installation of any drainage works (e.g. cut off drains that may be necessary). The specialist agricultural contractor will also be responsible for stripping the top-soil and setting this to one side. Following this, the pipeline contractor will lay the pipe during which time the specialist contractor will be used to cross-connect any drains. Once pipe laying is complete, the specialist agricultural contractor will return to replace the top-soil, working only when conditions are appropriate to handle top-soil. Re-seeding will then follow, although in a few cases some landowners may prefer to re-seed their own land. The timing of re-seeding is crucial and should not be too late in the season or too early. We will use good quality seed applied at generous seed rates.

As part of the Land Condition and Drainage Report, ADAS will assess the risk of soil erosion during construction (e.g. from steeply surrounding topography) and recommend any mitigation measures. We will seek to control surface water erosion by not stripping soil over too large a working area in advance of construction work. Timely reinstatement by the specialist agricultural contractor will also reduce the duration that land is exposed to the risk of soil erosion.

Concerns were raised about the impact on local businesses. Concerns were expressed about the impact on local businesses and economy. We will be working hard to minimise any disruption to businesses and tourism during the construction work. We will be holding further meetings with the business and tourism communities to discuss our plans in more detail and identify specific mitigation actions. Overall, we expect the development of the pipeline will have a positive impact on the economy through employment opportunities and use of the local supply chain. During construction, the workforce will require all sorts of local services, from hotels to sandwiches. During the construction phase (estimated 2018 to 2022) the project will be employing in the region of 500 people throughout the supply chain.

Several people were either concerned or requested detailed information about road closures and traffic disruption. We will work closely with local people and businesses to make sure there is as little impact on their day-to-day lives as possible during the construction period. We will make sure construction is carried out safely and keep the disruption to local roads and communities to a minimum.

Construction works will unfortunately generate extra traffic for a temporary period. We fully understand the traffic concerns and we will be working to minimise disruption, as well as giving as much advance warning as possible. We will also work hard to make sure we plan carefully with help from local communities to minimise any adverse effects on tourism and livelihoods.
Several people were interested or concerned about their current water supply and connection to UU. These included enquiries about the opportunity to have a public water supply connection and potential adverse effects on water supply pipes during construction. Others had specific questions about water quality or water pressure at their property. Several people asked whether the water will be fluoridated; we explained that this is not a decision for United Utilities and that Public Health England and Cumbria County Council are responsible for consulting the local community on such matters.

Some people were interested to learn more about some of the logistical or technical aspects of the construction process, e.g. flood risk, disposal of displaced soil. Detailed flood risk investigations are being carried out. We do not expect that the cessation of abstraction at Ennerdale Water or Crummock Water will have any adverse flood impact on the communities downstream of the lakes. We are exploring the options for disposal of displaced soil but wherever possible we will reuse the soil locally.

**Local council presentations**

Our presentations to the local councils across the West Cumbria region were generally well received. Around half of the meetings concluded with no further concerns from council members regarding our proposals, but there were a range of concerns from council members from the other half of the meetings. Overall, the concerns raised were similar to those highlighted by the local community at the public exhibitions, but some were different to those raised elsewhere (Table 2).

**Table 2. Summary of the types of comments received at the council presentations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Type of comments/concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keswick TC</td>
<td>18/12/2014</td>
<td>No comments/concerns OR issues resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underskiddaw PC</td>
<td>20/01/2015</td>
<td>No comments/concerns OR issues resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threlkeld PC</td>
<td>20/01/2015</td>
<td>No comments/concerns OR issues resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria CC</td>
<td>22/01/2015</td>
<td>No comments/concerns OR issues resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s and Castlerigg PC</td>
<td>29/01/2015</td>
<td>No comments/concerns OR issues resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allhallows PC</td>
<td>04/02/2015</td>
<td>Why is protecting the mussels so important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will there be employment opportunities for local people/companies during the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is there enough water in Thirlmere to keep providing water in the long term?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How will the arrangements at Ennerdale be left?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are we also supplying Manchester and Liverpool? Can we reduce that if so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are we getting drier weather year on year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who is funding the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleator Moor PC</td>
<td>10/02/2015</td>
<td>No comments/concerns OR issues resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridekirk PC</td>
<td>12/02/2015</td>
<td>No comments/concerns OR issues resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth TC</td>
<td>18/02/2015</td>
<td>Will there be enough water in Thirlmere to provide West Cumbria and other districts using this water supply?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will there be employment opportunities for local people/companies during the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embleton &amp; District PC</td>
<td>18/02/2015</td>
<td>What is the pipeline route?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why has this pipeline route been chosen?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerned about impact on wildlife. Who is funding the project?

Great Clifton PC 19/02/2015
Why is protecting the mussels so important?
Is there enough water in Thirlmere to keep providing water in the long term?
Will there be employment opportunities for local people/companies during the project?
How will you keep us updated?
What is the construction process for laying the pipe?
To what extent will the infrastructure and pipeline be below or above ground?

Lorton PC 04/03/2015 No comments/concerns OR issues resolved

Cumbria CC 05/03/2015
What is the pipeline route?
Why has this pipeline route been chosen?
Concerned about traffic issues during construction.

Lamplugh PC 18/03/2015 No comments/concerns OR issues resolved

Blindcrake PC 23/03/2015 No comments/concerns OR issues resolved

Keswick TC 16/04/2015 Are we also supplying Manchester and Liverpool? Can we reduce that if so?

Bothel &Threapland TC 12/05/2015 No comments/concerns OR issues resolved

Bolton PC 19/05/2015 No comments/concerns OR issues resolved

Our responses to comments or concerns raised at the local council meetings

Some council members asked why protecting the mussels in the River Ehen is so important.
The freshwater mussels in the River Ehen are considered to be England’s only remaining viable population. If we do not protect them, they could become extinct in England. They are an internationally protected species and are protected under European Union law. Since introducing measures to protect them in recent years, initial studies suggest that the mussels' habitat and health has shown some improvement, but there is still a problem with too few young mussels to sustain the population in the future. Expert advice is that restoring natural processes such as the river flow and the movement of river gravels will help improve the habitat for the mussels. There are also other important wildlife in the River Ehen and by introducing measures to protect the mussels, there will also be benefits to several other rare or protected species in the river.

One council member was interested to know how the infrastructure at Ennerdale Water will be left.
Although abstraction will cease at Ennerdale Water, the weir and associated infrastructure at the lake will likely remain in place at least in the short term. We are continuing discussions with Natural England, Environment Agency and other stakeholders as to the longer-term plan for Ennerdale and to some extent this will depend on whether there will still be a need to manage the flow regime in the River Ehen by use of the weir structure. We will consult further with local councils and the local community on the future use of the infrastructure at Ennerdale in due course.

Some council members asked: Is there enough water in Thirlmere to keep providing water to West Cumbria in the long term? Some council members asked whether Thirlmere will also be supplying Manchester and Liverpool, and if so, whether this could be reduced? Our water resource planning experts have assessed the future demands for water in West Cumbria over the long term and carefully analysed the reliability of water supplies from Thirlmere Reservoir taking account of uncertainties such as climate change and any potential changes in environmental legislation. We are confident that there is
sufficient water storage capacity in Thirlmere to provide reliable supplies of water to West Cumbria in the longer term. In most years, there are plentiful amounts of water stored in Thirlmere to supply West Cumbria, south Cumbria and areas further south. In prolonged dry weather conditions, supplies from Thirlmere to those areas further south will be reduced to conserve water storage. This is made possible by the integrated water network that supplies most of North West England, allowing other water sources to be used to offset reduced supplies from Thirlmere. In this way, we will protect the water storage in Thirlmere for supply to West Cumbria.

Questions were raised regarding the reasoning for the chosen pipeline route. The pipeline route has been chosen through consideration of the route that minimises disruption to traffic, maximises use of gravity flow of water and has potential to utilise green technology. Our decision took account of the feedback received during the first phase of local community consultation on three alternative routes. Concerns about traffic disruption and need for access in the longer term for maintenance were the main issues raised during the consultation on these three routes.

Some council members asked: What is the construction process for laying the pipe? To what extent will the infrastructure and pipeline be below or above ground? The large diameter trunk main between Thirlmere and the proposed Bridekirk Water Treatment Works will either be twin 900mm pipes laid side by side or a single 1.2m diameter pipe. The working width will typically be 35 metres. The water mains for distributing water from the new water treatment works (Bridekirk to Quarry Hill; Bridekirk to Stainburn; Bridekirk to Cornhow; Bridekirk to Summergrove) will be between 400mm and 600mm in diameter. The working width for these pipes will be in the order of 20 metres. Our pipes are laid with 900mm of ground cover. The large diameter trunk main may require some sections to be laid a greater depth (up to 3-4 metres); however these sections should be relatively short in length. Generally the distribution mains will be laid with 900mm of cover and some sections may be “sliplined” which is where we use our existing water mains as a sleeve.

Once built, most of the new infrastructure will be buried out of sight leaving no lasting visual impact. The operation of a pipeline nearly always requires the installation of air valves and washout valves at high and low points along the pipeline route, respectively. We aim to locate these valves at field boundaries where they do not interfere with farming operations. The finished level of the chambers containing these valves will typically be flush with ground level wherever feasible.

We will be discussing the landscaping and design of the proposed new water treatment works with the local planning authority to ensure no adverse visual impacts arise from the above ground structures.

Some concerns regarding traffic issues during construction were raised. We will work closely with local people and businesses to make sure there is as little impact on their day-to-day lives as possible during the construction period. Construction works will, unfortunately, generate some extra traffic for a temporary period. We fully understand the traffic concerns and we will be working to minimise disruption, as well as giving as much advance warning as possible. We will also work hard to make sure we plan carefully with help from local communities to minimise any adverse effects on tourism and livelihoods.

Some council members were interested in who was funding the project. United Utilities is funding the project in full. Through the water industry regulatory process, costs are initially mostly borne by the water company through a mix of equity and debt funding, and then gradually recovered over time across all water bill payers in North West England. Like all of our major infrastructure schemes, no single community or county will bear the cost. We know we need to keep bills affordable and that is why we are committed to keeping water bill increases over the next five years (2015-20) at less than the rate of inflation.

A reoccurring question was: Will there be employment opportunities for local people/companies during the project? It is likely that the construction of the pipeline and treatment works will have a positive impact on the local economy through employment and use of the local supply chain. The workforce will require use of all sorts of local services from hotels to sandwiches. During the construction phase (estimated 2018 to 2022), the project will be employing in the region of 500 people throughout the supply chain.

One concern was related to climate change and as to whether West Cumbria is getting drier weather year on year. The latest government projections for the Cumbrian climate is that the winters will be wetter and the summers slightly drier, and that flood and drought extremes are likely to occur more frequently. We have considered this evidence in our long-term water resources planning and in developing
our proposals for West Cumbria. Connecting West Cumbria to Thirlmere Reservoir will provide a more resilient and reliable water supply given the much larger water storage capacity of Thirlmere compared to that available at Ennerdale Water and Crummock Water, which have always been relatively susceptible to drought conditions.

**How will you keep us updated?** We will keep all stakeholders informed on a regular basis as to our plans and inform people of any decisions as swiftly as possible. We will keep our dedicated website updated for those people with access to the internet. The website at [www.unitedutilities.com/west-cumbria-proposals](http://www.unitedutilities.com/west-cumbria-proposals) provides a wealth of information regarding the West Cumbria water supply scheme. We will also use other media and communication tools to report on progress with the project. We will be holding further consultation events to enable people to find out more information, ask any questions and discuss any concerns.

**Outcomes from other stakeholder meetings**

Additional meetings were mainly arranged at the request of landowners and local businesses to discuss specific issues or concerns, for example access to land and/or impact on income. We had meetings with several landowners who were concerned about impacts on farmland and to discuss the best time of year for work to be carried out. All issues were resolved on site.

We have discussed concerns about impacts on local businesses with several business owners, discussed possible solutions and agreed follow up meetings to resolve the issues.

We met with the Keswick tourism group to discuss the effect that the pipeline construction will have on tourism in the area. There were concerns regarding the closure of the A66 slip road on to Penrith Road and the access to Keswick during this work, particularly during the school holidays. The group were very keen to promote a “Keswick is open for business” message during the construction work period. The use of press, radio and television communications and on-road signage was discussed. It was suggested that the Keswick “Brown Signs Group” are consulted over suggestions for any signage. A further meeting is to be arranged for local businesses in the tourist trade. Further work is underway as part of the detailed design activities to minimise disruption to the local community, tourism and the local economy as far as possible.

We also met with the Forestry Commission. Concerns were expressed about the effect of the construction on three woodland sites: Dodd Wood, Messingmire Wood and Howgill Wood. The primary issues were impact on wildlife (including an osprey nesting site), as well as access for recreation and business purposes. Overall, the Forestry Commission were understanding of the reasons for the scheme. However, there are still some issues to be resolved and further discussions will take place to address them.

**KEY CONCLUSIONS**

Phase two of our consultation activities were generally well received and well attended. The main points raised during the public exhibitions were:

- The need to provide an increased level of detail about the precise pipeline route, water treatment works location, design and construction methods.
- Concerns about the impact of construction on the environment;
- Concerns as to the impact of construction on farmland
- Concerns as to the impact of construction on local businesses
- Concerns about the impact of construction on traffic congestion in the area.

The main points raised during the local council presentations were:

- Ensuring there was sufficient capacity at Thirlmere in the longer term to reliably supply water to West Cumbria
- How the project is being funded and who is paying for it?
- Questions were asked regarding the construction methods for the pipeline and water treatment works
- Concerns were raised about the impact on farmland
- The impact of construction works on the local economy, including the effects it might have on tourism and local businesses
• Concerns at to the impact that construction works will have on traffic congestion
• The opportunities for local employment and the local economy from the construction work.

We have responded to all of the points raised during this second phase of consultation. A detailed comments and response log is attached to this report at Appendix A.

A key response is to provide more detailed information on the specific location of the pipeline route and associated infrastructure, the design of the treatment works and other above ground structures and the construction methods to be used as soon as we have it available. We will also be working hard to minimise the concerns raised about disruption due to the construction work and ensure that the construction does not adversely impact on the environment and farmland.

Next Steps

We are committed to ongoing consultation and dialogue with the local community. We are already organising further opportunities for the public to find out more about our developing plans, to ask questions and provide views and opinions. We will be specifically contacting town and parish councils, local community groups and also seek the views of those who commute through the area on a regular basis.

We are aiming to submit a planning application in early 2016. If planning permission is granted, we would expect to start construction from 2017 onwards. Consultation will continue throughout the whole planning and construction period.

We will continue to keep our dedicated website updated at www.unitedutilities.com/cumbria.

UNITED UTILITIES WATER LIMITED
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Appendix E

Lodore Falls Workshop summary report
West Cumbria Water Supplies Project – Thirlmere Transfer
Stakeholder Engagement Update & Summary of the Stakeholder Meeting at the Lodore Falls Hotel, 21 July 2015

Background to West Cumbria Water Supplies Project

United Utilities is committed to safeguarding water supplies in West Cumbria in a responsible and sustainable manner, ensuring there is sufficient water available for the future for homes and businesses, as well as supporting the local economy. To meet this commitment, we plan to link West Cumbria to our regional water supply network by building a major new twin pipeline from Thirlmere Reservoir to West Cumbria, along with a new water treatment works and associated pumping stations and water storage tanks (known as “service reservoirs”). With careful planning and dialogue with stakeholders and the local community, we will make sure there is minimal long-term environmental impact arising from this new supply link. Our plans will mean we no longer need to take water from environmentally sensitive water sources in West Cumbria, including Ennerdale Water, Crummock Water and Overwater.

Stakeholder Engagement Update

We have planned three key phases of public consultation and engagement in relation to the proposals prior to submitting our planning application for the West Cumbria water supply scheme in early 2016.

**Phase 1** of our consultation programme took place during the spring and summer of 2014. We consulted with local residents, interested parties and other stakeholders using a wide variety of methods to explain the issues affecting water supplies for West Cumbria and to obtain feedback on the proposed options to help guide our decisions for securing future water supplies. From the feedback received, it was clear that there were a wide range of views on the proposal for a pipeline from Thirlmere reservoir, from very supportive to strongly opposed. We worked through all of the views and comments, seeking to address the many issues raised. This feedback helped guide our plans for developing the route that the pipeline should take, as well as a determining the location for the new water treatment works.

**Phase 2** of consultation took place during winter and spring 2015. During this time we held a number of public exhibitions throughout the West Cumbria area, as well as presentations to Parish Councils, with the aim to obtain feedback on the preferred pipeline route and proposed site for the water treatment works.

**Phase 3** commenced at the end of July 2015 and comprises consultation on the detailed scheme designs of our preferred option involving a variety of events and meetings.

**Phase 3 of Consultation: Summary of stakeholder meeting at Lodore Falls Hotel, Borrowdale**

Our first stakeholder meeting of Phase 3 was held at the Lodore Falls Hotel, Borrowdale, Keswick on 21 July. It was held primarily for non-statutory stakeholders with an interest in the scheme, ranging from groups representing environmental interests to tourism and recreation organisations, including:

- Friends of the Lake District
- Forestry Commission
- Butterfly Conservation Cumbria
- Egremont and District Angling Association
- Cockermouth Angling Association
- Derwent Owners Association
- Cumbria Tourism
- Keswick Tourism
- West Cumbria Rivers Trust
- Cumbria County Council
- The National Trust
The latest plans for design of the West Cumbria Water Supplies Project – Thirlmere Transfer were summarised in a short presentation to stakeholders before attendees were split into two groups to attend two workshop sessions in turn, covering:

- landscape, ecology and environment
- access, recreation and tourism.

Detailed maps of the pipeline route were displayed in each of the workshop rooms and were available for stakeholders to mark up any areas of concern and note the details on feedback cards. Stakeholders also had the opportunity to ask any questions and raise any concerns directly with our experts covering environmental topics, civil engineering, planning, recreation, access and tourism. Attendees were encouraged to complete comments cards to record any issues or concerns. These comments have been collated and the key points raised are summarised below. A meeting log setting out all the comments and our responses has also been produced.

**Summary of key stakeholder comments**

**Landscape, ecology and environment**

- Concern about environmental impact on the rivers and becks during the construction phase.
- Concern about potential for temporary disruption to public rights of way during construction phase.
- Concern about the potential for temporary scars on the landscape due to construction machinery.
- Questions raised as to why the freshwater mussels living in the River Ehen cannot be managed better instead of ceasing all water abstraction from Ennerdale Water.
- Concern about temporary disruption to traffic during the construction phase.
- Concern about the visual impact due to loss of trees at some sites where construction is taking place. How can this be mitigated?
- Will there be funding available for local community projects for those communities affected by the scheme?
- How will the loss of habitat due to the scheme construction be minimised, i.e. trees, hedgerows, wildlife?
- What will happen with the existing Water Treatment Works once they are no longer needed?
- Can the detailed plans/maps/survey information regarding the pipeline route be made available to stakeholders?
- What effect will ceasing abstraction from Ennerdale Water have on water levels downstream in the River Ehen?
- Pleased to see that the pipeline route will avoid the breeding colonies of marsh fritillary butterflies at Bassenthwaite Lake.
- Are there are opportunities to restore ecological connectivity and natural systems as a result of the pipeline scheme?
- Are there any opportunities to support land management practices that slow the rate of water runoff into rivers and streams?
- Concern raised about the visual impact around the Keswick area relating to the proposed works compound on the A66.
- There are several beck/stream/ditch crossings throughout the pipeline route - what is the standard methodology for these crossings and what mitigation measures are in place for these?
- It was suggested that the pipeline “corridors” required to pass through woodland should seek to create variability in the corridor, i.e. not all the same graded edge, use open ground 'scallops' and different scrub height to create a varied corridor.
- Some concern raised about field drain intersections - how are these to be accommodated in the design and mitigation as inevitably they will be intersected/damaged?
• What exactly is happening with the Ben Gill River? What is United Utilities, Environment Agency and Natural England doing about making sure the river is not adversely affected by recent works to re-route the river?

**Access, recreation and tourism**

• Is there an opportunity for United Utilities to subsidise a programme of sustainable transport links in the Keswick/Cockermouth area, e.g. cycle routes connecting towns and cycle routes around the lakes?
• Is there funding available to improve rights of way access routes where they have been affected by the pipeline?
• Is there opportunity to create publicly accessible routes that enable public to walk alongside watercourses?
• Is there an opportunity to support the development of a Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) landscape partnership bid - one that might focus on the communities along the coastline of West Cumbria?
• Concern raised regarding the construction of the pipeline crossing of the River Derwent at Papcastle. The river is a key migration/spawning site for salmon and sea trout. As well as the environmental impact, anglers are concerned about potential disruption to fish runs, sediment laden water, etc.
• River crossings generally along the route are an obvious concern to anglers – crossing works should be carried out at a time which causes minimum disruption to the migratory fish life cycle and to angling activity.
• Is United Utilities open to the idea of educating the local community and children regarding water issues and reasons why the pipeline is required, combined with a wider understanding regarding watercourses/flooding issues/management?
• How will progress of the project be communicated to all of the local Parish Councils?
• What are we doing about the abandoned water main from Ennerdale WTW to Summergrove service reservoir? Is it being left in place? If so, is there a risk of collapse of this main at some future point in time?
• Can United Utilities promote that West Cumbria is still open for business during construction, perhaps using signage and by helping to promote positive press coverage.
• Can you provide more details on the decommissioning of the water abstraction facilities at Crummock Water and Overwater, i.e. timescales?
• How will you coordinate and keep communication flowing with National Trust tenants, other tenants and landowners within the catchment areas affected as well as those downstream of water sources.
• Concerns raised about access for Calvert Trust disabled horse riders as circuit horse rides conducted in the area will be affected by the pipeline construction work.

**Conclusion**

A wide range of comments and concerns were raised and discussed at the meeting. Many of these were addressed during the workshop sessions through discussion with the project team. However, some issues will require further meetings with stakeholders and interested parties as the project design continues to be developed. The comments made will be considered as part of the planning application process and associated Environmental Impact Assessment. A response log to the comments made at the workshop is attached to this report (copy of Lodore Falls comments and responses).

The overall feedback from attendees was positive, with attendees pleased to see more details on the scheme being made available and having the opportunity to ask questions directly to the experts involved with developing the scheme.
Appendix F

Blank copy of Phase 3 questionnaire
1. Now we have a preferred route, is there anything else we should be considering in the design of this route?

2. We want to make sure that our proposed water treatment works at Bridekirk is in keeping with the local area. What should we consider in the design of our works? For example, what would you like us to clad it in?

3. Is the level of detail given to you today sufficient at this stage?  
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   If not, what else would you like to know?
4. We have a series of public engagement events planned and have all this information available online. Is there anything else we could do to gather views and opinions on the proposals?  
   If yes what?  
   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. How would you prefer to be contacted about the project as it progresses?

Additional comments

Are you a member of a local group or charity and would like us to come to a meeting and talk about our proposals? Then please fill in your details below and we’ll be in touch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of group/charity:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once completed you can had it in to a member of the team or post it to:

Planning for the Future, United Utilities, Haweswater House, Lingley Mere Business Park, Lingley Green Avenue, Great Sankey, Warrington, WA5 3LP.

Alternatively you can visit unitedutilities.com/west-cumbria and fill in the feedback form online or email: myview@uuplc.co.uk

Thank you