

 the low tax borough	London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham CABINET 11 NOVEMBER 2013
A WATER MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM	
Report of the Leader of the Council - Councillor Nicholas Botterill	
Open Report	
Classification: For Decision) Key Decision: Yes	
Wards Affected: All	
Accountable Executive Director: Nigel Pallace, Director of Transport & Technical Services	
Report Author: (name and title) Tom Conniffe, Principal Policy & Strategy Officer, FCS	Contact Details: Tel: 020 8753 2195 E-mail: tom.conniffe@lbhf.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. In London, our management of water as a resource has become unbalanced. We are failing to address the increasing pressure on this resource nor are we adapting our water management systems to cope with more unpredictable changes in precipitation.
- 1.2. The Water Management Policy for Hammersmith & Fulham (“the policy”) is a first step to ensuring that the authority uses its powers and undertakes its statutory duties to maximise best practice, including within its own assets, to address local, national and European requirements for better and more sustainable water management.
- 1.3. The policy is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. That, subject to available resources, the Council:

- a) implements, where it has yet to do so, the recommendations of the Flooding Scrutiny Task Force report of July 2012 as they relate to water management;
- b) includes the recommendations of this Policy in the ongoing update to the surface water management plan;
- c) develops a highways sustainable drainage policy to set out the context and options available with a cost and delivery time frame;
- d) develops green infrastructure (GI) and sustainable drainage policies (SuDS) in each client department, in order to promote the uptake of GI and SuDS, and considers implementing GI and SuDS in all capital schemes;
- e) requires all capital scheme approvals to consider the implications for flood risk and to assess the costs and benefits of installing sustainable drainage;
- f) undertakes an assessment to determine whether there are any current opportunities for parks and green spaces to include flood risk mitigation measures;
- g) identifies a list of potential integrated water management and sustainable drainage projects for further evaluation and/or implementation across the whole range of Council assets and seeks third-party funding wherever possible to help bring these to fruition;

2.2 It should be recognised, however, that all works will need to be done within existing budgets, where third party funding is not forthcoming. The recommendations within this document, therefore, reflect long term goals for delivering an integrated water management strategy across the borough.

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

3.1. The Water Management Policy for Hammersmith & Fulham is being adopted as a first step to ensuring that the authority uses its powers and undertakes its statutory duties to maximise best practice, including within its own assets, to address local, national and European requirements for better and more sustainable water management.

4. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

4.1. Changes in population, sea levels and weather systems are predicted to continue across the globe and throughout the rest of the century at an ever increasing rate.

4.2. The 2011 Census revealed that the population of England and Wales has increased by 7% in the last ten years, from 52.4m to 56.1m. The

population in Hammersmith and Fulham has increased by 10% over the same period, from 165,500 in 2001 to 182,500 in 2011. The further population increase in Hammersmith and Fulham over the next ten years is expected to be even greater than 10%.

- 4.3. Population increases lead to increasing demands on the finite natural resources that we rely upon for life and good health. An increasing population places ever increasing demand on the infrastructure that we rely upon for the provision of potable water, to maintain sanitation and a healthy society.
- 4.4. In London, as in many other major cities around the world, our management of water as a resource, from the cradle to the grave, has become unbalanced. We are failing to address the increasing pressure that a growing population places upon this resource nor are we adapting our water management systems to cope with more varied and unpredictable changes in precipitation.
- 4.5. In 2012 the wettest April to June on record took place in the UK, with floods throughout the country, and yet a hosepipe ban was in force in the South East at the same time. This anomaly is due to the fact that we lack an integrated water management strategy. During periods of heavy rainfall in London the combined sewerage system can become overloaded with surface water run-off. During dry periods we find we have a water shortage because we haven't retained our surface water.
- 4.6. Several strategies at various levels have already been developed to try and combat the problems of poor water resource management. In March 2009, the Environment Agency published a national water strategy for England and Wales, including a detailed section on water resources management containing specific actions that will, inter alia:
 - ensure water is used efficiently in homes and buildings, and by industry and agriculture;
 - provide greater incentives for water companies and individuals to manage demand;
 - share existing water resources more effectively;
 - further reduce leakage;
 - ensure that reliable options for resource development are considered;
 - allocate water resources more effectively in the future.
- 4.7. In October 2011, the Mayor of London published "Securing London's Water Future", the water management strategy for the capital. Its goal is to improve water management across the spectrum, from drinking water to sewage and floodwater.
- 4.8. In November 2012, the European Commission published a "Blueprint for Europe's Water Resources". In aiming to ensure compliance with the European Union Water Framework Directive (WFD), this strategy places a significant emphasis on moving towards 'green' infrastructure, such as

sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), away from traditional 'grey' infrastructure, such as tunnelling, in managing water resources.

- 4.9. A key responsibility for H&F is the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, including a Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP), which are currently being drafted. The Surface Water Management Plan should therefore be developed with this integrated policy in mind. The Council has already addressed wider issues relating to flooding through the Flooding Scrutiny Task Force, which reported in July 2012.
- 4.10. Hammersmith and Fulham's Water Management Policy is a first step, therefore, to ensuring that the authority uses its powers and undertakes its statutory duties to maximise best practice in every sphere, including within its own substantial assets to address local, national and European requirements for better and more sustainable water management.

5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

- 5.1. Water management issues need to be viewed from a holistic perspective in order to deliver sustainable solutions. Many of the problems that we have with water management in London today are because hitherto inter-related issues have only been addressed in isolation from one another with no authority able to take a holistic approach. We have built drains that run into the sewerage system either for treatment or, in times of heavy runoff, before discharging directly into the River Thames. Where we have had water supply problems we have built reservoirs and pumped water in from elsewhere. Sustainable drainage systems or Green Infrastructure (GI) offer more holistic and sustainable solutions to our water management problems in a 21st century urban environment.
- 5.2. Thames Water's plan to build the Thames Tideway Tunnel is far from a holistic solution to our water management problems in London. At a current projected cost of £4.2bn it will only partially address the problem of sewage overflow in the Thames. It will do nothing to alleviate flooding, which is a real problem in riparian boroughs, nor will it do anything to address spring and summer water shortages.
- 5.3. In more ecologically enlightened cities and regions, such as Philadelphia, Chicago, Portland, Milwaukee, Malmo and the North Rhine-Westphalia region of Germany, no one is looking at grey infrastructure storage solutions in isolation anymore. There is a clear consensus amongst progressive governments, mayors and municipalities that GI and SuDS are the way forward. We need to redirect surface water run-off from the sewerage system and return it to the natural ecosystem or store it for use in times of drought. Sustainable drainage measures such as green roofs, permeable paving, rain gardens, rainwater harvesting and rills and swales offer a holistic solution to our water management problems.
- 5.4. The fragmented nature of London government presents problems in delivering an integrated city-wide water management strategy that all-powerful mayoralities, such as those that exist in US cities, do not face.

What is needed in London is the appointment of a Water Commissioner with sufficient powers to oversee the implementation of SuDS and GI. In the absence of any such appointment, however, we need all areas of London government to do their bit in delivering an integrated solution. This policy sets out Hammersmith & Fulham Council's commitment to use our statutory and regulatory powers to direct and influence all infrastructure within the borough to utilise and adopt GI and SuDS and to encourage other authorities to take a similar stance.

6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 6.1. The water management policy contains long term goals for delivering integrated water management across the borough. In doing so, it brings together policies and actions from other sources, including the Flooding Scrutiny Task Force and the Surface Water Management Plan. As such, no options appraisal is included here.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1. The key objective, of expanding sustainable drainage systems and green infrastructure across the borough, is included in the current public consultation on the Sustainable Community Strategy 2014-22. This consultation runs until mid-December. Key partners have already been consulted on its inclusion.
- 7.2. Owing to its long-term, aspirational and largely internal-facing nature, the water management policy has not been subject to wider consultation.

8. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. The legal implications are contained in the body of the report.
- 9.2. Implications verified by: Tasnim Shawkat, Director of Law, 020 8753 2700.

10. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1. It is too early at this stage to cost out the full programme, however as more detailed work plans and projects are identified they will be fully costed and the finance resource – which is likely to come from existing budgets – will be identified.
- 10.2. Implications completed by: Gary Hannaway, Director of Finance and Resources (TTS), 020 8753 6071.

11. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 11.1. The report proposals and linked policies contribute directly to the management of the built and natural environment risks. These risks and the responsibility for their management extend into the client departments whom should consider developing sustainable drainage policies as integral to capital schemes. Where areas are at risk these should be measured, identified and treated within appropriate and suitable flood risk management strategy. Natural environmental weather related risks are considered within the Bi-borough Enterprise Wide Risk Register, risk number 2 Customer and client needs and expectations. Consideration will be given to a new risk entry to the register on this specific area. This will provide greater clarity to the Executive and Members on the effect of the mitigations developed to counter this risk.
- 11.2. Implications completed by: Michael Sloniowski, Bi-borough Risk Manager, 020 8753 2587.

12. PROCUREMENT AND IT STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1. None at this stage.
- 12.2. Implications verified by: Robert Hillman, Procurement Consultant, 020 8753 1538.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT**

No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
	None		

LIST OF APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: A Water Management Policy for Hammersmith & Fulham

A Water Management Policy for Hammersmith & Fulham

1. Why We Need a Water Management Policy

- 1.1 In the 21st century we are seeing global population increases at an unprecedented rate. We are also seeing the impact of climate change in melting ice caps, rising sea levels and the increasing frequency of extreme weather events. These changes in population, sea levels and weather systems are predicted to continue across the globe and throughout the rest of the century at an ever increasing rate.
- 1.2 The 2011 Census revealed that the population of England and Wales has increased by 7% in the last ten years, from 52.4m to 56.1m. The population in Hammersmith and Fulham has increased by 10% over the same period, from 165,500 in 2001 to 182,500 in 2011. The further population increase in Hammersmith and Fulham over the next ten years is expected to be even greater than 10%, with over 20,000 new homes planned for the north of the borough.
- 1.3 Population increases lead to increasing demands on the finite natural resources that we rely upon for life and good health. The most important of these resources, of course, is water. In urban areas an increasing population also places ever increasing demand on the infrastructure that we rely upon for the provision of potable water, to maintain sanitation and a healthy society. Water is, again, the key resource in sanitation systems.
- 1.4 In London, as in many other major cities around the world, our management of water as a resource, from the cradle to the grave, has become unbalanced. We are failing to address the increasing pressure that a growing population places upon this resource nor are we adapting our water management systems to cope with more varied and unpredictable changes in precipitation.
- 1.5 Most major urban centres in the Western world developed around major river systems. Problems of public health were managed through improved water supply and effective disposal of sewage and waste water. In London this was championed by the Victorian engineer, Joseph Bazalgette, in designing combined sewerage and water drainage systems around those river systems. Today those major cities have much greater populations and have expanded into sprawling metropolises, concreting over much of their green spaces. This has resulted in the need for new thinking in water and sewage management to avoid the overloading of combined sewerage and

surface water drainage systems and the waste of valuable fresh rain water.

- 1.6 In 2012 the wettest April to June on record took place in the UK, with floods throughout the country, and yet a hosepipe ban was in force in the South East at the same time. This anomaly is due to the fact that we lack an integrated water management strategy. During periods of heavy rainfall in London the combined sewerage system can become overloaded with surface water run-off, which can result in overflows of raw sewage into the River Thames. During dry periods we find we have a water shortage because we haven't retained our surface water.
- 1.7 Several strategies at various levels have already been developed to try and combat the problems of poor water resource management. In March 2009, the Environment Agency published a national water strategy for England and Wales, including a detailed section on water resources management containing specific actions that will, inter alia:
 - ensure water is used efficiently in homes and buildings, and by industry and agriculture;
 - provide greater incentives for water companies and individuals to manage demand;
 - share existing water resources more effectively;
 - further reduce leakage;
 - ensure that reliable options for resource development are considered;
 - allocate water resources more effectively in the future.
- 1.8 In October 2011, the Mayor of London published "Securing London's Water Future", the water management strategy for the capital. Its goal is to improve water management across the spectrum, from drinking water to sewage and floodwater.
- 1.9 In November 2012, the European Commission published a "Blueprint for Europe's Water Resources". In aiming to ensure compliance with the European Union Water Framework Directive (WFD), this strategy places a significant emphasis on moving towards 'green' infrastructure, such as sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), away from traditional 'grey' infrastructure, such as tunnelling, in managing water resources.
- 1.10 Hammersmith and Fulham's Water Management Policy is a first step, therefore, to ensuring that the authority uses its powers and undertakes its statutory duties to maximise best practice in every sphere, including within its own substantial assets to address local, national and European requirements for better and more sustainable water management.

2. What a Water Management Policy Needs to Deliver

- 2.1 Water management issues need to be viewed from a holistic perspective in order to deliver sustainable solutions. Many of the

problems that we have with water management in London today are because hitherto inter-related issues have only been addressed in isolation from one another with no authority able to take a holistic approach. Where we have had drainage problems we have built drains that run into the sewerage system either for treatment or, in times of heavy runoff, before discharging directly into the River Thames. Where we have had water supply problems we have built reservoirs and pumped water in from elsewhere. Sustainable drainage systems or Green Infrastructure (GI) offer more holistic and sustainable solutions to our water management problems in a 21st century urban environment.

- 2.2 Thames Water's plan to build the Thames Tideway Tunnel is far from a holistic solution to our water management problems in London. At a current projected cost of £4.2bn it will only partially address the problem of sewage overflow in the Thames. It will do nothing to alleviate flooding, which is a real problem in riparian boroughs, nor will it do anything to address spring and summer water shortages – surface water run-off, combined with raw sewage, will be stored in a 'super sewer' 70 metres below ground.
- 2.3 In more ecologically enlightened cities and regions, such as Philadelphia, Chicago, Portland, Milwaukee, Malmö and the North Rhine-Westphalia region of Germany, no one is looking at grey infrastructure storage solutions in isolation anymore. There is a clear consensus amongst progressive governments, mayors and municipalities that GI and SuDS are the way forward. We need to redirect surface water run-off from the sewerage system and return it to the natural ecosystem or store it for use in times of drought. Sustainable drainage measures such as green roofs, permeable paving, rain gardens, rainwater harvesting and rills and swales offer a holistic solution to our water management problems.
- 2.4 The fragmented nature of London government presents problems in delivering an integrated city-wide water management strategy that all-powerful mayoralities, such as those that exist in US cities, do not face. What is needed in London is the appointment of a Water Commissioner with sufficient powers to oversee the implementation of SuDS and GI. In the absence of any such appointment, however, we need all areas of London government to do their bit in delivering an integrated solution. This policy sets out Hammersmith & Fulham Council's commitment to use our statutory and regulatory powers to direct and influence all infrastructure within the borough to utilise and adopt GI and SuDS and to encourage other authorities to take a similar stance.

Recommendations:

- In order to promote the uptake of green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems, all Council client departments should develop GI and SuDS policies and consider implementing GI and SuDS in all

capital schemes. Funding may be available through the flooding budget to cover feasibility assessments for schemes.

- All capital scheme approvals should consider the implications for flood risk and assess the costs and benefits of installing sustainable drainage.

3. Flood Risk Management

3.1 The Council as a Lead Local Flood Authority has the responsibility to improve flood risk management by planning for and reducing (or mitigating) the impact of flood events. Flood risk, in this context, is defined as flood risk originating from surface runoff, groundwater and ordinary watercourses. Tidal and flood risk from 'main rivers', namely the River Thames, is not the responsibility of the LLFA but of the Environment Agency (EA). The LLFA responsibilities do not include flooding from sewers unless this is wholly or partly caused by rainwater or other precipitation entering or otherwise affecting the system, or from water supply systems (for example burst water mains).

3.2 The Council as a Lead Local Flood Authority is responsible for:

- Managing flood risk in a co-ordinated way and creating effective partnerships with adjacent LLFAs and other key stakeholders such as Thames Water (TW)*, Environment Agency (EA), TfL;
- Investigating flood events in the borough;
- Developing and maintaining a public register of Flood Risk Management Assets;
- Approving, maintaining and adopting sustainable drainage systems through the SuDS Approval Body. The SuDS Approval Bodies have not yet been set up as enabling legislation is awaited.

** TW may wish to deliver, either on its own or in partnership with the Council, sustainable surface drainage in order to reduce the impact of surface runoff entering critical sewers that are at capacity or where sewer flooding occurs, particularly in properties with basements. This is different to where the Council may wish to target schemes which are likely to be in areas where there is a risk of surface water flooding.*

3.3 A key responsibility for H&F is the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, including a Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP), which are currently being drafted. The Surface Water Management Plan should therefore be developed with this integrated policy in mind. The Council has already addressed wider issues relating to flooding through the Flooding Scrutiny Task Force, which reported in July 2012.

Recommendations:

- Subject to available resources, the Council should implement, where it has yet to do so, the recommendations of the Flooding Scrutiny Task Force report as they relate to water management;
- The Council should include the recommendations of this policy in the ongoing update to the surface water management plan.

4. New Development

- 4.1 The Mayor's London Plan and H&F planning policies aim to reduce water use and the risk of flooding in new developments. Policies promote sustainable drainage and the use of rainwater harvesting and using dual potable and grey water recycling systems where they are energy efficient and cost-effective.

5. Housing

- 5.1 Housing estates in the Council's ownership offer scope for SuDS works. There are numerous flat-roofed buildings with the potential for green roof technologies as well as extensive areas of impermeable hard landscaping, which may be replaced with permeable alternatives. Sheltered housing schemes may also offer opportunities for rain water harvesting and potential soakaway alternatives to the rainwater sewer connections. However, it should be noted that larger schemes will come with a high capital cost for which there is usually no budgetary provision. Notwithstanding, SuDS should be considered wherever possible when implementing capital schemes. Consideration should also be given to the role that local communities can have with the upkeep of SuDS projects, such as encouraging local gardening groups to take a proactive approach to maintenance of green areas.

6. Schools

- 6.1 Average annual water consumption per pupil per year in secondary schools without swimming pools is around 4,400 litres, which could be reduced to 2,600 litres per pupil per year with careful water management coupled with an education programme¹. The 2012-14 Water for Schools retrofit programme (see 6.3) is aiming for an average £1,600 saving per participating school. The programme pilot cost £122,000 to cover four schools.

- 6.2 Cost savings can be made by:

- Reducing water use by the specification of water efficient technologies at the design stage, e.g. for toilet flushing and urinals;
- Good ongoing water management including monitoring of water use to help target areas where cost savings can be made;
- Sub-metering certain specific water uses within schools such as garden watering, to provide evidence to claim reductions in sewerage charges from the water companies;
- Sustainable drainage systems, which may be cheaper to build than traditional drainage and easier to maintain by on-site staff;
- Efficient plumbing design which can reduce heating costs;

¹ Figures provided by ech2o, the delivery consultancy for Cambridge school's rainwater harvesting system (see 6.3)

- Other sustainable drainage systems may also include swales, rain gardens, reed beds, green walls, green roofs and/or other water friendly garden and landscape features.

It should be noted that larger schemes that utilise these technologies will come with a high capital cost for which there is usually no budgetary provision. Notwithstanding, SuDS should be considered wherever possible when implementing capital schemes.

- 6.3 The Council participated in Phase 1 of the 'Water in Schools' project, run and funded by the Greater London Authority (GLA) and made up of a partnership consisting of the GLA, Thames Water, the Environment Agency and the London Sustainable Schools Forum. The aim is to deliver a water retrofit programme in all London schools by undertaking water audits, repair work to leakages, distribution of free water efficiency devices, and an educational programme to raise awareness of water efficiency; highlight sustainable water solutions; and promote pathways into pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship opportunities in the water and Green sectors. In phase one (March 2012) of this project, Cambridge School was chosen to take part and a rainwater harvesting system was retrofitted followed by a whole day of workshops to raise awareness in the school on the subject of water efficiency and water management in school and at home. More info and the case study are at:
http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Environment_and_Planning/Carbon_education/Green_schools/176755_School_case_studies.asp.

7. Public Buildings

- 7.1. The Council is concerned about the amount of localised flooding incidents which have occurred in the past in the borough and would like to set an example to residents and business and, thereby, also reduce the strain on the combined sewers in the area.
- 7.2. Retrofitting rainwater harvesting in council buildings and collecting rainwater to be used back in the buildings will not only reduce the strain on the combined sewer system and, therefore, reduce localised flooding incidents, but will also reduce the demand for mains water and reduce water consumption and utility costs associated with water usage.
- 7.3. Hammersmith Town Hall was chosen as a possible site for a pilot project to retrofit a rain water harvesting system. When benchmarked for water usage the Town Hall was found to be 5 times higher in water usage compared to an average office where typical consumption is 7m³ per person per year. A rainwater harvesting system for the Town Hall can potentially yield between 95-288m³ of rainwater in a year, thus reducing the same amount of mains water required. The pilot project is currently on hold due to possible re-development of the town hall, however, water management and minimisation, as well as low energy design, have all been included as part of the future re-development.

- 7.4. The Council is also looking at other projects for water minimisation and management which include working with Thames Water to fit automatic meter reading for water meters to better understand consumption patterns in water usage and identify other potential projects for reducing water usage and costs.

Recommendation:

- The Council should identify a list of potential integrated water management and sustainable drainage projects for further evaluation and/or implementation across the whole range of Council assets and seek third-party funding wherever possible to help bring these to fruition.

8. Parks and green spaces

- 8.1 Parks can also play a positive role in water management. Green spaces can be better utilised to attenuate surface water. This should be integrated where possible into any parks developments such as play areas.

Recommendation:

- The Council should undertake an assessment to determine whether there are any current opportunities for parks and green spaces to include flood risk mitigation measures.

9. Highways

- 9.1 Road and footways are impermeable and in a dense urban environment, such as Hammersmith and Fulham, represent a significant proportion of the borough's total impermeable area. The implication of any impermeable area is that it is a barrier to the natural flow-path of rainwater into the watercourses. At present virtually all the rain falling onto the road and footway surfaces, which does not evaporate, flows into the highway drains and the combined sewerage system.

- 9.2 The impact of heavy rainfall on our road network will give rise to an increased risk of flooding on the ground as well as risks of sewer flooding, particularly in basements below ground. There are a range of potential solutions but each site will have to be assessed on its relative importance and the local circumstances. Any designs must be assessed on a cost/benefit basis, bearing in mind any impact on the streetscape, traffic and loss of valuable road space. A highways sustainable drainage policy needs to be developed to set out the context and options available with a cost and delivery time frame.

- 9.3 It should be noted that virtually 100% of all road maintenance in the borough is surface renewal treatments only and any measure to develop permeable solutions, storage or attenuation measures come

with an additional high capital cost and hence could not be accommodated within existing budgets.

- 9.4 The effectiveness of any permeable paving proposals are not currently known because of a lack of detail on ground permeability, although other measures could be considered.

Recommendation:

- The Council should develop a highways sustainable drainage policy to set out the context and options available with a cost and delivery time frame.

10. Summary of Recommendations

- 10.1 In conclusion it is recommended that the Council:

- implements, where it has yet to do so, the recommendations of the Flooding Scrutiny Task Force report of July 2012 as they relate to water management;
- includes the recommendations of this policy in the ongoing update to the surface water management plan;
- develops a highways sustainable drainage policy to set out the context and options available with a cost and delivery time frame;
- develops green infrastructure and sustainable drainage policies in each client department, in order to promote the uptake of GI and SuDS, and considers implementing GI and SuDS in all capital schemes;
- requires all capital scheme approvals to consider the implications for flood risk and to assess the costs and benefits of installing sustainable drainage;
- undertakes an assessment to determine whether there are any current opportunities for parks and green spaces to include flood risk mitigation measures;
- identifies a list of potential integrated water management and sustainable drainage projects for further evaluation and/or implementation across the whole range of Council assets and seeks third-party funding wherever possible to help bring these to fruition.

- 10.2 It should be recognised, however, that all works will need to be done within existing budgets, where third party funding is not forthcoming. The recommendations within this document, therefore, reflect long term goals for delivering an integrated water management strategy across the borough.