



**sharing knowledge**  
**building best practice**

---

# RP664: Model agreements for sustainable water management systems

## Consultation

---

### Introduction

One of the biggest barriers to the widespread uptake of both sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and rainwater/greywater use systems is the question of eventual ownership of the systems and, in particular, who will maintain and repair them. This project will develop model operation and maintenance agreements for SUDS and rainwater/greywater use systems. It will also provide simple guidance for developers, building operators and practitioners on how these systems can be incorporated into developments.

Consultation with key stakeholders involved with implementing sustainable water management systems (SUDS and rainwater/greywater use systems) will be vital in developing a widely applicable and acceptable approach to the development of model agreements for sustainable water management systems.

The consultation process included the circulation of questionnaires, individual discussions and a consultation workshop. Around forty individuals provided input into the individual consultation, either through questionnaires or discussions over the phone or face to face. In addition to this the facilitated workshop was attended by 26 delegates. The consultation initially involved the identification of relevant consultees, the development of pertinent questions and the identification of the most convenient method of consultation. Those consulted include Local Authorities, Regulators, Water Companies, practitioners, consultants and end users. The full list of consultees can be found at the end of this report.

The consultation process was designed to canvass the opinions of stakeholders that have a role in contributing to sustainable water management to determine how model agreements can be implemented, what should be included in model agreements and what scenarios are they likely to be used. The specific objectives of the consultation include.

- Identify and clarify stakeholders' roles and responsibilities.
- Identify stakeholders' requirements for model agreements (including particular issues that should be covered within them).
- Ascertain scenarios where the use of model agreements can contribute to the incorporation of sustainable water management systems in developments.
- Identify case studies relevant to the development of model agreements.

The questions asked during the individual consultation and the workshop were included to meet these objectives and provide an indication of what the potential target audience require from the project outputs. The core questions asked during the consultation exercise were:

- What are the drivers for incorporating sustainable water management systems?
- What are the solutions to improving the implementation of sustainable water management systems?
- What is the role of model agreements?
- What are the requirements for model agreements?
- What are the potential scenarios where model agreements can be implemented?

## Drivers for incorporating sustainable water management systems

*This was asked to determine the most important drivers for incorporating sustainable water management systems. The information gleaned from the consultation supports the findings of other exercises undertaken by other organisations and provides useful background information.*

**Climate change** – There is growing evidence that our climate is warming. Climate change will potentially affect both the demand for water and its availability within the environment. It is likely that household water use may increase as a result of hotter summers and climate change will also alter groundwater and river flow regimes. Sustainable water management systems can help reduce the impacts of climate change, rainwater and greywater use systems can contribute to the efficient use of resources whilst sustainable drainage and the retention of surface water can facilitate groundwater recharge.

**Demographic changes** – Government projections show an increase of around 3.3 million households in England and Wales between 1996 and 2016, this is mainly driven by the trend towards smaller household size. Smaller households use more water per person in relation to larger households as opportunities for economies of scale are reduced.

**Reducing surface runoff and diffuse pollution** – rainwater reuse systems and sustainable drainage systems can facilitate the attenuation and storage of surface water runoff and potentially reduce the flood risk within a development area. Rainwater reuse systems and sustainable drainage are regarded as preventative systems, controlling both water quantity and water quality at, or close to, the source.

**Potential to save costs** – Sustainable water management systems designed to reduce and control surface runoff means there may be a reduced need to supplement and increase existing infrastructure to cope with increased flows. They should also reduce the need to upgrade sewage treatment works to treat increased flows as a result of surface water runoff.

**Water sustainability** – Sustainable drainage systems are, in most cases, an improvement over conventional and traditional drainage solutions as they generally consider a wider range of social, economic and environmental factors. The incorporation of sustainable water management systems can also contribute to the environmental image of a development and to developers by demonstrating an awareness and commitment to the environment.

Rainwater and greywater use has the potential to reduce a household's demand for water by around a third (if used to supply water for toilet flushing), reliable systems can therefore save water and save money. The widespread appropriate use of these types of systems could help reduce the need for additional water abstractions.

**Planning requirements** – With the introduction of *PPG 25 – Development and flood risk*, and the amendments to Part H of the Building Regulations many development plans and planning applications are encouraging or requesting the wider use of SUDS to provide the associated environmental benefits.

## Solutions to improving the implementation of sustainable water management systems

*This was asked to determine the potential contribution that model agreements could make to the further incorporation of sustainable water management within developments.*

### Increased commitment to sustainability

The contribution that sustainable water management systems can make to overall sustainability could be promoted to planners, engineers and developers. This will help encourage the incorporation of rainwater and greywater use systems and SUDS in new developments.

Incentives and regulation need to be implemented, some developers will not incorporate measures like SUDS unless they have to. Local Authorities need to be proactive in stipulating the inclusion of SUDS in developments as consistent with EA National Policy.

### Clarification of responsibilities

Many stakeholders believe that the clarification and definition of responsibilities will help encourage the incorporation of SUDS within developments. This definition of roles can possibly be best achieved by introducing legislation that imposes a responsibility on the sewerage undertaker (as part of their drainage system) or Local Authorities (as part of Public Open Space) to adopt and maintain SUDS.

Alternatively, Ofwat and the water companies believe that SUDS may be facilitated by the categorisation of SUDS as Sewers. This may allow SUDS to be adopted (or built) as sewerage assets and maintenance will be

relatively straightforward under established price setting mechanisms. This approach will solve most of the problems but other types of agreements may be required to meet the needs of specific scenarios (in a similar way to the private management of septic tanks etc).

### **Economic analysis**

More research into whole life costs and costing comparisons should be undertaken and the results should be disseminated. The subsequent transparency in costs may assist the promotion of economic benefits of Sustainable Water Management Systems, particularly SUDS.

### **Harmonisation between planning and technical considerations**

The design team should proactively consult at the initial design/planning stages to ensure that the design of the sustainable water management systems evolves reflecting possible site constraints and feedback from the relevant stakeholders.

### **Detailed design guidance**

Clear design, installation and performance guidance as well as guidance on future maintenance implications for sustainable water management systems needs to be widely disseminated. A logbook with maintenance requirements could be included with rainwater and greywater use systems. Guidance on design standards for SUDS could also be part of statutory regulations.

### **Role of model agreements**

*This question was included to provide the project team with an idea of the requirements and expectations of the project and associated outputs from the intended target audience.*

### **Standardisation**

Model agreements should clearly identify the rights and responsibilities of stakeholders and the creation of a level playing field by establishing a common basis for the long-term maintenance of systems. This could help to eliminate the need for each organisation to produce their own, often differing, list of requirements for the long term management of systems.

### **Reduction of costs and risks**

Model agreements for sustainable water management systems should reduce the need for discussion, liaison and potentially lengthy negotiations. Model agreements will therefore help ensure resources are used efficiently and that the risks associated with long term performance and operation of sustainable water management systems are negated.

### **Promotion of good practice**

The incorporation of sustainable water management systems will be encouraged if the issues of design, performance requirements, cost and operation and management issues are clearly addressed within model agreements, so that stakeholders understand and agree their obligations. This will enable service providers deliver a good level of customer care for those that use and benefit from Sustainable Water Management Systems.

Model agreements should provide a consistent framework for professionals to work within. They should provide increased security about planning, designing and constructing sustainable water management systems in the knowledge that they will be adopted and maintained in the long term by a competent organisation working within a standardised framework. In this context, the model agreement will also allow regulators and other interested parties to check that the sustainable water management system is functioning as designed.

### **Requirements for model agreements**

*This was asked to ascertain what should be included within the model agreements and what ideally should be in place in order to facilitate the effective use of model agreements for sustainable water management systems.*

The requirements for applicable and practical model agreements were discussed at the Consultation Workshop. Stakeholder groups were asked to identify their key requirements for the development of model agreements. These groups were End Users, the Construction Industry, Regulators and Water Companies. These were then grouped into five strategic themes. A summary of the main findings presented by each group is provided in Table 1.

The requirements suggested by the different stakeholders were often interrelated and there was considerable overlap of the requirements for model agreements between groups. All of the stakeholders focussed on the need for clarity in the model agreements by identifying the stakeholders and clearly defining their obligations with regard to the long term maintenance and operation of sustainable water management systems. Many of the

stakeholders also agreed for the inclusion of a maintenance schedule, outlining the type, level and frequency of maintenance required for the specific sustainable water management system. Another common requirement was that payment schedules or mechanisms should be included to provide advice on how the costs should be calculated.

The main findings from the workshop were consistent with the feedback received from consultees obtained during the independent consultation exercise when they were asked about ‘what should be included within the model agreements?’.

Consultation was also specifically sought with people and organisations that have utilised or worked with rainwater and greywater use systems. Specific requirements for model agreements for rainwater and greywater use systems include:

- The possible specification of a water recycling target
- Specification of water quality parameters
- Ensure that the system is properly designed, installed and commissioned
- Guarantee long term maintenance and supervision with periodic monitoring
- Guidance for end users to ensure that they are aware of issues that could impact the reliable and safe operation of systems
- The provision of a logbook or operating records to be inspected by relevant stakeholders when required
- Inclusion of an annual service, which would include cleaning the filter(s) used within systems.

**Table 1: Summary of findings from Consultation Workshop on requirements for model agreements**

	<b>End users</b>	<b>Construction industry</b>
Design issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must provide publicly and politically acceptable solutions</li> <li>• All issues or results of consultation must be included in the development brief</li> <li>• Reliability and performance of systems link to maintenance</li> <li>• Competent design and quality assurance should be included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifications and standards need to be included and, if possible, move towards a SUDS for Adoption document</li> <li>• How to ensure that systems are well designed and constructed/installed. A method of accreditation needs to be introduced</li> </ul> <p><i>Other issues for consideration:</i> What are the required levels of performance? Who will inspect them?</p>
Legal/statutory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Model agreements should enable SUDS to be implemented where ‘adoption’ might not be possible</li> <li>• Issues must be dealt with proactively to inform the design brief</li> <li>• Need to define and accept what is best practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will be included and what duties/obligations will they have?</li> </ul> <p><i>Other issues for consideration:</i> timescale, health and safety. Who does the land revert to should the agreement end? Payment schedule, Insurance (professional indemnity or site insurance?)</p>
Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanisms must enable the implementation of sustainable development</li> <li>• Who should take on these opportunities (not problems!)?</li> <li>• What actions should be included in maintenance schedules and how can this be included in standards of care and a monitoring regime? This can be included in a specification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the frequency and level of maintenance that should be included in the schedule?</li> <li>• Who should undertake the inspection?</li> </ul> <p><i>Other issues for consideration:</i> How can system failure be identified? What procedures do you need for reporting defects?</p>
Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must provide incentives for long term sustainability</li> <li>• Costs (and best value) should be defined in terms of whole life costs</li> <li>• How can opportunity costs, externalities (holistic objectives) be included?</li> <li>• Trade offs between responsibilities/payments/risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How should future maintenance costs be calculated?</li> <li>• What variables should be included in the formula?</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to ensure that wider objectives and benefits are appreciated</li> <li>• Need to ensure that social inclusion is included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to establish a timescale for setting up agreements.</li> </ul> <p><i>Other issues for consideration:</i> How do you ensure defects are corrected and maintenance is carried out as required pre handover? What supporting paperwork do you require from the designer? How do you get householders to take on responsibility?</p>

	<b>Regulators</b>	<b>Water Companies</b>
Design issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best practice design included needs to be flexible and maximise all benefits. This should include accreditation and performance testing</li> <li>• The issue of developer densities and the trade off between PPG25 and PPG3 needs to be addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National design guidance needs to facilitate the development of dependable assets</li> <li>• What water quality standards should be designed to for rainwater and greywater use systems?</li> <li>• Sustainable water management systems should be designed to minimise the need for maintenance</li> </ul>
Legal/statutory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to clearly identify roles and responsibilities, ie who pays, approves, adopts and maintains (agreed by group as being fundamental)</li> <li>• Need to include agreed definitions, eg SUDS, maintenance, are SUDS sewers?</li> <li>• Should water quality standards be introduced for re-use systems?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risks for stakeholders need to be clearly identified and allocated.</li> <li>• What happens if maintenance company or other organisations become insolvent?</li> <li>• How will the obligations in the agreements be enforced, who will collect fees?</li> <li>• What WQ parameters should be included?</li> <li>• Who takes responsibility for clear-up after pollution incidents?</li> </ul>
Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to provide guidance on maintenance, including information on levels and frequency of maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to ascertain the maintenance requirements and the impact this may have on OPEX</li> <li>• Need to clearly define the boundary of responsibilities for maintenance</li> </ul>
Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What payment mechanisms should be included?</li> <li>• Environmental benefits should be included, what cost benefit model should be used</li> <li>• Need to identify who benefits from systems and who should pay. Recipients need to realise they're benefiting. The benefits are shared, should the cost be shared also?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What mechanisms would be included, deposit, bond, insurance etc?</li> <li>• How can costs be calculated for (bond, insurance, inspection)?</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big challenge will be to motivate all the parties to work to the model agreement</li> <li>• What scale should the agreement be on, local or catchment size?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be any difference in the model agreements for different types of land ownership, ie private and public?</li> <li>• How can health and safety considerations be included?</li> <li>• The guidance should ensure that international experiences are included and that we should communicate with builders</li> </ul>

## Scenarios of the use of model agreements

*Consultees and workshop participants were asked to suggest scenarios where they believe model agreement could be applied. This was asked to ascertain situations or scenarios where the target audience thought model agreements could help contribute to sustainable water management.*

Many of the consultees believed that the model agreements would be useful in circumstances where elements of SUDS are not within the curtilage of houses and thus do not fall to the house-owners to maintain. They would also be useful for dealing with residential developments, where it would not be reasonable to leave maintenance to a large number of private householders or where there is general ambiguity about responsibilities. The model agreement should be flexible enough to cope with a variety of scenarios, but should be capable of being modified for certain situations.

There was also general consensus that different model agreements need to be developed to cover SUDS applications and rainwater or greywater use systems. There could also potentially be variations based on new developments and retrofit scenarios. Scenarios would also vary according to the type of property, land use or ownership, ie residential/commercial and public/private.

During the workshop, participants discussed the stakeholders or parties that were likely to be included in the model agreements. These are summarised below in Table 2:

**Table 2: Stakeholders**

Stakeholder/parties	Organisations
User	Tenants, owner occupiers, public and private organisations
Owner	Householders, large commercial landlord, Local Authority, Highway authority, developers, private landlord. public organisation
Service provider	PFI operators, independent contractors/service providers, Local Authorities, Water Companies, property management company or the owner themselves
Other legal roles	Local Authority, (Local Planning Authority, Local Land Drainage Authority and Local Highway Authority), Internal Drainage Board, Water Company, Environment Agency, technology provider

During the workshop, consultees were split into groups and were asked to concentrate on scenarios where they thought model agreements could be implemented. Between the groups there was some duplication of scenarios.

Some common issues discussed were the need for incentives or enforceability of model agreements and monitoring to ensure that the stakeholders are competently performing their duties as stated in the agreements. Some of the scenarios may require a change in legislation.

Scenario suggestions include:

**Adoption by Local Authority/Council** – The developer constructs/installs the system, gives schedules (maintenance) and a commuted sum, hands over the system to the LA who then takes responsibility for maintenance but they contract out the maintenance work.

**Set up separate responsible organisation** – The developer constructs/installs the system and provides schedules along with the provision of a commuted sum or covenant in the title (service charge). The responsible organisation could set initial design and construction standards and then take on the responsibility for maintaining the system either directly or through sub contracting the work. *This was identified as being aspirational as no organisation currently has this remit or the resources to take this on.*

**Adoption by a sewerage undertaker** – The developer constructs the SUDS system but in a similar way to S104 (Water Industry Act) as in Sewers for Adoption there is an initial payment and an ongoing fee to manage the asset. *However, this would probably require legislative changes.*

**Adoption by an independent management company** – Similar to the scenario with the Local Authority but requires a contingency plan should the agreement end (if the management company becomes insolvent) and the stakeholders need to ensure that the maintenance is undertaken. Funding would be via a plot covenant fee.

Agreements of this kind could potentially be between an individual owner and maintenance provider or a group of people formed from a mixed occupation (industrial estate) or multi-occupancy (residents association) where

the group would share the cost of the maintenance contractor. It was thought that this process could work well for small SUDS sites or rainwater and greywater use systems. Residents/tenants associations may also require agreements between individuals.

The Beddington Zero Energy Development (BEDZed) project in Sutton is a good example of a multi-occupancy scenario where a communal water recycling system has been incorporated and there's an agreement between the developer, management company and the residents.

**Housing Association properties** – SUDS and rainwater and greywater use systems are normally included within existing maintenance agreements, eg SUDS maintenance is incorporated within existing requirements for landscaping. There may be issues in the future with Right to Buy.

**Adoption of public open space** – This would require the creation of a consortium potentially between the developer and the Local Authority. This approach has been used in the DEX Project in Dunfermline, Scotland. Problems may arise with the calculation of the commuted sum.

**Adoption by a management company that is a subsidiary of the developer** – Similar to the independent management company but would need to include a restriction on claw-back if ownership of the land occupied by the SUDS is retained by the developer.

**Adoption by NGO/Charity/trust** – Organisation takes on ownership of the system funded by lump sum or subscription, likely to be site specific and the system would need to be linked to the remit of the organisation involved.

**National framework agreements** – Above ground systems can be adopted by the LA; below ground adopted by the sewerage undertaker. Payment can be by commuted sums and ongoing payments. *It was suggested that this approach will be taken forward as there have been problems where this has been undertaken before and it is not regarded by practitioners as being holistic.*

**Adoption by Highway Authority** – This agreement would be between the developer and the Highway Authority. This is thought to be problematic.

There was general consensus that the easiest solution or scenario would be the adoption of sustainable water management systems by a statutory organisation, possibly a Local Authority or Water Company. Following from this a model agreement between tenants or property owners and a management company was considered to be the next easiest scenario to implement.

It was generally considered that those model agreements for sustainable water management systems used in new developments would be easier to implement as opposed to retrofit solutions. It was also agreed that scenarios with a small number of stakeholders/parties would be the easiest to implement and administer. The use of model agreements may also be further facilitated in situations where other maintenance agreements already exist, eg Housing Association or Industrial Estates.

## Potential problems with model agreements

*This question was asked to pre-empt any problems consultees foresee with the use and application of model agreements within real situations. The limited experience and use of model agreements for sustainable water management systems affected the level and detail of responses from consultees.*

**Inflexibility** – Inflexibility of the model agreements may make their application in different situations difficult, ie different Agency regions and different water companies. Inflexible model agreements may also restrict innovation if not well designed. The agreement should identify the relevant issues and standards that need to be achieved, but should not specify how they are to be achieved. The model agreement should also be flexible enough to cope with parties changing over time, eg with occupiers moving or maintenance companies changing.

**Enforceability** – The model agreement should be legally binding. However, there is uncertainty regarding the enforceability of the agreement, ie who will ensure that fees are paid and duties carried out.

## Model agreements in use

Many developers and sewerage undertakers have used model agreements as provided by Sewers for Adoption to adopt sewers under an Adoption Agreement under Section 104 of the Water Industry Act (1991). However, these are relevant to traditional piped sewer systems.

Some Local Authorities have set-up 'Section 106 Agreements' under Section 106 of the Town and Country Act (1990) as this allows a Local Planning Authority to enter a legally binding agreement (planning obligation) with a developer over an issue. The Section 106 Agreement is well understood by developers and Local Authorities and can potentially be adapted to take on the requirements for SUDS, in such cases an additional model agreement may not be appropriate.

Ipswich Borough Council (IBC) has, in the past adopted infiltration basins and soakaways for highways under Section 38 of the Highways Act (1980) IBC acting as a landowner and Highway Authority. Adoption is often subject to tests proving the design infiltration rate is achieved with no impact on safety factors. A commuted sum is required, as is a surety to guarantee completion to the appropriate standard.

Within Scotland they developed a framework for maintenance agreements for new developments where SUDS are required. The above ground SUDS such as swales, retention ponds, detention ponds shall be taken over and maintained by the local authority. Where the SUDS are below ground structures, such as piped systems (including perforated pipes and surrounding material), soakaways, catchpits and filter drains will be owned and maintained by the Water Authority (as it was then). Where appropriate the Water Authority was also responsible for the discharge into water courses. The Local Authority or the Water Authority were also able to require a site specific agreement involving third parties where a development requires major SUDS. This is likely to change as a result of changes in legislation brought about by Scottish SUDS Working Party.

The Greenbelt Group of Companies (GGC) have developed an agreement for the management and maintenance of SUDS. Within this agreement, the developer enters into an agreement with the GGC for them to assume ownership and management of open areas including SUDS features. Before GGC takes ownership of the open areas they have to be certain that the systems are operating as designed. They also need to receive information on health and safety and maintenance records.

The SUDS components with the DEX development in Dunfermline, Scotland are maintained by a number of organisations. The treatment ponds are maintained by the developer, swales are adopted by the Highways Authority and the above ground attenuation components are adopted by the council, developers and neighbouring landowners. The developer has subcontracted the maintenance arrangements to a local landscaping company who visits the sites monthly and as requested by the developers. The maintenance specification includes:

- Inlet and outlets are to be checked and cleared of silt and debris
- Litter picking from water body and surrounding area
- Control of algae
- Maintenance embankments

Within England and Wales the majority of agreements for SUDS are informal arrangements made between clients and construction or landscaping companies for specific sites.

On consulting manufacturers of rainwater and greywater use systems the majority of organisations are too small to provide maintenance agreements or do not provide agreements because they are confident that systems are reliable.

## List of consultees

Name	Organisation	Sector	Attended Workshop
Charles Ainger	MWH	Consultant	Y
Ken Banfield	Anglian Water	Water Co	Y
David Barraclough	RTPI	LA	
Bob Bray	Robert Bray Associates	Consultant	Y
Reg Brown	BSRIA	Consultant	
Dave Brook	ODPM - Planning	Regulator	
Jim Conlin	Scottish Water	Water Co	
Denis Cooper	Ipswich Borough Council	LA	
Rupert Cowan	Hammond Suddards Edge	Legal	Y
Robert Cunningham	The Wildlife Trusts	End User	Y
Steve Dickie	Entec UK Limited	Consultant	Y
Mark Everard	Forum for the Future	Reg/Consultant	Y
Graham Fairhurst	Telford & Wrekin Council	LA	Y
David Gallagher	EA Greywater Panel	End User	
Carolin Gohler	Cambridge City Council	LA	
Nick Grant	Elemental Solutions	Consultant	
Gill Greatorex	EA Greywater Panel	End User	Y
Ian Hardwick	JJ Gallagher	Client	
John Hamilton	Northern Ireland Water Service	Water Co	Y
David Harley	SEPA	Regulator	
Andy Hawkes	JJ Gallagher	Client	Y
Mark Holland	SANDS		
John Holmes	Halliwell Landau	Legal	Y
Steve Hunt	Stevenage Borough Council	LA	Y
Brian Hurst	Freewater Uk	Supplier	Y
Kendrick Jackson	Gleeson Homes	Client	
Chris Jefferies	University of Abertay	Consultant	
Paul Jeffrey	Cranfield University	Consultant	Y
Phil Jobson	Welcome Break	End User	
Peter Johns	Formpave	Supplier	
Mike Johnson	ODPM - Building Regs	Regulator	Y
Bruce Kavanagh	Tully D'Ath	Consultant	
Chris Kearns	Sth Gloucester	LA	
David Knaggs	Metropolitan Water Company	Water Co	Y
Denis Lane	Stevenage Borough Council	LA	Y
Richard Lemon	Hampshire CC	LA	Y
Rebecca Lemon	EA	Regulator	Y
Kevin Light	Davies Light Associates	Consultant	Y
Kirsteen Macdonald	Ewan Associates	Consultant	
Chris Mackenzie	Harborough District Council	LA	
Alex Middleton	Greenbelt Group	Mgt Co	Y
Terry Nash	Free Rain	Supplier	
John Nicholson	Severn Trent Water	Water Co	Y
Chris Patmore	ENSR	Consultant	Y
Prosper Paul	EA	Regulator	
Stella Peterson	Salford City Council	LA	Y
Jon Reed	Atkins	Consultant	
Neil Robinson-Welsh	PD Marketing Ltd	Consultant	
Peter Robinson	ENTEC	Consultant	
Owen Saward	Wealden District Council	LA	
David Sellers	Leeds City Council	LA	
Andy Shuttleworth	SEL Environmental	Supplier	Y
Nick Trollope	Fairview New Homes	Client	Y
Kate Turner	Telford Wrekin Council	LA	
Chris Tyler	WSP Development Ltd	Consultant	Y
Mike Waite	DEFRA	Regulator	
Simon Walster	Owat	Regulator	
Martin Ward	Atkins	Consultant	Y
Adrian Watkins	CEIMA Ltd (Dex)	Consultant	
Joe Whiteman	Countryside Properties	Client	Y
Tom Wild	SEPA	Regulator	
Steve Wilson	Environmental Protection Group Ltd	Consultant	Y
Peter Woods	Tesco	End User	