

**Lincolnshire Reservoir
Community Liaison Group Meeting Minutes**

27 November 2025

Chair: Charles Campion (CC)

Anglian Water Project Team:

Attendee name (initials)	Role/Specialism
Kelly Linay (KL)	Stakeholder Lead
Katie Atkin (KA)	Relationship Lead
Grant Tufts (GT)	Regional Engagement
Hugh Maxfield (HM)	Lands Lead
Ben Shin (BS)	Design and Engineering Integration Lead
Jack Moore (JM)	Compound General Foreman
Roxanne Blake (RB)	Stakeholder Engagement, Communications and Consultation
Liam Gullis (LG)	Stakeholder Engagement, Communications and Consultation
Lucy Simpson (LS)	Stakeholder Engagement, Communications and Consultation

Attendees:

Attendee name	Organisation
Andy Topp	Burton Pedwardine Village Meeting
Michael Coy	Burton Pedwardine Village Meeting
Cllr. Geoff Hotchkin	Helpringham Parish Council
Cllr. Will Watts	Helpringham Parish Council
Katie Littlewood	Lincolnshire Community Foundation
Cllr. Ray Whittaker	Lincolnshire County Council
Paul Ireland	Little Hale Parish Council
Cllr. Chris Collard	North Kesteven District Council
Cllr. Sally Tarry	North Kesteven District Council
Luisa McIntosh	North Kesteven District Council
Karen Sweeney	Scredington Parish Council
Charles Campion	Swaton Parish Council and Chair of the CLG
Cllr Elaine Penketh	Swaton Parish Council

Helen Earley	Threekingham Parish Council
Tony Lyon-Marrion	Threekingham Parish Council

Time:	7-9pm on Thursday 27 November 2025
Location:	Scredington Community Centre, Church Lane, NG34 0AG

Item	
<p>Welcome and introduction</p> <p>KL and CC welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>The project team introduced themselves, and KL introduced General Foreman – Jack Moore (JM) to the meeting.</p> <p>JM introduced himself and explained that he would be available to answer survey-specific questions. JM offered to share his contact details with the members.</p> <p>To contact Jack about the ongoing survey works, please email him on jack.moore@costain.com or call him on 07345 471606.</p> <p>CC confirmed that the minutes from the previous CLG, held in June, had been shared in September. He explained that as per the terms of reference, meeting minutes will be produced, with a summary of the meeting uploaded onto the project website.</p> <p>CC outlined the meeting agenda, explaining that pre-submitted questions will be answered at the end.</p> <p>Project update</p> <p>KL presented an update on what has happened on the project since the last CLG meeting in June 2025, including the ongoing survey works off Mareham Lane, as well as community engagement activities such as Parish Council meetings and attending local village shows.</p> <p>She added that responses to feedback from statutory stakeholders during the second phase of consultation had largely been issued. Individual responses to landowners were still being worked through and would now be sent in early 2026.</p> <p>She added that Anglian Water hope to attend more community events across Lincolnshire in the coming months.</p> <p>Surveys</p> <p>HM provided an update on survey works and an overview of what the surveys that started in Spring 2025 have involved.</p> <p>An attendee asked what the excavated tiered surveys are, and HM explained that these are called Observational Trial Pits (OTPs).</p>	

HM explained what ground investigations and non-intrusive surveys have taken place this year, including 4 OTPs, 94 boreholes, 405 archaeological trial pits and over 222 days of surveying completed by walkover teams.

HM added that surveys completed this year have focused on the main reservoir site, and these will continue into 2026. This survey work will also extend to locations for the proposed associated water infrastructure across the scheme – with 6 OTPs and ground investigations planned for these areas.

An attendee asked if surveys in 2026 will require new licenses. HM explained that surveys in 2026 will include additional works in the same location as surveys undertaken in 2025 as well as new locations. RB added that conversations with the landowners will begin in the new year.

An attendee asked about the discovery of Neolithic artefacts found at the site when it was proposed for a previous solar project. It was asked if AW had purchased this data.

No intrusive or walkover surveys were carried out by Low Carbon within the reservoir scheme footprint, as the surveys were cancelled once the reservoir scheme was announced. Therefore, no Neolithic artefacts were recovered by Low Carbon within the scheme footprint.

An attendee also asked if any unexpected archaeological artefacts have been found during the surveys. RB confirmed that information about any archaeological artefacts found during the survey work will be shared once the relevant authorities, such as the Environment Agency, have been consulted with.

RB added that a newsletter providing information about the surveys and any interesting artefacts found will be shared to web subscribers soon.

RB said the team would explore different ways to keep people informed about survey findings going forward.

In response to the newsletter, it was asked if it will be shared with all web subscribers or just landowners. RB explained that the newsletter will be shared with all subscribed to the project updates.

HM added that, if requested, concerned landowners can be provided more information on survey findings contingent with permissions from relevant stakeholders.

Ongoing project development work

BS explained the ongoing project development work, including an overview of the design options presented during the last stage of consultation.

BS outlined the key areas that are being developed, including renewable energy options, the 132kV line running across the proposed site that would need diverting, construction, and traffic and transport proposals.

He explained that although AW is unable to provide detailed information on these topics now, more information will be presented at a third phase of public consultation in 2026.

An attendee asked if any of the landowners are putting pressure on AW to put renewable energy provisions on their land. BS responded that landowners are a consideration when developing proposals for renewable energy.

HM added that at this stage, assessments for renewable energy provisions are based on what technology options and what locations would work the best. At this point, no conversations have taken place with concerned landowners, including conversations about the potential for floating solar.

An attendee asked if AW is under any pressure from the Crown Estate, and if the project is under any constraints due to their ownership of land.

HM responded that the Crown Estate is in a unique position as landowners as land they own cannot be compulsorily purchased.

CC asked if AW are obliged to follow certain instructions from the Crown Estate, such as using the roadway at the back of Swaton.

HM responded that AW is assessing all factors, the CE is just one of the landowning stakeholders, who have a unique position relating to acquisition, so while there is a need to work closely with them, AW is not obliged to follow their instructions. AW will do what it considers best for the project, and its impact on communities and the environment, balancing a range of factors, including the CE's views.

An attendee asked if the Crown Estate will be compensated with a commercial rate or an agricultural rate for their land.

HM responded that all land has been assessed in the same way.

An attendee asked if the repositioning of the 132kV line running across the proposed main reservoir site will be moved underground.

BS explained that AW is focusing on developing proposed diversion corridors in the first instance and as the project develops, more information about the diversion options will be presented. He also explained that this is National Grid's asset, therefore AW need to work closely with them as plans for the proposed diversion develop.

An attendee said that the consensus from members is that when questions about the diversion are asked, the standard response is that AW will get back to them with more information.

An attendee asked if National Grid has confirmed if the diversion can go underground. Another attendee stated that residents in Swaton and Helpringham are concerned about the cable diversion.

RB responded that the project team understands people have questions but the pace and level of design and development work that has to be done with regards to the electricity line diversion, including engagement with National Grid takes time. Option assessments for overground or underground cables need to be worked through in collaboration with National Grid.

AW understands that the lack of answers is frustrating but in terms of project work, this time frame represents a lot of design and development work taking place. The purpose of the CLG is to keep members informed about the project's progress and communicate the intended direction of travel.

An attendee stated that by the next round of consultation, they would like to know where the pylon line will be diverted, and concerns were also raised about the impact of the diversion on the housing market.

KL reassured the members that there will be at least two more rounds of public consultation where members of the community and other stakeholders can have their say.

Post meeting note: A potential route (or routes) for the diversion will be presented at the next round of consultation in 2026. Information on optioneering carried out to date on the diversion routing will also be presented to provide attendees with a good understanding of the proposals.

An attendee asked if the prospect of a rail siding is being considered.

KL outlined that all possible transport options are being considered, including rail, vehicle and by water. She added that traffic and transport options will be a key theme of the next consultation and all options will be considered with a focus on how best to mitigate impacts on local communities.

An attendee asked if a lot of stone will be transported to the site.

RB responded that whilst some hard aggregate will need to be brought in, there is already clay present on site. AW know people are looking for answers on how materials will be transported to the site so more information will be available as the proposals develop.

Consultation and engagement plans

RB gave a presentation on the plans for consultation and engagement, explaining that there will be another round of consultation in 2026, where more information will be available.

RB outlined that the plans for the next round of consultation are currently being worked through. She highlighted that since the second phase of consultation in 2024; the project team have been holding briefings with parish councils.

RB explained that feedback from parish councils during these briefings had been taken on board and in light of these conversations, a new poster was created and sent out to ensure that the project and its contact details were visible outside of consultation.

Copies of the poster were made available for members to take away with them and display at key community touch points.

An attendee asked if copies were laminated. In response, RB offered to provide laminated copies for display outside if specifically requested.

RB added that a project fact file is also being developed to keep local communities informed and offer a reliable reference point for key project information.

RB requested that members participate in a breakout session to share their thoughts on the best ways to keep people informed before the next consultation.

An attendee asked for confirmation of when the next consultation will be in 2026.

RB responded that although the original plan was three stages of consultation, there will now be four rounds. She explained that exact timings for the third phase of consultation are still being finalised.

An attendee asked if three rounds are the statutory amount of consultation. RB answered that the only statutory consultation requirement is one round open for 28 days.

RB explained that AW want to ensure there is ample opportunity to get community feedback therefore, four rounds of consultation are now planned. One in 2026 and another

before the application is submitted. RB offered to share a link to the project timeline, which can be found [here](#).

There was a 5-minute breakout session with discussions taking place on tables about the best ways for the project to engage with local communities. Members of the project team then presented what ideas their table had come up with.

These ideas have been noted by the consultation team for consideration as part of future engagement plans.

Thriving Communities Fund

GT added that Anglian Water is mindful of the community they operate in, so they are committed to supporting the activities of local communities.

The presentation then came to a conclusion, ready for a Q&A session. KA started this section by running through some questions asked in advance of the meeting – allocating them to relevant members of the project team.

Questions asked in advance of the meeting

Members of the project team answered attendee's pre-submitted questions. Please see these questions below.

1. When will the field survey work be paused over this winter? and when will it commence again in spring?

We've already largely demobilised from the site for winter – a process which started on 23 October when our Observational Trial Pits were complete. This was then followed by 90% of the ground investigation borehole rigs being demobilised on 31 October, and on 14 November, all ground investigation plant and equipment was also demobilised. There are a number of installed boreholes that we intend to retain, which will enable ground water level monitoring to be carried out over a longer period of time.

The remaining work on site involves completing the archaeological logging and mapping of our trial trenches, of which there are around 120 currently open. We expect to have completed our archaeological mapping by around 5 December. The trenches and mapping are reviewed by the Lincolnshire County Council's Archaeologist on a weekly basis, who will sign off work completed each week and enable us to backfill. Backfill has been impeded recently due to rain, but we are striving to complete this before Christmas. Any trenches that can't be filled, will be fully fenced off over the holiday period.

We still have some non-intrusive environmental and ecological surveys to complete, looking at things such as badgers and water quality. These will continue throughout the winter but only for a few days each month. We are planning to recommence other site works, including OTPs, GI, and archaeological trial trenches, from May 2026 through to October 2026.

2. Please can the vehicles remember to drive at a respectful speed along the lanes - especially past houses and farms - this especially is a request for the site ATV which has been going at dangerous speeds for its breaking capacity past houses with animals and children.

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Our ATVs are limited to 26mph. Driving at an appropriate and respectful speed is a recurring topic in our site inductions and daily team briefings. We take safety in and around the local area very seriously and will reiterate the importance of driving considerably on local roads to the team.

If you have any further concerns of a similar nature, please don't hesitate to contact our community relations team via email at info@lincsreservoir.co.uk or call on 0800 9152491.

3. Please can we have an update of progress and process with the Lancaster crash site?

The fieldwalking and metal detecting survey was completed by the archaeology team and unexploded ordnance specialists on 23 October. The teams are fairly confident that they have been able to identify the crash site within the field on their distribution plots and maps.

There were obvious fragments of aircraft debris on the ground as well as demolition material from farm buildings. No material was recovered from site, and it was all left in-situ, as agreed. The team will now need to go away and analyse the data in greater detail and produce a report, which will likely be finalised next year for further discussion with the relevant specialist parties.

4. What have been the findings so far with the survey work? And if you can't tell residents yet, when will they receive a copy of the findings?

Our survey work is ongoing, and many of the non-intrusive studies and ground investigations being carried out require us to sample all year round to obtain results that account for seasonality. As many of these surveys are carried out on private land and with licence from statutory bodies, we aren't able to share findings immediately.

However, we're committed to keeping local people informed about our work and will be issuing a newsletter to web subscribers soon. This will outline the progress we've made to date, alongside some of our key findings – which includes pottery pieces that help us understand the areas rich history, and fossils which showcase the geology's unique history and relationship with the North Sea.

If you haven't yet subscribed to our e-newsletter, you can do so on our website at www.lincsreservoir.co.uk.

5. Why is AW not exploring the multiple Lakes that are for sale in the region as a much cheaper option for storing water?

We conducted a thorough options appraisal and decision-making process for our latest Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP24), which sets out how we will secure future water supply for our customers and protect the environment. As part of this process, we determined that a new storage reservoir (the Lincolnshire Reservoir) is the best solution to ensure enhanced drought resilience and to store the large amounts of water needed to meet growing demand across the region.

The need for a raw water storage reservoir in Lincolnshire has been approved by Government, via our WRMP. This established the type of infrastructure we needed to build to secure water for public supply – our task was then to know where best to locate it. We conducted a very thorough site selection process to identify a suitable location, considering 108 possible locations against a wide range of criteria.

6. Why is AW not exploring the quarries between here and Grantham as potential water storage spaces, the one along the A52 is being expanded significantly and is closer to the 'blue pipe'.

As mentioned previously, our latest WRMP identified that a new reservoir in Lincolnshire was the best option to help meet future demand for water in the region – and we considered more than a hundred different locations for this reservoir.

It's worth noting that geology was also a really important factor when selecting the preferred site for the reservoir, and the chosen site is based on clay, which is known as a low permeability material. This means it is excellent for storing water. If consented, we will be developing a consistent low permeability embankment and foundation structure that minimises the free movement of water, limiting impacts on surrounding groundwater levels from the reservoir water.

The SPA project, which we believe this question is referring to, is not related to the reservoir scheme, and is focussed on moving water from 'wetter' to 'drier' areas of the region. This will help Anglian Water to combat the risk of shortages, boost resilience, and secure water supplies across the region.

7. Why does the pipeline corridor extend northwards then bend into the reservoir site eastwards? It would make more sense for the pipeline corridor to be more straight, and travel parallel to the A52 to meet the water treatment works. Did you consider this?

We have assessed the suggested alignment, running parallel to the A52. There are two priority woodland habitats, due north of Threekingham – which were identified in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan as being of principal importance for the purpose of conserving or enhancing biodiversity. Furthermore, there is a scheduled monument west of Threekingham, directly south of A52. Therefore, the corridor shown in our second phase of consultation is routed north of the caravan park, accounting for these constraints.

8. How will you stop construction traffic going through the villages? There is a concern that workers during construction, or tourists once the reservoir is operational, may drive through Threekingham Village to cut out the A52/A15 roundabout.

We want to make sure that our work causes as little disruption as possible for local communities and road networks. If improvements to infrastructure are needed to support or reduce the impact of construction or operational traffic, we'll put these in place before any impact occurs, working closely with the highway authority to agree the right approach.

We'll also carry out a Traffic and Transport Assessment to look carefully at how we can minimise any potential effects on local roads during both construction and operation.

If the DCO application is consented, we'll manage construction traffic through a detailed construction traffic management plan. This plan will be prepared by the contractor and agreed with the Local Highway Authority before work starts. It will set out the routes for construction vehicles — particularly Heavy Goods Vehicles — and include practical measures to keep disruption for residents to an absolute minimum.

Additional questions raised the Q&A section

Q: Can landowners be advised on how to deal with greater crested newts?

SB answered that newts typically go into depressions which is why they're being monitored at the main reservoir site OTP. This is why survey teams will be conducting observations.

KL added that landowners don't have a duty of care, however, AW has a legal duty to look after the protected species.

Q: Can surveyors see the newts during surveys if health and safety requires them to stand twenty feet away?

SB responded that health and safety is paramount during surveys and that there will be a process to follow when observing species on the site.

Q: Can survey workers car share to lower the number of vehicles driving to and from the survey compound?

JM responded that they would look at implementing car sharing, however, this is not always possible due to people leaving the site at different times.

Q: Would it be possible to put signs on the back and front of the survey vehicles as well as numbers so they can be identified.

JM answered that they identify vehicles by number plate but understand that to local communities this can be challenging, therefore, he will take the idea to the wider management team.

Q: Are the multiple lakes around the area are not as big as the proposed main reservoir site or does the WRMP not allow the use of lakes?

RB responded that the WRMP explores how much water is needed and how Anglian Water will achieve this. The supplementary appendix in the WRMP explores all supply side options. The WRMP is then approved by the Government. She also offered to share a link to the supplementary appendix, see [here](#).

Q: The proposed main reservoir site is not a natural place for a reservoir, and it will have a financial and environmental cost associated with being a non-impounded reservoir. So why is it going here?

RB responded that there has been a high level of consideration into the engineering requirements for the reservoir, the selected site performed best out of all other options.

KL added that the WRMP looks at the best value for customers and a reservoir was deemed the best strategic resource option. She understands that the current landscape is not typical for a reservoir, however, the natural provision of clay on site made it the best option.

RB noted that the proposed supply capacity of 169 million litres of water is high volume.

An attendee suggested that the lakes in the local area have the same volume. RB responded that the site appraisal process did not just look at volume, it is a combination of factors.

GT added that leakage reduction is a key priority for AW as well as new supply options – they are reducing leaks through targeted efforts to predict, address, and quickly resolve frequent occurrences.

Q: What are the ecological effects on drawing water from other water sources in comparison to letting the reservoir fill with water naturally?

SB responded that water monitoring and flow assessments will be conducted as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to ensure that ecological impacts are minimal. KA added that Anglian Water is working closely with key stakeholders such as the Environment Agency to develop the proposals.

RB explained that the chosen location in Lincolnshire was selected through the WRMP process as the optimal site to capture water from high river flows during wet periods. Abstraction is regulated by the EA, who will only provide abstraction licences if no confident there will be no derogation to sources.

Q: Have AW have looked at brick pits in the local area?

KL responded that 108 sites had been assessed across a 1,900 km² search area, and confirmed the site is no longer being questioned.

Q: Are you aware of the fault line present at the chosen site?

BS answered that there three fault lines, but Anglian Water is confident in the proposed design and site layout. He also noted that information is publicly available on the British Geological Survey website.

Q: Which consultation will allow feedback on acceptable traffic impacts for residents?

RB responded that there will be two further consultations and even after the DCO is submitted, the public can still take part in the examination process by registering with the Planning Inspectorate.

Q: A road has recently been resurfaced in Burton Pedwardine leading to the A17, so has AW has liaised with the Highways Agency about improvements to local roads?

The attendees then deferred to a councillor from Lincolnshire County Council (LCC). The councillor noted their surprised at the road being resurfaced and explained that LCC does not have control of road repairs and they contract Balfour Beatty.

KL responded that in relation to the project, Anglian Water is engaging with the Highways Authority and will conduct assessments to determine the suitability of local roads, with any possible upgrades considered.

Q: Do you know what roads will need to be upgraded?

KL answered that roads are still being assessed and will continue to be assessed as the project develops.

Q: There was flooding in North Beck in 2024 and residents are concerned about what is going to happen as a result of the project. What are you doing about this?

BS responded that Anglian Water is working closely with key stakeholders such as the Environment Agency to develop a flood risk model. The Environmental Impact

Assessment will also cover mitigating the flood risk. He affirmed that the minimum expectation is that the project cannot make the flood risk worse.

An attendee added that the anxiety is that flooding will be made worse. BS reaffirmed that the existing flood risk cannot be made worse as a result of the project.

Q: Why AW need 4,000 acres of land if 2,000 acres are going to be water and there only needs to be 10% extra for the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)?

HM answered that the current proposed project boundary incorporates storage areas, water treatment works, access routes and diversion routes – so it's an amalgamation of elements, not just water area or BNG. The boundary is indicative and may change, with obligations and access rights for the reservoir owner.

An attendee then asked if Anglian Water is required to own that area. HM responded that while there is an indicative project boundary showing land needed, this might not be permanent requirement—some areas may drop out of the final land allocation.

Q: Landowners just want to know how much land is going to be taken, when and how much will they receive for it?

HM confirmed the full land requirements will be clear at the statutory consultation, but this does not mean landowners won't be approached earlier. Planning is underway to begin heads-of-terms discussions with landowners in early 2026.

Q: Have you considered using local contractors for the survey work and construction of the reservoir?

KL outlined that Anglian Water wants to involve local contractors as much as possible however it is too early to offer contracts. For construction contracts, Anglian Water is happy to speak to those interested.

The procurement team's email address was offered to be shared, find this here – SROReservoirsmarketengagement@anglianwater.co.uk.

In response to contractors working on the surveys that started in spring 2025, she said Anglian Water would be happy to discuss the contractor procurement process that has taken place.

Close of meeting

CC apologised for not introducing the representative from Little Hale Parish Council.

CC added that the members have expressed that they would like future meetings to take place when there is an update.

KL suggested that the next meeting will take place next year but did not wish to commit to a date to ensure that the next CLG takes place when there are updates to share.

Post meeting note: During the meeting, one member raised the subject of financial compensation for time and expense for mileage travelled. The CLG is a voluntary endeavour for Anglian Water to get together with local community representatives to keep people informed and offer them the opportunity to ask questions.

While some members may be recompensed for the time given up to attend via their employers, we recognise that others such as parish councillors carry out their role on a voluntary basis, including participation in initiatives such as the CLG. We welcome everyone's attendance and appreciate people giving up their time – but we can't reimburse for this.

We have looked into the matter of financial reimbursement for mileage expenses. Informed by the Government's Advisory Fuel Rates (AFRs), reimbursement for fuel is typically around 40p per mile. Given the local nature of this group, costs for administering payment would far outweigh the amounts being reimbursed to members.

Anglian Water pays for the costs of venue hires associated with the meetings and refreshments, and considers this a fair and reasonable cost for facilitating the group.

Again, we welcome everyone's involvement – if time and travel costs are a concern, we are happy to explore online options for people to join remotely, though we do feel the group works best in person.

RB suggested amending the Terms of Reference and that different meeting formats, for example virtual meetings, can be considered to make it easier for people to attend.

The project team explained that a copy of the slides and a summary of the meeting will be added to the project website: www.lincsreservoir.co.uk

NEXT MEETING: TBC