



# NUTRIENT MITIGATION OPTIONS TECHNICAL REVIEW

Guidance on phosphorus mitigation options for  
use in Carmarthenshire

Report for: Carmarthenshire County Council

Ref. 7719844

Ricardo ref. ED15472100

Issue: 1

27/06/2022

**Customer:**  
Carmarthenshire County Council

**Customer reference:**  
7719844

**Contact:**  
Dr Gabriel Connor-Streich,  
Gemini Building,  
Fermi Avenue,  
Harwell, Didcot,  
OX11 0QR, UK

**T:** +44 (0) 1235 753 328  
**E:** Gabriel.Streich@Ricardo.com

**Confidentiality, copyright and reproduction:**

This report is the Copyright of Carmarthenshire County Council and has been prepared by Ricardo Energy & Environment, a trading name of Ricardo-AEA Ltd under contract 'Provision of Specialist Phosphate Mitigation Advice and Development of Phosphate Calculator' dated 08/07/2021. The contents of this report may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, nor passed to any organisation or person without the specific prior written permission of Copyright of Carmarthenshire County Council. Ricardo Energy & Environment accepts no liability whatsoever to any third party for any loss or damage arising from any interpretation or use of the information contained in this report, or reliance on any views expressed therein, other than the liability that is agreed in the said contract.

**Author:**  
Declan Sealy  
Peggy Lloyd  
Jamie Sayers  
Dr. Gabriel Connor Streich

**Approved by:**  
Dr Jenny Mant

**Signed**



J. Mant

**Ricardo reference:**  
ED15472100

**Date:**  
27/06/2022

Ricardo is certified to ISO9001, ISO14001, ISO27001 and ISO45001.

Ricardo, its affiliates and subsidiaries and their respective officers, employees or agents are, individually and collectively, referred to as the 'Ricardo Group'. The Ricardo Group assumes no responsibility and shall not be liable to any person for any loss, damage or expense caused by reliance on the information or advice in this document or howsoever provided, unless that person has signed a contract with the relevant Ricardo Group entity for the provision of this information or advice and in that case any responsibility or liability is exclusively on the terms and conditions set out in that contract.

## Executive Summary

---

Carmarthenshire County Council (CCC) is facing barriers to consenting planning applications due to the implications of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) ruling known as the 'Dutch Case'<sup>1</sup>. In accordance with this ruling, new developments that are likely to affect European designated sites must remove or offset the additional nutrient loading caused by a development in order to comply with the Habitats Regulations<sup>2</sup>. By offsetting additional nutrients from new development, additional housing can be shown to be 'nutrient neutral', which in turn will show that this housing will not result in adverse effects on the site integrity of European sites within Carmarthenshire due to increased nutrient inputs.

The requirement for nutrient neutral development applies to new planning applications that may increase phosphorus (P) loading to the Afonydd Cleddau / Cleddau River Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Afon Tywi / River Tywi SAC, the Afon Teifi / River Teifi SAC and the Afon Gwy / River Wye SAC. Evidencing nutrient neutrality for P comprises calculation of a P budget using Carmarthenshire County Council's new nutrient budget calculator. Assuming the P budget for a development shows that the development will result in a net increase in P loading to the European sites of concern, the developer will need to mitigate this additional P load.

This report comprises a technical review of nutrient mitigation options for use in Carmarthenshire. A shortlist of mitigation options that may be appropriate for Carmarthenshire has been identified from a longlist of potential options. The shortlisted options are:

- Private sewerage drainage fields
- Wetlands
- SuDS
- Buffer strips
- Agricultural land use change
- River channel re-naturalisation
- Terrestrial sediment Traps
- Drainage Ditch Blocking
- Engineered logjams

A review of these mitigation options was completed in order to assist key stakeholders and decision makers in selecting appropriate mitigation solutions. This review provides details on the processes and factors that effect P removal in each of the solutions. For each solution, a set of practical considerations was provided. These practicalities will impact how the solution is deployed and how effective it might be. All the solutions will require some long-term maintenance and monitoring to remain effective over their lifetime. Key considerations on maintenance and monitoring were elaborated for each solution.

The review of mitigation options has highlighted that private sewerage drainage fields, wetlands, SuDS and agricultural land use change are likely to be able to be designed in a manner that will enable predictions of how much P these solutions can remove prior to deploying them. However, it should be cautioned that agricultural land use change schemes that simply remove agriculture from production will be prohibitively costly given the relatively low amount of P that comes from an average hectare of agricultural land use. Agroforestry (a sub-type of agricultural land use change) may provide a more viable agricultural land use change solution as it enables farmers to continue farming whilst changing how land is managed to reduce P pollution. However, predicting the scale of P reduction from agroforestry schemes is difficult and may require monitoring of a scheme to determine how much P it can remove.

Buffer strips have an evidence-base that may allow for choosing a precautionary estimate of P removal efficiency, though these solutions may also need monitoring to initially quantify the scale of P reduction they can deliver. Terrestrial sediment traps, river channel re-naturalisation, drainage ditch blocking and engineered logjams all have an evidence-base that supports their capacity to remove P from the environment, but these solutions will need monitoring to quantify the scale of P removal they can deliver.

In order to highlight how open-source datasets can be used to start targeting mitigation deployment, stalled housing applications were mapped, and their locations compared to potential locations where certain types of mitigation scheme could be deployed. Estimates of potential reductions that a treatment wetland at a

---

<sup>1</sup> Joined Cases C-293/17 and C-294/17 Coöperatie Mobilisation for the Environment UA and Others v College van gedeputeerde staten van Limburg and Other

<sup>2</sup> The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)

Wastewater treatment works (WwTW) could deliver were calculated using freely available data. These WwTWs were then mapped with stalled planning applications. This exercise showed that Pencader STW and Llandovery WwTW appear to have the highest number of planning applications that are constrained by phosphorus surrounding them, and thus could be good targets for treatment wetland deployment. A high-level analysis suggested that a wetland at the four WwTW with the highest estimated P loading, Llanybydder WwTW, Drefach/Velindre, Ffairfach, Llandovery WwTW would remove 1370, 1268, 1138 and 948 kg TP/year, respectively.

An exercise was also conducted using the Working with Natural Processes (WWNP) geospatial dataset that contains information on areas where solutions like buffer strips, drainage ditch blocking and sediment traps can be targeted. This dataset was used to highlight an approach to targeting deployment of these solutions within Carmarthenshire. This exercise highlighted how proposals for deploying these solutions could be developed.

Proposals for mitigation solutions will need to provide detailed information on how a scheme will be developed in order to provide sufficient evidence that the scheme will deliver P mitigation. A general framework has been suggested that can help to shape these proposals. It provides key areas such as feasibility assessments, design and maintenance planning that will need to be considered for the successful deployment of a mitigation solution.

Successful deployment of mitigation solutions will also require working with key delivery partners. The potential delivery partners for each type of solution have been outlined, along with the roles in delivering mitigation. It is likely that all schemes will require engagement with/by CCC, Natural Resources Wales, the Nutrient Management Board and developers. Other stakeholders like landowners / land managers, Dwr Cymru Welsh Water and environmental NGOs are likely to also have a role in delivery of specific solutions.

# CONTENTS

---

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>THE REQUIREMENT FOR NUTRIENT NEUTRALITY</b>                                    | <b>4</b>  |
| 1.1       | THE DUTCH CASE  | 4         |
| 1.2       | MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DUTCH CASE  | 4         |
| 1.3       | EUROPEAN SITES IN CARMARTHENSHIRE COUNTY  | 7         |
| 1.4       | PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT  | 9         |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>METHODOLOGY</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| 2.1       | INITIAL SCREENING   | 10        |
| 2.2       | DETAILED REVIEW   | 10        |
| 2.3       | MAPPING EXERCISE TO HIGHLIGHT APPROACHES TO LOCATING POTENTIAL MITIGATION OPTIONS | 11        |
| 2.3.1     | Mapping potential mitigation areas  | 11        |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>MITIGATION OPTION GUIDANCE SUMMARIES</b>                                       | <b>13</b> |
| 3.1       | PRIVATE SEWERAGE WITH DRAINAGE FIELD  | 14        |
| 3.2       | WETLANDS  | 15        |
| 3.3       | SUDS  | 16        |
| 3.4       | BUFFER STRIPS   | 17        |
| 3.5       | AGRICULTURAL LAND USE CHANGE  | 18        |
| 3.6       | RIVER CHANNEL RE-NATURALISATION   | 19        |
| 3.7       | DRAINAGE DITCH BLOCKING   | 20        |
| 3.8       | ENGINEERED LOGJAMS  | 21        |
| 3.9       | TERRESTRIAL SEDIMENT TRAPS  | 22        |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>DETAILED REVIEW OF MITIGATION OPTIONS</b>                                      | <b>23</b> |
| 4.1       | PRIVATE SEWERAGE WITH FIELD DRAINAGE  | 23        |
| 4.1.1     | Process of removal  | 23        |
| 4.1.2     | Types of private sewerage drainage field systems                                  | 23        |
| 4.1.3     | Factors affecting efficacy  | 23        |
| 4.1.4     | Practical considerations  | 24        |
| 4.1.5     | Long term maintenance and monitoring requirements                                 | 25        |
| 4.2       | AGRICULTURAL LAND USE CHANGE  | 25        |
| 4.2.1     | Process of removal  | 25        |
| 4.2.2     | Types of agricultural land use change   | 26        |
| 4.2.3     | Factors affecting efficacy  | 26        |
| 4.2.4     | Practical considerations  | 26        |
| 4.2.5     | Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements                                 | 27        |
| 4.3       | BUFFER STRIPS   | 27        |
| 4.3.1     | Process of removal  | 27        |
| 4.3.2     | Types of Buffers  | 28        |
| 4.3.3     | Factors affecting efficacy  | 28        |
| 4.3.4     | Practical considerations  | 29        |
| 4.3.5     | Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements                                 | 29        |
| 4.4       | WETLANDS  | 30        |
| 4.4.1     | Process of removal  | 30        |
| 4.4.2     | Wetland types   | 31        |
| 4.4.3     | Factors affecting efficacy  | 31        |
| 4.4.4     | Practical considerations  | 33        |
| 4.4.5     | Long term maintenance and monitoring requirements                                 | 34        |

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.5   | SUDS   | 34 |
| 4.5.1 | Process of removal   | 34 |
| 4.5.2 | Types of SuDS  | 34 |
| 4.5.3 | Factors affecting efficacy   | 35 |
| 4.5.4 | Practical considerations   | 35 |
| 4.5.5 | Long term maintenance and monitoring requirements                            | 36 |
| 4.6   | RIVER CHANNEL RE-NATURALISATION  | 36 |
| 4.6.1 | Process of removal   | 36 |
| 4.6.2 | Types of river channel re-naturalisation                                     | 36 |
| 4.6.3 | Factors affecting efficacy   | 37 |
| 4.6.4 | Practical considerations   | 38 |
| 4.6.5 | Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements                            | 38 |
| 4.7   | DRAINAGE DITCH BLOCKING  | 39 |
| 4.7.1 | Process of removal   | 39 |
| 4.7.2 | Types of drainage ditch blocking   | 39 |
| 4.7.3 | Factors affecting efficacy   | 39 |
| 4.7.4 | Practical considerations   | 40 |
| 4.7.5 | Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements                            | 40 |
| 4.8   | ENGINEERED LOGJAMS   | 41 |
| 4.8.1 | Process of removal   | 41 |
| 4.8.2 | Types of logjam  | 41 |
| 4.8.3 | Factors affecting efficacy   | 41 |
| 4.8.4 | Practical considerations   | 41 |
| 4.8.5 | Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements                            | 42 |
| 4.9   | TERRESTRIAL SEDIMENT TRAPS   | 43 |
| 4.9.1 | Process of removal   | 43 |
| 4.9.2 | Types of sediment traps  | 43 |
| 4.9.3 | Factors affecting efficacy   | 43 |
| 4.9.4 | Practical considerations   | 43 |
| 4.9.5 | Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements                            | 44 |
| 5.    | MAPPING POTENTIAL MITIGATION LOCATIONS                                       | 44 |
| 5.1   | IDENTIFICATION OF WWTW WHERE A WETLAND COULD BE CREATED.                     | 44 |
| 5.2   | HIGH LEVEL EXAMPLE OF FINDING MITIGATION FOR A SPECIFIC PLANNING APPLICATION | 48 |
| 5.3   | TARGET AREAS FOR CATCHMENT-MANAGEMENT MITIGATION SOLUTIONS                   | 48 |
| 5.3.1 | Riparian buffer creation areas   | 48 |
| 5.3.2 | Location of runoff attenuation features                                      | 49 |
| 6.    | GENERIC FRAMEWORK FOR MITIGATION OPTION PROPOSALS                            | 55 |
| 7.    | DELIVERY PARTNERS  | 56 |
| 8.    | SUMMARY  | 60 |
| 9.    | REFERENCES   | 62 |

## Appendices

---

|            |                                     |   |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| APPENDIX 1 | LOGLIST OF MITIGATION SOLUTIONS     | 1 |
| APPENDIX 2 | USEFUL OPENSOURCE DATASETS          | 3 |
| APPENDIX 3 | TABLE OF WASTEWATER TREATMENT WORKS | 6 |

## GLOSSARY

| Abbreviation | Definition                             |
|--------------|--|
| CCC          | Carmarthenshire County Council         |
| CC           | Carmarthenshire County                 |
| P            | Phosphorus                             |
| TP           | Total Phosphorus                       |
| SAC          | Special Areas of Conservation          |
| CJEU         | Court of Justice of the European Union |
| LPA          | Local Planning Authority               |
| NRW          | Natural Resources Wales                |
| WwTW         | Wastewater Treatment Works             |
| PTP          | Package Treatment Plants               |
| ST           | Septic Tank                            |
| HRA          | Habitat Regulations Assessment         |
| AA           | Appropriate Assessment                 |
| LSE          | Likely Significant Effects             |
| WFD          | Water Framework Directive              |
| SuDS         | Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems     |
| HOST         | Hydrology of Soil Types                |
| MC           | Management Catchment                   |
| RBD          | River Basin District                   |

# 1 THE REQUIREMENT FOR NUTRIENT NEUTRALITY

---

## 1.1 THE DUTCH CASE

The recent (2018) ruling in the European Court of Justice<sup>3</sup> referred to as 'The Dutch Case' or 'The Dutch Nitrogen Cases' resulted in a change to how the Habitat Regulations (as amended, 2017) are applied to plans or projects in the catchments of European Designated sites (hereafter, European sites) that are under pressure from pre-existing levels of nutrients.

The Dutch Case was concerned with the potential detrimental effects of nutrient loading from agricultural practices in the Netherlands on European Designated sites. However, the legal interpretation of The Dutch Case now requires local planning authorities to consider the impacts from new plans and projects that may generate additional nutrient inputs to European sites.

## 1.2 MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DUTCH CASE

Following the Dutch Case, Natural Resources Wales (NRW) issued interim planning advice in relation to new planning applications that have the potential to increase phosphorus (P) levels in rivers that are designated as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)<sup>4</sup> and are under pressure from elevated nutrient concentrations. This interim advice has presented a significant barrier to Carmarthenshire County Council (CCC) being able to determine new planning applications.

The CCC administrative boundary contains various SAC rivers and their catchments that are under pressure from high levels of existing nutrient input. The additional nutrient load from the increase in wastewater and/or the change in land use created by a new plan or project can create an 'impact pathway' that will exacerbate the problems related to nutrient loading that are currently seen in Carmarthenshire's SAC rivers. This impact pathway is shown diagrammatically in Figure 1-1.

The existence of this impact pathway for nutrients from a new development will result in an HRA finding 'Likely Significant Effects' on the ecology of CCC's European sites due to increased nutrient inputs. The two key nutrients that are output by new developments are nitrogen (N) and P. The SAC rivers in Carmarthenshire County (CC) are under pressure from P.

An HRA comprises two key stages: Screening and Appropriate Assessment (AA). The Screening stage involves identifying whether a project or plan could infringe on the management objectives of a European site or significantly impact the quality of the site. Therefore, the existence of a nutrient impact pathway needs to be determined in this opening stage. The key factors to consider when assessing whether this pathway exists are:

1. Whether the development is within a catchment that drains to an affected European site.
2. Whether the receiving wastewater treatment works discharges to an affected European site.
3. Whether the development will lead to an increase in 'overnight stays.'

If the answer is yes to either 1, or the answer is yes to 2 and 3 as outlined above, the second stage of the HRA process, an AA, will need to be completed. The first step in an AA that is applying nutrient neutrality is to understand whether a development will cause additional nutrient inputs to a European site. This requires calculation of the amount of nutrients a new residential development will create, otherwise known as a nutrient budget. Where a nutrient budget calculation shows that a development a plan or project will add additional nutrients to the European site, it will not be possible to conclude no 'Adverse Effect on Site Integrity' on the site if no mitigation is put in place. Thus, in order to conclude no 'Adverse Effect on Site Integrity' due to nutrient impacts, mitigation of nutrients to achieve 'Nutrient


---

<sup>3</sup> Joined Cases C-293/17 and C-294/17 *Coöperatie Mobilisation for the Environment UA and Others v College van gedeputeerde staten van Limburg and Other* (the Dutch Nitrogen cases)

<sup>4</sup> See Natural Resources Wales (NRW) interim advice for planning applications that have the potential to increase phosphate levels in river Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), available here: <https://cdn.cyfoethnaturiol.cymru/media/693022/interim-planning-advice-following-river-sac-compliance-report.pdf?mode=pad>, accessed on: 17/11/2021

Neutrality' needs to be secured. The output from a nutrient budget will determine the annual amount of mitigation required to achieve Nutrient Neutrality for a plan or project.

Figure 1-1 Diagram showing potential nutrient impact pathways



### 1.3 EUROPEAN SITES IN CARMARTHENSHIRE COUNTY

The Afonydd Cleddau / Cleddau Rivers SAC, Afon Tywi / River Tywi SAC, the Afon Teifi / River Teifi SAC and the Afon Gwy / River Wye SAC are European sites that are in unfavourable condition or are close to unfavourable condition due to excessive P levels. Parts of the catchments of these European sites are within the CCC administrative boundary. If a development is within these catchments, a P budget will need to be completed in order to consider if the developer will cause adverse effects on site integrity due to increased nutrient loading to Carmarthenshire's SAC rivers. Figure 1.2 shows the location of these sites.

These rivers support a wide range of habitats and species between them, including:

- An abundance of water-crowfoots; white-flowered species which can be found as floating mats typically in the first half of summer.
- Fish species such as Brook Lamprey, Sea Lamprey, River Lamprey, Bullhead, Atlantic Salmon, Twaite Shad, and Allis Shad.
- White-clawed crayfish.
- Otters.
- Floating water plantain.

Increased levels of P entering aquatic environments via surface water and groundwater can severely threaten the sensitive habitats and species within each SAC. The elevated levels of nutrients can cause eutrophication, leading to algal blooms which disrupt normal ecosystem function and cause major changes in the aquatic community. These algal blooms can result in reduced levels of oxygen within the water, which in turn can lead to the death of many aquatic organisms including invertebrates and fish.

The habitats and species within these rivers that result in their respective designations as a SAC are referred to as 'qualifying features'. Not all of these qualifying features will be sensitive to changes in nutrients within these rivers. When completing an HRA involving nutrient neutrality, CCC must identify and screen out qualifying features that are not sensitive to nutrients via an HRA. Developers will be asked to submit information to support this process.

More detailed information on the qualifying features of the SAC can be found in the following links:

- [Afonydd Cleddau/ Cleddau Rivers<sup>5</sup>](#)
- [Afon Teifi/ River Teifi<sup>6</sup>](#)
- [Afon Tywi/ River Tywi<sup>7</sup>](#)
- [River Wye/ Afon Gwy<sup>8</sup>](#)

---


<sup>5</sup> See Afonydd Cleddau/ Cleddau Rivers, available here: <https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0030074>, accessed on: 10/02/2021.

<sup>6</sup> See Afon Teifi/ River Teifi, available here: <https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0012670>, accessed on: 10/02/2021.

<sup>7</sup> See Afon Tywi/ River Tywi, available here: <https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0013010>, accessed on: 10/02/2021.

<sup>8</sup> See River Wye/ Afon Gwy, available here: <https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0012642>, accessed on: 10/10/02/2021.

Figure 1.2 A map showing the Carmarthenshire County Council administrative boundary, the European Designated sites with nutrient issues and the area that drains to the sites.



## 1.4 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The impact of the Dutch Case has stalled numerous planning applications in CCC. The CCC LDP<sup>9</sup> identified 15,778 units / dwellings were needed during the Local Plan period (around 1000 a year). Based on an average of around 1 kg TP/year produced by each new dwelling, this equates to an estimated 1000 kg TP/year of required mitigation in order to meet the requirement for P neutral development. As such, there is an urgent requirement to identify P mitigation solutions that are appropriate for CC.

This report aims to provide a review and associated guidance on a range of mitigation measures that can be used to mitigate the additional P loading that will be generated by new development in CC. A range of mitigation options have been reviewed, starting with a longlist of options. Options that clearly did not have a sufficient evidence-base or that would not be able to provide quantifiable reductions in P loading to CC's SAC rivers were removed from the longlist to provide a shortlist of viable mitigation options. This shortlist was subjected to a more thorough review process to establish whether the evidence-base underpinning each option is sufficient to show it can provide P removal *beyond reasonable scientific doubt*.

A summary of each option's mitigation potential and other key considerations is provided for each option in a succinct summary table (Section 3). A detailed review of each option in Section 4 then provides information on the processes active in each option that remove or immobilise P, the different types of each option, factors that affect the efficacy of an option, practical considerations if deploying an option and long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements. A mapping exercise was then conducted in order to highlight approaches to identifying key locations where different mitigation options could be deployed (Section 5). To facilitate the development of mitigation proposals, a generic framework for developing a proposal is detailed in Section 6. In Section 7, a summary of potential mitigation delivery partners for each option is provided, with a summary of the report provided in Section 8.

---

<sup>9</sup> See: Carmarthenshire Local Development Plan, available here: [http://www.cartogold.co.uk/CarmarthenshireLDP/english/text/00\\_Content.htm](http://www.cartogold.co.uk/CarmarthenshireLDP/english/text/00_Content.htm), accessed on 05/05/2022

## 2. METHODOLOGY

---

The sections below describe the methodology used to identify a longlist of mitigation options, and the rationale underpinning the selection of a shortlist of mitigation options. The approach undertaken to complete a literature review of the shortlisted mitigation options is described. The mapping exercise used to identify locations of mitigation solutions is detailed.

### 2.1 INITIAL SCREENING

Initially, a longlist of potential mitigation options were compiled following a review of the P mitigation measures for the River Avon SAC (Wood, 2019), a literature review of various unpublished reports by Ricardo, and expert knowledge of nutrient mitigation measures. This longlist details an array of potential phosphorus removal mitigation options that work in theory, however many of these options are unlikely to be viable in practice within the affected areas of Carmarthenshire. The longlist is provided in Appendix 1 along with a brief explanation of the reason for rejection against the rejected options. Retained options were compiled into a shortlist on which to target a more detailed review. This review is summarised for each option in Section 3 with a detailed review of how each mitigation solution in Section 4.

### 2.2 DETAILED REVIEW

The detailed review of each mitigation option provides the rationale and evidence behind the selection of shortlisted mitigation options. Searches for academic literature were made using the Google Scholar academic search engine by entering keywords and phrases associated with the topic. Searches for grey literature used the Google search engine. Articles were initially screened by examining the relevance of the abstract, with articles with details relevant to P mitigation in their abstracts retained for a full review.

The review focussed on studies that evaluate the efficacy of a mitigation measure by providing a measure of P removal based on the change between influent P load or concentration and effluent P load or concentration. These studies allow for a percentage efficiency of P removal to be determined, which can be used for estimating potential reductions. However, the effectiveness of measures is affected by a range of factors including study location and seasonality, and hence the review prioritised the inclusion of papers that had a monitoring period longer than one-year and were UK based. However, this was not always possible. Catchment management solutions are often created for reasons other than nutrient removal, such as flood risk mitigation or biodiversity enhancement, however these were still included in this review if data on nutrient removal were also reported.

There are multiple forms of phosphorus within the aquatic environment. These include dissolved forms, suspended solids, phosphorus sorbed (binded) to soil particles, phosphorus within biomass structures and phosphorus contained within the structure of soil particles (Kadlec and Wallace, 2009). For the purposes of assessing the efficacy of phosphorus removal, this review focussed on studies that reported results for total phosphorus (TP), which includes both dissolved and particulate forms of P. This aligns with the outputs from nutrient budget calculations using the Carmarthenshire nutrient budget calculator, which are also reported as a load of TP requiring mitigation.

A large variation is expected in the efficacy of nutrient mitigation solutions because of the variety of independent natural processes taking place as well as the combination effects of these processes. The main phosphorus removal processes for mitigation measures typically include:

- Sedimentation
- Plant uptake
- Sorption
- Precipitation

For a given mitigation measure, a combination of the following physical factors may affect these processes and therefore the efficacy of the measure:

- Inlet nutrient concentration

- Design of the mitigation measure
- Age of the mitigation measure
- Topography
- Vegetation characteristics (species, age, percentage cover)
- Soil characteristics (soil type, particle size, hydraulic conductivity, existing nutrient concentration)
- Geology
- Maintenance regime

The aim of this review was to provide information on the following areas:

- Process of P removal;
- Types of solution;
- P removal rate or removal efficiency; typically the results are reported quantitatively as g/m<sup>2</sup>/year or as a percentage of the inlet load;
- Factors that affect the efficacy of a solutions ability to remove P;
- Practical considerations for location selection;
- Maintenance / management requirements.

## 2.3 MAPPING EXERCISE TO HIGHLIGHT APPROACHES TO LOCATING POTENTIAL MITIGATION OPTIONS

A mapping exercise using GIS was performed in order to highlight potential locations where certain types of mitigation solution could be deployed. The intention of this exercise was not to provide a detailed mapping of all the possible areas in Carmarthenshire where mitigation solutions could be deployed, but to highlight how open-source datasets can be used to help ID potential locations for further investigation.

The CC boundary was used as the study area for the purposes of this assessment. Geospatial data were downloaded from the Welsh geodata portal<sup>10</sup>. The datasets used in this methodology can be seen in Appendix 2. Microsoft Excel was used for data analysis and QGIS Desktop was used for mapping and geospatial processing. A dataset of stalled application in CC was mapped based on the postcode of the application.

### 2.3.1 Mapping potential mitigation areas

#### 2.3.1.1 Identifying locations of mitigation options at point sources

The Consented Discharges to Controlled Waters with Conditions<sup>11</sup> dataset contains information on WwTW discharges in Wales. This dataset includes information such as the location of the WwTW and the conditions of the permits. Conditions typically include limits on water quality parameters and daily discharge flow volumes. This dataset was first filtered to only contain sewage disposal works and converted to CSV. One dataset was created with all combined sewage overflows (CSOs), sewage pumping stations (SPS) and private sewerage discharges removed. There are two main reasons for removing these discharges. Firstly, the loading from CSOs is highly variable and so it is very difficult to quantify the reductions achieved through treating the effluent. Private sewage P loading is likely to be extremely low per site and so a lot of small-scale treatment solutions would be needed. It is for these reasons that the focus is on WwTWs where the mitigation potential is much larger. This condensed dataset allowed for the identification of WwTWs that could be targeted with mitigation options.

<sup>10</sup> See: Lle – a Geo-Portal for Wales, available here: <https://lle.gov.wales/home?lang=en>, accessed on: 10/01/2022

<sup>11</sup> See: Consented Discharges to Controlled Waters with Conditions ,available here: <https://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/ConsentedDischargesToControlledWatersWithConditions/?lang=en>, accessed on: 11/10/2021

The refined WwTW datasets were mapped using the national grid reference (NGR) and clipped to the catchment boundaries of the affected WFD Waterbody Catchments that drain directly to affected European sites, or to tributaries which eventually drain to European sites. The list of these WFD waterbodies can be viewed in the accompanying CCC Nutrient Budget Calculator Guidance Document<sup>12</sup>. See Figure 1.2 for the WwTW locations, and Appendix 3 for the names of the WwTWs. The daily dry weather flow maximum limits<sup>13</sup> for the WwTW within the affected areas were used to estimate the total annual phosphorus loading. Multiplying the dry weather flow maximum limit by the default P concentration of the final effluent (8 mg/l) and the number of days in a year produced an estimate of the total annual P loading. This data was then used to target a shortlist of WwTWs with high P loadings that would produce the biggest P reductions with a mitigation solution in place.

### 2.3.1.2 Fish Farms

Fish farms have significant potential for P mitigation through taking a farm out of aquacultural production. A search of fish farms in Carmarthenshire was completed using Google and the Welsh discharge consents register, as most fish farms require consents to discharge to rivers. This search returned no fish farms with P limits that were within the catchments of affected European sites.

### 2.3.1.3 Mapping stalled planning applications to target areas needing mitigation solutions

CCC provided a database of planning applications that are currently stalled in the planning process. This dataset contains information on the type of planning application, the status of an application and the cause of barriers to the application being consented. Locations were mapped of housing developments that were stalled because of P only and ones that were stalled but not with P as the main cause. These development sites were mapped using the postcode of the application. This data allowed for the identification of areas that urgently require appropriate mitigation options based on the density of stalled planning applications.

### 2.3.1.4 Diffuse Mitigation solutions

JBA Consulting have produced a dataset titled Working With Natural Processed (WWNP) that has mapped the opportunity locations for different natural flood management (NFM) techniques<sup>14</sup>. Some of these NFM techniques may also provide benefits for P removal, such riparian buffers and runoff attenuation features that can trap sediment. The WWNP dataset shows locations of high surface water runoff accumulation across the land surface. These locations of flow accumulation shows areas within catchments where it may be possible to temporarily store water during rainfall events using runoff attenuation features. These data were used to map and identify possible locations for runoff attenuation features in Carmarthenshire that can be used for slowing surface water flow pathways and thus retaining P, using features like wetlands, detention ponds and silt traps that promote sediment deposition. A dataset that identifies areas of potential riparian woodland planting<sup>15</sup> was used to highlight areas next to rivers that are not currently wooded but have the potential to be turned into riparian buffers.

The WWNP datasets have been used to highlight target areas suitable for deploying certain types of catchment management solutions for P removal. In this report these are:

- a) Areas suitable for riparian buffer planting as shown by the Riparian woodland planting opportunity areas in the WWNP data
- b) Areas where runoff attenuation feats could be deployed, as these show areas in the landscape where surface water flows accumulate and so could be good target locations for deploying measures that help to trap sediment.

<sup>12</sup> See: Nutrient Budget Calculator Guidance, available here: <https://www.carmarthenshire.gov.wales/media/1227826/nutrient-budget-calculator-guidance-document-updated.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> The dry weather flow maximum limit is the total volume of water that can be legally discharged in dry weather conditions.

<sup>14</sup> See: WWNP Runoff Attenuation Features 1% AEP - Wales, available here: <http://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/WWNPRunoffAttenuationFeatures1/?lang=en>, accessed on: 01/02/2022

<sup>15</sup> See: WWNP Riparian Woodland Potential – Wales, available here: <https://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/WWNPRiparianWoodlandPotentialWales/?lang=en>, accessed on: 10/02/2022

### 3. MITIGATION OPTION GUIDANCE SUMMARIES

---

The sections below provide summaries of the shortlisted mitigation solutions. Each solution has a set of descriptors that provide high-level information on key aspects of each solution that should be considered when determining if the solution will be deployed. The shortlisted mitigation solutions are as follows:

- Private sewerage drainage fields
- Wetlands
- SuDS
- Buffer strips
- Agricultural land use change
- River channel re-naturalisation
- Terrestrial sediment Traps
- Drainage Ditch Blocking
- Engineered logjams

For each of these options, a detailed review of the theory behind how they function as a P mitigation solution is provided in Section 4. The tables in the following sub-sections contain summary information for each the mitigation solution. These tables contain a brief summary description of the mitigation option, its maintenance requirements and the additional benefits that an option may provide. Additional benefits may include natural flood management (NFM), biodiversity enhancement, amenity value, carbon sequestration and additional pollutant removal amongst others.

Further detail on each mitigation option is provided based on a qualitative scoring system under the following categories:

**Development scale** provides an indication of the size of a development that a mitigation option may feasibly be able to serve. The small category would be the equivalent to a minor development. The medium and large categories would be the equivalent to a major development<sup>16</sup>, but they split to provide more detailed classifications:

- Small – 0-9 dwellings/units or <0.5 ha
- Medium – 10-99 dwellings/units or 0.5-2 hectares.
- large – 100+ dwellings / units or 2 hectares.

**Spatial scale** considers the area that is likely to be needed to deploy the solution. The categories are defined as:

- Small – 0-0.5 ha or applicable at the household scale.
- Medium – 0.5-2 ha of land required.
- Large – 2+ ha of land required.

**P removal efficiency** indicates the potential amount of P that a well-designed application of the mitigation solution should be able to remove. This is described as percentage reduction of the P that enters the solution. If a solution can achieve high percentage reduction in P, it still needs a high P load to enter the mitigation system in order to provide a large amount of P mitigation. The categories are defined as:

- Low – <33%
- Medium – 33-67%
- High – 67-100%

---

<sup>16</sup> See: Pre-application Community Consultation: Best Practice Guidance for Developers, available here: <https://gov.wales/planning-major-developments-guidance-pre-application-consultation>, accessed on: 05/04/2022

**Longevity** considers the timescale over which a mitigation measure will continue to function effectively without requiring maintenance. The categories are defined as:

- Short – <10 years
- Medium – 10-50 years
- High – 50+ years

**Certainty** describes how predictable the reductions in P that a mitigation solution can deliver are. The categories are defined as:

- Low – Unpredictable
- Medium – Some uncertainty
- High – Predictable performance [GPT1]

### 3.1 PRIVATE SEWERAGE WITH DRAINAGE FIELD

| Key option considerations     |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effluent of a private sewerage system, such as a package treatment works (PTP), is diverted to a drainage field. A drainage field is a network of discharge pipes laid in trenches under the ground surface so that effluent can be discharged to the ground.</li> <li>• The percolation of effluent through the soil immobilises any sediment bound P, and the soluble P is bound to soils and sediment.</li> </ul> |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interannual/annual servicing</li> <li>• Interannual/annual desludging of sewerage treatment system</li> <li>• Chemical dosing (if applicable)</li> <li>• Monthly checks of drainage field for water logging</li> </ul>   |
| Potential additional benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional environmental benefits</li> </ul>  |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All development sizes</li> </ul>   |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small / medium</li> </ul>  |
| P removal efficiency          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low</li> </ul>   |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |

## 3.2 WETLANDS

| Key option considerations     |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wastewater, surface runoff or streamflow is discharged to a constrained area that is saturated or permanently inundated.</li> <li>• Sediment-bound P is deposited within the wetland and soluble P is adsorbed onto the surface of soils particles.</li> <li>• Plant roots uptake P and incorporate it within their structure.</li> </ul>  |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desilting/desludging every 10 years (timescales dependent on wetland type, design and management practices).</li> <li>• Seasonal trimming and removal of vegetation.</li> <li>• Annual visual inspections</li> <li>• Monitoring of inlet water quality and outlet water quality is recommended.</li> <li>• Replacement of bed material that is saturated with P (if using an artificial bed material is used for the purposes of removing P),</li> </ul> |
| Potential additional benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsurface flow wetlands (See Section 4.4) can provide carbon sequestration and additional pollutant removal.</li> <li>• More natural wetlands with an open body of water can provide NFM, biodiversity enhancement, amenity value, carbon sequestration, and additional pollutant removal.</li> </ul>   |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium / large</li> </ul>  |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium / large</li> </ul>  |
| P removal efficiency          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |

### 3.3 SUDS

| Key option considerations     |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SuDS is a general term for a variety of different mitigation measures that capture urban runoff and mimic natural drainage processes in urban environments.</li> <li>• SuDS reduce flow velocities and facilitate infiltration and bio-filtration. Sediment-bound P can be deposited at low flow velocities.</li> <li>• Soluble P is adsorbed onto the surface of soils particles when water infiltrates or is bio-filtered.</li> <li>• Plant roots uptake P and incorporate it within their structure.</li> </ul> |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certain SuDS features may need desilting.</li> <li>• Seasonal trimming and removal of vegetation.</li> <li>• Monthly/seasonal litter and debris removal.</li> <li>• Annual visual inspections</li> <li>• Monitoring of inlet water quality and outlet water quality is recommended.</li> </ul>   |
| Potential additional benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFM, biodiversity enhancement, amenity value, carbon sequestration and additional pollutant removal.</li> </ul>  |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sizes</li> </ul>   |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small / medium</li> </ul>  |
| P removal efficiency          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium</li> </ul>  |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium</li> </ul>  |

### 3.4 BUFFER STRIPS

| Key option considerations     |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thin, vegetated land parcels that intercept surface runoff and sub-surface flow pathways.</li> <li>• Sediment-bound P is deposited as surface flow velocities are reduced.</li> <li>• Soluble P is adsorbed onto the surface of soils particles.</li> <li>• Plant roots uptake P and incorporate it within their structure.</li> </ul> |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual vegetation management</li> </ul>  |
| Potential additional benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFM, biodiversity enhancement, carbon sequestration and additional pollutant removal.</li> </ul>   |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small / medium</li> </ul>  |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium</li> </ul>  |
| P removal efficiency          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium</li> </ul>  |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium</li> </ul>  |

### 3.5 AGRICULTURAL LAND USE CHANGE

| Key option considerations     |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural land use change can comprise agroforestry (silvopasture), short rotation coppice (SRC), converting agricultural land to woodland, or a switch to less intensive farming practices.</li> <li>• The aim of this measure is to reduce the P inputs to agricultural land and reduce mobilisation of sediment through more natural land management systems or growing and harvesting specific plants and trees to remove P stored in soil.</li> </ul> |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seasonal/interannual vegetation management</li> <li>• Harvesting of plants/trees, if appropriate.</li> </ul>  |
| Potential additional benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFM, biodiversity enhancement, amenity value, carbon sequestration and additional pollutant removal.</li> </ul>   |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small / medium</li> </ul>   |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large</li> </ul>  |
| P removal efficiency          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low</li> </ul>  |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>   |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>   |

### 3.6 RIVER CHANNEL RE-NATURALISATION

| Key option considerations     |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aim of river restoration is to return river reaches to a more natural state. This can facilitate natural processes that remove nutrients from river water.</li> <li>• River restoration techniques are varied and may involve reconnection of a river to the floodplain, re-meandering a channelised section, creating berms and riffle-pool systems and riparian vegetation planting.</li> <li>• These techniques promotes processes that remove P from river water by increasing sediment deposition and increasing the contact time of water with riverbed and bank sediments that can in turn remove dissolved P.</li> </ul> |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptive management regime depending on location and degree of re-naturalisation.</li> </ul>   |
| Potential additional benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFM, biodiversity enhancement, amenity value, carbon sequestration and additional pollutant removal.</li> </ul>  |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium</li> </ul>  |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium</li> </ul>  |
| P removal efficiency          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variable – dependent on design and available P in river water</li> </ul>   |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low</li> </ul>   |

### 3.7 DRAINAGE DITCH BLOCKING

| Key option considerations     |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This involves blocking drainage ditches, typically in agricultural environments, by creating an impermeable dam (or similar) which disrupts flow and raises the water table level.</li> <li>• Sediment-bound P is immobilised and sorption of dissolved P can increase.</li> </ul> |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low maintenance, mainly requiring visual inspection and likely low frequency repairs if a scheme is well designed.</li> </ul>  |
| Additional benefits           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFM, biodiversity enhancement, additional pollutant removal.</li> </ul>  |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small / medium</li> </ul>  |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small</li> </ul>   |
| P removal performance         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low</li> </ul>   |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High</li> </ul>  |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low</li> </ul>   |

### 3.8 ENGINEERED LOGJAMS

| Key option considerations     |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leaky dams made of logs, branches and woody debris are constructed in order to simulate a natural logjam or beaver dam.</li> <li>This can slow flows and help to re-naturalise a river reach.</li> <li>P removal is enhanced through sediment deposition and P adsorption to sub-surface sediments.</li> </ul> |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-designed schemes will need little maintenance and may self-stabilise and reinforce themselves over time. Adaptive management needed in case repairs are needed.</li> </ul>  |
| Additional benefits           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NFM, biodiversity enhancement, carbon sequestration and additional pollutant removal.</li> </ul>   |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small / medium</li> </ul>  |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small / medium</li> </ul>  |
| P removal performance         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low / medium</li> </ul>  |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium / high</li> </ul>   |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low</li> </ul>   |

### 3.9 TERRESTRIAL SEDIMENT TRAPS

| Key option considerations     |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Summary description of option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary or permanent barriers made of geotextiles or other permeable materials that allow water through but trap sediment.</li> <li>• Temporary detention ponds that capture runoff and trap sediment in the process</li> <li>• Typically, the sediment source is from diffuse agricultural sources.</li> <li>• Sediment-bound P is immobilised.</li> </ul> |
| Maintenance requirements      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sediment fences require little maintenance if left to be buried by accumulated sediment.</li> <li>• For continued functionality, sediment can be removed once the fence is buried</li> </ul>  |
| Potential additional benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional pollutant removal</li> </ul>   |
| Development scale             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium</li> </ul>   |
| Spatial scale                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small</li> </ul>  |
| P removal efficiency          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low</li> </ul>  |
| Longevity                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low / medium</li> </ul>   |
| Certainty                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low</li> </ul>  |

## 4. DETAILED REVIEW OF MITIGATION OPTIONS

---

The following sub-sections provide a detailed review of each of the shortlisted mitigation options summarised in Section 3. This review provides details on the process of P removal active in a given mitigation option. The types of a mitigation solution where different types are available. Factors that impact the efficacy of solution. Practical considerations for each solution and any long-term maintenance requirements.

### 4.1 PRIVATE SEWERAGE WITH FIELD DRAINAGE

#### 4.1.1 Process of removal

The process of removal in a private sewerage system is dependent on the type used. Both STs and PTPs are not typically designed for P removal, though there is generally some incidental reduction in P. The main process of P removal is the settlement of organic matter via gravity as solid waste is settled out within the system. If chemical dosing is used in a PTP, chemical precipitation of P will be the main removal process.

The effluent from a PTP or ST can be discharged to a field drainage system. The private treatment system discharges treated effluent via a network of perforated pipes laid underground. The pipes are laid in specialised backfilled trenches (equivalent to soakaways). The effluent discharges slowly and percolates through the soils. P is subsequently adsorbed to sediments and soils. However, drainage fields eventually become saturated with P and cease to function effectively or potentially become a source of P to the environment (May, et al., 2015).

#### 4.1.2 Types of private sewerage drainage field systems

Drainage field systems have to adhere to the Building Regulations 2010 Drainage and Waste Disposal Part H (rules and regulations begin in section 1.26)<sup>17</sup>. The material used to backfill drainage field trenches where pipes are laid can be selected for maximum P removal. Instead of discharging the effluent straight to local soils, a filter material can be used with high P sorption capacity (the ability of a material to bind with P). Previously, a study using a filter media called Polonite (with grains of 2-5 mm diameter) observed a 90% P reduction over a two-year monitoring period (Renman and Renman, 2010). A review of various filter materials found gravels, sands and soils generally have a low sorption capacity (< 0.5 grams of TP per kg), whereas fine (< 1 mm) blast furnace slag, fly ash, and Polonite have high phosphorous sorption capacities (over 1 gram of TP per kg) (Cucarella & Renman, 2009). Assuming a single development needs to mitigate 1 kg TP/year. A tonne of filter material with high sorption capacities may be needed for one year of P mitigation. Lightweight expanded clay aggregates (LWAs) are another potential filter material with a high P sorption capacity and a potential to be recycled. A study of nine private sewerage systems discharging to drainage fields comprising Filtralite™ (an LWA) reported removal capacities of 7.5 grams P/kg (Jenssen et al, 2010).

Treated effluent from private sewerage systems can also be diverted through a wetland to remove P. A previous study of a swale drainage system recorded phosphorus reductions of 98.4% (18 to 0.28 TP mg/l) (Abrahams, et al., 2017). However, a wetland system is likely to be more costly than a drainage field and require more maintenance for the same P removal performance.

#### 4.1.3 Factors affecting efficacy

The P removal performance of both STs and PTPs is very uncertain due to the different manufacturers, types of systems, sizes, population served, treatment processes, and maintenance regimes. P loads from STs are typically higher than from PTPs (May, et al., 2015; Lowe, et al., 2007). The assumed average P concentration from a PTP is 9.7 mg/l (after May & Woods, 2016). However, a manufacturer may specify a lower concentration of TP in the final effluent. It is important to choose

---

<sup>17</sup> See: Part H: drainage and waste disposal, available here: <https://gov.wales/building-regulations-approved-documents>, accessed on: 06/06/2022

a system that has been designed for additional phosphorous removal in order to lessen the additional amount of P removal required from a drainage field. The amount of settled organic matter (sludge) in a private sewerage system can affect its performance. Therefore, desludging the system according to the manufacturer's specification is crucial to maintain functionality.

The drainage field performance is strongly affected by the soil type. A study of 24 septic systems in Canada recorded average phosphorus retention of 97% at sites located on non-calcareous sediments and 69% at sites where the sediments were calcareous (Robertson, 2019). Soils with a high sorption capacity will perform better. Once the sorption capacity is reached the P begins to spread further into unsaturated soils. Soils and filter material will eventually become saturated with P, leading to a migratory effluent plume. An effluent plume originating from a septic tank was recorded moving towards a water body at one-metre per year (Robertson, 2008).

Hydraulic conductivity refers to a soil's ability to drain water. Soils with low hydraulic conductivity are at risk of becoming saturated faster, which can result in overland flow of sewage effluent that has not had sufficient subsurface time to undergo P removal. Hydraulic conductivity decreases with decreasing soil particle size, i.e. sandy soils have higher hydraulic conductivity than clay soils, though conversely the P sorption potential of soils tends to increase as particle size decreases. Soil saturation can also occur if the distribution pipes become blocked by oils, fats and food waste. Therefore, it is important to regularly check that the drainage field is functioning correctly.

The age of the private sewerage system and the drainage field can affect performance. Depending on the material used, the system may begin to deteriorate over time and leak untreated effluent with plastic, fibre glass, and concrete lasting longer than steel (May et al, 2015). Increased usage of the drainage field with time can result in the soils or filter materials sorption capacity being reached. Materials with a higher sorption capacity than the local soils can be used as discussed above. However, these materials will also have a finite P sorption capacity and will therefore decrease in efficacy over time.

#### 4.1.4 Practical considerations

A drainage field's soil composition and drainage characteristics should be well understood. The water table must not come within 2 metres of the ground surface at any time. The topography of the site should be considered as drainage fields should comprise a network of perforated pipes laid in a uniform gradient (trenches should not be steeper than 1:200). The full design specifics of a drainage field can be seen in The Building Regulations 2010 Drainage and Waste Disposal Part H<sup>17</sup>. This document states a drainage field must be at least 10 m from any watercourse or permeable drain, 50 m from boreholes or abstraction points, 15 m from buildings, sufficient distance from other drainage fields, and not in a Zone 1 groundwater protection zone. Considering the ability for an effluent plume to migrate towards a watercourse (Robertson, 2008; May et al, 2015), the potential for P pollution would be reduced by locating the field even further from a watercourse than 10 m.

The regulations also state that the drainage field should be downslope of groundwater sources, away from water supply pipes and away from any roads or paved surfaces. The design and construction of a drainage field should ensure that the pipe perforations discharge effluent into soils under aerobic conditions. An inspection or a sample chamber should be installed between the septic tank and the drainage field.

The size of a drainage field can be estimated using the following equation:

$$A_t = p * V_p * 0.25$$

Where:

$A_t$  = area of drainage field in square-metres

$P$  = number of persons served

$V_p$  = Percolation value

The percolation value is calculated from the results of a percolation test. Suitable values are in the region of 12-100<sup>17</sup>. Therefore, for single household, with an average occupancy rate of 2.3 the drainage field size would need to be between 6.9 and 57.5 m<sup>2</sup>, depending on the hydraulic conductivity.

#### 4.1.5 Long term maintenance and monitoring requirements

Desludging of the private sewerage system to the manufacturers specification is essential. Monitoring of the drainage field influent is recommended to understand how effective the private sewerage system is, and to make assumptions about the P loading to the drainage field. Monthly checks of the drainage field water level is recommended in order to spot potential issues with the system becoming saturated. Servicing is needed if a problem is encountered such as pipe blockages. Soil samples prior to implementation and annually post-implementation would provide information about the soil P dynamics. If a filter material with a high P sorption capacity is being used, this material should be replaced once its P saturation limit is reached. Checking when a filter material has reached its saturation limit will require testing of the material. The waste products of these systems are likely to either be treated as sewage sludge or controlled waste, both of which have specific disposal requirements.

The lifecycle of STs and PTP are estimated to be between 10-40 years. Systems over 30 years old are 12 times more likely to cause water pollution issues than systems less than 10 years old (May et al, 2015). This figure is highly dependent on the materials used, the manufacturer guidelines, and the maintenance regime. A drainage field is assumed to have a 10 to 20-year lifespan. Assuming the private sewerage system and a drainage field would last 20 years, it may be necessary to replace and relocate a drainage field at least four times during the lifetime of a development to ensure P removal in perpetuity.

In order to provide a precautionary management plan, a lifespan towards the lower end of the range of drainage field lifespans should be assumed. However, monitoring can demonstrate that the systems lifespan has not been reached. The concentration of P in the influent and effluent should be assessed at least annually to ensure the private sewerage system is treating the wastewater to the desired standard. Monitoring of the drainage field will involve taking soil samples before and after the construction of the drainage field and analysing the samples for the P load held within the soil. Sample analysis will need to be conducted in a manner that can ascertain whether the soil has reached sorption capacity. Understanding the drainage fields sorption capacity will indicate how far the drainage field is through its lifespan. Should the soil P continue to increase at a steady rate, it is unlikely the soils sorption capacity has been reached. A detailed sampling strategy will be required to produce an accurate assessment of whether a drainage field has reached sorption capacity.

## 4.2 AGRICULTURAL LAND USE CHANGE

### 4.2.1 Process of removal

Agricultural land use change can either involve the cessation of agricultural practices on previously agricultural land or a change to the way agricultural land is managed while still remaining in agriculture. Cessation of agriculture removes the main inputs of P (fertiliser and animal waste) into agricultural land. This removal of P inputs is the main process that provides a reduction in P loading to the environment and it is relatively easy to evidence the scale of P reduction through the use of agricultural export coefficients like those utilised in the Carmarthenshire Nutrient Budget Calculator. Where agriculture is ceased and previous agricultural land is allowed to rewild or is planted with woodland, vegetation communities will generally return to a more natural state.

This has the added benefit of supporting the removal of P from surface and sub-surface flow pathways that may be intercepted by the rewilded / woodland planted land area through a reduction in soil erosion and an increase in the uptake of P by vegetation. It should be noted, however, that currently quantifying this additional benefit is difficult as there is a need to determine influent and effluent P load to a rewilded area before and after rewilding in order to determine the change caused by the change in vegetation.

Agroforestry can be described as a farming system where trees are planted within the areas used for arable food or livestock production. Agroforestry is often differentiated from silvo-pasture (the combination of livestock pastures with trees) and silvo-arable farming (the combining of arable agriculture with trees). These farming styles are designed to optimise the benefits from natural biological interactions within a farmed landscape (Briggs, 2012), which include P removal. The key difference between standard agricultural land and agroforestry is the presence of phreatophytic (deep rooted) trees that can access previously inaccessible nutrients. Uptake of nutrients by vegetation is therefore a key mechanism by which P is removed from the soil system in land managed as agroforestry. P losses

are also reduced through a reduction in soil erosion as trees slow the flow of surface water runoff and increase soil infiltration rates, which in turn reduces losses of P from land managed as agroforestry when compared with traditional agriculture.

#### 4.2.2 Types of agricultural land use change

As described above, the two main types of agricultural land use change for P removal are cessation of agriculture followed by rewilding or woodland planting, and agroforestry. Agroforestry can be further differentiated to systems in which trees are incorporated into a farming system producing livestock or arable crops but without seeking to harvest products from the trees, or systems where the trees are the main source of a harvestable product. Short-rotation coppice (SRC) is an example of an agroforestry system that involves growing trees in order to harvest energy crops such as poplar and willow. These crops have been reported to remove up to 15.8 kg P per 10 oven dry tonnes per hectare per year (Potter, 1999).

#### 4.2.3 Factors affecting efficacy

Where agriculture is being ceased and the main process of P removal is stopping input of P from agricultural practices, the main factor affecting the efficacy of a mitigation scheme will be the intensity of P inputs from current agricultural land use. More intense agricultural systems will have higher P inputs and thus potentially better targets for the cessation of agriculture. Where agricultural land use change involves a move to agroforestry, the most important factor is the plant tree species used and the time taken to become established. An endemic mixture of plants and trees should be grown with deep rooted trees that can utilise the nutrients in the permanently saturated phreatic zone. Trees that grow faster will also remove and store nutrients more quickly than slower growing trees. A tree density of 80 - 120 trees/ha is recommended as the best bio-physical density for crop and tree growth, whilst no industry standard recommendation has been made regarding nutrient removal (Briggs, 2012).

Table 4:1 outlines the percentage removal efficiencies extracted from literature for agroforestry. The values included are those that were retained following removal of studies that had monitored agroforestry sites for less than a year, did not account for seasonality, and did not have repeatable methods. The resultant information provided in the table provides an overview of the range of percentages that potential schemes can expect to achieve.

Table 4:1 Percentage removal efficiencies as extracted from literature

| % P removal efficiency | Number of study sites | References            |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 4.95                   | 3                     | (Zhang, et al., 2007) |
| 71.94                  | 3                     | (Xia, et al., 2013)   |

#### 4.2.4 Practical considerations

Any agricultural land use change mitigation scheme should target the farm types with the highest P export coefficients. Farmscoper modelling outputs in the CCC Nutrient Budget Calculator can be used to guide which farm types have the highest P export, however a more accurate assessment using a field scale Farmscoper modelling exercise help to fully understand the scale of P reductions that could be achieved.

Historic application of animal excretions, manure and fertiliser can result in store of P building up in soils (referred to as 'legacy P') that can continue to be released for a period of time. The lag time for the legacy P store to return to background levels is uncertain and highly variable. Various studies have reported that it could take between 7-44 years for legacy soil P concentrations to reduce to background levels (McCollum, 1991; Schulte et al., 2010; Dodd et al., 2012). As such, calculations of P loading reductions from agricultural land use change schemes should account for legacy P by assuming a lag time of 20 years, unless monitoring can prove otherwise. Soil erosion reduction techniques, such as

sediment fences or bunds, cover crops and drainage ditch blocking can be implemented to reduce this lag time, though monitoring would likely be required as evidence that these techniques are effective.

Taking agricultural land out of production may prove to be a costly P mitigation option. There is approximately 203,700 ha of land in Carmarthenshire classed as agricultural, the majority of which is classified as grade 3a and 4<sup>9</sup>. These grades indicate relatively unproductive land and thus as likely to have lower P inputs and thus less mitigation potential. A search of farm prices in Carmarthenshire suggests grassland is likely to cost over £10000 per hectare. The P export coefficients used in the Carmarthenshire Nutrient Budget Calculator suggest that farming on grassland has a P export of between 0.16-2.68 kg P/ha, depending on rainfall and the drainage, which highlights the potential high costs of generating P mitigation through the cessation of agriculture.

#### 4.2.5 Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements

For schemes that are just stopping agricultural production, it would be beneficial to support early vegetation establishment that will help to evidence that the land is no longer being farmed. Planting woodland or other vegetation communities that are not compatible with farming can provide an easy means to show that formerly agricultural land is no longer being farmed and thus the P mitigation has been secured. Depending on whether the agricultural cessation schemes are being managed to return land to a specific semi-natural habitat type or simply to allow it to rewild naturally will determine whether or not more active long-term maintenance is required. Agroforestry systems may require greater maintenance and management which will be performed as part of the management of an agricultural system. It may be appropriate to implement an adaptive management plan that is more rigorous initially to target the removal of invasive species with the aim of quickly depleting the legacy P reserves.

Baseline values representative of the nutrient input from current agricultural land uses are needed to determine the efficacy of the solution once the scheme is in place. These values could be determined through monitoring, which should take place for a minimum of a year with monthly measurements taken to calculate the influent and effluent nutrient loads from the system prior to any land use change. Models of agricultural diffuse pollution that generate export coefficients could also be used to determine the P output from an agricultural site prior to land use change. If a precautionary nutrient removal percentage is established with NRW prior to implementing the scheme, monitoring will likely be required to check compliance. If no percentage is chosen in advance, a long-term monitoring implementation will be needed to compare against the baseline and establish the nutrient reduction from the scheme. Long-term monitoring should start with at least a monthly frequency. This frequency may be able to be reduced if a solution settles into a more stable pattern of P export once the scheme is established. This will account for any lag times associated with the scheme, ensuring credits are allocated after the system is fully functional. The monitoring method must provide an appropriate experimental design which collects enough data to be confident in characterising the surface and subsurface flows and concentrations across the site.

### 4.3 BUFFER STRIPS

#### 4.3.1 Process of removal

The main mechanism of P removal in buffer strips is via sorption to sediments and soils. For this to occur, terrestrial overland flows must infiltrate into soils, providing dissolved P a chance to bind to subsurface sediments. The availability of P sorption sites in soil is determined by soil chemistry and assuming sorption sites are available, chemical sorption onto the surface of sediments occurs quickly (Reddy, et al., 1998). If there is a significant residence time of water in the subsurface of a buffer, P can diffuse into porous Al- and Fe- oxides. This is a much slower process, often taking days and it reduces the lability of the adsorbed P, rendering it temporarily insoluble and inaccessible to plants. The effectiveness of both the initial sorption and the physical penetration of P into soil particles is dependent on soil type (Environment Agency, 2015). There is little clarity as to what the ideal residence time for water in a buffer is, however literature suggests that the longer the residence time, the more likely it is for P to be immobilised for a longer period of time (Reddy, et al., 1998). It is worth noting that there is potential for P sorption sites in soils to become saturated, preventing sediments from mitigating any

further nutrient pollution. Under these circumstances it is possible for P to start leaching from soils, temporarily rendering the buffer strip as a source of P.

Sediment deposition also plays a large role in attenuating the impacts of nutrient run-off. The process occurs when sediment-bound P entering the buffer strip via terrestrial overland flows is deposited, immobilising P within the local environment (Mainstone & Parr, 2002). This occurs in areas of greater surface roughness, caused by variations in vegetation types and particularly larger woody vegetation, whereby surface flow velocities and energy available for sediment transport are reduced. This causes the deposition of particulates and their adsorbed P. This mechanism of P removal may only be temporary, as resuspension can occur if surface runoff events are sufficient to cause soil erosion and re-suspend sediment bound P for transport into rivers.

Phosphorus is a key nutrient for biomass production in plants. The presence of plants within a buffer strip therefore affects the nutrient attenuation capacity of the solution, with more plants allowing for a greater uptake (Cole, et al., 2020). This process, however, also acts only as a short-term sink unless appropriate maintenance is carried out. For example, harvesting and removal of biomass from the catchment must take place to prevent decomposition and remobilisation of nutrients to the local environment.

#### 4.3.2 Types of Buffers

Buffer strips can either be located within fields or at field margins away from watercourses, which are often referred to as windbreaks or shelterbelts, or they can be located at field margins along watercourse where they are referred to as riparian buffers. In both locations, the overall processes that remove P in a buffer remain relatively similar, though the efficacy of the solution is dependent upon the local environmental conditions. It should also be noted that typically shelterbelts have been implemented to provide shelter wind and protect agricultural soil from erosion. To achieve this, they are often located at the upwind edge of a field (Forestry Commission, 2022), which may not necessarily be the optimal position for maximising nutrient mitigation benefits from a buffer strip. Most studies of the efficacy of buffer strips for nutrient removal focus on riparian buffer strips. Owing to their location next to watercourses, riparian buffers are more likely intercept greater amounts of surface runoff and subsurface flows, resulting in greater amounts of nutrient removal than shelterbelts. As such, there is less evidence on the efficacy of shelterbelts for nutrient removal.

#### 4.3.3 Factors affecting efficacy

Presence of vegetation is essential when implementing a buffer strip to attenuate nutrient pollution. In riparian buffers vegetation promotes nutrient uptake as well as stabilising river banks against erosion, reducing nutrient bound sediment losses to rivers (Haycock, 1997). The scale of nutrient uptake by vegetation also dependent upon plant type as uptake is only active during the growing season when plants accumulate biomass. Vegetation management is also important to prevent a buffer from becoming a source of P to the surrounding environment (discussed further below).

Buffer width has been found to have a considerable effect on the efficacy of a buffer for P removal. As well as allowing increased sediment deposition and infiltration to occur, wider buffers promote greater hydraulic residence times. This allows nutrients infiltrating subsurface sediments a greater chance of chemical sorption as well as complete physical adsorption, which renders the P fixed for a longer period of time. There is little clarity on the ideal width for a buffer, though a minimum of 6 m has been suggested for optimal nutrient retention when implemented in line with other design criteria (Wilkinson, et al., 2020). It has, however, been suggested that buffer width accounts for less than a third of sediment trapping capacities, with local environmental conditions, such as soil type, slope and rainfall intensity having notable influences (Wilkinson, et al., 2020).

Table 4:2 outlines the percentage removal efficiencies extracted from literature. The values included are those that remained after removing studies that did not sample a buffer for more than a year, account for seasonality of have repeatable monitoring methods. They values provided in the table below show an overview of the range of percentages that potential schemes can expect to achieve.

Table 4:2 Percentage removal efficiencies as extracted from literature

| % P removal efficiency (TP) | Number of study sites | Location | References                  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------------|
| 10.9                        | 3                     | Canada   | (Vanrobaeys, et al., 2019)  |
| 80.9                        | 2                     | USA      | (Peterjohn & Correll, 1984) |
| 84.5                        | 1                     | USA      | (Lee, et al., 2003)         |
| 89                          | 1                     | USA      | (Schwer & Clausen, 1989)    |

#### 4.3.4 Practical considerations

Optimum buffer strip design should aim to decrease surface runoff velocities, increase infiltration and maximise resident time of water in the subsurface. The infiltration capacity of soils is heavily dependent upon the local gradient and soil type, which in turn affects the extent to which nutrient mitigation takes place within a buffer strip. Steep gradients (>10°) and poorly draining soils cause reductions in the infiltration rate of overland flow. Increasing buffer width to more than 6 m can help to mitigate these risks (Aberdeenshire Council, 2015), though it is generally advisable to select sites for buffers that are relatively flat and on freely draining soils if possible. Soil type also affects the chemical processes that immobilise P in soils. Clay soils have a high specific surface area, providing more P sorption sites and thus promoting the conditions required for immobilising P in soil. However, clay soils also have poor drainage and thus will limit infiltration capacity. Ideally a balance will be met to allow for optimal drainage as well as P sorption capacity, which is likely to be seen in loamy soils that are mix of sand, silt and clay particles.

Soil type, gradient and buffer width will interact to impact the residence time of water within buffers. Longer residence times are more likely to promote P removal by soils. Sandy soils on steep gradients will result in the higher subsurface flow velocities and shorter residence times, whereas shallow gradients and silty or clay soils will increase residence times. Wider buffers will increase residence times in all situations. Finally, the type and density of vegetation planted in a buffer will impact both how much P is taken up by vegetation and how the buffer reduces overland flow velocities and promotes sediment deposition. Fast growing tree species or other woody vegetation will have the optimal impact for both uptake of P and reducing flow velocities in the buffer. Considerations should also be given to density of tree planting so that tree canopies do not shade out understory vegetation, which can result in bare soil within a buffer that would increase the risk of soil erosion and associated P transport. Vegetation species planted in buffer strips should be native varieties that will help to improve the biodiversity benefits a buffer can deliver.

#### 4.3.5 Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements

To help a buffer strip to remain effective in perpetuity, management and maintenance may be required to permanently remove P from a catchment. If a buffer strip is planted with annual plants, vegetation removal of dead plants should be scheduled for the end of the growing season. This will prevent decomposition and remobilisation of nutrients back into the surrounding environment. Management may also be required to remove plants like nettles, brambles and invasive species that may colonise the buffer area before native vegetation can establish. For perennial plants, the extent to which P is removed from the system is dependent upon the longevity of the plants, how much biomass is shed over time and how this biomass is managed. Long-term maintenance plans to remove biomass shed by perennial plants should be put in place to reduce the risk of P being remobilised after it has been stored in biomass. These plans should involve periodic harvesting and appropriate disposal of harvested biomass in a way that does not simply recirculate the nutrients within the same catchment system.


Baseline values representative of the nutrient concentrations entering and exiting the buffer strip are required to be able to monitor the efficacy of the solution once the scheme is in place. If a precautionary nutrient removal percentage is established with NRW prior to implementing the scheme, monitoring will likely be required to check compliance. If no percentage is chosen in advance, concentration results acquired from longer term monitoring after implementation need to be compared against the baseline to establish the nutrient reduction potential. The monitoring method must provide a reasonable experimental design which collects enough data to be confident in characterising the surface and subsurface flows and concentrations across the buffer strip. Monitoring of P load reductions achieved by the buffer should be conducted with at least monthly frequency to calculate the influent and effluent nutrient loads. It is highly recommended for monitoring programmes for run over multiple years to determine any lag times associated with the scheme and ensure the scheme continues to deliver the required mitigation. It may be possible to reduce monitoring frequency if a stable pattern of P removal by a buffer is determined from higher frequency monitoring, with lower frequency monitoring used as part of an adaptive management system that will increase monitoring frequency if deviations from established P removal patterns are observed.

## 4.4 WETLANDS

### 4.4.1 Process of removal

There are three primary phosphorus removal mechanisms in wetlands (Kadlec & Wallace; 2009): sorption of phosphorus to soils and sediments, uptake and incorporation of phosphorus by flora and fauna (biomass storage), and burial of sediments (sedimentation/accretion). Sorption and biomass storage have limited retention capacity and can become saturated (although secondary processes, such as sedimentation, can remove saturated components), whereas sedimentation/accretion is indefinite provided there is storage capacity within the wetland. Particulate settling can rapidly remove large amounts of phosphorus from water carrying high amounts of suspended sediment. There may also be redistribution of phosphorus stores within a wetland that affect its availability and mobility (see Figure 4-1). There is a large body of literature that supports the use of wetlands for nutrient removal (Kadlec & Wallace, 2009; Forbes et al, 2011; Land, et al., 2016) and provided they are designed correctly, wetlands can provide significant nutrient removal benefits with relatively high certainty.

Figure 4-1 A diagram showing the P fluxes within a wetland (from Kadlec and Wallace, 2009).



#### 4.4.2 Wetland types

Wetlands are traditionally configured so water flows through from an inlet to an outlet. They can comprise a singular wetland 'cell' or a chain of connected cells. Typically, P concentrations will decrease along the flow path through a wetland as the process detailed above take effect. There are many different wetlands configurations that are categorised based on the water source, the type of flow through the wetland and the vegetation used.

Treatment Wetlands comprise natural or constructed wetlands that are designed and managed to improve the water quality of a known inflow rate and quality to a desired standard. These systems are referred to as 'closed' because the characteristics of the inflow are tightly controlled by the source of water to the wetland. Wetlands removing P from the final effluent at WwTWs are examples of 'closed', Treatment Wetland systems because the characteristics of the water entering the system (the influent) are known and will not vary markedly over time.

Wetland systems treating non-controlled sources of water such as agricultural runoff can be referred to as 'Other Wetlands'. These systems are typically designed and managed to receive and treat influent with more dynamic water volumes and more variable water quality parameters, e.g. surface runoff or stream flow. This distinction between wetland types based on the source of the influent has a significant impact on the ability to predict the quantity of P a wetland will remove. Variable inflow rates and water quality make it very difficult to predict how much P 'Other Wetlands' will remove. Treatment Wetlands with known inflow rates and inflow water quality allow for much more accurate prediction of P removal capacity based on appropriate design. Both Treatment and 'Other Wetlands' also have a various sub-categories based on their specific design.

There are two main sub-categories of wetland include: surface flow wetlands and subsurface flow wetlands. Free water surface (FWS) wetlands are the most common surface flow wetland. These comprise areas of open water and are most similar to a natural wetland. FWS wetlands can be further split according to the mix of emergent plants, submerged plants and floating vegetation that are planted in the wetland. They are often used as tertiary treatment of domestic wastewater, urban runoff and agricultural runoff. These wetlands provide the most ancillary benefits due to the provision of biodiversity improvements and amenity value.

There are two main types of subsurface wetlands, horizontal subsurface flow (HSSF) wetlands and vertical flow (VF) wetlands. HSSF wetlands are designed so water flows laterally through a planted bed from the inlet to the outlet. Treatment occurs as water moves horizontally through the bed of the wetland. In comparison, VF wetlands discharge water over a permeable substrate planted with vegetation. Water treatment occurs through percolation through the root zone. Both subsurface flow wetlands can be used for the primary treatment of wastewater. It is possible to treat raw sewage with specific configurations of VF systems.

Although there is a distinction between wetlands dependent on the way in which water flows through the system and is thereby treated, in most cases there will be some percolation of flow through wetland beds although liners and low permeability substrates are often used to limit infiltration. It is also noted that combinations of different wetland configurations may be used in a chain of wetland cells. These are considered hybrid systems and commonly make use of a VF wetland stage followed by a series of HSSF wetlands.

#### 4.4.3 Factors affecting efficacy

The P removal ability of wetlands is extremely variable as a result of the number of factors. There is high variability in phosphorous removal rates reported in the literature. Although median P removal rates of around 50% have been reported in a key review of wetland efficacy (Land, et al., 2016), also noting that greater removal efficiencies can be achieved through good design and maintenance. Well-designed systems that incorporate best practice and utilise multiple wetland cells in sequence can achieve P removal rates of around 90%. For example, a four-year study of a 1.2 ha wetland system with five cells treating dairy farm runoff observed annual P removal rates of 91.2-96.4% (Forbes, et al., 2011). The success of P removal through sedimentation, plant uptake, sorption and precipitation is dependent on the following (Land et al, 2016):

- Type of wetland
- Hydraulic loading rate (HLR)
- Influent TP concentration
- Water source
- Size and shape (area, depth, length)
- Flow pattern and hydraulic efficiency
- Water residence time
- Age
- Sediment / soil type
- Vegetation type and coverage
- Fauna
- Management regime

A selection of these key factors that affect efficacy and that can be accounted for through wetland design are elaborated further below.

#### 4.4.3.1 *Type of wetland:*

Subsurface flow (HSSF and VF) wetlands have been reported to remove as 70% of P (significantly more than the reported by Land et al, 2016 FWS median removal efficiency of 50%) although they are rarely designed with phosphorus retention as a primary performance objective. Whilst such wetlands can be designed with P retention in mind with the use of a high phosphorus sorption capacity substrate material such material has a finite sorption capacity and requires periodic removal and replacement. In reality, the P removal performance of HSSF wetlands, like most wetlands, is variable and has been found to reduce overtime as sorption capacities of the substrate are reached. VF wetlands require more frequent maintenance than an HSSF wetland, however HSSF wetlands typically require a larger area than VF.

It is possible to improve the performance of wetlands with mechanical or chemical processes, albeit with a higher construction cost and a higher operating cost than passive wetlands. For example, wetlands can be built with reactive media in the substrate that will remove soluble phosphorous through the formation of insoluble complexes of metal phosphates (Jenssen et al, 2010). Aeration of the substrate (achieved through pumping air to the base of the wetland) can also be used to increase mixing of water and increase oxidation-reduction potential, which has been found to improve P removal (Vera et al, 2014).

#### 4.4.3.2 *Hydraulic loading rate and influent TP rate*

The HLR (expressed in m/d) is calculated by dividing the influent discharge by the wetland area. The hydraulic loading rate multiplied by the inlet concentration will provide the P loading rate of a wetland. The HLR thus affects the amount of P in the system, which affects the removal capacity of the wetland and informs the management regime. The P removal performance increases with decreasing load rate as water is held in the system for longer periods of time, allowing greater time for removal processes to act on the P load entering the wetland. The impact of higher HLRs was seen in a pilot scale hybrid wetland system consisting of a FWS cell connected to a subsurface flow wetland treating water from a fish farm (Lin et al, 2002). This study reported a drop in P removal efficiencies from 71.2% to 31.9% as the HLR increased from 2.3 to 13.5 cm/day. Therefore, a wetland optimised for P removal should consider maintaining a low HLR.

The phosphorus loading rate (PLR) is calculated by multiplying the inlet concentration by the HLR. Higher inlet concentrations are positively correlated with P removal efficiency and high P loading rates generally result in higher removal rates. Thus, wetland design would benefit from a high inlet concentration of P whilst aiming to keep HLR as low as possible.

#### **4.4.3.3 Size, shape and depth**

Wetland design should aim to maximise the residence time of the effluent from the inlet to the outlet in order to maximise treatment efficacy. The size and shape of a wetland will influence residence times. The HLR decreases as wetland area (size) increase relative to the influent flow rate, with lower HLRs resulting in higher residence times. Thus, wetlands should be sized in order to minimise the HLR. Wetland shape will also affect how flow is distributed across the wetland and thus impact residence times. A wetland should be shaped in order to avoid flow moving quickly through a central area from inlet to outlet, in order to increase residence time of water within the wetland. The SuDS manual (Woods-Ballard, et al., 2015) specifies various good practice techniques for wetland design. This guide suggests that wetlands should have a flow route length to width ratio of at least 3:1, highlighting the importance of increasing flow route length in order to increase water residence times. The SuDS manual also suggests that wetlands should not exceed 2 metres in depth to facilitate oxygen circulation to the wetland bed, with shallower wetlands promoting greater oxygen circulation.

#### **4.4.3.4 Velocity:**

The inflow rate and the shape of the wetland will influence the velocity of water flow. The distribution of water tends to be more uniform at low velocities. Low velocities are also necessary to avoid re-suspension of sediments. The resuspension of sediments has been suggested to occur at velocities of over 0.2 m/s (Olin et al, 2000), though this will depend on the dominant sediment size within a wetland. Existing FWS wetlands typically operate at velocities lower than 0.001 m/s (Kadlec & Wallace, 2009). Large wetlands in Florida designed to control P are subject to a maximum velocity threshold of 0.03 m/s. This indicates that high velocities pose risks to the ability for wetlands to retain P that has been stored in sediments.

#### **4.4.3.5 Vegetation**

P is an essential nutrient for plant growth. Plant root systems absorb P and incorporate it within the plant structure. Seasonal die-off of vegetation can bury nutrients within the wetland, however decomposition of vegetation can result in the remobilisation of nutrients previously stored in vegetation. Seasonal vegetation removal is the most effective means to completely remove P stored in vegetation from the wetland system. It is important to select vegetation that has high P removal capacity but is native to area where a wetland is being deployed. Phragmites species are common reeds that are often used to plant wetlands, especially subsurface flow wetlands (Kadlec & Wallace, 2009). However, Phragmites can out compete other vegetation leading to a reduction in P removal, especially in FWS wetlands (Avers, 2007). If a wetland is being created to have biodiversity and social amenity co-benefits, vegetation communities should be selected carefully and managed to maximise P removal and other co-benefits.

#### **4.4.4 Practical considerations**

Good wetland design should provide a detailed plan that describes how the wetland has been designed to maximise P removal efficacy by controlling for the factors detailed above. This design should also account for the topography of the proposed wetland site. For example, the slope of the surrounding land should not result in surface runoff draining into the wetland as this may compromise treatment efficiency. Ideally a wetland should also be sited where topography allows a wetland to be gravity fed, as this will typically require less maintenance than a pumped system and will be cheaper to operate. A topographic survey of a prospective wetland site should therefore be completed in order to understand the flow pathways and help inform a wetland feasibility assessment.

Soil type where a wetland system is being constructed is also important. The hydraulic conductivity of soil can be used to calculate water losses through leakage and inform the design of the wetland. Where wetlands are being located on permeable soils, wetlands may need to be lined with impermeable material such as clay. Peatland soils should be avoided due to their higher environmental and ecological value. Wetland design should include an analysis of soils on at a proposed wetland site. As water that infiltrate into soils may percolate through underlying geological strata and potentially in to an aquifer, the geology and hydrogeology of a site should also be considered when assessing wetland feasibility. Hydrogeological assessments should consider groundwater vulnerability to remove the risk of a wetland causing pollution to an aquifers that may impact water resources.

Flood risk at proposed wetland site is also very important. If a wetland is in Flood Zone 2 or 3 then a flood risk assessment should be completed. Flooding a wetland has the potential to mobilise a large store of P through resuspension of accreted sediment.

Consideration should be given to whether a proposed wetland has any environmental designations, e.g. SSSI, National Nature Reserve etc. Developing wetlands on sites designated for historical and/or archaeological importance should also be considered and avoided where possible. If possible, the previous land use on a proposed wetland site should be determined to assess the likelihood of ground contamination and legacy P causing problems with water quality of water discharged from the wetland.

#### 4.4.5 Long term maintenance and monitoring requirements

Monitoring of a wetland is essential to assess P removal efficacy. The wetland design process should incorporate suitable allowances for uncertainty that means predicted P removal estimates from a wetland are suitably precautionary. As such, design calculations of P offsetting delivered by a wetland are likely to be underestimates. This means that monitoring of a wetland once operational may show that it is delivering more P offsetting than estimated as part of the design process. Monitoring should assess the influent load entering the wetland and the effluent load exiting the wetland. This will allow calculation of the removal of P being achieved by the wetland and would ideally be carried out at least monthly, however more frequent monitoring would be beneficial. An adaptive monitoring regime may be possible whereby frequency of monitoring can be reduced from a higher to lower frequency if the monitoring data shows that changes in P removal efficiency occur with a predictable temporal pattern, e.g. seasonal changes. In contrast, a reduction in P removal efficacy may indicate that the current management plan is not suitable and needs to be reviewed.

Wetlands may require seasonal vegetation management. The removal of vegetation may provide additional P removal from the system. Wetland proposals should include maintenance plans that will support maintenance of design specifications, which will in turn help to retain P removal efficiency.

Sedimentation is one of the main P removal processes in FWS wetlands. Therefore, space for accretion needs to be provided through desilting/desludging to maintain the functionality of P removal via this mechanism. If this is not completed, wetlands can switch from a sink to a source of P (Sharpley, et al., 2013; Land, et al., 2016). Wetland proposals should detail comprehensive management plans that include disposal of removed sediment in ways that do not reintroduce removed P to the affected catchment. Desilting/desludging frequency varies dependent on the design and the loading, although it has been suggested that removal of sediment will not be required before 10 - 15 years depending on the sedimentation rates (Ellis et al, 2003). A well-designed wetland may need desilting/desludging when the main pool volume is reduced by 20% and could be carried out every 25-50 years with effective pre-treatment (Woods-Ballard et al, 2015). Visual monitoring should be carried out regularly to assess the bed level and plan a sediment removal regime accordingly.

## 4.5 SUDS

### 4.5.1 Process of removal

The main process of removal in SuDS are very similar to those described above for buffers (Section 4.3) and wetlands (Section 4.4), with the specific processes active within a SuDS design dependent on the SuDS features used. SuDS are traditionally used for flood management although they can contribute to significant water quality improvements. SuDS promote the infiltration of water and thus sorption of P to soils, slow runoff velocities to encourage sediment deposition and provide an environment for plant growth and concomitant nutrient uptake. These three processes can immobilise and remove phosphorous from the environment.

### 4.5.2 Types of SuDS

There are a range of different types of SuDS. Types of SuDS that can provide some benefit for P removal are as follows:

- Wetlands – shallow ponds and reed beds that provide stormwater attenuation, sediment settlement and pollutant removal.
- Bioretention systems – shallow planted depressions that can filter water and treat pollution:
  - Detention basins – a vegetated depression that captures rainfall and slowly drains it to act as a pollution filter.
  - Retention ponds – a larger depression that is permanently inundated and will retain sediments and associated pollution.
- Swales – vegetated linear conveyance/storage channels that attenuate flows, promoting infiltration and the settlement of pollutants.
- Permeable pavements – pavements and hard surfaces that allow infiltration and filtering of pollutants.
- Soakaways – excavations filled with rubble that receive piped runoff to promote percolation and filter pollutants.
- Filter drains – excavated ground backfilled with permeable material allowing runoff to percolate and allowing some or all of it to soak away into soil layers, filtering pollutants. Runoff that does not infiltrate into a filter drain should be discharged to a swale or other SuDS component if possible.
- Rain gardens or filter strips – vegetated land parcels that reduce flows, act as filters for pollutants and store P through uptake by vegetation.
- Green roofs and living walls - vegetated roofs and walls of buildings that reduce runoff and promote deposition of sediment bound pollution, as well as P removal by plant uptake.

#### 4.5.3 Factors affecting efficacy

Like wetlands, the P removal performance of SuDS is controlled by their design. If wetlands are being incorporated into a SuDS design, the same factors detailed in Section 4.4.3 are relevant. The SuDS manual details key design considerations and best practice guidelines (Woods-Ballard, et al., 2015). The type of SuDS used will influence P reductions that can be delivered by a SuDS design. Wetlands, bioretention systems, swales and filter drains are likely to provide the best P reductions because they facilitate the two key P removal processes, sedimentation and sorption.

Site characteristics, such as the site area and type of urban land use that SuDS are draining will affect the amount of P available for removal and thus the amount of P removal that SuDS can deliver. More freely draining soils that allow SuDS components that encourage infiltration will increase the likelihood of P removal through binding to sediments. Sediment retaining/trapping SuDS features will decrease in P removal effectiveness if too much sediment accumulates. Without desilting/sediment removal sediment-bound P may become remobilised.

The use of a SuDS treatment train providing a mixture of P removal methods can enhance overall performance. Including a permanent wetland or pond feature within a SuDS treatment train is likely to maximise the P removal potential of a SuDS design (Bastien, et al., 2010). Modelled performances of SuDS treatment trains with wetland systems in a series provides the most P removal (around 70%) (Bastien, et al., 2010).

#### 4.5.4 Practical considerations

The concentration of P in urban runoff often peaks during the early stages of a rainfall event in what is termed the 'first flush'. It is essential that SuDS are designed to capture and retain at least the water volume associated with the first flush. The annual loading of P to a SuDS train will need to be calculated in order to understand the potential reduction in P that the SuDS can achieve. A site-specific export coefficient can be identified using the CCC Nutrient Budget Calculator, though onsite monitoring is preferable. SuDS should be designed to be able to treat the runoff volume generated from the catchment that drains to them without becoming over saturated. Over saturation will limit or stop water infiltrating into the ground, decreasing P sorption rates and may reduce the system's ability to slow flows, in turn decreasing sedimentation of sediment-bound P.

#### 4.5.5 Long term maintenance and monitoring requirements

The requirement for routine maintenance of SuDS is dependent on the SuDS features used. A full breakdown of SuDS maintenance requirements can be seen in Keating et al (2015) and Woods-Ballard et al (2015). Most systems require the removal of green waste and debris on a monthly basis (Keating, et al., 2015). Regular grass cutting and weed removal should be carried out in order to prevent the system becoming overgrown with unwanted and unproductive vegetation. Visual inspections and reporting of the vegetation, water quality, water depth and bed level water should be completed regularly. Desilting/sediment removal may be required in features that are designed to accumulate sediment to avoid remobilisation of sediment-bound P. Appropriate disposal of sediments should be conducted in order to reduce the risk of recirculating sediment-bound P within the same river catchment. It is possible that the dredged sediments will have to be disposed of as hazardous waste. The SuDS Manual provides a sediment categorisation and disposal decision tree (Woods-Ballard, et al., 2015). Other required maintenance may include vegetation replacement and/or removal depending on vegetation type, blockages and cleaning soakaways and other subsurface drainage features.

Whilst it may be possible to stipulate the efficacy of a SuDS design for P removal before it is built, it would be highly beneficial to monitor the system in order to determine the actual P removal performance. Sampling of urban runoff prior to it entering SuDS features and sampling of treated runoff at the point where it discharges to a watercourse should provide a general understanding of the P load reduction caused by a SuDS design. Sampling programmes will ideally be reactive to rainfall events of different magnitudes in order to capture the variability of urban surface water runoff pollution.

### 4.6 RIVER CHANNEL RE-NATURALISATION

#### 4.6.1 Process of removal

P sorption to sediments is the primary process driving nutrient removal from river systems. Sorption can occur within channelised and natural / restored rivers, though the process is enhanced in natural / restored reaches due to the increased contact of river flow with hyporheic sediments. The initial physical sorption of P happens quickly, whilst longer residence times are required for dissolved P to complete penetration into sediment particles and chemically lock P within sediments for a longer period of time (Johnston & Dawson, 2005). This process is reversible, however, with desorption occurring if the P concentration of overlying water drops below a threshold. This threshold is dynamic as the P sorption capacity of sediments changes over time.

P uptake by vegetation and P deposition by sedimentation also facilitate nutrient removal from river flows. These processes are enhanced by re-naturalisation schemes that increase habitat heterogeneity and floodplain reconnection. Greater habitat heterogeneity in restored rivers will generally increase in-channel and marginal vegetation densities which in turn increases the assimilation of P by biomass. However, most vegetation in rivers is short lived and assimilated nutrients are likely to be remobilised when vegetation dies and decomposes. Increased vegetation densities in rivers will also slow flow and result in greater deposition of sediment and associated P. Burial of sediment-bound P can help to increase the longevity of this P store but it is also reversible, with the potential for remobilisation of sediment-bound P likely under high flow events due to bed and bank erosion. Floodplain reconnection schemes that increase the connectivity of river flow with the floodplain during flood events can also promote sediment deposition and P removal, though this P store can also be remobilised during high flow events (Sharpley, et al., 2013).

#### 4.6.2 Types of river channel re-naturalisation

Channel re-naturalisation seeks to reinstate natural processes in anthropogenically modified river channels through the re-establishment of natural channel forms and habitats. There are many types of approaches that can be applied and are often completed in conjunction with other mitigation options

described in the document. The River Restoration Centre's Manual of River Restoration Techniques<sup>18</sup> provides an overview of many channel and floodplain re-naturalisation techniques.

In the context of P removal, floodplain reconnection is the scheme with the most evidence supporting its nutrient mitigation capacities. Floodplain reconnection aims to increase lateral connectivity by hydrologically reconnecting floodplains, or alternatively wetlands, unused tributary channels, and oxbow lakes. The overall aim is to re-naturalise channel form, rectify anthropogenic disconnect between rivers and riparian corridors, and create ecologically functional floodplains. This helps to increase the regularity of lateral inundation, allowing wetlands and native vegetation to recolonise naturally whilst encouraging the river to return to its natural, heterogeneous state, pre-channelisation. This supports natural processes, some of which drive nutrient reductions in naturally functioning rivers.

#### 4.6.3 Factors affecting efficacy

The key requirement for promoting nutrient removal in this context is the reinstatement of habitat and geomorphic diversity. Techniques focussed on maximising channel form heterogeneity are likely to increase the potential for hyporheic exchange between benthic and riparian sediments. Natural channel complexity increases flow turbulence, resulting in greater exchange of water with the hyporheic zone. Increased heterogeneity can occur as a result of introducing vegetation, re-meandering, riffle and pool sequences and tributary channel reconnection, amongst other techniques. This enhanced geomorphic diversity can promote nutrient removal through reduced velocities increasing the residence times of water within a river reach. Increased residence times will generally allow more time for P removal processes to occur.

The initial P concentrations prior to channel and floodplain naturalisation in a given reach is important to understand in optimising the success of a river restoration scheme for nutrient removal (Bernhardt & Palmer, 2011). Harper et al. (1999) suggest P removal to function best when P concentrations are above 0.3 µg/l. P adsorption to sediments is likely to still occur under low concentrations, albeit at a reduced rate as the chemical process constantly seeks to equilibrate the P concentration in overlying water with that of benthic/riparian sediments. Riverbed sediment type also affects P sorption capacity as certain sediment types, such as clay, has significantly more sorption sites available for nutrient retention than others. As such awareness of bed sediment types is essential to aid the process of producing P reduction estimates and of siting restoration schemes in areas that likely to promote P removal.

Where vegetation abundance increases, this will also help to promote the hydrodynamic processes that increase transient storage, reduce velocities, and increase the abundance of organic debris within the channel. These secondary processes help to increase rates of P sorption and deposition, so whilst plant uptake does not contribute significantly to P removal, vegetation can play a large role in other nutrient removal processes through increasing channel heterogeneity.

River and flood re-naturalisation schemes are likely to have the greatest benefit for nutrient removal if the main source of nutrient pollution enters the river upstream rather than at some point along the restored reach. This ensures maximum concentrations to support the various processes that remove P as well as providing the nutrients with the longest period of time possible to be immobilised/removed.

To be able to achieve the greatest quantity of P removal possible, it is recommended that consideration is given towards all of the above factors expected to affect the efficacy of the given solution. Currently there is no industry standard regarding the design of larger scale river and floodplain re-naturalisation schemes to support the achievement of nutrient removal and literature on the estimated potential for nutrient removal is lacking. As such, baseline and longer-term monitoring will be required prior to and following the implementation of a scheme in order to determine how much P the scheme is removing.

---

<sup>18</sup> See: <https://www.therrc.co.uk/manual-river-restoration-techniques>, Accessed on: 23/06/2022

#### 4.6.4 Practical considerations

All river channel re-naturalisation schemes require design which will differ depending on the type of re-naturalisation that is proposed. In general, a well-designed river channel re-naturalisation will need to consider the river environment, including flows, sediment type, slope, riverbank material, channel morphology and various other factors. The core design objective of a re-naturalisation scheme should be to encourage the development of natural processes that attenuate nutrient pollution, and the design of the scheme should show how this will be achieved within a given river environment.

Baseline monitoring should be conducted to determine the nutrient concentration in the proposed reach for re-naturalisation. Rivers with very low nutrient concentrations will both have low nutrient loads for removal but will also likely have lower rates of P removal, as chemical P removal rates in sediments often increase with increasing P concentration up to a limit imposed by the physical and chemical characteristics of the sediment and chemical characteristics of river water. As such, re-naturalisation schemes in rivers with low P concentrations may limit the utility of channel re-naturalisation for the purpose of P mitigation.

Floodplain topography will need to be assessed in re-naturalisation schemes that aiming to reconnect rivers with their floodplains. Gently sloping floodplain topography will be most beneficial for sedimentation and associated P removal during flood events. This also shows the need allow 'room for the river' within a river corridor. Floodplain reconnection should also aim to understand the current and previous land use around the river to ascertain if legacy P stored with soils may be remobilised when a restored river floods.

Any alterations to a river channel will require engagement and permissions from NRW. Flood risk increases associated with floodplain reconnection will need to be considered and most re-naturalisation schemes will require a flood risk assessment. Increased flood risk and the associated loss of land will also likely require engagement with landowners / land managers. Any schemes requiring large-scale alterations to channel planform are likely to require earthworks, which will in turn require construction and environmental management plans, as well as potentially requiring planning permission. As it is likely re-naturalisation scheme will be carried out within a designated sites (a SAC river) or supporting habitat for a SAC river, there will also be a requirement to consider any potential risks to the protected features of the designated site.

#### 4.6.5 Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements

Whilst such re-naturalisation schemes should ideally be self-maintaining in reality they are likely to require adaptive management for longer term sustainability. Short-term monitoring of a scheme after it has been established will help to determine how effective the scheme is at P removal. It is recommended that a scheme is monitored in order to determine the nutrient removal benefit on a seasonal basis and in response to land use / management changes within a river catchment. Long-term monitoring programmes would be highly beneficial to determine the effectiveness of a river restoration scheme for P removal, with the results from sampling programmes being fed into an adaptive management system. Flow measurements and water quality samples (measuring total phosphorus) should be taken upstream and downstream of a restored river reach in order to assess the scale of P reduction a scheme may achieve, which should be referenced against the P load recorded in a baseline survey.

Visual inspections to check whether a scheme is meeting its design objectives is also highly beneficial as this will help to establish any adaptive management requirements to support ongoing nutrient benefits. The specific requirements of these inspections will depend on the type of techniques uses and the scale of the scheme. The following visual checks are suggested:

- Periodicity of lateral inundation: A floodplain reconnection scheme should be assessed to ensure that lateral inundation is occurring periodically as opposed to either constantly or only during low frequency, high magnitude flood events.
- Vegetation: If floodplain, benthic or riparian vegetation is planted it should be monitored, especially during the establishment phase. Replanting should take place if die back occurs and plants don't naturally regrow, for example.

- Invasive species should also be identified early and removed against where necessary.

## 4.7 DRAINAGE DITCH BLOCKING

### 4.7.1 Process of removal

The primary mechanisms for P removal by drainage ditch blocking is sediment deposition and sorption of dissolved P to sediments. Sorption of dissolved P requires longer residence times in order for P to be chemically bound within sediments (Johnston & Dawson, 2005). Removal of P by deposition entails placing a barrier (blocking the ditch) to slow flow and prevent downstream transport of sediments. The sorption process is enhanced in blocked drainage ditches, through increased contact time with particulate material, resulting from increased surface roughness and reduced flow velocities. Increased surface roughness decreases the sediment transport capacity of the stream, resulting in immobilization of P within the environment (Reddy, et al., 1998).

P uptake by vegetation also facilitates P removal while also increasing the surface roughness of the sediment and increasing hydrological heterogeneity. However, aquatic vegetation typically has a relatively short lifespan and will degrade, therefore P removal by plants can be short lived. Upon decomposition, P assimilated by uptake in aquatic plants can be readily re-mobilised in aquatic environments (Yoon, et al., 2014).

### 4.7.2 Types of drainage ditch blocking

Drainage ditch blocking aims to create a water-tight dam which results in water table rise caused by non-continuous flow. There are many types of dam material which can be used to create a drainage ditch block such as turf, plastic pilling, plywood, wooden plank, corrugated Perspex, heather bales, and straw bales or any combination (Ramchunder, et al., 2009; Armstrong, et al., 2010). Each dam material will have different desired outcomes and implications for use which will affect the decision-making process for which schemes will be most appropriate for nutrient neutrality. Implications relate to the suitability of the environment, as not all dam types are suitable. Poor choice of dam material for the surrounding topography of the environment is what often leads to dam failure, for example plywood dams are more suited to very wet peatlands than a heather bale dam. Dam failure has obvious implications for P removal efficiencies; therefore it is an important factor to consider to ensure greater likelihood of dam success (Armstrong, et al., 2010).

### 4.7.3 Factors affecting efficacy

Nutrient removal in drainage ditches by ditch blocking is reliant on several factors. The main factor is to reduce flow velocities and increase transient storage by increasing hydrological heterogeneity (Ramchunder, et al., 2009). Drainage ditch blocking practices that focus on facilitating reductions in flow velocity within a ditch are likely to increase the contact time and spatial extent of flow through soils and sediments. Although the chemical sorption of P to sediments is a quick reaction, the full, slow phase physical process of P penetration into soil particles can take days (Reddy, et al., 1998). This slow phase P penetration immobilises P for longer, hence it is importance to slow flow through a ditch in order to increase transient storage of water in soils that the ditch is draining. Geomorphic characteristics can also have an influence on P removal. Drainage ditches that create shallower wider pools upstream of the ditch block create conditions that allow for increased contact time of water with sediments, which will generally promote greater P removal (Armstrong, et al., 2010).

Drainage ditch blocking schemes will have the greatest P removal efficiency in ditches with soil types that promote P sorption. Soils with high specific surface areas, such as clay soils, have significant quantities of sorption sites with which to bind P (Reddy, et al., 1998). However, P sorption can be inhibited by the organic matter content of soil. Organic matter competes for sorption sites and can also alter sorption sites, both of which prevent the sorption of P to soils while also potentially causing P release (Reddy, et al., 1998).

Schemes that implement vegetation cover around blocked drains encourage conditions for increased surface roughness, flow velocity reduction and reduced sediment transport capacity (Holden, 2009).

The process of P removal via plant uptake is also increased in ditch blocks that facilitate revegetation by creating pools with favourable conditions for plant growth (Armstrong, et al., 2010).

There is limited research available regarding the effectiveness of drainage ditch blocking practices for P removal. The majority of studies focus on other environmental or water quality parameters such as DOC concentration or vegetation density, or studies were conducted in peatlands which may not be transferrable to other upland or lowland environments. Furthermore, the majority of studies take place in non-UK countries, with little certainty regarding the transferability of the results to the UK environment. Due to the lack of available literature regarding the estimated potential of nutrient removal within ditch blocking schemes, a percentage estimate for P removal efficiency was unable to be determined, however the literature suggests that drainage blocking will deliver some P removal benefits. To determine the efficacy of ditch blocking schemes, baseline and long-term monitoring is required both prior to and post-implementation.

#### 4.7.4 Practical considerations

Drainage ditch blocking aims to create a watertight dam that will hold water in a ditch and thus promote processes that remove P from agricultural drainage. The design of a ditch blocking scheme will need to consider ditch geometry and materials that will be suitable for blocking the ditch. Choice of materials should consider the hydrology of the ditch to reduce the risk of the dam being washed away during heavy rainfall events.

A ditch blocking scheme will need to determine the P loading rate to the ditch and the P load of water exiting the ditch in order to determine how much P the scheme is removing. This will require a suitable monitoring programme.

Ecological surveys should be conducted to determine whether the change in habitat within the ditch may have negative impacts on any protected habitats or species. It is also likely that blocking a drainage ditch may result in localised flooding of surrounding agricultural land during rainfall events. This will require engagement with landowners / land managers to ensure they will not object to the loss of land during wet weather.

#### 4.7.5 Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements

A well blocked ditch should need little long-term maintenance. Sediment accumulation and vegetation growth are likely to help reinforce the ditch block. Visual inspection of the block should be carried out periodically during rainfall events to check that the block is still effectively damming water. The required frequency of these checks will be dependent on the dam material used, with non-natural materials like Perspex sheets likely to need less frequent inspections assuming they are installed securely. Wooden dams are most likely to need repair as they are subject to bowing and distortion of the wood.

Visual inspections may indicate the need for management of vegetation to either remove vegetation if it is significantly decreasing the amount of water that the blocked ditch can hold to replanting if vegetation has been lost or has not successfully established vegetation. Sediment accumulation may also decrease the amount of water than can be held behind blocked ditches and monitoring the level accretion would help to determine either then sediment may need to be removed from a ditch or when the ditch may stop functioning as effectively for sediment and P storage.

Monitoring will be required to quantify the amount of P that is removed by a blocked drainage ditch. This monitoring programme will need to determine the influent P load to the ditch, which will need a sampling design that can quantify the influent flow rate and the TP concentration of influent water. Sampling of flow rate and TP concentration in the ditch network downstream of the dam will enable a quantification of the P load reduction caused by a ditch blocking scheme. The P load entering a blocked ditch and the process that immobilise P within a ditch will vary seasonally and in response changes in surrounding land management. Monitoring programmes should be established that will enable management and maintenance efforts to be targeted over the lifetime the solution. Sampling programmes will need to be reactive to rainfall events in order to sample runoff entering and exiting a blocked ditch.

## 4.8 ENGINEERED LOGJAMS

### 4.8.1 Process of removal

Engineered logjams mimic the environmental conditions produced as a result of dams formed by beavers. The nutrient removal processes are thus very similar between the two systems and beaver dams can provide an analogue for logjams. Sedimentation, chemical sorption, and biomass assimilation are the three P removal processes caused by logjams. Sedimentation occurs as a result of reduced velocities and increased channel heterogeneity which together reduce the sediment transport capacity of the channel, causing deposition of sediment bound P. Nutrient removal is also facilitated by sorption of P to deposited sediments and debris, encouraged by the increased contact time with particulate material caused flowing flow behind engineered or natural dams. Logjams can also promote removal of P via uptake by vegetation. Increased vegetation growth in the pools and wetlands that form behind logjams can also contribute to greater surface roughness, further increasing the potential for sediment deposition and storage of associated nutrients.

### 4.8.2 Types of logjam

Engineered logjams consist of a series of dams placed along a stretch of river, each reducing flow velocities by temporarily retaining a small body of water behind the dam in the form of a pool. Engineered logjams are mainly made of large wood such as whole tree trunks, logs or branches and debris such as fresh or decomposed organic matter (Herrera Environmental Consultants, 2006). Depending on the type of dam constructed as well as the construction materials there will be different desired outcomes and implications regarding nutrient removal capacity. Depending on the surrounding topography and hydrology of the site, the type engineered logjam will differ. Log steps and valley jams are more applicable for grade control whereas the design of jams on the outside of meanders or on the edge or banks are more applicable for flow manipulation (Herrera Environmental Consultants, 2006). This potentially could affect the removal capacities of the scheme as the type of dam that may be more effective at P removal, may not be achievable to build within the constraints of the site. This will affect the decision-making process regarding which dam type will be the most appropriate for achieving nutrient neutrality.

### 4.8.3 Factors affecting efficacy

The size of pools that form upstream of either engineered or natural beaver dams will influence the nutrient removal capacity of the system, with large ponds holding more sediments and associated nutrients (Puttock, et al., 2018). Large and shallow ponds are favourable for P removal due to the large surface area to volume ratios, which increase transient storage of water within sediments and hence support the nutrient removal processes that occur in the hyporheic zone (Roberts, et al., 2007).

There is also a need to understand the hydrology of a stream where a logjam will be deployed so that the dam structure will not be washed out during periods of high flow (Lammers & Bledsoe, 2017). As such, logjams are best suited to small watercourses < 2 m (Eden Rivers Trust, n.d.).

Vegetation density within the pools formed upstream of dams will influence the system's capacity for P retention, with removal rates being positively correlated with the quantity of vegetation. This is achieved via nutrient assimilation, reduced velocities, and the resulting prolonged contact of nutrients with vegetation and P sorption sites.

Research regarding engineered logjams and beaver dams is not comprehensive enough to be able to establish suitably precautionary nutrient removal estimates prior to implementation. As such, monitoring will be required before and after the scheme is introduced in order to determine the amount of P removal a logjam scheme has achieved.

### 4.8.4 Practical considerations

Engineered logjams will need design details that show how they will mimic the environmental conditions created by beaver damming that result in P removal by sedimentation, chemical sorption and biomass assimilation. Designs will need consider site-specific characteristics, including the geomorphology and

hydrology of the river that is being dammed. These factors will be very important to ensure that a logjam is designed in a way that stops it getting washed away in high flows.

The characteristics of riverbeds should also be considered in order to maximise P removal potential. For example, clay bed streams are less suitable as they result in less hyporheic exchange between sediments and overlying water, which may result in lower rates of P removal.

Engineered logjams will increase the connectivity of river channels with their floodplains and can result in localised increases in flooding onto floodplain areas. This approach will therefore require engagement with both landowners / land managers as well as NRW, in order to ensure that the increased in localised flood risk is acceptable. Logjam schemes are thus likely to require some form of flood risk assessment. The potential implications of localised flooding on landowners / land managers mean that engagement with these stakeholders is essential.

Baseline surveys of the P load within the section of river to be dammed will help to inform whether a potential logjam site will provide a significant quantity of P mitigation. Monitoring of a scheme once operational will be essential to quantify the amount of P it is removing from a river system.

If the proposed location for a logjam is within the boundary of a designated site or its supporting habitat, considerations should be given as to whether the physical habitat alterations caused by a scheme will have adverse effects on the protected features of the site. Any adverse impacts on protected features of designated sites may cause issues for the feasibility of a scheme.

#### 4.8.5 Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements

The management and maintenance required to ensure an engineered log jam scheme remains safe and functional will mainly consist of checks of the dam and surrounding area. Although the specific maintenance required will be site-specific and will depend on how a scheme is designed, management and maintenance should have regard for the following:

- Sediment scour issues: As channel bed scour is the leading cause for engineered log jam failure, a sediment scour analysis should take place prior to implementation of the scheme and to assess the extent of the risk of scouring that could undermine a logjam. If issues with channel bed scour are identified, appropriate action must be taken to reduce the risk a dam being undermined and failing.
- Debris and sediment removal: As engineered log jams aim to slow the flow velocity of the river and not stop flow entirely, the dam should remain semi-permeable and leaky. Removing debris and sediment build up should take place routinely to ensure that these build-ups do not obstruct the flow of water entirely.
- Snags: Woody debris can become snagged within the log jam, which can cause flow obstructions and cause flow to overtop the dam. In order to avoid this, woody debris that has become snagged within a logjam should be removed. This may involve the use of heavy machinery, depending on the size of the snagged woody debris.
- Structural damage repair: Regular checks to assess the structural integrity of an engineered log jam should be carried out. If any structural damage is identified or if the structural integrity is compromised, repair works should be carried out.

A monitoring programme will be required to quantify the amount of P removed by a logjam. Baseline monitoring of nutrient concentrations is recommended but is not essential – sampling upstream and downstream of a logjam after it is constructed should be sufficient to quantify the reduction in P load caused by a scheme “before” implementation (i.e., upstream of the scheme) and after. Monitoring before the scheme has been deployed and at points along the length of river that is being dammed will provide an indication of the P load that will enter the dammed length of channel directly, rather than just measuring the P load that enters the dammed stretch of river from upstream. Operational monitoring should take flow measurements and TP water quality samples upstream and downstream of the dammed section of channel in order to quantify the influent and effluent load of TP to a logjam scheme. This monitoring regime will allow for the quantification of any TP load reduction caused by the logjam. Monitoring should initially be conducted at a minimum monthly frequency to capture seasonal variation. Monitoring programmes should be conducted for as long as required for the system to reach equilibrium,

whereby the fluctuations in load reductions show steady patterns of change on repeating cycle, or simply stabilise around a long-term average. At this point it may be possible to reduce monitoring frequency and use sampling results as part of an adaptive management system to highlight when maintenance may be required if monitoring results suggest a change in P removal patterns.

## 4.9 TERRESTRIAL SEDIMENT TRAPS

### 4.9.1 Process of removal

The erosion of soils contributes to diffuse P pollution due to the desorption of soil-bound P from soils that are washed into rivers. Heavy rainfall and subsequent surface water runoff mobilises sediments, with a greater risk of soil erosions and sediment mobilisation in high-risk areas such as steep slopes, exposed soils, types of vegetation cover and hillslope connectivity with river channels (Vinten et al, 2017). Sediment traps immobilise sediment and sediment-bound P by trapping sediment on surface water runoff pathways. A sediment trap is placed in an area where surface water flow pathways are known to occur. Sediment accumulates in the traps and is left to stabilise or is removed, thus immobilising and removing a source of P pollution to rivers. The efficacy of a sediment trap is determined by measuring or estimating the volume of sediment that accumulates behind a trap over a given period of time and sampling soils to understand the P load within the trapped sediment.

### 4.9.2 Types of sediment traps

There are various types of sediment traps. Sediment fences (also known as a filter fence or silt fence) are temporary fences comprised of a permeable geotextile that is constructed downslope of a farm at a field boundary and at the location of known surface water runoff pathway. This blocks the flow pathway and water is forced through the permeable fence, slowing flow to cause sedimentation and essentially acting as a filter to trap sediment and the associated P load (Vinten et al, 2014). Sediment fences can be constructed cheaply and also moved to different locations once accumulated sediment has been removed. It is also possible to leave them in a location and allow them to become buried. They are typically used on arable farms and in construction sites. Earthen bunds and leaky dams are more permanent features that will have the same impact as a sediment fence but cannot be moved once they have been installed.

Detention ponds are depressions that are filled by surface water runoff during rainfall events, forming ephemeral wetland features. A detention pond will slow surface water runoff flows and drain slowly, allowing time for sediment to be trapped in the pond. Detention ponds are typically used as a SuDS feature, though they can also be deployed in the rural environment to intercept eroded soils. Urban detention ponds are typically more engineered than rural detention ponds in order to reduce the risk of localised flooding if the pond overtops. Rural detention ponds can utilise natural depressions by routing flow to these features.

### 4.9.3 Factors affecting efficacy

The performance of sediment fences are primarily controlled by their location. The location of the fence will dictate how much surface water runoff passes through the fence and thus how much sediment will be trapped by it. Therefore, best practice suggests locating these features on a surface water runoff pathway downslope of an agricultural field.

Detention ponds will reduce in effectiveness once they are full and flow moves continuously through the ponds without slowing sufficiently to support sediment deposition. Sediment accumulation will also affect the storage capacity of a pond, which can in turn affect the time taken for a pond to fill and subsequently reduce the potential for sediment deposition.

### 4.9.4 Practical considerations

The permeable geotextiles used for sediment fences can become blocked, which can cause water to back up behind a fence and then overtop it, resulting in a reduction in sediment deposition and P removal performance (Vinten et al, 2014). It may be necessary to periodically clean sediment fences to ensure they continue to allow water to pass through rather than over them. It is also important not to

build fences in an area of high flow velocities as this could cause damage to the fence and impact P removal performance.

Rural detention ponds are typically designed with an outlet that allows water out when it is near ground level, rather than being positioned at the base of a pond, in order to avoid accumulated sediment blocking the outlet (Fiener et al, 2005).

For both sediment fences and detention ponds, an approach to estimating the quantity of P removal the sediment trap can achieve will need to be developed if these solutions are to be deployed without needing prior monitoring to quantify their efficacy. It is likely that an estimate of P removal could be derived by delineating the catchment area for a sediment trap and determining likely runoff rates for this catchment. Combining runoff rates with estimates of soil erosion potential and the probable P load of soils within the trap's catchment area could provide an estimate of the amount of P a sediment trap could remove. No established method has been found to derive an estimate of P load removal by sediment traps and the required assessment would need to be carried out for each location where a trap could be deployed. Monitoring of sediment traps provides an alternative approach to determining their efficacy, however this would require deploying them without having an estimate of the quantum of P mitigation they could deliver.

#### 4.9.5 Long-term maintenance and monitoring requirements

The maintenance requirements for sediment fences is dependent on their use. If a sediment fence is being left to be buried, no maintenance will be required, provided there are no rips or breaks in the geotextile used. However, this would not prove nutrient neutrality in perpetuity. Therefore, to increase the longevity of nutrient retention, the sediment should be removed and disposed of correctly. Alternatively, a mobile sediment fence could be utilised that is moved once the captured sediment is stabilised.

Urban detention ponds require regular maintenance in a similar manner to SuDS wetland features (see Section 4.4 and 4.5). Rural detention ponds will require less maintenance than permanently inundated wetlands, though as is the case with sediment fences, they will fill with sediment if left unmaintained and thus will only provide a temporary mitigation solution. Visual monitoring of the detention pond is required to assess the sediment accumulation rates. Removal of sediment and safe disposal in a way that does not recirculate the removed P within an affected river catchment can help to prolong the life of a detention pond. The outlet pipes in detention ponds may need regular unblocking or desilting.

Monitoring should be used to determine the amount of P that is being removed by terrestrial sediment traps. Ideally monitoring will be carried out throughout the lifetime of a sediment trap as the amount of sediment being stored by these solutions will vary over time, depending on landcover, land management and weather conditions in the area of catchment that the sediment trap is receiving runoff from. The frequency of monitoring should be set by the frequency of runoff events that may deliver sediment to a trap. Alternatively, the amount of P stored in a trap could be calculated when sediment is removed.

## 5. MAPPING POTENTIAL MITIGATION LOCATIONS

---

### 5.1 IDENTIFICATION OF WWTW WHERE A WETLAND COULD BE CREATED.

Figure 5-1 shows the estimated TP loading from the WwTW in the affected catchments within Carmarthenshire based on the consented dry weather flow (DWF) limits. The consented DWF for a WwTW describes the maximum consented flow rate from a WwTW when it is not receiving combined foul and stormwater flows. It is the maximum amount of water a WwTW should discharge when it has not been raining (hence 'dry weather flow') and so the only water that should enter a works is raw sewage. Estimated TP loads for each WwTW were calculated by multiplying the DWF by the assumed

non-permit limited WwTW P concentration in the final effluent (8 mg/l<sup>19</sup>). The ten WwTW with the highest estimated TP load are shown in Table 5.1. Llanybydder WwTW and Llandovery WwTW are positioned relatively high in their respective catchments. This strategic location is important because any water quality improvements will propagate downstream and thus be available to developments that will impact the rivers further downstream in each catchment.

Pencader STW and Llandovery WwTW appear to have the highest number of planning applications that are constrained by phosphorus surrounding them. A development that is near a WwTW does not necessarily connect to that WwTW, but a general assumption can be made that a site will connect to the closest WwTW.

Using the rate of removal for tertiary treatment of domestic wastewater of 46%, from Land et al. (2016) a wetland at the four WwTW with the highest estimated loading, Llanybydder WwTW, Drefach/Velindre, Ffairfach, Llandovery WwTW would remove 1370, 1268, 1138 and 948 kg TP/year, respectively. It should be noted that these removal rates are high level estimates and the actual quantum of mitigation available from a wetland at each site will depend on many factors to do with wetland design and measured inflow characteristics. A well designed wetland may be able to achieve significantly greater treatment efficiency than 46%. However, these estimates are likely to be in the region of what a wetland could deliver at these sites and should provide a starting point from which further investigation of suitable wetland sites can be developed.

Assuming a dwelling outputs around 1 kg TP/year (a value that in reality is extremely variable and highly dependent on the occupancy rate, water usage and pre- and post-development land uses), a wetland at one of these WwTW could provide P mitigation for around 1000 dwellings. Considering the CCC LDP estimated that around 1000 homes are needed per year<sup>9</sup>, a treatment wetland at one of these sites could make a significant contribution to the mitigation requirement within Carmarthenshire.

When selecting a potential location for a treatment wetland at a WwTW, a variety of datasets can be used to mask out areas where a wetland should not be created, such as on designated sites where the wetland would interfere with the site's conservation objectives. Appendix 2 contains a list of datasets that could be used to inform an assessment of site feasibility, with descriptions on how they can be used.


---

<sup>19</sup> As used in the Carmarthenshire Nutrient Budget Calculator.

Table 5.1 The ten WwTW with the highest loading in the affected catchments in Carmarthenshire

| Name                             | Coordinates (X Y) |        | Dry Weather Flow Maximum limit (m <sup>3</sup> /day) | Estimated P load (kg/year) |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------|--|----------------------------|
| Llanybydder WwTW Ceredigion      | 251724            | 243265 | 1019   | 2978                       |
| Drefach/Velindre WwTW            | 235336            | 240291 | 943  | 2755                       |
| Ffairfach STW                    | 261590            | 221170 | 847  | 2475                       |
| Llandovery WwTW                  | 276130            | 233180 | 705  | 2060                       |
| Llandysul WwTW                   | 241910            | 240290 | 689  | 2013                       |
| Pencader STW                     | 244600            | 236500 | 439  | 1283                       |
| Llangadog STW                    | 269890            | 228140 | 427  | 1248                       |
| Llanpumpsaint WwTW               | 241540            | 229140 | 317  | 926                        |
| Pont-Ar-Gothi & Nantgaredig WwTW | 250446            | 221217 | 171  | 500                        |
| Talley WwTW Llandeilo Carms      | 264050            | 231782 | 128  | 374                        |

Figure 5-1 A map showing the estimated TP loading from WwTWs with dry weather flow permitted limits in the affected catchments within Carmarthenshire County Council.



## 5.2 HIGH LEVEL EXAMPLE OF FINDING MITIGATION FOR A SPECIFIC PLANNING APPLICATION

According to the information provided by CCC, application number W/39283 is for 16 new dwellings. Assuming it could feasibly connect to a WwTW (Pencader STW is the nearest WwTW although this is not confirmed), a PTP may not be appropriate. A review of the site plans<sup>20</sup> allowed for estimation of the nutrient budget. The site use will be predominantly residential land on an area of approximately 0.5 ha (see website for the Blossom Garage development). Should the site be connected to Pencader STW, the P budget is estimated to be 16.23 kg TP/year, with the new land use contributing 1.5 kg TP/year. It would not be feasible for this development to mitigate this loading onsite with SuDS as the loading from the new land use is too small. Therefore, this application will need mitigation using one of the offsite mitigation measures listed Sections 3 and 4.

According to the Consented discharge register, Pencader STW uses biological filtration to treat sewage and has a permitted daily dry weather flow discharge of 439 m<sup>3</sup>. This equates to 3.51 kg TP/day or 590 kg TP/year, assuming the WwTW treats the final effluent to 8 mg TP/litre. Assuming a HLR of 2.3 cm per day, the loading at which Lin et al (2002) recorded high P removal rates, a wetland receiving 439 m<sup>3</sup> would need to be 1.9 hectares. There is a 3-hectare land parcel of grassland and marsh adjacent to Pencader WwTW (see redline boundary in Figure 5-2) downstream of the discharge. This land parcel could be used for a treatment wetland, provided a full feasibility assessment was completed and showed the site was viable for wetland deployment. A wetland at this location and treating effluent from the Pencader STW would be suitable for providing mitigation to application number W/39283 and any other applications that discharge to Pencader STW or that discharge to the Afon Teifi upstream of the Pencader STW.

## 5.3 TARGET AREAS FOR CATCHMENT-MANAGEMENT MITIGATION SOLUTIONS

The JBA WWNP (see Section 2.3.1.4) dataset was used to provide an analysis of potential areas that may be suitable for the deployment of buffer strips (see Section 4.3) and sediment traps (see Section 4.9). Areas were selected based on the locations of stalled developments in downstream catchment areas relative to the locations where mitigation schemes could be deployed. This is a high-level analysis, more detailed feasibility studies will be needed to inform actual locations for deployment of mitigation, however the following analysis provides an indication of how more detailed work could be targeted to specific locations to try and maximise the benefit from catchment management interventions to mitigate P from the agricultural sources.

### 5.3.1 Riparian buffer creation areas

Figure 5-4, Figure 5-4 and Figure 5-5 demonstrate the use of the WWNP Riparian Woodland Potential dataset in three target catchments examples. The WWNP Riparian Woodland Potential dataset maps area 50 metres either side of river waterbodies what would be suitable for riparian buffer creation. As explained in Section 4.3, a riparian buffer could be as narrow as 6 m metres to be effective and ideally would be between 20-30 m wide. As such, the Riparian Woodland Potential dataset is a very useful tool to identify these area with potential for deploying riparian buffer strips.

The first example target catchment is a larger sub-catchment comprising 14 single waterbody catchments in the headwaters of the Afon Tywi. The catchment contains areas which are outside of the CC boundary. This catchment has been selected because tackling diffuse pollution near the top of the catchment will allow for the beneficial affects to propagate downstream. Within this catchment there are five stalled planning applications. The area of this catchment is 358.0 km<sup>2</sup>. The area of the potential riparian buffer areas is 1251 hectares.

<sup>20</sup> See Blossom Garage development plans, available here: <https://www.c2jarchitects.co.uk/blossom-garage-pencader-proposed-residential-development/>, accessed on: 20/04/2022

The second example target catchment is a small, single waterbody catchment for the Tyweli which eventually feeds into the Afon Teifi. This small catchment has been targeted because there are seven stalled applications in and around the catchment. It also allows for comparisons to be made between different size catchments. The area of this catchment is 12.3 km<sup>2</sup>. The overview of this catchment shows a satellite image of the landcovers within the riparian buffer planting zone which highlights that the opportunity areas for. The area of the potential riparian buffers are largely agricultural fields without a buffer zone to stop P pollution in runoff directly entering the watercourse. This highlights the utility of the WWNP Riparian Woodland Potential dataset for initial targeting of locations for buffer deployment. areas is 40 hectares.

The third target catchment is a larger, single river waterbody catchment with an area of 37.8 km<sup>2</sup> that is completely within Ceridigion. This catchment has been included to demonstrate the potential requirement to implement schemes in a collaborative way, across county borders. Target catchment three drains to the Afon Teifi and riparian buffer mitigation schemes in this catchment could benefit stalled developments that are downstream on the Teifi and that are within the CCC authority area. The area of the potential riparian buffer areas is 212 hectares.

Without a full-scale feasibility exercise, it is difficult to quantify the potential P removal that these riparian buffers could provide. However, it is possible to demonstrate what information would need to be known in order to predict the P removal for a riparian buffer scheme. In order to understand the P loading to a riparian buffer and thus the potential P removal from a buffer scheme, the following steps would need to be completed:

- Identify a Riparian buffer opportunity area
- Create a catchment boundary and identify flow pathways through topographical analysis. This can be completed through analysis of a Digital Terrain Model (DTM) in a GIS.
- Ensure flows pathways are routed through the riparian buffer opportunity area.
- Calculate the area of the catchment.
- Identify the landcovers, and their areal extents, within the catchment. This would include the soil types, the rainfall volume received and the farm type, if appropriate.
- Use the Carmarthenshire Nutrient Budget Calculator, or conduct field scale modelling / monitoring, to establish the P export coefficients for the landcovers within the catchment.
- Multiply the export coefficients for each landcover type by the relevant export coefficient to calculate the total P load entering the buffer.
- Apply a P removal rate, based on sufficient evidence, to the total P load in order to identify the amount of P retained by the buffer.

Figure 5-4 shows the overview of the Tyweli Target Catchment 2. Figure 5-5 shows a map of a small section of the Tyweli in Target Catchment 2. The boundary on the map shows a hypothetical catchment area that drains to the river that could be derived using freely available 3-D elevation model data. The red arrows indicate hypothetical flow pathways. There is a riparian buffer opportunity area between the catchment and the river, as demonstrated by the WWNP dataset. The next step in this exercise would be to identify the landcovers types and their associated export coefficients to calculate to total P loading to the buffer. Applying a removal rate to this total load would provide an estimate of the total P load mitigated using this solution.

### 5.3.2 Location of runoff attenuation features

As well as showing potential areas for riparian buffer creation, Figure 5-4 also maps locations of potential runoff attenuation features in the Tyweli catchment (Target catchment 2). The Runoff Attenuation Features Potential<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup> dataset estimates locations where it may be possible to temporarily store water during a 1 in 100-year rainfall event. The dataset contains information on the potential type of attenuation feature. For example, some features are described as 'Gully blocking' which are areas of run-off attenuation features on steeper ground, where leaky barriers may

be more appropriate<sup>21</sup>. As such, the Runoff Attenuation Features Potential dataset could be used to locate areas to implement drainage ditch blocking solutions. Other mapped attenuation features could be used to identify potential locations for sediment fences and/or detention ponds. It is noted that the runoff attenuation features opportunity dataset will not provide the ability to estimate the P removal performance of these features and that monitoring will be needed in order to ascertain the efficacy of these solutions.

---

<sup>21</sup> See: Working with natural processes mapping technical report, available here: <https://www.gov.uk/flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-research-reports/working-with-natural-processes-to-reduce-flood-risk>, accessed on: 20/05/2022

Figure 5-2 A map showing Pencader WwTW and a potential location for a wetland north of the site.




Figure 5-3 A map showing target catchments for riparian buffer creation using the WWNP Riparian Woodland Potential dataset




Figure 5-4 A map showing the Tyweli target catchment and the potential riparian buffer creation areas and the 1 in 100 year runoff attenuation features using the WWNP datasets





Figure 5-5 A map showing an example of a hypothetical catchment for a potential riparian buffer creation areas in the Tyweli target catchment



## 6. GENERIC FRAMEWORK FOR MITIGATION OPTION PROPOSALS

---

Deployment of any of the mitigation solutions detailed in Sections 3 and 4 will require a supporting mitigation proposal that will provide information on feasibility and supporting technical assessments and/or plans detailing how the quantity of P mitigation will be determined. This section describes some key area that should be covered in a mitigation proposal. The list detailed below is not an exhaustive checklist, but should provide a guide on the kinds of information that will be submitted with a good mitigation proposal. A proposal should aim to include as much information as possible on every point in the list, regardless of the mitigation solution being implemented. Appendix 2 provides a list of key datasets that can be used to assist with formulating a proposal.

### Design objectives:

- A proposal for a mitigation solution should have clearly defined objectives. Objectives should aim to state a realistic reduction in P that a mitigation solution can achieve, based on the best available evidence. Where a P mitigation solution cannot estimate a reduction in P loading before it has been implemented, it should state the requirement for monitoring to establish P load reductions.
- The target P source for reduction should be clearly defined. Any variation in the P load to the mitigation solution should be estimated and considered. All other sources of P should be outlined if known.
- Any additional benefits that a solution is aiming to achieve should be detailed.
- The long-term performance of the solution should be described, as well as any potential variability in this performance.

### Feasibility assessment:

- List the factors that could affect P removal performance and might impact getting the proposal approved.
- Common factors related to mitigation deployment site that might impact feasibility include:
  - Topography
  - Soil characteristics (type, grain size, hydraulic conductivity, soil nutrients)
  - Source Protection Zone locations
  - Geology and hydrogeology
  - Groundwater vulnerability
  - Proximity to Flood Zone 2 and 3
  - Proximity to designated sites
  - Location of priority habitats
  - Location of historic monuments and archaeological sites
  - Proximity to strategic land allocation areas
  - Proximity to key infrastructure
  - Previous land use

### Design overview:

- The design overview should provide a high-level conceptualisation of the mitigation solution.
- The design overview should recognise the potential for further iterations of a design to incorporate feedback from stakeholders and new evidence.

- The framework for how P loading to a solution and P load reductions will be calculated should be clearly set out.
- The design overview should reference any requirements for management and maintenance of a mitigation solution to maintain P removal functions.

#### **Detailed design of the solution:**

- Detailed design should include any features and design elements that are fundamental to the functionality of the solution.
- The design should include the specific information about a solutions such as dimensions, vegetation planting plans, flow rates into and out of a solution and other details that describe how the solution will be built / developed.
- The detailed design should make an explicit link between how a solution's design will promote the processes that remove P.
- Where possible, the detailed design should be used to show how a solution will result in a quantified reduction in P loading.

#### **Implementation of the solution:**

- A construction / deployment plan for the solution should be provided.
- This plan should show the key steps required for the delivery of a solution so that it will achieve any stated P removal performance.
- This plan should also clearly state any required delivery partners and their role in the implementation of a solution.

#### **Monitoring strategy**

- A monitoring plan should be provided. This should include information on:
  - The group responsible for monitoring the solution
  - The monitoring period
  - The sampling strategy
  - Baseline monitoring (prior to implementation of a solution)
  - Operational monitoring (post-implementation)
  - Monitoring methods
  - Reporting plan, including how monitoring will be linked to maintenance requirements.

#### **Management and maintenance plan:**

- A management and maintenance plan should include:
  - The maintenance requirements to ensure P removal functionality for the lifetime of a solution.
  - The maintenance actions that need to be implemented if functionality reduces.
  - The group responsible for completing these actions.
  - How maintenance will be financed over the lifetime of a solution.
  - How maintenance actions will be logged and reported to a responsible body, if required.

## **7. DELIVERY PARTNERS**

---

Successful delivery of the mitigation measures described above will require the engagement of a range of partners from different stakeholder groups. Figure 7-1 provides an overview of stakeholder groups that are likely to be engaged in the delivery of each mitigation option. CCC along with the NMB for the

SAC river catchments within CCC's authority area will be involved with the delivery of all P mitigation solutions in the county. NRW will also have a role as the statutory consultee on HRAs to approve mitigation proposals. Developers will be involved in all types of mitigation provision as the end users of the mitigation provided by different solutions. As such, these stakeholders have been placed centrally and linked to all mitigation solutions in Figure 7-1 and will be referred to below as the "central stakeholders". It is also noted that CCC, as the Competent Authority, will ultimately be responsible for signing off on any kind of mitigation scheme that will support an HRA AA of P neutrality. The stakeholder groups linked to each of the mitigation options in Figure 7-1 may have the roles detailed below for each mitigation option or set of options.

#### *Private sewerage drainage fields*

- Unlikely to require other stakeholder engagement than the central stakeholders as the solutions will be managed by property owners.
- These solutions will have technical specifications that will detail how the design of the system will result in a quantified reduction in P loading, which may be sufficient for a dwelling or dwellings to achieve P neutrality.
- Whilst it is CCC as the Competent Authority who will ultimately sign off on the HRA AA that will be supported by the technical specification for a private sewerage drainage field, NRW are also likely to be involved in the sign off process as the statutory consultee for European sites.

#### *Buffer strips, river restoration, engineered logjams*

- Both national parks and farmers / landowners / land managers may have a role in determining where these solutions can be deployed.
- Farmers and land managers are likely to need consultation on any impacts these solutions may have on present land uses.
- River restoration and engineered logjams may result in greater local floodplain connectivity, which may result in areas where localised flooding becomes more common, with associated impacts on land use that will impact farmers and land managers.
- There may be a requirement to purchase land from landowners to deploy these solutions. Buffer strips will require an area of land to be given up for the buffer. River restoration schemes may require some land to be given up if the scheme is going to result in changes to river form that will alter areas of riverbank, but not all schemes will require land use to be changed.
- Mitigation proposals for these schemes will require supporting technical information that will detail the reduction in P a scheme will provide.
- Early engagement with NRW on these proposals will be beneficial and help to ensure proposals and the supporting technical information are sufficiently robust in their approach to quantifying and delivering P reductions.
- As detailed above, for river restoration and engineered logjams it is likely that a scheme will need to be monitored to evidence the reductions in P it will deliver. The results of the monitoring and thus the P reductions provided by one of these schemes are likely to require ratification by NRW.
- For buffer strips, it is likely that engagement with NRW will be needed to agree the percentage reduction in P a scheme can deliver. As detailed above, we suggest a precautionary value of x% has support based on the literature and this can be used as a starting point for engagement with NRW.
- Rivers trusts and wildlife trusts may have a dual role in both provisioning these mitigation solutions and the long-term maintenance and management.
- The NMB should be consulted to consider the location of these schemes and how this might interact with other P reduction schemes.

#### *Agricultural land use change, drainage ditch blocking, sediment traps*

- Both national parks and farmers / landowners / land managers may have a role determining where these solutions can be deployed.

- Farmers and land managers are likely to need consultation on any impacts these solutions may have on present land uses.
- Sediment traps and drainage ditch blocking may both cause a loss of areas of land that could be used for farming and thus would need to have agreement with farmers that they will be maintained.
- Mitigation proposals for these schemes will require supporting technical information that will detail the reduction in P a scheme will provide.
- Early engagement with NRW on these proposals will be beneficial and help to ensure proposals and the supporting technical information are sufficiently robust in their approach to quantifying and delivering P reductions.
- As detailed above, for drainage ditch blocking it is likely that a scheme will need to be monitored to evidence the reductions in P it will deliver. The results of the monitoring and thus the P reductions provided by one of these schemes are likely to require ratification by NRW.
- Sediment traps and agricultural land use change schemes are likely to be able to have their potential P reduction benefit quantified before deployment. NRW will require engagement on the supporting technical information to show scale of P reduction that can be achieved by these proposals.
- Wildlife trusts may have a dual role in both provisioning these mitigation solutions and the long-term maintenance and management.
- The NMB should be consulted to consider the location of these schemes and how this might interact with other P reduction schemes.


#### *SuDS*

- A technical report detailing the SuDS design and how this design will result in a quantified amount of P reduction will need to be provided to CCC and NRW.
- SuDS Approving Bodies (SABs) will be involved in the approval and adoption of SuDS schemes.

#### *Wetlands*

- Likely to be deployed on agricultural land, requiring engagement with farmers / landowners / land managers.
- WWTWs are a key source of water to supply treatment wetlands, requiring engagement with DCWW.
- NRW will require consultation on the design of a wetland to ensure they are confident that the wetland will deliver stated P mitigation benefits.
- CCC and the NMB may have a role in determining strategic locations where wetlands should be deployed, in order to serve the largest amount of development.
- Rivers trusts may play a role both in the design and commissioning process and/or the long-term management and maintenance of a wetland.
- Private providers of wetlands schemes may choose to develop schemes to sell P credits to developers.

Figure 7-1: Diagram showing the likely stakeholders who will need to be engaged for each type of mitigation option, noting that some mitigation options are likely to require engagement with similar stakeholder groups. N.b. CCC = Carmarthenshire County Council, NMB = Nutrient Management Board, NRW = Natural Resources Wales, DCWW = Dwr Cymru Welsh Water, SABs = SuDS Approving Body.



## 8. SUMMARY

---

This technical review has detailed a set of mitigation options that may be appropriate for mitigating P in Carmarthenshire. The review has sought to provide guidance on how these mitigation solutions could be deployed in order to provide P offsetting and support sustainable house building within the county. An initial longlist of mitigation options was selected based on previous reviews of mitigation options. From this longlist, a shortlist of options was developed based on an analysis of whether a mitigation option has the evidence-base required to show that it will be able to provide P mitigation beyond reasonable scientific doubt and/or whether the option is viable for deployment in Carmarthenshire. This shortlist includes options which have an evidence-base that is sufficient to provide confidence that an option will deliver P mitigation, but where monitoring may be required to quantify the amount of P mitigation the option can provide.

Each shortlisted option has been reviewed to provide detail on the processes within each option that remove or immobilise P within the environment. These processes were categorised as P removal by sedimentation, P removal by chemical sorption to sediment and P removal by plant uptake. Different combinations of these processes are active in each of the shortlisted mitigation options, with different processes active in different types of the shortlisted options. Various factors affect the efficacy of these processes within each mitigation option and these should be considered in proposals for a given mitigation option to maximise the potential P removal that an option can deliver. Different practical considerations and long-term maintenance and monitoring are required for each mitigation option. These practical considerations as well as maintenance and monitoring plans should be included in mitigation proposals and will help to secure the P removal potential of a scheme. Monitoring plans should be developed as part of the mitigation outline design process. Monitoring design should be developed relative to need to support most effective maintenance and to demonstrate nutrient mitigation success. As such monitoring timelines will be dependent on a range of factors including for example, current knowledge base, scale, location and design. Deployment of P mitigation schemes will need to be supported by a proposal detailing the design of a scheme. If it is possible to predict the amount of P a scheme will remove before it is deployed, the design will provide details of how this predicted P removal has been calculated. Alternatively, for options where quantifying the reduction in P mitigation will require monitoring, a mitigation proposal should include design details that include what monitoring will be required to evidence the P reductions delivered by a scheme.

Wetlands, drainage fields and SuDS can be designed in such a way that the P removal potential of these options can be predicted before they are deployed. A detailed design for each of these solutions should provide the relevant supporting information, data and calculations that can quantify the scale of P removal each option can achieve. Prediction of the P removal an option can receive should embed enough precaution to allow for the option to underachieve without causing a risk that developments relying on a scheme will not have sufficient mitigation available. Where suitably precautionary estimates of mitigation potential are made for wetlands, drainage fields and SuDS, monitoring the performance of scheme may provide the opportunity to release additional mitigation if the option is found to be performing better than predicted.

Agricultural land use change involving woodland planting or rewilding can evidence P reductions from this option easily as the removal of agricultural P sources can be readily quantified using agricultural P export coefficients. However, due to the relatively low amount of P that comes from average agricultural land uses relative to the cost of agricultural land, rewilding and woodland planting schemes are likely to be a very costly way of generating P mitigation. Conversion of farming systems to agroforestry provides an approach to generating P mitigation from agricultural land that means that farmers can continue to generate income from agricultural production while managing farms in a way that reduces P pollution. The evidence to support the scale of P reduction from agroforestry is relatively limited and may not be sufficient to provide accurate predictions of the amount of P mitigation that these schemes can deliver. Monitoring an agroforestry scheme may be required to determine the scale of P reductions it can achieve.

Buffer strips, drainage ditch blocking and terrestrial sediment traps all provide P mitigation solutions that can be deployed within the agricultural landscape to retain diffuse P pollution. These solutions

could also be deployed in urban areas, but fewer studies of their application in urban environments have been found. The theory supporting the potential of these mitigation to remove P is robust, however it is likely that monitoring of these schemes will be required to provide a robust quantification of the scale of P mitigation a solution can deliver. Buffer strips have the most evidence of their P reduction potential and it may be possible to provide a precautionary estimate of their efficacy through a well-reasoned and well evidenced design process.

River channel re-naturalisation and engineered logjams are two types of river channel management scheme that are both likely to provide P reduction benefits, but which will require monitoring to determine the scale of P reductions they can achieve. These options have a range of ancillary benefits, such as NFM, carbon sequestration and biodiversity improvements that could support their deployment as P mitigation schemes that will deliver significant co-benefits.

This report has also provided outputs from a GIS exercise that demonstrated the utility of using open-source datasets to aid decision making on mitigation strategies and where mitigation can be targeted within Carmarthenshire. Four WwTW have been identified that are likely to contribute a high P load to Carmarthenshire's SAC rivers. It is recommended that a catchment-wide mitigation strategy should target these WwTW initially due to the potential reductions that a well-designed treatment wetland could provide and thus ability for these sites to provide a predictable quantity of strategic mitigation that can help to unblock development in Carmarthenshire. The GIS exercise also highlighted how a freely available dataset can be used to target locations where catchment management-based mitigation solutions such as riparian buffers, terrestrial sediment traps and drainage ditch blocking could be deployed.

Finally, an outline for a general framework to support mitigation proposals was elaborated that highlights the kind of details a mitigation proposal should include in order to evidence that a mitigation solution will deliver quantifiable reductions in P pollution. This framework includes considerations on how to determine the feasibility of a mitigation option and recommendations on how option design can be used to increase certainty that an option will deliver P mitigation. Part of a successful mitigation proposal will required the identification of any delivery partners. Suggestions of the likely partners required for engagement in the delivery of each option were detailed. CCC, the NMB, NRW and developers are likely to be involved in the delivery of all mitigation options. Specific mitigation options are likely to have distinct stakeholder groups that may need engagement to support delivery of an option. These groups may include landowners / land managers where an option will require land use change. Engagement with DCWW for the deployment of treatment wetland schemes. And engagement with Environmental NGOs who may be able to support both the deployment and long-term management of various different types of mitigation solution.

## 9. REFERENCES

---

### Front page image credits:

Afon Tywi / River Tywi

cc-by-sa/2.0 - © Alan Richards - [geograph.org.uk/p/7082057](http://geograph.org.uk/p/7082057)

### Literature:

Aberdeenshire Council, 2015. *Understanding Planning Advice*. [Online] Available at: [https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/media/21345/2015\\_09-buffer-strips-planning-advice.pdf](https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/media/21345/2015_09-buffer-strips-planning-advice.pdf) [Accessed April 2022].

Abrahams, J., Coupe, S., Sañudo-Fontaneda, L. & Schmutz, U., 2017. The Brookside Farm Wetland Ecosystem Treatment (WET) System: A Low-Energy Methodology for Sewage Purification, Biomass Production (Yield), Flood Resilience and Biodiversity Enhancement.. *Sustainability*, p. 147.

Armstrong, A. et al., 2010. The impact of peatland drain-blocking on dissolved organic carbon loss and discolouration of water; results from a national survey. *Journal of Hydrology*, 381(1-2), pp. 112-120.

Bastien, N., Arthur, S., Wallis, S. & Scholz, M., 2010. The best management of SuDS treatment trains: a holistic approach. *Water Science and Technology*, p. 263–272.

Bernhardt, E. S. & Palmer, M. A., 2011. River restoration: the fuzzy logic of repairing reaches to reverse catchment scale degradation. *Ecological Applications*, 21(6), pp. 1926-1931.

Briggs, S., 2012. *Agroforestry: A new approach to increasing farm production*, s.l.: Nuffield Farming Scholarships Trust.

Cameira, M., Tedesco, S. & Leitao, T., 2014. Water and nitrogen budgets under different production systems in Lisbon urban farming. *Biosystems engineering*, Volume 125, pp. 64-79.

Chen, C., Condrón, L. & Xu, Z., 2008. Impacts of grassland afforestation with coniferous trees on soil phosphorus dynamics and associated microbial processes: a review. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 255(3-4), pp. 396-409.

Cole, L. J., Stockan, J. & Helliwell, R., 2020. Managing riparian buffer strips to optimise ecosystem services: A review. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, Volume 296, p. 106891.

Cucarella, V. & Renman, G., 2009. Phosphorus sorption capacity of filter materials used for on-site wastewater treatment determined in batch experiments—a comparative study.. *Journal of environmental quality*, pp. 381-392.

Deng, Q. et al., 2017. A global meta-analysis of soil phosphorus dynamics after afforestation. *New Phytologist*, 213(1), pp. 181-192.

Dodd, R. J., McDowell, R. W. & Condrón, L. M., 2012. Predicting the changes in environmentally and agronomically significant phosphorus forms following the cessation of phosphorus fertilizer applications to grassland. *Soil Use and Management*, pp. 135-147.

Eden Rivers Trust, n.d. *Leaky dams*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.edenrivertrust.org.uk/your-eden/explore-edens-rivers/leaky-dams/> [Accessed 1 February 2022].

Edwards, A. & Withers, P., 2008. Transport and delivery of suspended solids, nitrogen and phosphorus from various sources to freshwaters in the UK. *Journal of Hydrology*, 3-4(350), pp. 144-153.

Environment Agency, 2015. *Phosphorus Cycling in Rivers*, Bristol: Environment Agency.

Forbes, E. G. A., Foy, R., Mulholland, M. V. & Brettell, J. L., 2011. Performance of a constructed wetland for treating farm-yard dirty water. *Water Science and Technology*, pp. 22-28.

Forestry Commission, 2022. *Farming Advice Service*. [Online] Available at: [c/sites/default/files/docs/2022-02/Intro%20to%20buffer%20strips%20windbreaks%20shelterbelts%20-](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/108222/Intro%20to%20buffer%20strips%20windbreaks%20shelterbelts%20-02.pdf)

[%20Final\\_0.pdf?msclid=dd26eb63c15911eca1da5f43528cd65c](#)  
[Accessed April 2022].

Gao, Y. et al., 2016. 2016. *Water Science and Technology*, 74(3), pp. 714-721.

Gorton, E., Kellagher, R. & Udale-Clarke, H., 2017. *21st Century Drainage Programme -Capacity Assessment Framework: Guidance Document*, s.l.: Water UK.

Groffman, P. et al., 2009. Nitrate leaching and nitrous oxide flux in urban forests and grasslands. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, Issue 38, pp. 1848-1860.

Harper, D. M. et al., 1999. A catchment-scale approach to the physical restoration of lowland UK rivers. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 9(1), pp. 141-157.

Haycock, N., 1997. *Buffer zones : their processes and potential in water protection*. Hertfordshire: Quest Environmental.

Heal, K. et al., 2009. Medium-term performance and maintenance of SUDS: a case-study of Hopwood Park Motorway Service Area, UK. *Water Science and Technology*, 59(12), pp. 2485-2494.

Herrera Environmental Consultants, I., 2006. *Conceptual Design Guidelines Application of Engineered Logjams*, s.l.: Scottish Environmental Protection Agency.

Holden, J., 2009. *A grip-blocking overview*, Leeds: School of Geography, University of Leeds..

Holmans, A. H., 2005. *Historical Statistics of Housing in Britain*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge.

Johnston, A. E. & Dawson, C. J., 2005. *Phosphorus in Agriculture*, Peterborough : Agricultural Industries Confederation .

Kadlec, R. & Wallace, S., 2009. *Treatment Wetlands, Second Edition*. s.l.:CRC press.

Keating, K. et al., 2015. *Cost estimation for SUDS - summary of evidence*, Bristol: Environment Agency.

Kocadagistan, B., Kocadagistan, E., T. N. & Demircioğlu, N., 2005. Wastewater treatment with combined upflow anaerobic fixed-bed and suspended aerobic reactor equipped with a membrane unit. *Process Biochemistry*, 40(1), pp. 177-182.

Lammers, R. W. & Bledsoe, B. P., 2017. What role does stream restoration play in nutrient management?. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology* , 47(6).

Land, M. et al., 2016. How effective are created or restored freshwater wetlands for nitrogen and phosphorus removal? A systematic review.. *Environmental Evidence*, pp. 1-26.

Lee, K. H., Isenhardt, T. M. & Schultz, R. C., 2003. Sediment and nutrient removal in an established multi-species riparian buffer. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 58(1), pp. 1-8.

Li, H. et al., 2020. Simultaneous nitrogen and phosphorus removal by interactions between phosphate accumulating organisms (PAOs) and denitrifying phosphate accumulating organisms (DPAOs) in a sequencing batch reactor. *Science of The Total Environment*, Volume 744, p. 140852.

Li, R., Yuan, Y., Zhan, X. & Liu, B., 2014. Phosphorus removal in a sulfur–limestone autotrophic denitrification (SLAD) biofilter. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 21(2), pp. 917-978.

Lowe, K. et al., 2007. Influent constituent characteristics of the modern waste stream from single sources: Literature review. *Water Environment Research Foundation*.

Mainstone, C. P. & Parr, W., 2002. Phosphorus in rivers — ecology and management. *Science of the Total Environment*, Volume 282-283, pp. 25-47.

Marshall, M. et al., 2014. The impact of rural land management changes on soil hydraulic properties and runoff processes: results from experimental plots in upland UK. *Hydrological Processes*, 28(4), pp. 2617-2629.

May, L., Place, C., O'Malley, M. & Spears, B., 2015. *The impact of phosphorus inputs from small discharges on designated freshwater sites*. *Natural England Commissioned Reports, Number 170.*, s.l.: Natural England.

May, L. et al., 2015. *Development of a risk assessment tool to assess the significance of septic tanks around freshwater*, s.l.: Natural England Commissioned Reports.

- May, L. & Woods, H., 2016. *Phosphorous in Package Treatment Plant effluents*, s.l.: Natural England Commissioned Reports, Number221.
- May, L. & Woods, H., 2016. *Phosphorous in Package Treatment Plant effluents. Natural England Commissioned Reports, Number 221.*, s.l.: Natural England.
- Mitchell, G., 2005. Mapping hazard from urban non-point pollution: A screening model to support sustainable urban drainage planning. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 74(1), pp. 1-9.
- Naden, P. et al., 2016. Nutrient fluxes from domestic wastewater: A national-scale historical perspective for the UK 1800–2010.. *Science of the Total Environment*, Volume 572, pp. 1471-1484.
- Natural England, 2020. *Advice on Nutrient Neutrality for New Development in the Stour Catchment in Relation to Stodmarsh Designated Sites - For Local Planning Authorities*, s.l.: s.n.
- O'Keeffe, J. et al., 2015. *Practical measures for reducing phosphorus and faecal microbial loads from onsite wastewater treatment system discharges to the environment: a review*, s.l.: CREW.
- Owens, P. N., Wood, G. A., Deeks, L. K. & Hann, M., 2006. *Appendix 3. Spatial and temporal information on catchment soil characteristics*, s.l.: National Soil Resources Institute.
- Perry, T. & Nawaz, R., 2008. An investigation into the extent and impacts of hard surfacing of domestic gardens in an area of Leeds, United Kingdom. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 86(1), pp. 1-13.
- Peterjohn, W. T. & Correll, D. L., 1984. Nutrient dynamics in an agricultural watershed: Observations on the role of a riparian forest. *Ecological Society of America*, 65(5), pp. 1466-1475.
- Potter, C., 1999. *Coppiced trees as energy crops. Final report to ETSU for DTI on contract ETSU B 1078*, Harwell: s.n.
- Puttock, A., Graham, H. A., Carless, D. & Brazier, R. E., 2018. Sediment and nutrient storage in a beaver engineered wetland. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 43(11), p. 2358–2370.
- Ramchunder, S. J., Brown, L. E. & Holden, J., 2009. Environmental effects of drainage, drain-blocking and prescribed vegetation burning in UK upland peatlands. *Progress in Physical Geography: Earth and Environment*, 33(1), pp. 49-79.
- Ramchunder, S. J., Brown, L. E. & Holden, J., 2009. Environmental effects of drainage, drain-blocking and prescribed vegetation burning in UK upland peatlands.. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 33(1), pp. 49-79.
- Reddy, K. R., O Connor, G. A. & Gale, P. M., 1998. Phosphorus Sorption Capacities of Wetland Soils and Stream Sediments Impacted by Dairy Effluent. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 27(2), pp. 438-447.
- Reddy, K. R., O Connor, G. A. & Gale, P. M., 1998. Phosphorus Sorption Capacities of Wetland Soils and Stream Sediments Impacted by Dairy Effluent. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, pp. 438-447.
- Renman, A. & Renman, G., 2010. Long-term phosphate removal by the calcium-silicate material Polonite in wastewater filtration systems. *Chemosphere*, p. 659–664.
- Ricardo, 2021. *Herefordshire Council Interim Phosphate Delivery Plan: Stage 1 - Guidance for calculating phosphate budgets for new developments draining to the River Wye SAC*, s.l.: s.n.
- Ricardo, 2021. *Nutrient Neutrality – Generic Nutrient Budget Methodology, Part 1: Technical Review*, s.l.: Ricardo.
- Roberts, B. J., Mulholland, P. J. & Houser, J. N., 2007. Effects of upland disturbance and instream restoration on hydrodynamics and ammonium uptake in headwater streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, 26(1).
- Schulte, R. P. O. et al., 2010. Modelling soil phosphorus decline: Expectations of Water Framework Directive policies. *Environmental Science & Policy*, pp. 472-484.
- Schwer, C. B. & Clausen, J. C., 1989. Vegetative Filter Treatment of Dairy Milkhouse Wastewater. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 18(4), pp. 446-451.
- Sharpley, A. et al., 2013. Phosphorus legacy: Overcoming the effects of past management practices to mitigate future water quality impairment. *Journal of environmental quality*, pp. 1308-1326.

- Shatwell, T. & Cordery, I., 1999. *Nutrient storage in urban wetlands*. 339 - 348 in: Ellis, J B (Edit); *Impacts of urban growth on surface water and groundwater quality*.. Wallingford: IAHS Press.
- Strecker, E. W., Kersnor, J. M., Driscoll, E. D. & Horner, R. R., 1992. *The use of wetlands for controlling stormwater pollution*. Report EPA/600 , Washington: The Terrane Institute.
- Vanrobaeys, J. A. et al., 2019. Seasonal Efficacy of Vegetated Filter Strips for Phosphorus Reduction in Surface Runoff. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 48(4), pp. 880-888.
- Wang, L., Li, B., Li, Y. & Wang, J., 2021. Enhanced biological nitrogen removal under low dissolved oxygen in an anaerobic-anoxic-oxic system: Kinetics, stoichiometry and microbial community. *Chemosphere*, p. 128184.
- White, P. J. & Hammond, J. P., 2008. *Updating the Estimate of the Sources of Phosphorus in UK Waters*, Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Wilkinson, M., Stutter, M. & Nisbet, T., 2020. *3D buffer strips: designed to deliver more for the environment*, Bristol: Environment Agency.
- Woods-Ballard, B. et al., 2015. *The SUDS manual*. London: CIRIA.
- Xia, L., Hoermann, G., Ma, L. & Yang, L., 2013. Reducing nitrogen and phosphorus losses from arable slope land with contour hedgerows and perennial alfalfa mulching in Three Gorges Area, China. *CATENA*, Volume 110, pp. 86-94.
- Yoon, T. K. et al., 2014. Soil moisture effects on leaf litter decomposition and soil carbon dioxide efflux in wetland and upland forests.. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, pp. 1804 - 1816.
- Zhang, F., Jingping, Y., Ronglan, W. & Daoliang, M., 2007. Analysis of Nitrogen and Phosphorus Input and Output Characteristics and Use Efficiency in Pear Tree–Upland Rice Intercropping Systems. *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 28(12), pp. 2125-2143.

# APPENDICES

---

## Appendix 1 Longlist of mitigation solutions

The long list of mitigation options is provided in the table below.

| Mitigation Solution  | Included? | Justification   |
|--|-----------|---|
| Private sewerage with drainage fields                                | Yes       | They are appropriate for small developments and sewerage systems can provide technical documentation evidencing P removal / concentration of the final effluent.  |
| SuDS   | Yes       | These are a legal requirement. They can be designed to achieve relatively high certainty of a known P removal rate.   |
| Wetlands   | Yes       | They are nature-based solutions that can be designed to achieve relatively high certainty of a known P removal rate.  |
| Buffer strips  | Yes       |   |
| Agricultural land use change / short rotation coppice / agroforestry | Yes       |   |
| River restoration  | Yes       | They have a lot of theoretical evidence for P removal, albeit with difficulty to quantify specific P removal rate without conducting monitoring work. They are part of wider catalogue of catchment management practices. |
| Sediment Traps   | Yes       |   |
| Drainage Ditch Blocking  | Yes       |   |
| Engineered logjams   | Yes       |   |
| Taking fish farms out of production                                  | No        | No fish farms within affected catchments in Carmarthenshire.  |
| Water efficiency measures  | No        | It is very difficult to predict or measure the impact of water efficiency measures in sewer catchments for WwTWs without a P permit. Maintenance of water efficiency measures is hard to secure in perpetuity.            |
| Reducing the intensity of agricultural production                    | No        | It is difficult to predict or measure the impact of P reductions. Significant lag times due to legacy P stores. Difficult to secure and measure in perpetuity.  |
| Transporting excess phosphorous from dairy farms to arable farms     | No        |   |
| Regulatory controls on agricultural phosphorus                       | No        |   |
| Reduce leakage from the foul sewage network                          | No        | Quantifying the potential reduction in P loading that these options will deliver is very difficult.   |
| Reduce leakage from potable water supply                             | No        |   |
|  |           |   |

| Mitigation Solution  | Included? | Justification  |
|--|-----------|--|
| Increased treatment of effluent                            | No        | This is outside of the control of the LPA and the developer and would have to be delivered by Dwr Cymru Welsh Water. The Asset Management Planning cycle and regulations on water companies that limit their ability to receive direct payments for upgrades at WwTWs limits the ability to deploy these solutions. This solution also contains a lot embodied carbon and thus is not aligned with the water sector's Net Zero strategies. |
| Diverting surface water flows away from the sewage network | No        | This will only reduce P loading in sewer catchments where WwTWs have P permits. As there are no works with P permits in affected areas of Carmarthenshire, this option is not viable.  |
| Addressing misconnections                                  | No        |  |

## Appendix 2 Useful opensource datasets

This section lists some datasets that could be useful to help locate mitigation solutions and cover the key themes in the generic framework for mitigation option proposals.

### Datasets that can be used to locate mitigation features:

**Name:** WWNP Runoff Attenuation Features 1% AEP

**Link:** <http://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/WWNPRunoffAttenuationFeatures1/?lang=en>

**Description:** locations of high flow accumulation across the land surface or in smaller channels, where it may be possible to temporarily store water and attenuate flooding during high flows. For the 1 in 100-year event. This could be used for locating wetlands, sediment traps, drainage blocking areas etc.

**Name:** WWNP Runoff Attenuation Features 3.3% AEP

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_WWNP\\_RUNOFF\\_ANTEN\\_3PC](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_WWNP_RUNOFF_ANTEN_3PC)

**Description:** locations of high flow accumulation across the land surface or in smaller channels, where it may be possible to temporarily store water and attenuate flooding during high flows. For the 1 in 100 year event. This could be used for locating wetlands, sediment traps, drainage blocking areas etc.

**Name:** WWNP Riparian Woodland Potential

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_WWNP\\_RIPERIAN\\_WOODLAND\\_POTENTIAL](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_WWNP_RIPERIAN_WOODLAND_POTENTIAL)

**Description:** locations where tree planting may be possible on smaller floodplains close to flow pathways. This could be used for locating areas of riparian buffer creation.

**Name:** WWNP Floodplain Woodland Planting Potential

**Link:** <https://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/WWNPFloodplainWoodlandPlantingPotentialWales/?lang=en>

**Description:** locations where tree planting on the floodplain may be possible that are not wooded. This could be used for locating areas of buffer creation or areas to target agricultural land use change.

**Name:** WWNP Wider Catchment Woodland Potential

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_WWNP\\_WIDER\\_CATCHMENT\\_POTENTIAL](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_WWNP_WIDER_CATCHMENT_POTENTIAL)

**Description:** locations where there are slowly permeable soils, where scrub and tree planting may be most effective to increase infiltration and hydrological losses. This could be used for locating areas of buffer creation or areas to target agricultural land use change.

**Name:** WWNP Floodplain Reconnection Potential

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_WWNP\\_FLOODPLAIN\\_RECONNECTION\\_POTENTIAL](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_WWNP_FLOODPLAIN_RECONNECTION_POTENTIAL)

**Description:** dataset shows the locations where it may be possible to reconnect a watercourse and its natural floodplain, especially during high flows. The dataset targets areas of currently poor connectivity. This can be used to locate potential areas for wetlands receiving stream flow.

### General landcover information for assessing site suitability:

**Name:** Soilscales

**Link:** <http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscales/>

**Description:** An online map of soil types in the UK.

**Name:** Landmap Landscape Habitats

**Link:** <http://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/LandmapLandscapeHabitats/?lang=en>

**Description:** Geographic dataset showing habitat landscape classification for Wales.

**Name:** OS Open Zoomstack

**Link:** <https://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/business-government/products/open-zoomstack>

**Description:** UK landcover spatial data (roads, surface water, greenspace, buildings)

**Name:** WFD Groundwater bodies Cycle 2

**Link:** <http://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/WaterFrameworkDirectiveWFDGroundwaterBodiesCycle2/?lang=en>

**Description:** Groundwater spatial data. This can be used for ascertaining the groundwater vulnerability to pollution.

**Name:** WFD River Waterbody Catchments Cycle 2

**Link:**

<https://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/WaterFrameworkDirectiveRiverCatchmentWaterbodiesCycle2/?lang=en>

**Description:** Geospatial data showing the hydrological catchments of rivers, streams and canals

**Name:** CORINE landcover

**Link:** <https://land.copernicus.eu/pan-european/corine-land-cover/clc2018?tab=download>

**Description:** UK landcover spatial data.

**Name:** British Geological Survey (BGS) Geology 625k

**Link:** <https://www.bgs.ac.uk/datasets/bgs-geology/>

**Description:** UK geology spatial data.

**Name:** Flood Map for Planning Flood Zones 2 and 3

**Link:** <https://datamap.gov.wales/layergroups/inspire-nrw:FloodMapforPlanningFloodZones2and3>

**Description:** Flood map spatial data.

**Datasets that may affect the feasibility of a mitigation solution:**

**Name:** Ancient Woodland Inventory 2021

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_ANCIENT\\_WOODLAND\\_INVENTORY\\_2021](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_ANCIENT_WOODLAND_INVENTORY_2021)

**Description:** Spatial data showing the locations of Ancient Woodlands.

**Name:** Peatlands of Wales

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/geonode:peatlands\\_of\\_wales\\_scg8](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/geonode:peatlands_of_wales_scg8)

**Description:** Spatial data showing the location of peatlands.

**Name:** Source Protection Zone (SPZ) (Zone 1)

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_Source\\_Protection\\_Zones](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_Source_Protection_Zones)

**Description:** Spatial data showing the locations of SPZ

**Name:** WOM21 Priority Habitat - High Sensitivity

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/geonode:gwc21\\_priority\\_habitat\\_high\\_sensitivity](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/geonode:gwc21_priority_habitat_high_sensitivity)

**Description:** Spatial data showing semi-natural habitats which are listed as priority habitats under Section 7 of the Environment Act.

**Name:** Geological Conservation Review (GCR) Site Boundaries

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_GCR\\_SITES](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_GCR_SITES)

**Description:** Spatial data showing the site boundaries for all Geological Conservation Review

**Name:** National Inventory of Woodland and Trees

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_NIWT](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_NIWT)

**Description:** Spatial data showing woodland areas.

**Name:** National Nature Reserves (NNR)

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_NNR](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_NNR)

**Description:** Spatial data showing NNR in Wales.

**Name:** National Trails

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_NATIONAL\\_TRAIL](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_NATIONAL_TRAIL)

**Description:** Spatial data showing national trails.

**Name:** National Parks

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_NATIONAL\\_PARK](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_NATIONAL_PARK)

**Description:** Spatial data showing the locations of National Parks.

**Name:** Open Access - Registered Common Land

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_COMMON\\_LAND\\_2014](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_COMMON_LAND_2014)

**Description:** Spatial data showing locations of public access land.

**Name:** Open Access - Other Statutory Access Land

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_OTHER\\_STATUTORY\\_LAND\\_2014](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_OTHER_STATUTORY_LAND_2014)

**Description:** This spatial dataset contains all Common Land with a higher right of access.

**Name:** Ramsar Wetlands of international importance

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_RAM SAR](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_RAM SAR)

**Description:** Spatial data showing the locations of Ramsar designated wetlands

**Name:** Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGS)

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_RIG\\_SITES](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_RIG_SITES)

**Description:** Spatial information showing RIGS.

**Name:** Scheduled Monuments

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-wg:Cadw\\_SAM](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-wg:Cadw_SAM)

**Description:** Spatial data showing archaeological sites of national importance.

**Name:** Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_SSSI](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_SSSI)

**Description:** Spatial data showing locations SSSIs.

**Name:** Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_SAC](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_SAC)

**Description:** This spatial dataset shows the locations of SACs..

**Name:** Special Areas of Conservation (SPA)

**Link:** [https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW\\_SPA](https://datamap.gov.wales/layers/inspire-nrw:NRW_SPA)

**Description:** This spatial dataset shows the locations of SPAs/

## Appendix 3 Table of Wastewater Treatment Works

| Wastewater Treatment Works        | Wastewater Treatment Works       |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Abergorlech WwTW Llandeilo        | Glanyrafon STW Whitemill         |
| Alltwalis STW                     | Golden Grove WwTW Llandeilo      |
| Bethlehem STW Bethlehem Llandeilo | Gwynfe STW Capel                 |
| Brechfa WwTW                      | Heol Timothy STW Ffaldybrenin    |
| Bro Dolau STW Rhydcymerau         | Llandoverly Wastewater Treatment |
| Bro Nant STW Nantyffin Brechfa    | Llandysul WwTW                   |
| Broad Oak WwTW Fe Broad Oak       | Llanfihangel-ar-arth STW         |
| Bronwydd STW                      | Llanfynydd STW                   |
| Bryndulais STW                    | Llangadog STW                    |
| Bryngwyn WwTW Gwynfe Rd Llandeilo | Llangathen STW                   |
| Caio STW                          | Llanpumpsaint WwTW               |
| Capel Iwan STW                    | Llansawel WwTW                   |
| Cilycwm WwTW                      | Llanybydder WwTW Ceredigion      |
| Crugybar STW Crugybar Llandeilo   | Myddfai WwTW Myddfai             |
| Cwm Ifor WwTW                     | Pencader STW                     |
| Cwmduad STW                       | Pentrecwrt STW                   |
| Cwrt Henri STW                    | Pont-Ar-Gothi & Nantgaredig WwTW |
| Cynghordy WwTW                    | Pumpsaint STW                    |
| Cynwyl Elfed WwTW                 | Rhandirmwyn STW                  |
| Danrhelyg STW Newcastle Emlyn     | Salem STW                        |
| Drefach/Velindre WwTW             | Talley WwTW Llandeilo            |
| Farmers STW                       | Trapp STW                        |
| Felingwm WwTW                     | Twynllanan STW                   |
| Ffairfach STW                     |                                  |



T: +44 (0) 1235 75 3000

E: [enquiry@ricardo.com](mailto:enquiry@ricardo.com)

W: [ee.ricardo.com](http://ee.ricardo.com)