

# **Water-Sensitive Planning (WSP)**

Integrating Water Considerations  
Into Urban and Regional Planning

**Naomi Carmon**

**and**

**Uri Shamir**

Faculty of Architecture and  
Town Planning

Faculty of Civil and  
Environmental Engineering

**The Center for Urban and Regional Studies**

**Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel**

Published in *Water and Environment Journal*, 2010, Vol. 24 (3), pp.181-191.

**Water-Sensitive Planning (WSP):**  
**Integrating Water Considerations into Urban and Regional Planning**

Naomi Carmon      Uri Shamir

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Introduction	3
The Evolving International Knowledge and Experience	3
Urban WSP	7
• <b>Placement and Design of Open Spaces and Road</b>	7
• <b>Preservation and Rehabilitation of Urban Streams</b>	8
• <b>Urban Stormwater Management</b>	8
• <b>The 3Ms of stormwater management</b>	8
• <b>Best Management Practices (BMPs) I: Urban Land Use Practices</b>	9
• <b>Best Management Practices (BMPs) II: Land Cover Design</b>	10
• <b>Best Management Practices (BMPs) III: Constructed Facilities</b>	11
Regional WSP	12
• <b>Catchment Area Master Plan</b>	12
• <b>Partial Catchment Plan</b>	13
• <b>Delineation of floodplains</b>	14
Necessary and Supporting Conditions for Implementing WSP	14
Conclusions	17
• <b>Work in progress and its paradigms</b>	17
• <b>Generic Principles for Sustainable Development</b>	18
References	19

# **Water-Sensitive Planning (WSP): Integrating Water Considerations into Urban and Regional Planning**

**Naomi Carmon**

**Uri Shamir**

## **Abstract**

WSP – Water-Sensitive Planning – is an approach to sustainable development that integrates management of water resources into urban and regional planning. Following a literature survey and a condensed report of our fifteen years of studies, the paper presents WSP’s goals, fields, principles and practices and the paradigms that underpin them, with special attention to stormwater management. It encompasses all planning scales, from the building lot to the catchment area. The paper ends with suggested generic planning principles that evolved with the growth of WSP but are intended to serve also other domains of planning for sustainable development.

## **Introduction**

WSP - Water-Sensitive Planning - integrates management of water resources into urban and regional planning. WSP aims to promote sustainable development and construction. Its goals are: Improving the planned environment for its users, preserving and augmenting water resources and improving their quality, reducing the negative impacts of stormwater, and achieving these goals in a cost-effective way and with involvement of citizens. Thus, WSP serves simultaneously and synergistically social, environmental and economic goals and objectives.

This paper presents WSP as it evolved over fifteen years of research work, case studies, and contributions to the creation of national and municipal guidelines and statutory planning directives. It opens with a brief survey of related studies in several countries and an overview of our work with its special characteristics. In light of space limitation, we condensed the details of our studies and devoted most of the space to presenting and explaining its product: The principles we developed, the suggested practices, and the paradigms that underpin them. These constitute the framework that we call WSP. The paper ends with a set of generic principles for sustainable development.

## **The evolving international knowledge and experience**

New approaches to stormwater management have been developed contemporaneously in several countries in the last two decades, without much communication among the countries. All of them adopted sustainable development as an umbrella goal, yet different objectives motivated the initial research effort in the each country.

Researchers in Australia, like the Water Sensitive Urban Design Research Group (1989), were among the first to investigate the subject. Bekele & Argue (1994) connected urban planning with stormwater management mainly in order to protect groundwater in aquifers; Taylor & Wong (2002) published a series of technical reports regarding Best Management Practices for treating stormwater quality; Runoff quality is also the subject of a guide published by Engineers Australia, National Committee for Water Engineering (2006); Fletcher et al. (2004) dealt with flood protection and environmental objectives on the regional and national scale; a broad approach of Integrated Urban Water Management was suggested by Mitchell (2004)†. Australia seems to be advanced also on the way to implement WSUD, first in various states, including Western Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland, and later by the national government. Recently, because of the most severe drought since European settlement, the subject of stormwater management – quantity and quality – is considered a topic of national importance (Roy et al. 2008).

In the US, protection of water quality in streams and lakes from overland flow pollution has been a driving objective for stormwater management since the 1970s (USEPA 1999). More recently, drainage engineers (Konrad et al. 1995), landscape architects (Ferguson & Debo 1990; France 2002) and planners (JAPA 2007) have suggested new ways to promote the same and related objectives, working mostly in their separate disciplines and only lately with some degree of integration. Among approaches that have been suggested and tested are “limiting imperiousness” (Arnold & Gibbson 1996; Moglen & Kim 2007), compact development and increased housing density (USEPA 2006), and LID - Low Impact Development. LID was pioneered by Prince George's County (1999) in Maryland; it requires that the hydrological response (in terms of runoff volume from each storm leaving the developed unit) be kept as it was prior to development, while allowing the planner to select the means for achieving this. LID has been adopted by the USEPA (2007; see USEPA 2000 for a literature survey) as a leading planning approach for runoff management, stating that "One of the most exciting new trends ... today is the movement by many cities, counties, states, and private-sector developers toward the increased use of Low Impact Development (LID) to help protect and restore water quality." The USEPA estimated the cost of implementing sets of LID BMPs in comparison to conventional development in 17 locations; the results show savings of 15 to 80%, relative to conventional design, in all cases except one (ibid.).

Japanese researchers, aiming at flood protection and urban stream restoration, developed models, and conducted longitudinal field studies in which they measured the regulating effect of retention, detention and infiltration on the volume and discharge of runoff (Herath et al. 1993; Musiaka et al. 1999). Environmental objectives motivate initiatives in British Columbia, Canada, where the Rainwater Management and Green Infrastructure approach is being adopted by municipalities and the Provinces, using a mathematical model that enables planners to assess and compare the effectiveness of alternative development plans (Government of BC 2008). In Britain, the focus was primarily on sustainable design of urban drainage (Butler & Parkinson 1997; Butler & Davies 2000; Andoh & Iwugo 2002; CIRIA 2004). The British Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) subsequently widened the scope and turned from sustainable drainage to sustainable water (and wastewater) management in connection with land-use planning, taking into account social, economic and environmental aspects (CIRIA 2006). Last, but not least, extensive research in New Zealand (van Roon et al. 2005; van Roon 2007) strives to go beyond alternative stormwater management to an integrated urban and rural design and development process, studying the various relevant issues, including barriers to implementation.

The movement towards comprehensiveness, which has recently been taken by researchers in Britain and New Zealand, characterized our studies in Israel for a long time. Indeed, we started small but gradually expanded. In 1993 we began with just one goal in mind and a limited geographical scale: Conservation of water resources, especially recharging runoff into groundwater in the Coastal Aquifer, emphasizing “on site” infiltration in individual (private and public) building lots. We used rainfall and land-use data in selected locations, with existing and self-developed models (SCS, SWMM, HMM), to simulate the differences in runoff volume and infiltration between conventional building practices and implementation of WSP means, mainly impervious areas (roofs, paved spaces) connected to pervious ones (lawn, garden) (Carmon et al. 1997; Kronaveter et al. 2001; Katz et al. 2001). A main conclusion we reached is that by 1990 the Coastal Aquifer, Israel's main aquifer, had lost 70 million cubic meters of water per year through reduced infiltration due to urban development, and that if the same development practices continue, the loss would reach 150 mcm/year by 2020; this loss could be reduced significantly by simple means, such as connecting impervious to pervious areas in yards.

We moved from studies of the individual lot and urban block to the neighborhood level, conducted field measurements of runoff quantity and quality that were compared with simulation results (Burmil et al. 2003). We increased our interest in additional goals of Water-Sensitive Planning, such as urban water conservation (Be'eri et al. 2005) and urban quality of life (Hadad 2007), while

working on larger geographical scales – the region/river catchment basin and the country as a whole (Shamir & Carmon 2007).

Through ten successive research projects in a period of fifteen years, we gradually expanded the scope of comprehensiveness and advanced towards integration, a trend that can be identified in several research groups around the world, in Australia, New Zealand, Britain and the US. Currently, our work emphasizes the integrative principle of *Multiple goals and common means*, side by side with another four integrating principles:

- (a) *Multiple goals and common means* – WSP’s goals encompass preservation of water resources - groundwater, streams etc. - quality and quantity; preventing – or at least decreasing - flooding, while reducing drainage costs; protection of ecological systems; using runoff water to reduce use from conventional sources; improved urban quality of life, in terms of green and healthy environment. Frequently, the goals include also promotion of social capital, through peoples' contacts to advance joint objectives, and inter-agency cooperation. Each of the WSP means, such as detention, retention and infiltration facilities, can potentially serve several goals simultaneously, thus promoting integration and synergy in goals achievement.
- (b) *Integrating research approaches and methods* – We combined critical reviews of the international literature with our own studies, covering a variety of methods: field measurements, simulation with hydrological models, workshops of brainstorming with practitioners in various professions, some economic analysis, social and administrative feasibility study; all these together are the basis of WSP policy and its principles.
- (c) *Inter-disciplinarily* - Not only multidisciplinary but also interdisciplinary work of planning and design, landscaping, hydrology and water resources management, ecology, economics and sociology. The various disciplinary professionals work together and are required to cooperate and integrate their work, starting from the initial stages of every planning project.
- (d) *Integration along levels of planning* – Identifying common principles for planning at all levels, from the private yard to the neighborhood, city and catchment area (see below the 3Ms of stormwater management).
- (e) *Integration between research and implementation aspects* – Two-way flow of knowledge, insights and conclusions between researchers and practitioners.

This paper is the first publication of the integrated research project<sup>1</sup>. It focuses on our policy recommendations, on suggested principles and BMPs (Best Management Practices). Because of space limitations and our wish to present the integrated approach as a whole, not in all places could we elaborate the rationale and findings which support the suggested policies and guidelines, but we provide some essential support to most of them.

## **Urban WSP**

WSP is intended to be implemented primarily in newly developed areas (greenfields). However, most of WSP's percepts and means are relevant also to infill and redevelopment projects (brownfields), and can be introduced into existing urban fabrics as well.

### **Placement and Design of Open Spaces and Roads**

A leading WSP principle is placement of open spaces and roads in accordance with the natural hydro-geographic layout. Compliance with this principle determines to a large extent the level of achievement of WSP's goals and the corresponding price. WSP requires planners to start the spatial planning of an area with such placement, before other land uses are located.

Open spaces play critical roles in city life, as places for leisure activities, as air refreshers and also as receptors of stormwater. This is true for all their sizes, from large urban parks to a private yard. Where open spaces are located in consideration with the natural stream system, they can be used also for preventing and mitigating floods by retention and detention of stormwater (Ishizaki et al. 1993; Herath et al. 1993; Musiake et al. 1999) and for purifying and infiltrating runoff, thus recharging groundwater with clean water (Burmil et al. 2003). Stormwater that reaches open spaces may be used for irrigation and also serve as landscaping elements (Glenn 2002; Hadad 2007).

Roads and streets constitute up to 70% of the impervious urban area (Wong et al. 2000) and serve primarily for transporting people and goods. But they also act as important conveyors of stormwater; in fact, they constitute the major drainage system that serves as important flow path when the drainage pipes underneath are charged beyond their capacity (ASCE & WEF, 1992: 50-56, 250-260). They should therefore be designed in close consultation between planners, road engineers and drainage experts, all taking into account WSP guidelines, including: Creating continuous flow paths along roads to the outlet of a regional drainage system, without going

---

<sup>1</sup> Our publications in English in the 1990s were mentioned above. Since then we issued research reports in Hebrew only, including a comprehensive policy report (Shamir & Carmon 2007), trying – with considerable success – to challenge and change the conventional wisdom and practices in Israel.

through local depressions that have no natural outlet; as far as possible, distance roads from natural tracks that serve to drain runoff from large built areas (2-3 square km); and to the extent possible, lay out streets that avoid going down steep slopes, which increase the velocity of flow and act to accumulate runoff rapidly in the downstream areas.

### **Preservation and Rehabilitation of Urban Streams**

WSP advises cities that have a stream in or close to the built areas to maintain it, revive it if it has deteriorated, place along it open spaces, and make it accessible to the public, in a manner that enhances its social and ecological functions, while preserving its role in the flood protection scheme. International experience shows that revitalizing streams can leverage urban quality of life and provide a central artery to the city, an asset that has the potential of changing the image of the city and carrying immense economic value. A striking example is the rehabilitation of the river Cheonggyecheon in Seoul, which required the displacement of a major highway in the middle of a city of 10 million residents (Seoul Museum of History 2005; more modest examples are found in Green Places 2007). Small creeks, even those that flow only in the rainy season, are also valuable as environmental and social assets. "Day-lighting" of streams and creeks is becoming more common, as their value is recognized (Booth et al. 2004).

### **Urban Stormwater Management**

In ancient time people stored rainwater close to their homes and used it. The Romans, great city planners, were among the first to plan sophisticated methods to get rid of urban runoff. Since their days, it became the tradition to consider runoff as a nuisance, which causes flooding that results in inconvenience and damages, and must therefore be removed quickly and effectively from the built areas. Our work (Carmon & Shamir 1997; Carmon et al. 1997; Burmil et al. 2003; Shamir & Carmon 2007) led us to state that **runoff is a resource**, not merely a nuisance. Much of the work, especially the studies conducted with our graduate students, (six research theses) was devoted to understanding the practical implications of this conclusion. The guidelines we developed, based on these studies and on findings found in the international literature, are presented below.

### **The 3Ms of stormwater management**

Stormwater management should always take into consideration the context of the whole relevant catchment area, including consideration of the flows upstream and downstream of the planned unit area. Within that, and with due consideration to local conditions, the following three Ms should be followed for every spatial unit, from a single lot and building block up to a neighborhood and the whole city:



- (1) **Minimize** the difference in **runoff volume** leaving the area after as compared with before the development;
- (2) **Minimize** the difference in **discharge** leaving the area after as compared with before the development;
- (3) **Minimize** the **pollutant load** in the runoff leaving the planned area.

It is evident that we believe in maintaining the natural hydrological balance as the preferred state of affairs. Obviously, in many cases this is a theoretical objective rather than a specific target, and still WSP requires planners, engineers and decision makers to try their best to arrive as close as possible to this ideal. Needless to say, we have a responsibility to protect people and property from harmful flooding, even where their houses were wrongly planned and built on flood plains. Yet the above rules require us to think “outside the box”, remembering that sometimes even built mistakes can be corrected (see the Cheonggyecheon example mentioned above), and that instead of the conventional protective dikes and large drainage systems, one may consider buying out endangered properties or close down basements in flood plains, and compensate residents, for example with building permits on their roofs.

The main tools for implementing the 3Ms of stormwater management are BMPs – Best Management Practices - that have been developed and studied in several countries. Japanese researchers (Ishizaki et al. 1993) compared measurements of runoff, over a 10-year period, from an urban area with BMPs to runoff from an adjacent area without BMPs, and reported the 40 largest storms over this period; they found that the volume (per unit area) from the former is always reduced by at least 70% compared to the latter, and by more than 90% in half of these large storms. At the same time, the peak discharge (per unit area) of these storms is also reduced by a factor of 2-3. Measurements in the US of the effect of BMPs (primarily grass swales) showed reduction of pollutant concentrations ranging between 15% (Nitrates) and 87% (Phosphorus), and of heavy metals (Copper, Lead, Zinc) in the range of 43-64% (USEPA 1999).

In our work, we distinguish three types of BMPs: One - land use planning; second - land cover design; third - constructed facilities, such as reservoirs, swales, and pervious paved surfaces.

### **Best Management Practices (BMPs) I: Urban Land Use Practices**

Common urban land use practices can be used to control urban runoff quantity and quality. Prominent among them is **higher-density development**, which serves multiple goals: Social (enables more and better services), economic (reduced costs), environmental (lower pollution loads), and also - lower runoff per housing unit. The following figures for the effect of building density on generation of runoff were calculated (USEPA 2005): 1 housing unit per acre – 530

m<sup>3</sup>/year, 4 units per acre – 175 m<sup>3</sup>/year from each unit, 8 units per acre – 140 m<sup>3</sup>/year from each unit. The low density thus generates 3 times more runoff per housing unit than the medium density and 3.8 times more than the high density. In addition, because it consumes less land to accommodate the same number of homes, higher density development can also better protect regional water quality. **Mixed Land Use** of housing, employment and services may also be regarded as a BMP, because it reduces the area of roads and sidewalks and the size of parking lots. Since roads and parking spaces and lots take up to one third of the urban area, reducing them contributes to decreasing the impervious areas and their negative effect on water resources and flooding.

### **Best Management Practices (BMPs) II: Land Cover Design**

Land cover design can provide most useful means for turning urban runoff from nuisance into a water resource. Where managed with the 3Ms in mind, it enables catching most of the runoff generated by small and medium rainstorm events (which constitute up to 90% of all rainfall events), for either direct use - irrigation and landscaping, including roof landscaping, and/or for indirect use through recharge into the groundwater. Field measurements by us (Burmil et al. 2003) and others in Israel (Asaf et al. 2004; 2005) showed that the level of contamination of urban runoff from residential areas is low enough to suit both irrigation and recharge to groundwater by infiltration.

In countries with limited water resources, the use of BMPs of land cover design for **infiltration of stormwater into the ground**, mainly for recharging groundwater, may be a significant method for augmenting and possibly improving the quality of a scarce resource. This is especially true for the semi-arid country of Israel, in which much of the population growth occurs in and around the metropolitan area of Tel Aviv that sits above the coastal aquifer, which is the largest water storage of the country. Hence, much of our research concentrated on infiltration and groundwater recharge as a means for augmenting the water resource, with relative ease of implementation and moderate cost. An indicative simulation result is: In a region with rainfall of 600 mm/year and a relatively flat and pervious soil (3% slope, 30 mm/hour), connecting the drains from 100 square meters of roof to a 10 square meter pervious area in the garden/lot reduced annual runoff volume leaving the lot by as much as 70% (with no specially constructed facilities) (Carmon & Shamir 1997).

Based on our work and on findings in the international literature, the following relatively simple and inexpensive land cover BMPs for infiltrating clean urban runoff are hereby suggested:

- **Reduce impervious areas and increase pervious areas**, caring for their vegetation not to consume too much water;

- **Intersperse impervious with pervious areas**, to which flows from the impervious areas are directed;
- **Pass runoff through vegetated patches and/or through the ground**, to cleanse the water from pollutants, especially from suspended sediments.
- **On-site infiltration**, i.e., try to maximize infiltration as close as possible to where it is generated, while avoiding damage to buildings and infrastructure. If possible, runoff should be infiltrated in the yard itself; if not then in the building block or the neighborhood, and only the excess is allowed to flow to the urban drainage system.

Rules for on-site infiltration, in private and public yards are:

- **Make each yard into a micro-catchment**, by placing a low wall around it, with an outlet to allow excess water to flow out<sup>2</sup>.
- Direct runoff from roofs and impervious areas to the pervious areas;
- Maintain soil permeability by avoiding mixing it with building materials and imported heavy soils and compaction.

### **Best Management Practices (BMPs) III: Constructed Facilities**

The professional literature is replete with information on constructed BMPs, their function, design, and sometimes also their cost (e.g., USEPA 1999). Roughly, they can be classified into three categories: (a) **Point structures** - for example: a recharge well which receives rainfall from a roof drain or a yard; a sand filter, used to improve runoff quality before it is discharged downstream or recharged into the ground; a small neighborhood reservoir as part of the landscaping; parking areas covered with a pervious pavement; (b) **Linear structures** - for example: infiltration channel in a park or large yard; porous underground drainage pipe; swales along a road, and (c) **Local reservoirs** – volumes for detention, retention, infiltration, and wetlands, of a size and design that still fit into the built area without endangering residents, especially children.

WSP's approach to constructed BMPs gives preference to **small, simple, and cheap structures**, introduced into the urban fabric without disrupting it. Moreover, WSP is probably unique in its guidance to use them to simultaneously and synergistically implement the 3Ms enunciated above, i.e., to minimize the volume and discharge coming out of every land unit (emphasis on “on-site handling”), to improve the quality of the runoff before it reaches the outlet and to use the runoff locally to improve the landscape and environment (Shamir & Carmon 2007).

---

<sup>2</sup> Under the conditions on the Israeli Coastal Plain, a 20cm high wall around the lot, or at least surrounding its lowest part, suffices (Katz et al. 2001).

The effectiveness of constructed BMPs of the modest type was calculated for a planned 40 hectare (283,000 square meters) neighborhood of 1,400 households in single- and multi-unit buildings on Israel's Coastal Plain, where the average rainfall is 600 mm/year and the soil is moderately pervious (13 mm/hour). The water-sensitive planning included re-configuration of the housing location and orientation, addition of open narrow canals, and small detention and retention pools in public spaces. Comparison with a conventional plan for that neighborhood indicated improvement of the landscape and water quality, while reducing runoff volume by 60%, which went largely to augment the groundwater (Hadad 2007).

## **Regional WSP**

The framework for regional WSP is the drainage basin, the area from which runoff flows to a single outlet, such as a river, a lake or the sea. In recent years, with the trend towards sustainable development, the term used is: Integrated Catchment Management (ICM). This concept is central in the European Union's Water Framework Directive (2000) that calls for ICM plans for each European river basin within the next fifteen years. Yet in most countries, even those that have partly adopted urban WSP practices, the implementation of regional WSP – or ICM – suffers from lack of appropriate data and cooperative work of scientists and developers (Bowden 1999), and in general is rare (Roy et al. 2008).

Some of the literature on ICM is strictly ecological: "Integrated catchment management seeks to take into account complex relationships within ecosystems: Between flora and fauna, between geology and hydrology, between soils and the biosphere, and between the biosphere and the atmosphere" (Bowden 1999). Others are interested in modeling the relationships between surface water and groundwater (Wheater & Peach, 2004). Our work belongs to the group that tries to connect the various aspects and stakeholders: Scientists, professionals, policy-makers and the public (Johnson et al. 1996). Like Falkenmark (2004) we search for the balance between humans and nature. The catchment area links two mosaics, one of human water-related activities and the other of water-dependent ecosystems, terrestrial as well as aquatic. To make the two compatible, a management task is required.

### **Catchment Area Master Plan**

The tool that is suggested for ICM is a statutory framework of a Catchment Area Master Plan (CAMP), a plan with hydro-geographical rather than political boundaries. The CAMP determines the location of new settlements, extension of existing ones, and "large" land uses, such as parks,

industrial zones, shopping malls, power and desalination plants, reservoirs, and waste disposal sites. While the primary considerations in determining their location are political, economic and social, WSP requires CAMPs to add to their goals also: Preventing or at least reducing substantially flooding and flood damages; protecting the quality and quantity of water in its sources; preserving local fauna and flora; and nurturing water bodies, mainly lakes and streams that create the balance between built and open spaces. For promoting these goals, CAMPs should contain core requirements for runoff management, including delineation of flood-plains at prescribed probabilities, location of retention and detention reservoirs, setting low and high flow limits at certain points along streams and flow paths, and stating runoff quality criteria. The plan may contain "protection zones" for water sources, such as along lake shores and around principal springs and wells.

Flood prevention (Blaikie et al. 1994) is a central goal of regional WSP. Instead of merely protecting against flooding, WSP prefers tools for averting flooding downstream by reducing flows leaving upstream areas of the watershed. A major means for reducing the discharge are urban BMPs throughout the catchment area. Nehrke & Roesner (2004) showed, by simulations with rainfall data from Denver and Atlanta a significant reduction of peak discharges for return periods from 1 to 50 years, by placing a detention reservoir at the outlet from a planned neighborhood. Sinai et al. (2006) suggested constructing in upstream open spaces mini detention reservoirs in depressions of the topography and larger ones in the valleys. Such devices have the potential of serving multiple purposes, in addition to flood control, including: infiltration into the aquifer, direct use of the water for irrigation of agriculture or landscape elements, settling of suspended materials and its appended pollutants from the runoff to improve its quality before it reaches the lower sections of the stream.

Certain actions taken in the catchment area may incur costs to one segment of the population while benefiting another. For example, if recharge of runoff from individual lots into the aquifer is made mandatory then the cost is imposed on home owners, while the benefit may accrue to the regional water authority that manages the aquifer. Similarly, retention upstream will benefit downstream dwellers while imposing a cost upstream. A Catchment Area Authority should hold responsibility for instituting regulations and financial instruments that make the catchment-wide development plan efficient and equitable in terms of sharing costs and benefits.

### **Partial Catchment Plan**

Where political or practical conditions do not allow taking the catchment area as a single planning entity, then a Partial Catchment Plan is a practical alternative (Thornes & Rowntree 2006). A partial

plan should indicate clearly the "boundary conditions" at its edges with other parts of the watershed: the expected parameters of runoff reaching it from upstream, and its own effect on areas downstream. Many cases of flooding result from inadequate consideration of such "boundary conditions", for example: a new development upstream that increases flows downstream without consideration of the latter area's capacity.

Frequently, the motivation of a Watershed Plan is creation of a **regional/metropolitan park based on a rehabilitated river** (Schanze et al. 2004; Brandeis 2004). Regional parks may play a very significant role in a regional revitalization processes, may enhance economic, social and cultural regeneration in addition to environmental improvement, as is the case of the Emscher river in the Ruhr area in Germany (Londong and Becker, 1994; European Academy for the Urban Environment 2007).

### **Delineation of floodplains**

Special attention should be paid to delineation of floodplains – areas along the stream into which water enters when the flow is higher than can be carried by the stream channel. Water is stored in the floodplain, some of it evaporates and some infiltrates into the ground, until the rest can flow back into the stream as its flow recedes (California Department of Water Resources 2007). The extent and delineation of the floodplains and the frequency and depth of their flooding are matters of “floodplain management”, which must be compatible with the land uses in these areas (see a British approach in Purnell 2002). Human settlement in floodplains is dangerous, even if the flooding frequency is low. There have been too many cases of casualties and economic losses in floodplains, such as the documented Midwestern flood of 1993 that caused \$12 to \$16 billion in damages (Pinter 2005). Frequently, such losses are the result of spreading urbanization, as was the case in Curitiba, Brazil (WMO/GWP 2004). This led to a management policy that prevented construction and settlements in the floodplain. Buying out floodplain properties and designation of floodplains for recreation or for agriculture are good practices, as these activities can be suspended temporarily during flooding with acceptable losses. Where planners cannot stop construction in floodplains, measures such as raising the buildings should be obligatory.

### **Necessary and Supporting Conditions for Implementing WSP**

It has been pointed out by others that there are impediments to implementation of planning approaches similar to WSP (Goonrey et al. 2003; van Roon et al. 2005, and a comprehensive

review by Roy et al. 2008). Experience in several countries, among them the US, Japan, Australia and New Zealand, as well as our own experience in Israel, indicates that implementation of WSP requires two necessary pre-requisites and promotion of several supporting means. The pre-requisites are:

**Legal and statutory frameworks** – Laws and regulations should be revised in order to overcome institutional constraints, to create planning zones according to a hydro-geographic delineation, and to consider runoff as a resource, not merely a nuisance. Our experience in Israel indicates that this is possible. Recent legislation has created 11 Basin Authorities, and in 2006/07 the Government approved a statutory national plan for integrating water considerations into urban and regional planning (TAMA 34b), which was influenced substantially by our recommendations for policy and planning.

**Training the relevant professional cadres in the spirit of WSP and interdisciplinary cooperation** - Conventional paradigms must be abandoned and replaced by new water-sensitive ones, and practitioners should be equipped with the necessary knowledge of the appropriate professional guidelines and tools, including advanced calculation methods (see an excellent example in <http://www.waterbalance.ca>).

A series of supporting means can promote the implementation of WSP, including:

**Economic incentives** - Recommended in order to encourage "water-sensitive behavior" by developers and home owners, in preference to rules and regulations designed to enforce such behavior.

**Public-civic partnerships (PCPs) and public-private partnerships (PPPs)** – In an era of “new governance” (Salamon 2002), partnerships with NGOs and/or private developers can promote significantly effective and efficient implementation. The Spanish city Zaragoza, noted for its successful water saving program, states that its success is due to partnership between all sectors of society (Zaragoza web site).

**Publicity and education** – Implementation of WSP, especially at the micro level (infiltration of runoff on-site, water conservation), requires citizen commitment and participation. There is ample evidence from cities in Western countries that citizens show increasing interest in being "green" ("blue" in our case), and yet, continuous investment in education and publicity for all stakeholder, from citizens – adults and children – to professionals and public officials, is necessary for sustainable success.

**Continuous development of knowledge** - The integration of water consideration into urban and regional planning, and the effect of BMPs require further studies and substantiation by pilot projects. Validating the 3Ms and other principles of stormwater management mentioned above requires additional field measurements and simulations, using both sophisticated (for research) and easy-to-use models (for wide implementation by practitioners). Feasibility studies of the cooperation and organization required for WSP implementation is called for. Last but not least, relevant experiences should be documented and lessons should be disseminated.

## **Conclusions**

### **Work in progress and its paradigms**

The paper reports on a work in progress. We started from sustainable management of urban runoff, moved to the larger space of the river catchment and to additional WSP subjects, including flood protection, streams rehabilitation, conservation of urban water, and using alternative water resources (the later were not detailed in this paper). Other fields are still waiting to be included in WSP, including soil conservation on the regional scale and wastewater management in the urban area. Beside the continuous scientific development of WSP fields, we pursue an educational effort, directed not only towards students in academia but also towards the relevant professional communities. Main difficulties are the requirements to change work habits and work paradigms:

- (a) WSP requires all relevant professionals – hydrologists, water systems engineers, urban and regional planners, landscape architects, road engineers and ecologists – to work in an integrated team (not one receiving the results of another, in sequence, and carrying it further), so that water considerations are intrinsic in urban and regional planning from the initiation of every planning project.
- (b) WSP requires planners to use the natural hydro-geographical structure (slopes, soils, water bodies and streams) as a starting point for selecting the location and spatial layout of any built environment and its open spaces, in every location and at every scale, from a region to a building lot.
- (c) WSP requires planners as well as water engineers to treat stormwater runoff as a resource, not merely a nuisance. Instead of removing runoff from the built areas as quickly as possible, as is common in conventional practice, WSP guides the planner and engineer how to design land use and land cover for managing the quantity and quality of runoff, so that it



can be used either directly, for improving the landscape, and/or indirectly for recharging the groundwater.

These requirements are proposed for universal WSP implementation, in contrast to many of WSP rules and guidelines suggested above that are place-related, i.e., their implementation depends on the specific land and water and other characteristics of each place.

### **Generic Principles for Sustainable Development**

WSP is a central partner in a family of planning approaches that aims to result in sustainable development. While working on WSP for the last decade, we have developed a set of principles that are – in our judgment – generic and should characterize any planning project for sustainable development. The eight principles are listed below with WSP-related illustrations.

- **Synergy in attaining environmental, social and economic goals** - WSP has the potential of conserving water resources while improving the urban environment, reducing the danger of flooding, increasing opportunities for recreation and leisure activities, and reducing costs of flooding damages and drainage systems. The message is that planning for achieving multiple objectives within a single framework is more effective and efficient than dealing with each separately.
- **Professional cooperation and development of trans-disciplinary new fields of research and action** – Disciplinary boundaries are removed, first by joint formulation of the issues, then in the cooperation for addressing them, and finally in the development of new paradigms and models that would not have evolved within the separate disciplines.
- **Multiple goals achieved by common means** – Consider a park, designed according to WSP rules, that provides recreational services to the community and serves as an attraction to tourists, while at the same time filters runoff to improve its quality and also infiltrates some of it to replenish groundwater; or: a detention reservoir designed to reduce flood discharges and pollutant loadings that serve also as a visual and recreational amenity.
- **Anticipatory (rather than reactive) planning** – Investment in means that prevent damages, rather than merely coping with them after they occur. For example: effective land use regulations, proper road design, and BMPs distributed throughout the watershed all help to retain runoff close to its origin and reduce runoff flows, thereby reducing the need to protect downstream with large drainage systems and dykes.

- **Common planning principles at all spatial scales** – For example: A design that minimizes the volume, discharge and pollution loading of runoff is applied to regional plans as well as to city and neighborhood, and down to the individual yard.
- **Work with nature (not against it)** – For example: Locate open and built areas, the road system and the drainage system in harmony with the area's geo-topo-hydrography, with special attention to the stream network, contrary to the tendency to sculpt the topography artificially.
- **"Small is beautiful"** (as coined by Schumacher, 1973) – Experience demonstrates that large projects can lead to large and irreversible damages (see the debates regarding big dams), while small-scale development is more adaptable to local needs and wishes, and mistakes can be corrected more easily. WSP emphasizes micro- and mezzo-level (yard, neighborhood) activities.
- **Finally, working with the community (not "for the community")** – WSP is promoted in democratic societies, where civic awareness and civic participation are being advanced. WSP, like other ingredients of sustainable development, has to grow bottom-up, with support and participation of stakeholders, and cannot be promoted just top-down.

While the examples that demonstrate each principle were drawn from our experience with WSP, the set of eight planning principles is suggested for all projects aimed at sustainable development. Adopting them is expected to serve the planning of sustainable housing and sustainable transportation as well as Water-Sensitive Planning.

## **Acknowledgments**

The Technion supported our studies, primarily through scholarships granted to the six graduate students who completed their MSc theses on WSP with us. We acknowledge our colleagues Dr. Avner Kessler, who collaborated with us throughout the way, Dr. Shmuel Burmil and Dr. Tal Alon-Moses, who also participated in some of our studies. Funding was provided by Israel's Ministry of Construction and Housing, the Israeli Water Commission, and the Ministry of Environmental Protection.

## References

- Andoh R. Y. G. and Iwugo K. O. (2002) *Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems: A UK Perspective*. [online] <http://cedb.asce.org/cgi/WWWdisplay.cgi?0204741> [accessed November 2 2008]
- Arnold, C. L., Jr. and Gibbson, C. J. (1996) Impervious Surface Coverage: The Emergence of a Key Environmental Indicator. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, **62**(2) 243-258.
- Asaf, L., Nativ, R., Shahin, K. Hassan, M. and Geyer, S. (2004) Controls on the Chemical and Isotopic Composition of Urban Stormwater in a Semiarid Zone. *Journal of Hydrology*, **294**, 270-293.
- Asaf, L., Nativ, R., Shahin, K., Geyer, S. and Ziv, B. (2005) Influence of Small- and Large-Scale Variables on the Chemical and Isotopic Composition of Urban Rainwater, as Illustrated by a case Study in Ashdod, Israel. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **110**, D11307.
- ASCE and WEF - American Society of Civil Engineers and Water Environment Federation (1992) *Design and Construction of Urban Stormwater Management Systems*, ASCE, Manual and Report of Engineering Practice N. 77. New York: Manual of Practice No. FD-20.
- Be'eri, S., Carmon, N. and Shamir, U. (2005) *Managing Urban Water Consumption: A Feasibility Study* (in Hebrew). Haifa: Technion Center for Urban and Regional Studies, 230 p.
- Bekele, G. and Argue, J.R. (1994) "Stormwater Research in South Australia", *National Conference Publication – Institute of Engineers, Australia*, **3**(94/15) 305-311.
- Blaikie P. M., Cannon, T., Davis, I. and Wisner, B. (1994) *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People Vulnerability and Disasters*. London: Routledge.
- Booth, D.B., Karr, J.R., Schauman, S., Konrad, C.P., Morley, S.A., Larson, M.G. and Burges, S.J. (2004) Reviving Urban Streams: Land Use, Hydrology, Biology, and Human Behavior. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, **40**(5) 1351-1364.
- Bowden, W.B. (1999) Integrated catchment management rediscovered: an essential tool for a new millennium. Proceedings of the Manaaki Whenua Conference, Landcare Research [online]. <http://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/news/conferences/manaakiwhenua/papers/bowden.asp> [accessed January 29 2009].
- Brandeis, A. (2004) *Rehabilitation of the Alexander River* (in Hebrew). Tichnun ["Planning"] **1**(1), 43-50. [online] <http://www.restorationplanning.com/alex.html> [accessed November 2 2008].
- Burmil, S., Shamir, U. and Carmon, N. (2003) *Urban Runoff in Residential Neighborhoods* (in Hebrew). Haifa: Technion Center for Urban and Regional Studies and the Grand Water Research Institute. 118 p.
- Butler, D. and Parkinson, J. (1997) Towards Sustainable Urban Drainage, *Water Science and Technology*, **35**(9) 53-63.
- Butler, D. and Davies, J.W. (2000) *Urban Drainage*, London: EandFN Spon.

- California Department of Water Resources (2007) *A California Challenge- Flooding in Central Valley*, A Report from an Independent Review Panel to the Department of Water Resources, State of California.
- Carmon, N. and Shamir, U. (1997) *Water Sensitive Urban Planning: Protecting Israel's Coastal Aquifer* (in Hebrew). Haifa: Technion Center for Urban and Regional Studies, 227 p.
- Carmon, N., Shamir, U. and Meiron-Pistiner, S. (1997) Water-Sensitive Urban Planning: Protecting Groundwater. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 40(4), 413-434.
- CIRIA (2004) Sustainable Drainage News, Issue 6, London: Construction Industry Research and Information Association [online] <http://www.ciria.org/suds> [accessed November 2 2008].
- CIRIA (2006) Sustainable Water Management in Land-Use Planning. London: Construction Industry Research and Information Association, report c630 [online] <http://www.ciria.co.uk/acatalog/c630.pdf> [accessed Nov 7, 2008].
- Eckhardt, D.A.V. and P.E. Stackelberg (1995) Relation of Ground-Water Quality to Land Use on Long Island. *Ground Water*, 33(6), 1019-1033.
- Engineers Australia, National Committee for Water Engineering (2006) <http://www.engaust.com.au/bookshop/arq.html> [accessed January 29, 2009]
- European Union Water Framework Directive (2000) [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index_en.html) [accessed January 29 2009]
- European Academy for the Urban Environment (2007) SURBAN – Database of Sustainable Urban Development in Europe. [online] <http://www.eaue.de> (Search the SURBAN database for Emscher Park) [accessed November 2 2008].
- Falkenmark, M. (2004) Towards Integrated Catchment Management: Opening the Paradigm Locks between Hydrology, Ecology and Policy-Making. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, **20** (3), 275 – 281.
- Ferguson, B. K. and Debo, T. N. (1990) *On-Site Stormwater Management: Applications for Landscape and Engineering*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.
- Fletcher, T.D., Deletic, A. and Hatt, B.E. (2004) *A Review of Stormwater Sensitive Urban Design in Australia*, Department of Civil Engineering and Institute for Sustainable Water Resources, Monash University. Australian Water Association and the CSIRO.
- France, R.L. (2002) *Handbook of Water Sensitive Planning and Design*, Lewis Publishers, USW: LLC/CRC Press Company, 728 p.
- Glenn, A. (2002) Constructed Wetlands and Storm Water Management at The Northern Water Feature (Sydney Olympic park)", In: France, R. (ed) *Handbook of Water Sensitive Planning and Design*, USA: LLC/CRC Press Company, pp. 247-261

- Goonrey, C.M., Lechte, P., Maheepala, S. and Mitchell, V.G. (2003) A review of current practices in and impediments to using stormwater as an alternative supply source within urban areas, The Institution of Engineers, Australia, 28<sup>th</sup> International Hydrology and Water Resources Symposium, Wollongong, NSW.
- Government of British Columbia (2008). *Stormwater Planning: A guidebook for British Columbia and Water balance Model*. Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection. [online] <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/epd/epdpa/mpp/stormwater/stormwater.html>  
<http://www.waterbalance.ca/> [accessed November 2 2008].
- Green Places (2007) Special issue on River Renaissance: The Role of Waterways in Regeneration. *Green Places*, Issue 34.
- Hadad C. (2007) *Runoff as a Resource for Urban Landscape Development*. MSc Thesis, Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning, Technion – Israel Institute of Technology.
- Herath, S., K. Musiaka and S. Hironaka (1993) Evaluation of Basin Scale Effects of Infiltration System, In: Torno, H. and Marsalek, J. (eds) Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Urban Storm Drainage, American Society of Civil Engineers.
- Ishizaki, K., Seiji, M., Kagawa, A., Mochizuki, T. and Imbe, M. (1993) Rainwater Infiltration Technology for Urban Areas. *Journal of Hydrosience and Hydraulic Engineering*, Special Issue: Practice in Hydraulic Engineering in Japan, Committee on Hydraulics, Japan Society of Civil Engineering.
- Johnson, A.K.L, Shrubsole, D. and Merrin, M. (1996) Integrated Catchment Management in Northern Australia: From Concept to Implementation. *Land Use Policy*, 13(4), 303-316.
- JAPA (2007) Special issue on Planning for Water. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 73(2). Guest editors: G. W. Page and L. Susskind.
- Katz, S., Burmil, S., Carmon, N. and Shamir U. (2001) *Water Sensitive Urban Planning: Infiltrating Rainfall into Groundwater by Designing Urban Lots. Reference Book for Architects, Environmental Planners and Drainage Engineers* (in Hebrew). Haifa: Technion Center for Urban and Regional Studies, 190 p.
- Konrad, C.P., Jensen, B.W., Burges, S. and Reinelt, L.E. (1995) *On-Site Residential Stormwater Management Alternatives*, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Washington, Center for Urban Water Resources Management.
- Kronaveter, L., Shamir, U. and Kessler, A. (2001) Water-Sensitive Urban Planning: Modeling On-Site Infiltration”. *ASCE Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 127(2), 78-88.
- Londong, D and Becker, M. (1994) Rehabilitation Concept for the Emscher System. *Water Science and Technology*, 29(1-2): 283-291.

- Mitchell, V.G. (2004) *Integrated Urban Water Management: A review of current Australian Practice*, the Australian Water Association and CSIRO, CMIT-2004-075
- Moglen, G.E. and Kim, S. (2007). Limiting Imperviousness: Are Threshold-Based Policies a Good Idea? ". *Journal of the American Planning Association*, **73**(2), 161-171.
- Musiak, K., Kubota, M., Imbe, M., Takano, N. and Dan, T. (1999) Design Concept for Renewal of Hydrological Water Cycle in Urban Area, 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Urban Storm Drainage, Sydney, Australia.
- Nehrke, S.M. and Roesner, L.A. (2004) Effect of Design Practices for Flood Control and Best Management Practices on the Flood-Frequency Curve. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management, ASCE*, **130**(2), 131-139.
- Pinter, N. (2005) One Step Forward, Two Steps Back on U.S. Floodplains. *Science* (Washington), **308** (5719), 207-208.
- Prince George's County (1999) *Low-Impact Development Design Strategies: An Integrated Design Approach*. Maryland: Department of Environmental Resource, Programs and Planning Division. [online] <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lid/lidnatl.pdf> (LID Design Strategies) and [http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lid/lid\\_hydr.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lid/lid_hydr.pdf) (Hydrologic Analysis) [accessed November 2 2008].
- Purnell, R. (2002) Flood Risk—A Government Perspective. *Civil Engineering*, **150**(5), 10-14.
- Roy, A.H., Wenger, S.J., Fletcher, T.D., Walsh, C.J., Lasdon, A.R., Shuster, W.D., Thurston, H.W. and Brown, R.R. (2008). *Impediments and Solutions to Sustainable, Watershed-Scale Urban Stormwater Management: Lessons from Australia and the United States*. *Environmental Management*, **42**:344–359
- Rutgers University (2000). *The Costs and Benefits of Alternative Growth Patterns*. New Brunswick NJ: Center for Urban Policy and Research.
- Salamon, L.M. (Ed) (2002) *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schanze, J., Olfert, A., Tourbier, J. T., Gersdorf, I. and Schwager, T. (2004) *Urban River Basin Enhancement Methods: Existing Urban River Rehabilitation Schemes*. EU research report, 188 p. [online] [http://www.urbem.net/WP2/WP2\\_case\\_studies.pdf](http://www.urbem.net/WP2/WP2_case_studies.pdf) [accessed November 2 2008]
- Schumacher, E. (1973) *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*. New York: Harper Colophon, and 1999 Hartley and Marks Publishers.
- Seoul Museum of History (2005) *The Reborn Cheonggyecheon*. [online] <http://english.seoul.go.kr/cheonggye/> and <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cheonggyecheon> [accessed November 2 2008].

- Shamir, U. and Carmon, N. (1999) *Water-Sensitive Urban Planning: The Case of Israel's Coastal Aquifer*, in: Ellis, J.B. (Ed.) *Impacts of Urban Growth on Surface Water and Groundwater Quality*. Wallingford: IAHS Publication No. 259, 409-415.
- Shamir, U. and Carmon, N. (2007) *Water Sensitive Planning: Incorporating Water Considerations into Urban and Regional Planning* (in Hebrew). Haifa: Technion Center for Urban and Regional Studies and the Grand Water Research Institute, 282 p.
- Sinai, G., Rubin, H., Nezlovin, D., Bamberger, E., Gilad, Y. and Eines, A. (2006) *Evaluation of Flood Waves from Developed Areas and their Attenuation Downstream* (In Hebrew). Haifa: Technion Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering, 37 p.
- Taylor, A.C. and Wong, T.H.F (2002) *Non-Structural Stormwater Quality Best Management Practices*. Melbourne, Australia: Cooperative Research Centre for Catchment Hydrology, Technical Reports 02/11-02/14.
- TAMA 34 B (2006-7) *Integrating Spatial Planning of the Water Sector into the National Statutory Plan for the State of Israel*. Chapter 3: Rivers and Drainage, and Chapter 4: Storage of Surface Runoff, Infiltration, Replenishment and Protection of Groundwater. Israel Ministry of Interior.
- Thornes, J.B and Rowntree, K. M. (2006) *Integrated Catchment Management in Semiarid Environments in the Context of the European Water Framework Directive, Land Degradation and Development*, 17:355-364.
- USEPA (1999) *Preliminary Data Summary of Urban Storm Water Best Management Practices*. EPA-821-R-99-012 [online] <http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/guide/stormwater/> [accessed November 2 2008]
- USEPA (2000). *Low Impact Development (LID) – A Literature Review*. EPA # 841-B-00-005. [online] <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lid/lid.pdf> [accessed November 2 2008]
- USEPA (2004). *Protecting Water Resources with Smart Growth*. EPA # 231-R-04-002. [online] [http://www.epa.gov/dced/water\\_resource.htm](http://www.epa.gov/dced/water_resource.htm) [accessed November 2 2008].
- USEPA (2005) *Using Smart Growth Techniques as Stormwater Best Management Practices*. EPA # 231-B-05002. [online] <http://yosemite.epa.gov/water/owrcCatalog.nsf/1ffc8769fdecb48085256ad3006f39fa/af2b6588bb0d957e85257124005f759e!OpenDocument> [accessed November 2 2008].
- USEPA (2006). *Protecting Water Resources with Higher-Density Development*. EPA # 231-R-06-001. [online] [http://www.epa.gov/dced/water\\_density.htm](http://www.epa.gov/dced/water_density.htm) [accessed November 2 2008].
- USEPA (2007) *Reducing Stormwater Costs through Low Impact Development (LID) Strategies and Practices*, EPA 841-F-07-006. [online] <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lid/costs07/> [accessed November 2 2008].

- van Roon, M., J. Dixon, and H. van Roon (2005) Reformulating Planning Tools to Promote Low Impact Urban Design and Development, *Proceedings of the New Zealand Water and Waste Association 4th South Pacific Conference on Stormwater and Aquatic Resource Protection*, Auckland, New Zealand.
- van Roon, M. (2007) Water Localization and Reclamation: Steps towards Low Impact Urban Design and Development , *Journal of Environmental Management*, **83** 437–447
- Water Sensitive Urban Design Research Group (1989) *Water Sensitive Residential Design: An Investigation into its Purpose in the Perth Metropolitan Region*, Australia: The Western Australian Water Resources Council, Leedsville, Western Australia.
- Wheater, H.S. and Peach, D. (2004) Developing Interdisciplinary Science for Integrated Catchment Management: The UK Lowland Catchment. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, **20**(3) 369-385
- WMO/GWP - World Meteorological Organization and the Global Water Partnership (2004) *The Associated Programme on Flood Management – Integrated Flood Management Case Study – Brazil: Flood Management in Curitiba Metropolitan Area*.
- Wong, T., Breen, P. and Lloyd, S. (2000). *Water Sensitive Road Design: Design Options for Improving Stormwater Quality of Road Runoff*. Technical Report 00/1. Australia: Research Center for Catchment Hydrology.
- Zaragoza, Water Saving city [online] <http://habitat.aq.upm.es/bpes/onu98/bp439.en.html> [accessed November 2 2008].