Written submission from A.R. Trotter

I am a partner of a farming partnership which farms the partners own land and also rents land in. I have the following comments on the proposals in the bill.

Land Rights Statement.

The definition and aims of land reform need to be clarified.

Land Commission.

There is a danger of this becoming an expensive body with a large secretariat and a strict budget should be agreed.

Tennant Farming Commissioner.

The name implies a bias in favour of tenants. Surely the post should be “A Let Land Commissioner.

Right of access to the name of persons in control of land.

This is mostly available on inquiry at present and is a reasonable request.

Engaging Communities.

This already happens through Community Councils but could be improved if Farmers were more inclined to stand for election to community councils.

Community Right to Buy.

There are already adequate routes through the tried system of Compulsory Purchase Orders.

Sporting Rates.

Many farms have limited or no sporting value. This is therefore going to be a tax on farming which cannot be recovered from leasing sporting rights. It will also result in a complicated valuation and appeal process.

Deer Management.

SNH already has powers.

Access.

No problems exist.

Tenancies.

The proposals will do nothing to achieve a wider pool of farms to let and the restrictions plus the wide succession proposals are a total disincentive to letting land. The succession proposal is also inefficient in respect of food production as it will lead to totally disinterested and unqualified persons becoming farmers.
Sale where the Landlord is in Breach.
This should not advantage either party.
Tenants and Landlords Improvements.
Agreed.