ENVIRONMENT, CLIMATE CHANGE AND LAND REFORM COMMITTEE

AGENDA

12th Meeting, 2018 (Session 5)

Tuesday 17 April 2018

The Committee will meet at 9.30 am in the Robert Burns Room (CR1).

1. **Decision on taking business in private:** The Committee will decide whether to take items 4, 5 & 6 in private.

2. **Scottish Crown Estate Bill:** The Committee will take evidence from—

   - Alex Kinninmonth, Head of Marine Policy, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Scotland, Scottish Environment LINK;
   - Councillor Norman MacDonald, Convener, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar;
   - Audrey MacIver, Director of Energy and Low Carbon, Highlands and Islands Enterprise;
   - Dr Calum MacLeod, Policy Director, Community Land Scotland;
   - Andy Wells, Head of Property, Crown Estate Scotland.

3. **Scottish Water Annual Report and Accounts 2016-17:** The Committee will take evidence from—

   - Johanna Dow, Chief Executive, Business Stream;
   - Peter Farrer, Chief Operating Officer, Douglas Millican, Chief Executive, and Professor Simon Parsons, Director of Strategic Customer Service Planning, Scottish Water;
   - Dame Susan Rice, Chair, Scottish Water and Business Stream.
4. **Committee on Climate Change – Annual Progress Report**: The Committee will consider draft correspondence to the Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy and Connectivity.

5. **Scottish Water Annual Report and Accounts 2016-17**: The Committee will consider evidence heard earlier in the meeting.

6. **Scottish Crown Estate Bill**: The Committee will consider evidence heard earlier in the meeting.

Lynn Tullis  
Clerk to the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee  
Room T3.40  
The Scottish Parliament  
Edinburgh  
Tel: 0131 348 5240  
Email: ecclr.committee@parliament.scot.

The papers for this meeting are as follows—

**Agenda Item 2**

Scottish Crown Estate Bill Cover Note  
PRIVATE PAPER  
ECCLR/S5/18/12/1

**Agenda Item 3**

Scottish Water Cover Note  
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ECCLR/S5/18/12/3

**Agenda Item 4**

PRIVATE PAPER  
ECCLR/S5/18/12/5 (P)
Introduction

1. The Scottish Crown Estate Bill was introduced in the Scottish Parliament on 24 January 2018. The Bill was published the following documents:
   - Scottish Crown Estate Bill
   - Policy Memorandum
   - Explanatory Notes
   - Financial Memorandum
   - Statement on Legislative Competence
   - Delegated Powers Memorandum

2. The Parliamentary Bureau referred the Bill to the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee to consider and report on the general principles.

3. The Finance and Constitution Committee will consider the Financial Memorandum to the Bill while the Delegated Powers and Law Reform Committee will consider the delegated powers at Stage 1.

Background to the Bill

4. The Crown Estate in Scotland was originally part of the UK wide Crown Estate, which is one of the largest property owners in the UK. It is independently managed in the UK by the Crown Estate Commissioners (CEC) which belongs to the reigning monarch ‘in right of The Crown’. However, it is not Her Majesty the Queen’s private property as Crown Estate assets cannot be sold by the monarch nor do revenues from it belong to them.

5. In 2014 the Smith Commission agreed responsibility for the management of the CEC economic assets in Scotland, and the revenue generated from these assets, should be transferred to the Scottish Parliament. This would include the Crown Estate’s seabed, urban assets, rural estates, mineral and fishing rights, and the Scottish foreshore for which it is responsible. It also agreed that following this transfer, responsibility for the management of those assets will be further devolved to local authority areas such as Orkney, Shetland, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar, or other areas who seek such responsibilities.
6. These recommendations were included in the Scotland Act 2016 and powers over the revenue and management of the Crown Estate in Scotland were subsequently transferred to the Scottish Government. It then established an interim body to take on the management functions of the Scottish assets. This body, Crown Estate Scotland, become fully operational on 1 April 2017 and operates under a framework document drawn up by the Scottish Government.

7. Crown Estate Scotland is responsible for managing:

- 37,000 hectares of rural land with agricultural tenancies, residential and commercial properties and forestry on four rural estates (Glenlivet, Fochabers, Applegirth and Whitehill);
- Rights to fish wild salmon and sea trout in in river and coastal areas;
- Rights to naturally-occurring gold and silver across most of Scotland;
- Just under half the foreshore around Scotland including 5,800 moorings and some ports and harbours;
- Leasing of virtually all seabed out to 12 nautical miles covering some 750 fish farming sites and agreements with cables & pipeline operators;
- The rights to offshore renewable energy and gas and carbon dioxide storage out to 200 nautical miles; and
- Retail and office units at 39-41 George Street Edinburgh.

Contents of the Bill

8. The Scottish Crown Estate Bill makes provision for the on-going devolution of the Crown Estate to Scottish Ministers following the Smith Commission’s recommendations and makes provision for its future management.


- Part 2 establishes the provision that Scottish Ministers may transfer management of Scottish Crown Estate assets to a ‘transferee’ (colloquially a manager) which could include CES, a local authority, another Scottish public authority or a community organisation.

- Part 3 makes provision for a number of managerial provisions including: allowing managers to dispose and/or acquire assets on behalf of the Crown as if they were owners; to maintain the financial value of the assets; to maintain and enhance the wider socio-economic benefits of Scotland; and prepare management plans.

- Part 4 covers a range of more general provisions, including the parliamentary procedure to be used for future regulations and the commencement of the Bill.
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9. The Committee’s timetable for consideration of the Bill at Stage 1 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 February</td>
<td>Launch of call for views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 February</td>
<td>Evidence session with Bill Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>Evidence session with stakeholders 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 March</td>
<td>Close of call for views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March</td>
<td>Evidence session with stakeholders 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 April</td>
<td>Evidence session with stakeholders 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April</td>
<td>Evidence session with Cabinet Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late May</td>
<td>Publication of Stage 1 report (depending on when agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Stage 1 debate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous meetings
10. At its meeting on Tuesday 20 February the Committee heard from officials from the Scottish Government on the Bill.

11. On Tuesday 13 March the Committee took evidence from NFU Scotland and tenant farmers representing Crown Estate Scotland’s four rural estates.

12. At its last meeting, on Tuesday 27 March, the Committee heard from those who have an interest in the management of Crown Estate Scotland’s non-agricultural assets, comprising: Scottish Renewables, the Scottish Salmon Producers’ Organisation, the British Ports Association and Fisheries Management Scotland.

Today’s meeting
The Committee will today hear from a range of groups on the strategic direction and governance of Crown Estate Scotland. These are:

- Alex Kinninmonth, Head of Marine Policy at Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Scotland, Scottish Environment LINK;
- Councillor Norman MacDonald, Convener of Comhairle nan Eilean Siar, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar;
- Audrey Maclver, Director of Energy and Low Carbon, Highlands and Islands Enterprise;
- Dr Calum MacLeod, Policy Director, Community Land Scotland;
- Andy Wells, Head of Property, Crown Estate Scotland.

Future meetings

1 The Committee agreed changes to its overall work programme at its meeting on Tuesday 6 March 2018. The timetable for its consideration of the Scottish Crown Estate Bill has since been updated to reflect these changes.
13. The Committee will conclude its scrutiny on Tuesday 24 April when it will hear from the Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform.

Call for views
14. Written evidence on the Bill can be read at:


SPiCe briefing
15. The Scottish Parliament’s Information Centre (SPiCe) has also prepared a detailed briefing on the Bill.

Clerks
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Introduction

1. The session will explore the performance of Scottish Water over the last financial year, including key achievements and areas for improvement. The Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform (ECCLR) Committee will consider Scottish Water’s Annual Report for 2016-2017 and issues arising from it.

2. The session also provides an opportunity to consider the issues raised in public petition PE1646. This petition has recently been referred to ECCLR Committee by the Public Petitions Committee.

Background

3. In Scotland, drinking water and sewerage services are provided by Scottish Water, which is a publicly owned company. Scottish Water operates within a regulatory framework and is accountable to Scottish Ministers who are in turn accountable to the Scottish Parliament. Since May 2016, Scottish Water comes within the remit of the ECCLR Committee.

4. The Committee heard evidence on Scottish Water's Annual Report 2015-16 from Scottish Water and Business Stream on 6 December 2016. The Committee wrote to both Scottish Water and Business Stream following this meeting, seeking further information on a range of issues, including:

Scottish Water

- Any potential negative effects on shellfish of discharges from waste water treatment works.
- Scottish Water’s wider responsibilities in relation to the estuary and marine environment.
- Details of emissions reductions Scottish Water achieved to date in relation to the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 and progress against 2020 targets.
- Work being carried out to raise awareness of energy use by staff.
- Whether Scottish Water’s public sector status was likely to be challenged by the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement between the EU and Canada.
Business Stream

- The current approach of Business Stream towards business customer meter readings and how that differs from that previously provided by Scottish Water.
- How Business Stream’s application of the leak allowance differs from that previously provided by Scottish Water.
- Payment terms for customers – and any consideration made of extending payment terms beyond the current 14 day limit.


6. On the 30 March 2017, the Convener also wrote to the Chief Executive of the Water Industry Commission for Scotland seeking clarification of whether the Commission had or was looking to carry out any work in relation to payment terms and the identification of leakages. A response was received on the 28th of April, 2017.

7. At its meeting on 12 September 2017 the Committee heard evidence from the Water Industry Commission for Scotland.

Scottish Water’s Annual Report 2016-17

8. Scottish Water’s Annual Report for 2016-17 sets out a number of key achievements for Scottish Water over the last financial year, including:

- Best ever customer service – highest ever Customer Experience Measure Score and lowest level of written complaints
- Value for customers – average household charge £38 below England and Wales’ average
- High quality water maintained – 99.91% of tests at customers’ taps passing stringent quality standards
- Trusted by customers – Scotland’s water sector is most trusted by consumers, according to Which? Consumer Insight Report
- Major investment – invested £627 million improving services and supporting the economy
- Best workplace – ‘Best Workplace in Scotland’ award and Scotland’s ‘Fair Work Employer 2016’

9. This year (2018) also marks the half-way point in Scottish Water’s current 6-year Business Plan which sets out Scottish Water’s key strategic aims.

Public Petition PE1646

10. In March 2018, the Public Petitions Committee referred PE1646 to the ECCLR Committee for its consideration. The Official Report of that meeting is available here.

11. The petition calls upon the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to i) review the role of the Drinking Water Quality Regulator and ii) commission independent research into the safety of the chloramination of drinking water.
12. The petition raises a number of issues, including:

- The level of customer engagement that takes place when chloramination is introduced to an area.
- The effect of chloramination on the taste/smell of water supplies.
- Perceived effects on customer health (e.g. a perception by customers that this may worsen existing skin complaints).
- A call for independent research into the effects of chloramination.

13. In the meeting of the Public Petitions Committee of 15 March of Brian Whittle MSP indicated he had been contacted by a number of constituents in Ayrshire about this issue. The ECCLR Committee has also received 3 submissions regarding this issue. These are attached at Annexe A to this paper.

14. In addition, at its meeting on 29 March 2018, the Public Petitions Committee considered Petition PE1680 on Private Water Supplies in Scotland. Details of the petition are included at Annexe B to this note. The Public Petitions Committee agreed to make the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee aware of this petition in advance of its session with Scottish Water.
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Email 1

Dear members of the ECCLR Committee

I note that at the March 15\textsuperscript{th} 2018 meeting of the Public Petitions Committee, Brian Whittle voiced concerns regarding Scottish Waters lack of public consultation or explanation for the change to Chloramination.

I share those concerns and also object to the extremely short time scale customers in Ayrshire were given on the change to Chloramination which was approximately two to three weeks.

Given the complex and contentious issues involved surely the committee cannot agree that this short notice is acceptable. It is not conducive to trust, public engagement or transparency.

I emailed Scottish Water with my concerns on the 20\textsuperscript{th} March 2018. Receiving no reply I contacted Scottish Water customer services again on the 26\textsuperscript{th} March. Here is the transcript of the email which includes my original questions and the answers given. Please note that Scottish Water do not feel that they are required to ‘consult with customers’.

[Beginning of email from Scottish Water]

Customer Engagement Centre <help@scottishwater.co.uk>

To: Karin Craig

26 Mar at 15:08

Dear Karin

We have contacted our public health team who have advised as below on your enquiries regarding chloramination.

- The lack of transparency and debate on the matter. Was there any public consultation and what information was forthcoming from Scottish Water? \textbf{The process is recognised by the water industry and authorised by water quality regulators on behalf of the Government as an effective and safe process for supplying potable water and ensuring meeting drinking water standards, as such when changing from chlorine to chloramines, into supply, we are not required to consult with customers, but we are expected to communicate with customers that it is going to happen.}
Scottish Water make the claim that chloramination is safe and has been used for some time both in the UK and globally. The fact that it has been used for some time does not make it safe. Asbestos was first used in 1858 and continued to be used worldwide until it was banned in 1977. Did the longevity of asbestos use make it safe? What studies have been carried out on the safety to human health, animals and the environment on the use of chloramination? Studies have been carried out by various bodies notably the World Health Organisation who endorse Chloramination as a safe and effective way to disinfect drinking water.

Chloramine does not dissipate from water easily. How does this effect cooked food? Chloraminated water is safe for bathing, drinking, cooking and all uses we have for water every day.

What filters do Scottish water recommend to remove Chloramine and any byproducts from the water? Sophisticated filtration systems involving activated carbon are commercially available but SW can’t advise/recommend on the use of any particular brand.

Will Scottish Water pay the bill for any private individual installing a suitable filter and for the ongoing maintenance? No

Why is it not standard practice for appropriate filters to be added at point of water supply to households and businesses? Chloramination is a safe and effective process for supplying potable water and ensuring meeting of drinking water standards, therefore filters would not be used as standard practice by SW. SW will continue to monitor water quality by taking samples as per our Regulatory obligations to ensure that the water meets these strict standards

If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact us. [End]

As far as I know there are little or no studies carried out that look at the impact of chloramination on human health, animal welfare or environmental impact. Scottish Water make huge claims re safety on the basis of very little evidence. Therefore it is imperative that customers not only are engaged with but that time scales are appropriate to gaining an understanding of the process involved and any negative outcomes. I, along with others, are now scrambling to look at filtering systems that deal with chloramination and due to time restraints and costs have not been able to acquire these or have them fitted

Karen Craig
27 March 2018
Dear members of the ECCLR Committee

This is my second submission on the issue.

I phoned up Scottish Water customer service today, the 28th March 2018, to ask when exactly the water supply in Ayrshire was to be subject to chloramination. It was confirmed to me that the process had began at the Bradan Water Treatment Works which supply the Ayrshire areas on the 19th of March 2018. It would take a few days to filter through the system but nonetheless it was now in the water supply.

The postcards that began dropping through Ayrshire households from around the 7th March stated that the chloramination process would commenced around the ‘end of the month’. I would argue that the 19th of March is evidently not ‘the end of the month’ - but a few days past the middle of the month.

Given that I, along with thousands of households in Ayrshire received our postcard notifications at the at the end of the first week in March. This amounts to a period of just under two weeks.

I would say that this should raise further concerns re transparency, honesty and lack of public engagement from Scottish Water . It has put householders and businesses at a disadvantage in terms of a honest and appropriate period of notification. The exact timescales regarding commencement of chloramination In Ayrshire seems to be deliberately vague, fudged and misleading.

Karen Craig
28 March 2018

Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee

Written submission from Catherine M Phillips

Dear Committee Members,

I understand that Petition PE01646 was referred to your committee for more information and I wish to raise several points of objection to the imminent Chloramination of water in Darvel, East Ayrshire.

On 9 March 2018 a postcard from Scottish Water (SW) was delivered to my house telling me that from the end of this month, Chloramination of our water supply would begin. I understand from SW own publications that 12 months notice to customers should be given, not 21 days. In fact the Strathspey Herald (local paper to Aviemore) published in July 2017 that Ayrshire water was going to be treated with Chloramine.

This was a process I had never heard of so I started doing some research and discovered that it is a process that is banned in many European countries, including France and Germany, in fact according to the European Water Regs 1998 it is used in only 3 others, Finland, Spain and Sweden, but only occasionally not all the time, so I read further and found out more. It is also banned in Canada and in many states in the USA.
1. Chloramine is less effective against E Coli, Rotavirus, Cryptosporidium, even Polio than just Chlorine

2. The inhalation of the vapours which build up in the bathroom during bathing and showering are harmful to the respiratory system, especially if there is existing lung disease such as asthma, copd etc

3. It is damaging to those with compromised immune systems ie Cancer patients, the very young, the elderly

4. It cannot be used during Dialysis treatment for those with Kidney disease

5. It is irritating to skin and can cause or exacerbate Excema, Psoriasis, Dermatitis etc

6. It kills fish, in tanks, in ponds, in burns, in rivers. The Matthew Burn runs along the bottom of my garden then into the River Irvine

7. It damages seeds during germination, and I am surrounded by farmland

8. Not enough studies have yet been carried out on the potential for carcinogens, so do we really want to start using chemicals that are subsequently found to be harmful to humans and therefore the legal action which would inevitably follow

9. It is very difficult and expensive to filter it from the water, a standard cheap Brita type jug will still filter the chlorine out but not the ammonia. An under sink filter costs over £150 and a whole house filter upwards of £400 plus fitting, plus regular filter cartridge replacement, or some more efficient systems are over £2000.

So why have SW chosen a method of disinfecting our water which is almost impossible to filter out without a large capital outlay by their customers.

These are my objections and concerns. In my family, my husband and I both suffer from asthma and I am worried sick about inhaling the vapour emitted by these chemicals whilst having my shower and the absorption through our skin.

None of the answers I have received from SW have addressed any of these issues, other than reiterating what it states in their own publicity, ie it is safe to drink, cook and wash with.

Asbestos was considered to be safe, lead in paint was considered to be safe, mercury in fillings and thermometers was considered to be safe, lead pipes were considered to be safe, but now we know better. Do not let Chloramine join the list of dangerous chemical compounds that we need to get rid of. There are better methods, please let us not be forced to have Chloramine.

Catherine M Phillips

28 March 2018
Dear ECCLR committee members,

On 7th March I received a postcard telling me that Scottish Water were protecting their pipes and supplies. In small letters hidden in the next smaller lettered section it mentioned a change to chloramination. I looked up the process, their website and had many concerns. My business is in animal care and building up local wildlife including vulnerable species like amphibians and orchids has been part of this, which I take a pride in. The website suggested fish and amphibians should not be in contact with this modified tap water. This would mean a new cleaning protocol must be implemented as well as changes to the filtration of drinking water. I contacted Scottish water on 9th March. They did not reply till 21st March. There was still no date for the implementation or answer to my environmental questions, just copies of text from a new FAQ which had been uploaded to their website. There was also a blame re notice laid on my provider who they suggest should have contacted me last September, when they informed them of the change and when I would have had good notice. This provider who did not do so happens to be also Scottish Water, their business arm. Business Stream are only responsible for metering and charging, not adjustment to supplies so I think this is passing the buck albeit to their own other department.

I discovered today via the Ayrshire Post newspaper that chloramination began at Loch Bradan on 19th March, leaving me no time to put any filters into place to protect staff (some very sensitive as we are all able autistic), pets and environment especially 3 species of amphibians who are breeding here in quantity. I responded to Scottish Water's reply of course and have had no response from them so far. As we could taste chalkiness in the water and I have had itchiness and diarrhoea this week we had already guessed at this change having been rushed in. I feel this is inadequate notice and disingenuous. 19th is not 'end of March' which would at least have been 3 weeks to create a personal and business response - i had to drop all my urgent business today to go purchase pumps and hoses for distributing rainwater and also install barrels for future collection so I can avoid murdering the local frog population! This is a nonsense.

Searching online I quickly found protocols developed for introducing such changes to a region which gave a 24 month gradually phased in plan together with wording suggestions, PR, press releases etc to allay fears and answer questions. Why did Scottish Water not act responsibly like this with consideration for its business and domestic customers? Why was notice so short and indeed inaccurate? Where is the plan to work with sensitive species? Suggesting water testing for total chlorine is a nonsense when most amphibians only breed in water, they live elsewhere. How do i test the earth? How do i clean without now supposedly dangerous water spilling into ditches?

While I am glad Scottish Water are caring for their pipes, i do believe they have a duty to care for customers and our wider environment. SEPA (Scottish water say) do not differentiate between chlorine in dissolved or bound form, (their answer re
environmental assessments was—they don’t have to) yet as chloramine its much more environmentally stable and toxic to anything gilled. It cannot evaporate. The many who did not get the postcard regarding this would not know unless they did research like me. The information has been inconsistent and inadequate. People who use water filters will not realise their filters will be ineffective in chlorine removal. Where is the transparency and honesty we expect of Scottish Government body service?

Rosie Mapplebeck
29 March 2018
Annexe B

PE1680: Private Water Supplies in Scotland

Petition summary

Calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to:

- review The Private Water Supplies (Scotland) Regulations 2006;
- produce guidance for all relevant bodies to comply with the Private Water Supplies (Scotland) Regulations 2006;
- transfer the Regulatory powers over the Drinking Water quality of private water supplies from Local Authorities to the Drinking Water Quality Regulator for Scotland;
- ensure an Equal Right of Appeal in the Planning process where objections on public health grounds are intimated by interested parties.

Previous Action

Over time we have raised these issues with:-

- Local Councillors, Council Planning Officers, and Environmental Health Officers;
- MSPs Elizabeth Smith and Roseanna Cunningham, MP Gordon Banks and MEP Iain Houghton;
- Ombudsmen, QC, Senior QC, successive Lord Advocates;
- Petitions to the Scottish Parliament (PE 439, PE 809, PE 1009);
- Petition to the European Parliament (0971/2009) which requested of the Scottish Government that it provide “measures to address the unnecessarily dangerous water situation” we and our community were facing;
- Director of Public Health (Tayside) and the Drinking Water Quality Regulator for Scotland;
- Scottish Human Rights Commission

Currently with:

- Scottish Government’s Standing Council on Europe (referred to sub-group).
- Scottish Parliament’s Commission on Parliamentary Reform (referred to Equalities and Human Rights Committee).

Background information

The benefits of a review would be:

- to eliminate inconsistencies in the implementation of the Scottish Regulations and through them with the EU Directive with which they should be compliant.

For example, whereas paragraphs 27 and 28 of the Directive provide that the member state should take action to restore water quality where that is necessary to protect human health, and Article 130 r (2) requires that priority be given to action
which rectifies the problem at source, the Scottish Minister responsible for the Directive states that in Scotland responsibility for the ongoing maintenance and any remedial action to bring a private water supply into Compliance rests with the owners and users of those supplies and not with national or local authorities.

- to reconsider the powers of enforcement granted to local authorities so that any remedial action required is proven effective.

The benefits of guidance provision would be:

- to ensure consistent practice across different services
- to ensure that Environmental Health departments are involved where Planning matters are raised which are pertinent to Public Health.

The benefit of transferring the regulatory powers over the quality of private water supplies to the Drinking Water Quality Regulator for Scotland would be:

- more objective and focused examination of water-specific issues
- more reliable avoidance of cases of water-borne disease;
- a specialist unit would achieve better liaison with the UK Cross-Government Strategy to ‘increase the prevention of infection’ (The Lancet) in parallel with increasing Anti-Microbial resistance, now listed on the National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies.

The benefits of an Equal Right of Appeal would be:

- to avert unduly preferential treatment of commercial developers over individual households;
- to ensure that Developers cannot pass on provision and maintenance costs for essential services to individuals or their communities.

**Personal Experience**

The developer contracted to repair the water collecting tank for the private water supply serving 35 households reneged on this. The Council’s planning department failed to enforce this repair at ‘source’, and refused to defer further building on site, thereby obstructing legal Action and allowing the passing on of these costs and associated health risks to us and the community.

Boil water notices have been issued over the past two decades, with cases of water-borne disease, including E.Coli 0157, notified. Bacterial contamination of our own domestic supply despite the presence of a UV filter necessitated our attachment to mains water at full cost.

The European Parliament Petitions Committee wrote to the Scottish Government to ask for measures to address the “unnecessarily dangerous” water situation faced by our community. These were refused by the Scottish Minister responsible for the Directive who indicated that this situation was “fairly typical” of supplies drawn from farmland.
Approval in principle for further development on the same supply still leaves Compliance with Regulations with regard to essential services reliant on the “honour" of commercial Developers.