

## Seil Island Community - Engagement Group

24<sup>th</sup> April 2017 3.00pm – 4.30pm

Seil Island Community Hall

## Attendees

- Michael Russell MSP (Chair) (MR)

## Councillors:

- Cllr Elaine Robertson (ER)
- Cllr Kieron Green (KG)
- Cllr Julie Mckenzie (JM)

## Community:

- Anne-Marie Robin (AR)
- David Ainsley (DA)
- John Gordon (JG)
- George Mackenzie(GM)
- Janice Baxter (JB)
- Alex Wright (AW)
- George Hannah (GH)
- Steven Jarron (SJ)

## Scottish Water:

- Alan Thomson (Head of Corporate Relations) (AT)
- Robert Stewart (General Manager Wastewater Service Strategy)(RS)
- Mark Williams (Head of Environmental Science and Regulation) (MW)
- Ruaridh Macgregor (Regional Communities Manager) (RM)

## Apologies:

- Jim Frame (SEPA Unit Manager) (JF)

Item		Actions
1	<p><b>Welcome – Michael Russell ( Chair)</b></p> <p>The chair welcomed all to the meeting and commenced with a round the table introductions.</p>	
2	<p><b>Review of previous minutes (Chair)</b></p> <p>MR – Asked if there were any comments on the minutes from the previous meeting. There were none.</p>	

3	<p><b>Options Development – Robert Stewart</b></p> <p>RS – Took the group through the options development presentation. This concluded that SW would be progressing Option 1A as the preferred option and is working to manage key risks / uncertainties (eg securing planning, licencing, land purchase, cost surety etc).</p> <p>MR – Summarised position that there was 1 acceptable option for the residents on the stakeholder group (1A) and that whilst there would be caveats as laid out in the presentation this was the leading option and the one that should be the focus</p> <p>AMR – read out a Statement from the stakeholder group which confirmed stance on preference for option 1A and added that they felt transparency on the process was imperative and it was important that the wider community were part of the communication strategy.</p> <p>MR – confirmed that this was important and would be address during this session</p>	
4	<p><b>Feedback and comments – Independent Expert</b></p> <p>CC – Confirmed the community stakeholder groups rationale behind the support of option 1A and rejection of option 3</p> <p>In support of 1A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Makes use of existing infrastructure</li> <li>- Well hidden away from houses</li> <li>- Tried and tested technology</li> <li>- Low risk strategy</li> <li>- Achieve receiving water designation</li> <li>- Best reflects needs of community</li> <li>- Reduces carbon footprint</li> <li>- Requirement for SW to go extra mile</li> </ul> <p>Against option 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community stakeholders did not see any positives</li> <li>- cosmetic concern</li> <li>- Perceived Risk of noise/smell</li> <li>- Concerns over impacts on Easdale bay</li> </ul> <p>MR – Summarised that only option 1A was acceptable to community stakeholders and that SW should take this option forward accepting the caveats that have still to be worked through to completion.</p>	

<p><b>Group Feedback and comments – All</b></p> <p>AMR - Re-iterated concerns from the community regarding the requirement to keep conversations private and the importance of community wide engagement.</p> <p>JB – Asked about the visual impact of the option 1A on the existing site</p> <p>RS – responded that we are still at early stages and this will be further developed when we progress to next stage.</p> <p>GMc – Raised the importance of landscaping and ensuring the visual impact was considered.</p> <p>DA – Mentioned existing issues with fencing on site.</p> <p>RS – Fencing will be looked at from both security and visual perspective.</p> <p>GH – Raised the possibility of objection to the planning applications</p> <p>MR – Outlined that application should have the support of the community stakeholder group</p> <p>MR – stated that community stakeholder should act as ambassadors of the scheme</p> <p>KG – Raised the potential visual impact of a new track to site</p> <p>RS- The track would need to be routed so as to minimise impact on views and we would look to utilise existing tracks i.e recent wind turbine development</p> <p>JB – Asked if pipe was underground</p> <p>RS – Confirmed Pipework would be underground</p> <p>ER – re-iterated the importance of screening of the site and that given historical issues with previous project, vitally important to get it right.</p> <p>RS – Stated that there would be a higher degree of control from SW in delivery process which would reduce risk of any repeat of issues experienced last time.</p> <p>SJ – Invasive species had to be considered as the last scheme had issues with the introduction to the island eg Japanese Knotweed.</p> <p>CC – Raised the issue of the technical issue with existing outfall position (1A) – there was an issue with the historical recoding of mean low tide mark. Potentially outfall 50 metres short.</p> <p>MW – Replayed the message from Jim Frame Sepa that the key criterion</p>	
--	--

	<p>was to achieve betterment and these outfall arrangements would be agreed with SEPA.</p> <p>CC – Asked what incentives were in place to compel individual properties to disconnect surface water and adopt SUDs approach.</p> <p>RS – Explained SW did not have any incentives specifically relating to surface water disconnection and it would be the discretion or personal motivation for property owners to be more sustainable</p> <p>CC – Asked where the construction site would be</p> <p>RS – Too early in process to confirm where the site compound would be.</p> <p>DA – Suggested it would best to be on site at 1A or the site utilised for the previous project or potentially at the area currently being used by the electricity company just before you get onto the island.</p> <p>CC – Raised the possibility of a pumped soak away option for the septic tank at Sea view terrace and asked about the 450K estimate for a standalone septic tank</p> <p>RS – SW will consider if technically viable and reasonable cost.</p>	
	<p><b>Timeline and Next Steps – Robert Stewart</b></p> <p>RS – ran through the next steps and time line</p>	
	<p><b>Wider community engagement – Alan Thomson</b></p> <p>AT – Explained that we were planning to go out and engage the wider Seil community through letter and an invitation to attend a public information event similar to last time.</p> <p>The information event would include info on our progression on option 1A and supporting information including drone footage and maps. This would be planned for June.</p> <p>MR – Stated the importance of communications being coordinated jointly between stakeholders and SW - a joint effort.</p> <p>ER – raised that she had been contacted by local press regarding the meeting and progress</p> <p>AT – The press will be part of communications process</p> <p>MR – asked for SW rep to attend the next Seil island community council meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of May.</p> <p>RM – agreed to attend.</p>	<p>Issue letter to the wider community to update on progress (agreed with Stakeholders)</p> <p>Community information event organised for June</p> <p>Ruaridh Macgregor to attend Seil Island community council meeting (23<sup>rd</sup> May)</p>

	<p>MR – asked that the next meeting of the group be scheduled once the licences and permissions are in place and before the final decision goes to the Scottish Water Board.</p> <p>MR – Thanked everyone for attending</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Meeting close</p>	
--	--	--