The Committee will consider the following new petitions—

**PE985** Petition by Mick Napier, on behalf of the Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign, calling on the Scottish Parliament to congratulate the Palestinian people on their ability to conduct democratic elections while under Israeli occupation, to call for the ending of all sanctions against Palestine and to invite a Palestinian parliamentary spokesman to address the Scottish Parliament.

**PE999** Petition by Jim Milne, on behalf of Dundee Anti-Poverty Forum, calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to review the school clothing grant system.

**PE983** Petition by Raymond Bell calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to ban the use of microchip implants on young people in Scotland.

**PE984** Petition by Dr Colin Watson, on behalf of Scothedge, calling on the Scottish Parliament to introduce legislation to provide local authorities with the power to deal with complaints regarding vigorous growing trees, hedges, vines or other plants.

**PE982** Petition by B Linden Jarvis calling on the Scottish Parliament to consider and debate the implications of proposed ship to ship transfers of oil at anchor in the Forth Estuary, specifically focussing such consideration and debate on the likely impact of such operations upon wildlife, tourism, local authority funding of clean-up and how it may use its powers within the 12 mile tidal limits to protect the local ecology, scenery, environment and areas of special scientific interest and habitat within the Estuary.

**PE993** Petition by David Walker calling for the Scottish Parliament to amend the Education (Scotland) Act 1980 to remove the statutory requirement on education authorities to provide religious observance in Scottish schools.
Public Petitions Committee – a template for public petitions

Should you wish to submit a public petition for consideration by the Public Petitions Committee please complete the template below. Please refer to the Guidance on submission of public petitions for advice on issues of admissibility before completing the template. You may also seek advice from the Clerk to the Committee whose contact details can be found at the end of this form.

Details of principal petitioner:

Please enter the name of person and organisation raising the petition, including a contact address where correspondence should be sent to, email address and phone number if available

Mick Napier

Text of petition:

The petition should clearly state what action the petitioner wishes the Parliament to take in no more than 5 lines of text, e.g.

The petitioner requests that the Scottish Parliament considers and debates the implications of the proposed Agenda for Change legislation for Speech and Language Therapy Services and service users within the NHS

Petition by Mick Napier, on behalf of the Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign, calling on the Scottish Parliament to congratulate the Palestinian people on their ability to conduct democratic elections while under Israeli occupation, to call for the ending of all sanctions against Palestine and to invite a Palestinian parliamentary spokesman to address the Scottish Parliament.

Additional information:

Any additional information in relation to your petition, including reasons why the action requested is necessary, should not be included here. However, it may be appended to the petition and will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition. Please note that you should limit the amount of any additional information which you may wish to provide in support of your petition to no more than 4 sides of A4.
Action taken to resolve issues of concern before submitting the petition:

Before submitting a petition to the Parliament, petitioners are expected to have made an attempt to resolve their issues of concern by, for example, making representations to the Scottish Executive or seeking the assistance of locally elected representatives, such as councillors, MSPs and MPs. Please enter details of those approached below and append copies of relevant correspondence, which will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition.

We made representations to the last meeting of the Cross Party Group on Palestine meeting in the Parliament with a number of MSPs present from the Labour, Liberal Democrat, and Green parties, together with the independent Pensioners MSP

Petitioners appearing before the Committee

The Convener of the Committee may invite petitioners to appear before the Public Petitions Committee to speak in support of their petition. Such an invitation will only be made if the Convener considers this would be useful in facilitating the Committee's consideration of the petition. It should be noted that due to the large volume of petitions it has to consider, the Committee is not able to invite all petitioners to appear before the Committee to speak in support of their petition.

Please indicate below whether you request to make a brief statement before the Committee when it comes to consider your petition.

I DO request to make a brief statement before the Committee ☐

I DO NOT request to make a brief statement before the Committee ☐

Signature of principal petitioner:

When satisfied that your petition meets all the criteria outlined in the Guidance on submission of public petitions, the principal petitioner should sign and date the form in the box below. Other signatures gathered should be appended to this form.

Signature

Date 18 June 2006

Please note that any additional information, copies of relevant correspondence and additional signatures should be appended to this form and submitted to:

The Clerk to the Public Petitions Committee,
The Scottish Parliament,
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP
Tel: 0131 348 5186 Fax: 0131 348 5088
e-mail: petitions@scottish.parliament.uk
Public Petitions Committee – a template for e-petitions

Should you wish to submit an e-petition allowing signatures to be gathered online on the Public Petitions Committee e-petitioner web pages please complete the template below. Before submitting your e-petition please consult the Guidance on submission of public petitions for advice on what is and is not admissible. You may also seek advice from the Clerk to the Committee whose contact details can be found at the end of this form.

**Details of principal petitioner:**
*Please enter the name of person and organisation raising the petition, including a contact address where correspondence should be sent to.*

| Jim Milne |

| Text of petition: |

The petition should clearly state what action the petitioner wishes the Parliament to take in no more than 5 lines of text, e.g.

The petitioner requests that the Scottish Parliament considers and debates the implications of the proposed Agenda for Change legislation for Speech and Language Therapy Services and service users within the NHS

Petition by Jim Milne, on behalf of Dundee Anti-Poverty Forum, calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to review the school clothing grant system.

| Period for gathering signatures: |

*Please enter the closing date for gathering signatures on your petition, which we would usually recommend is a period of between 4-6 weeks*  

| Closing date: 27 September 2006 |
Additional information:

Please enter any other information relating to the issues raised in your e-petition, including the reasons why the action requested is necessary. The text entered in this field should not exceed 2 pages. However, you may wish to provide further sources/links to background information.

We the undersigned declare that the School Clothing Grant allocated to and administered by the local authorities in Scotland and the systems that are used to allocate them are unfair and illogical.

The Petitioners therefore requests that the Scottish Parliament recommends to the Scottish Executive to carry out a review of the School Clothing Grant and the allocation systems with the view to:

- Increasing the grant allocation
- Ring fencing the grant and any under spend then can be reallocated to other budgets
- The Scottish Executive set out the criteria for qualification of the grant.
Action taken to resolve issues of concern before submitting an e-petition:

Before submitting a petition to the Parliament, petitioners are expected to have made an attempt to resolve their issues of concern, by for example, making representations to the Scottish Executive or seeking the assistance of locally elected representatives, such as councillors, MSPs and MSPs. Details of those approached should be entered.

We the petitioners have already approached via letter Peter Peacock MSP, Minister for Education and Young People and copied this to Iain Smith MSP convener of the Education Committee for assistance in resolving the issues contained in our petition.

Comments to stimulate on-line discussion:

Please provide at least one comment to set the scene for an on-line discussion on the petition, not exceeding 10 lines of text.

Education Authorities have a duty Under section 54 of the Education (Scotland) Act 1980, when it is brought to their attention that a pupil cannot receive education because his or her clothing is inadequate or unsuitable, to provide whatever assistance they consider necessary. Due to the discretion that local authorities can exercise over the school clothing grant, what we have is a hotch-potch. It is administered across Scotland inconsistently, with differing criteria of eligibility and level of grant available. Our research has shown that the targeting of the grant is poor and in some cases stigma is attached to the children whose parents apply. We believe that more. We believe that a review should take place to fully ascertain the different practices that are in operation and that more guidance is provided from SE.

Petitioners appearing before the Committee

The Convener of the Committee may invite petitioners to appear before the Public Petitions Committee to speak in support of their petition. Such an invitation will only be made if the Convener considers this would be useful in facilitating the Committee’s consideration of the petition. It should be noted that due to the large volume of petitions it has to consider, the Committee is not able to invite all petitioners to appear before the Committee to speak in support of their petition.

Please indicate below whether you request to make a brief statement before the Committee when it comes to consider your petition.

I DO request to make a brief statement before the Committee
I DO NOT request to make a brief statement before the Committee
Signature of principal petitioner:

When satisfied that your petition meets all the criteria outlined in the Guidance on submission of public petitions, the principal petitioner should sign and date the form in the box below. Other signatures gathered should be appended to this form.

SIGNATURE

Jim Milne

DATE

22-6-06

For advice on the content and wording of your e-petition please contact:

The Clerk to the Public Petitions Committee
The Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP
Tel: 0131 348 5186 Fax: 0131 348 5088
e-mail: petitions@scottish.parliament.uk

Note
Completed e-petition forms should also be sent to petitions@scottish.parliament.uk
Public Petitions Committee – a template for public petitions

Should you wish to submit a public petition for consideration by the Public Petitions Committee please complete the template below. Please refer to the Guidance on submission of public petitions for advice on issues of admissibility before completing the template. You may also seek advice from the Clerk to the Committee whose contact details can be found at the end of this form.

Details of principal petitioner:
Please enter the name of person and organisation raising the petition, including a contact address where correspondence should be sent to, email address and phone number if available

Raymond Bell

Text of petition:
The petition should clearly state what action the petitioner wishes the Parliament to take in no more than 5 lines of text, e.g.

The petitioner requests that the Scottish Parliament considers and debates the implications of the proposed Agenda for Change legislation for Speech and Language Therapy Services and service users within the NHS

Petition by Raymond Bell calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to ban the use of microchip implants on young people in Scotland.

Additional information:
Any additional information in relation to your petition, including reasons why the action requested is necessary, should not be included here. However, it may be appended to the petition and will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition. Please note that you should limit the amount of any additional information which you may wish to provide in support of your petition to no more than 4 sides of A4.
Action taken to resolve issues of concern before submitting the petition:

Before submitting a petition to the Parliament, petitioners are expected to have made an attempt to resolve their issues of concern by, for example, making representations to the Scottish Executive or seeking the assistance of locally elected representatives, such as councillors, MSPs and MPs. Please enter details of those approached below and append copies of relevant correspondence, which will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition.

Lord Provost of Glasgow
Glasgow Licensing Authority

Petitioners appearing before the Committee

The Convener of the Committee may invite petitioners to appear before the Public Petitions Committee to speak in support of their petition. Such an invitation will only be made if the Convener considers this would be useful in facilitating the Committee's consideration of the petition. It should be noted that due to the large volume of petitions it has to consider, the Committee is not able to invite all petitioners to appear before the Committee to speak in support of their petition.

Please indicate below whether you request to make a brief statement before the Committee when it comes to consider your petition.

I DO request to make a brief statement before the Committee [ ] YES

I DO NOT request to make a brief statement before the Committee [ ]

Signature of principal petitioner:

When satisfied that your petition meets all the criteria outlined in the Guidance on submission of public petitions, the principal petitioner should sign and date the form in the box below. Other signatures gathered should be appended to this form.

Signature

Raymond Hall

Date 20th June 2006

Please note that any additional information, copies of relevant correspondence and additional signatures should be appended to this form and submitted to:

The Clerk to the Public Petitions Committee,
The Scottish Parliament,
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP
Tel: 0131 348 5186 Fax: 0131 348 5088
e-mail: petitions@scottish.parliament.uk
Dear Ms Martin,

I spoke to you on the telephone yesterday. Thank you, I did receive your letter.

Since submitting my petition I have studied the EGE report on ICT Implants in the Human Body and believe that it is important for the Public Petitions Committee to have copies of the EGE press release. I would be very grateful if you could see that Committee members get copies of the enclosed pages.

Yours sincerely,

Raymond Bell
27 September 2006

Distinguished members of the Public Petitions Committee

I am very pleased that PE 983, concerning microchip implants, will be considered at your meeting on 4 October. I shall be viewing the live broadcast on the internet, here in Finland. This is very convenient.

Because the Glasgow night club, despite the many press reports, states that it has no plans to offer Verichip microchip implants to its customers, this issue may not seem to be of immediate concern to the Scottish Parliament. I hope that the Scottish Parliament can view Petition PE 983 within the wider context of EGE Opinion No. 20 and strive for greater protection of the Scottish public.

ETHICAL ASPECTS OF ICT IMPLANTS IN THE HUMAN BODY
The European Commission sponsored the European Group of Ethics in the New Technologies (EGE) to carry out an investigation into the ethical aspects of active Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) implants in the human body.
The EGE report; OPINION no. 20, was presented to the Commission on 17 March 2005.
I enclose a press release.

SERIOUS CONCERNS OF EGE
EGE voices its serious concerns on the potential abuse of active ICT implants, which are used for surveillance purposes, and calls for debate and for the approximation of laws relating to active implantable devices in the Member States.

Could Committee members please take careful note of EGE concerns in the enclosed press release. EGE urges Member States that a broad social and political debate is needed on ICT implants in the Human Body.

Scotland now has an opportunity in PE 983 to address new technical threats and challenges, which are a concern to the European Commission.

Yours faithfully,

Raymond Bell
Opinion on the ethical aspects of ICT implants in the human body

- Opinion N° 20 -

- 16 March 2005 -
Mandate 2005-2009

- Mandate
- Rules of Procedure (under review)
- Composition

MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN GROUP ON ETHICS IN SCIENCE AND NEW TECHNOLOGIES

The Group has fifteen members:

[Image of group members]

They are appointed by the President of the European Commission on the basis of their individual expertise, and they are experts in disciplines such as science, jurisprudence, philosophy and theology.

For its third mandate, the EGE has grown in size from 12 to 15 members. The President of the European Commission José Manuel Barroso decided to re-appoint six members of the previous group: Göran Hermerén, Linda Nielsen, Rafael Capurro, Int Beaulart, Pere Puigdomènec Rosell and Günter Viril, and invited the following nine new members to join the group: Emm Agius, Diana Bánáli, Anne Cambron-Thomsen, Carlo Cauni, Jozef Glaza, Hille Hakor, Julian Kindlerer, Krzysztof Murzyn and Paula Martinho da Silva.

Professor Göran HERMEREN (Sweden), Chairman
Philosopher, Professor of Medical Ethics, Faculty of Medicine, Lund University (biography) (25831)

Mrs Paula MARTINHO DA SILVA (Portugal), Vice-Chairman
Lawyer, President of the National Council of Ethics for the Science of Life (biography) (25616)

http://ec.europa.eu/european_group_ethics/mandate/composition_en.htm

20.9.2006
Ethical aspects of ICT implants in the human body: opinion presented to the Commission by the European Group on Ethics

The European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE), chaired by the Swedish philosopher, Göran Hermerén, adopted on 16 March 2005 Opinion N° 20 on the ethical aspects of information and communication technologies (ICT) implants in the human body and presented this to the Commission. The EGE is an independent, multidisciplinary and pluralist advisory group, which is composed of twelve members. Its role is to advise the European Commission on how ethical values should be taken into consideration in the regulation of scientific and technological developments.

At first sight ICT implants are ethically unproblematic if we think for instance about cardiac pacemakers. However, although particular ICT implants may be used to repair deficient bodily capabilities, others are ethically more problematic, particularly if such devices are accessible via digital networks. ICT implants, due to their network capability could be misused in several ways for all kinds of social surveillance or manipulation.

The idea of placing ICT devices “under our skin” in order not just to repair but even to enhance human capabilities gives rise to science fiction visions with threat and/or benefit characteristics. However, in some cases, the implantation of microchips with the potential for individual and social forms of control is already taking place.

The intimate relation between bodily and psychic functions is basic to our personal identity. Neurosciences are developing very quickly. The brain implants developed to alleviate tremors in Parkinson’s disease are only one example. They show that ICT implants may influence the nervous system and particularly the brain and thus human identity as a species as well as individual subjectivity and autonomy.

These are the essential reasons why ICT implants in the human body have large and important ethical consequences. Not surprisingly, the respect for human dignity has been the fundamental basis of EGE discussions of where the limits should be drawn for different applications of ICT implants.

As already mentioned, ICT implants can be used both for health and for non-medical purposes. Both types of implants clearly require informed consent. This information should not only concern possible benefits and health risks but also risks that such implants could be used to locate people and/or obtain access to information stored in these devices without the permission of the individuals in whom the devices are implanted.
Although the necessity for research can sometimes be questioned, new knowledge is essential for the development of individuals and societies. However, the freedom of research has to be restricted by respect for other important values and ethical principles. Nevertheless, the ethical notion of the inviolability of the human body should not be understood as a barrier against the advancement of science and technology but as a barrier against its possible misuse.

In its Opinion, the EGE makes the general point that non-medical applications of ICT implants are a potential threat to human dignity and democratic society.

Obviously, the principles of data protection need to be applied to this area, since data about the human body can be generated via such implants. The privacy and confidentiality of such data need to be guaranteed. The EGE stresses the importance that not only the individual has the right to protect his or her own personal data but that society should take care that online and surveillance systems, where they are permitted, should not become systems of untenable restriction or even negation of basic rights. This should be particularly considered in case such systems become part of health systems in which data is permanently or occasionally transmitted to other parties. The use of ICT implants in order to obtain remote control over the will of people should be strictly prohibited.

ICT implants could be used to enhance physical and mental capabilities. Efforts should be made to make sure that such ICT implants are not used to create a two-class society or to increase the gap between the industrialized countries and the rest of the world. Access to ICT implants for enhancement should only be for the purpose of bringing children or adults into the "normal" range for the population (normal meaning the conditions that generally prevail and that are not caused by genetic malfunction, disease or deficiency and lacking observable abnormalities), if they so wish and have given their informed consent. A second permissible purpose would be to improve health prospects, such as enhancing the immune system to be resistant to HIV for example. As for health purposes, access to ICT implants for enhancement purposes should be based on need rather than on economic resources or social position.

The EGE insists that surveillance applications of ICT implants may only be permitted if the legislator considers that there is an urgent and justified necessity in a democratic society and that there are no less intrusive methods. Nevertheless, the EGE does not favour such uses and considers that surveillance applications, under all circumstances, must be specified in legislation, and that surveillance procedures in individual cases should be approved and monitored by an independent court.

A broad social and political debate is needed as to what kind of applications should be accepted and legally approved, particularly concerning surveillance and enhancement. A precautionary approach is recommended by the EGE. The Member States and their national ethics councils have a responsibility to create conditions for education and constructive, well-informed debates in this area.

This field needs regulation. Currently, non-medical ICT implants in the human body are not explicitly covered by existing legislation, particularly in terms of privacy and data protection. In the EGE's view, implantable devices for medical purposes should be regulated in the same way as drugs when the medical goal is the same, particularly as such implants are only partly covered by Council Directive 90/385/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to active implantable medical devices. The EGE recommends that the European Commission should launch legislative initiatives in these areas of ICT implant applications.

More information: http://europa.eu.int/commm/european_group_ethics/index_en.htm
ICT implants used for coercion towards others who do not use such devices.

6.4.5. **ICT Implants, Commercialisation and Consumer Interests**

Whilst the human body, as such, should not give rise to financial gain, there is - as has been documented in the scientific background part of this report - already a commercial market for various kinds of ICT devices. It is essential that these products are not put on the market without adequate control. For instance, products that can be regarded as medical products should be controlled according to the relevant legal framework. Efforts should be made to make sure that all ICT devices are checked for safety and security before being put on the market.

6.4.6. **ICT Implants for Surveillance Purposes**

ICT implants for surveillance in particular threaten human dignity. They could be used by state authorities, individuals and groups to increase their power over others. The implants could be used to locate people (and also to retrieve other kinds of information about them). This might be justified for security reasons (early release for prisoners) or for safety reasons (location of vulnerable children).

However, the EGE insists that such surveillance applications of ICT implants may only be permitted if the legislator considers that there is an urgent and justified necessity in a democratic society (Article 8 of the Human Rights Convention) and there are no less intrusive methods. Nevertheless, the EGE does not favour such uses and considers that surveillance applications, under all circumstances, must be specified in legislation. Surveillance procedures in individual cases should be approved and monitored by an independent court.

The same general principles should apply to the use of ICT implants for military purposes.

6.5. **GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6.5.1. **Development of the Information Society**

The EGE considers that the ethical questions related to ICT implants in the human body are intimately related to the development of the Information Society as a whole. The EGE strongly supports the vision of a people-centric, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society as proclaimed in the Declaration of Principles of the World Summit on the Information Society (Geneva 2003).
Chippen in de Baja Beach Club

Betalen met geld in een club is vaak onhandig en ook een chippas werkt niet optimaal. Daarom heeft de Baja Beach Club in Rotterdam iets nieuws bedacht: de onderhuidse chip.

Een onderhuidse chip in de boomarm waarmee drankjes in de Rotterdamse Baja Beach Club kunnen worden afgezegeld. Metro-verkoper John van Schagen deed de proef op de som en liet er afgeopen dinsdag eentje plakken. Je leert het goed; betalen met een chip die doktoren in je arm!

EEN MEISJE krijgt een chip ingebracht in de Baja Beach Club. De club koomt als eerste in Nederland met een onderhuidse chip waarmee de dranken worden betaald. Aanvankelijk worden de chips, ter grootte van een rijstkorrel – geleverd bij 25 bezoekers. Aanschaf en plaatsing kost 2000 euro. Ook Metro-verkoper John van Schagen is de gelukkige eigenaar van een onderhuidse chip. Morgen in Metro zijn verhaal.

Joelle Poortvliet

WHAT ARE THEY?
HUMANS OR ANIMALS?

Please note: These photographs could have been from Glasgow.
Public Petitions Committee – a template for public petitions

Should you wish to submit a public petition for consideration by the Public Petitions Committee please complete the template below. Please refer to the Guidance on submission of public petitions for advice on issues of admissibility before completing the template. You may also seek advice from the Clerk to the Committee whose contact details can be found at the end of this form.

Details of principal petitioner:
Please enter the name of person and organisation raising the petition, including a contact address where correspondence should be sent to, email address and phone number if available

Dr Colin Watson
Secretary

Text of petition:
The petition should clearly state what action the petitioner wishes the Parliament to take in no more than 5 lines of text, e.g.

The petitioner requests that the Scottish Parliament considers and debates the implications of the proposed Agenda for Change legislation for Speech and Language Therapy Services and service users within the NHS

Petition by Dr Colin Watson, on behalf of Scothedge, calling on the Scottish Parliament to introduce legislation to provide local authorities with the power to deal with complaints regarding vigorous growing trees, hedges, shrubs, vines or other plants.

Additional information:
Any additional information in relation to your petition, including reasons why the action requested is necessary, should not be included here. However, it may be appended to the petition and will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition. Please note that you should limit the amount of any additional information which you may wish to provide in support of your petition to no more than 4 sides of A4.
Action taken to resolve issues of concern before submitting the petition:

Before submitting a petition to the Parliament, petitioners are expected to have made an attempt to resolve their issues of concern by, for example, making representations to the Scottish Executive or seeking the assistance of locally elected representatives, such as councillors, MSPs and MPs. Please enter details of those approached below and append copies of relevant correspondence, which will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition.

At present there is no legislation available to remedy the problems caused by improperly sited and/or mismanage trees/hedges/shrubs/vines or other vigorous growing plants owned by others. Local authorities, councillors and MSPs alike are all powerless to effect any current remedy without the creation and introduction of satisfactory legislation.

Petitioners appearing before the Committee

The Convener of the Committee may invite petitioners to appear before the Public Petitions Committee to speak in support of their petition. Such an invitation will only be made if the Convener considers this would be useful in facilitating the Committee’s consideration of the petition. It should be noted that due to the large volume of petitions it has to consider, the Committee is not able to invite all petitioners to appear before the Committee to speak in support of their petition.

Please indicate below whether you request to make a brief statement before the Committee when it comes to consider your petition.

I DO request to make a brief statement before the Committee ☐

I DO NOT request to make a brief statement before the Committee ☒

Signature of principal petitioner:

When satisfied that your petition meets all the criteria outlined in the Guidance on submission of public petitions, the principal petitioner should sign and date the form in the box below. Other signatures gathered should be appended to this form.

Signature ...........................................................

Date 28/6/06 ............................................................

Please note that any additional information, copies of relevant correspondence and additional signatures should be appended to this form and submitted to:

The Clerk to the Public Petitions Committee,
The Scottish Parliament,
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP
Tel: 0131 348 5186     Fax: 0131 348 5088
E-mail: petitions@scottish.parliament.uk
Seeking legislative control of problem hedges.

Website: http://www.Hedgeline.org/scothedge.htm

Clerk of the PublicPetitions Committee, (TG.01)
The Scottish Parliament,
Edinburgh EH99 1SP
25 September 2006

Dear Clerk,

Please find enclosed our Background Information document in support of PE984 to be considered on 4th October.

Initially prompted by the lack of progress of the Scott Barrie High Hedges Bill, we are extremely pleased to have heard the assurances of the Deputy Communities Minister and from Scott Barrie himself that the pre-requisite Public Consultancy is now imminent. Indeed it may be that this endeavour to gain protection against more than "hedges" may be more appropriate for the designated lead committee, probably the Communities Committee.

However the history has become focussed upon only a section of the boundary impact problem and with hindsight of the Westminster Bill we would like to correct what has turned out to be a deficiency (there are a few), in the English Bill before it is repeated in the Scottish Legislation.

Scothedge is a division of Hedgeline, the English campaign group.

I would like to record our thanks to the Petition Committee for their 3 year support of PE497 only terminated when we all understood the Scott Barrie Consultancy was imminent in May 2005. Our extreme gratitude is also due to the many MSPs who are supporting this issue.

Yours respectfully,

Dr. Colin Watson of behalf of the Scothedge Committee.
PE984 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Historically, the driving force behind "High Hedge" has been the vigorous Leyland Cypress which has become the icon for campaigners seeking to thwart the anti-social aggressive or selfish deployment or mismanagement of curtilage plants to harm the fair and reasonable enjoyment of neighbouring properties.

Legislators have neglected the reality that a hedge is simply a major player in un-neighbourly contention which is brutal in causing serious hardship to complainants and bitter dispute, there being no accountability of the owner to consider those outside his boundary and therefore have freedom to misbehave in a dreadful manner.

By limiting any statutory responsibility to the difficult legal description of a hedge and its characteristics such as height and for instance "a line of evergreen or semi-evergreen trees" as in the Westminster Bill, relief is denied to identical problems emanating from different plants.

For instance a single voluminous tree, bush or shrub might substantially block light from a house window and fail to attract statutory remediation whilst exactly the same loss of light provided by a legally defined hedge can be put right. This is clearly anomalous when the identical 'problem' but emanating from a different description of plant cannot be consistently dealt with. The same problem may be delivered by a variety of plants.

The attempt to legally define a tree or hedge rather than the 'problem' creates complexity in definition and anomaly in the ability to remove the problem. The Westminster legislation which is based upon this definition gives rise to many anomalies which are now bringing plentiful appeals and some very unexpected conclusions. The legislation fails all of those whose problems are not encapsulated within an arbitrary hedge description. Notably overgrown trees can bring horrendous problems when they become destructive of a neighbouring property, incur huge maintenance problems and impact every bit as seriously as the conceptual hedge.

As evidenced by the Community Committee debate on the 13th. on two high hedge probing amendments to the Planning Etc.(Scotland) Bill,

- MSPs consider that defining the "hedge" would be difficult and Scothedge agree. The way forward here is not to try to define an "illegal hedge". The illegality would be the action of the grower who uses greenery in such a way as to inflict distress and loss of amenity on a neighbour. This is goal setting legislation – the goal being to "minimise anti-social behaviour" rather than trying to define an illegal hedge. The Communities Committee members recognised anti-social behaviour as being the underlying reason for failure to resolve problems amicably.

- Is the benefit of the "greenery" to the grower and the general community disproportionate to the effect it has on the complainant?

The problem identifying guidelines would then be used to assist local authorities with arbitration without the added anomalies of difficult hedge identification.

The same meeting saw legislation which stretched beyond the 'hedge' definition as being draconian without appearing to take into consideration that no hedge or tree which was not causing a complaint which would come under any statutory remedial order or indeed come to the attention of the empowered local authority.

The extent of involvement of the local authority would simply be to distribute guideline leaflets to neighbours in dispute which laid out the ‘problems’ to be avoided and to make clear that failure to resolve a problem could enable either party to invoke arbitration with any
fee to be settled by the party losing the arbitration. In England the capitulation of hedge
growers realising that they would lose arbitration has been very substantial. In 2005/6 in
South Tyneside there were apparently 40 complaints of which only one went to arbitration.
The Local Council investigated around 2/3rd of the 39 to find that all had trimmed hedges. In
Birmingham it is reported that an anticipated 1500 complaints resulted in only 9 Local
Authority interventions. The reasons here were not analysed but a similar capitulation is likely
to have occurred.

So the arguments of excessive Local Council work deemed to have held up the Scott Barrie
High Hedge legislation may very well turn out to be a net relief when nearly all problems can
be resolved through the awareness of a last resort statutory resolution.

By taking such an approach, some very serious tree problems could be resolved to the
elimination of serious contentions which would remain should the narrow hedge description
be the only avenue to resolution.

Examples

This highland Scots Pine copse is not a hedge but it completely enshrouds this church hall
having grown since 1963. With no significant light, damp rot has set in. The trees belong to
the surrounding landowner who will not provide remedy.
An elderly and severely disabled home owner is required to dig himself out of layers of pine needles, survive serious root encroachment and lawn destruction through close to curtilage Scots Pines whose owner will not deal with. Far from it, the owner has planted dozens of new Scots pines along the complainants borders.

This borders family has serious root encroachment and shading problems and is advised by their MSP that the Scott Barrie Bill will should their problems. But is this a hedge?

Attempts to resolve this problem has involved MSPs, Local Councillors in copious but as yet ineffectual letter writing no doubt at substantial cost.

Other such problems exist which are known to Scothedge and MSPs.

These trees must either be called a hedge or the legislation must be inclusive of this and very many other situations if it is to resolve such serious and unfair problems.
A problem is a problem but the cause may be the deployment of a hedge or tree or a brick wall for that matter. The owner requires to be accountable for the problem inflicted on the neighbour. It may be more straightforward to define the problems in the legislation rather than the specific plant which delivers them.
Public Petitions Committee – a template for public petitions

Should you wish to submit a public petition for consideration by the Public Petitions Committee please complete the template below. Please refer to the Guidance on submission of public petitions for advice on issues of admissibility before completing the template. You may also seek advice from the Clerk to the Committee whose contact details can be found at the end of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of principal petitioner:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Please enter the name of person and organisation raising the petition, including a contact address where correspondence should be sent to, email address and phone number if available.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Linden Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Retired Businessman &amp; Shareholder Forth Ports PLC)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text of petition:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The petition should clearly state what action the petitioner wishes the Parliament to take in no more than 5 lines of text, e.g.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The petitioner requests that the Scottish Parliament considers and debates the implications of the proposed Agenda for Change legislation for Speech and Language Therapy Services and service users within the NHS</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The petitioner requests that the Scottish Parliament considers and debates the implications of the proposed ship to ship transfers of oil at anchor in the Forth Estuary, specifically focussing such consideration and debate on the likely impact of such operations upon wildlife, tourism, local authority funding of clean-up and how it may use its powers within the 12 mile tidal limits to protect the local ecology, scenery, environment and areas of special scientific interest and habitat within the Estuary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Any additional information in relation to your petition, including reasons why the action requested is necessary, should not be included here. However, it may be appended to the petition and will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition. Please note that you should limit the amount of any additional information which you may wish to provide in support of your petition to no more than 4 sides of A4.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action taken to resolve issues of concern before submitting the petition:
Before submitting a petition to the Parliament, petitioners are expected to have made an attempt to resolve their issues of concern by, for example, making representations to the Scottish Executive or seeking the assistance of locally elected representatives, such as councillors, MSPs and MPs. Please enter details of those approached below and append copies of relevant correspondence, which will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition.

Assistance has been sought from and representations made to Douglas Alexander MP, Scottish Natural Heritage, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, The Princess Royal, RSPB, SEPA, David Cameron MP, Orkney Harbours, Scottish Executive, Forth Ports PLC, The Scotsman, The Glasgow Herald, Sunday Herald, BBC Scotland, various institutional shareholders of Forth Ports PLC.

Petitioners appearing before the Committee
The Convener of the Committee may invite petitioners to appear before the Public Petitions Committee to speak in support of their petition. Such an invitation will only be made if the Convener considers this would be useful in facilitating the Committee’s consideration of the petition. It should be noted that due to the large volume of petitions it has to consider, the Committee is not able to invite all petitioners to appear before the Committee to speak in support of their petition.

Please indicate below whether you request to make a brief statement before the Committee when it comes to consider your petition.

I DO request to make a brief statement before the Committee [X]

I DO NOT request to make a brief statement before the Committee [ ]

Signature of principal petitioner:
When satisfied that your petition meets all the criteria outlined in the Guidance on submission of public petitions, the principal petitioner should sign and date the form in the box below. Other signatures gathered should be appended to this form.

Signature: ........................................................................................................

Date: 14-6-06 ........................................................................................................

Please note that any additional information, copies of relevant correspondence and additional signatures should be appended to this form and submitted to:

The Clerk to the Public Petitions Committee,
The Scottish Parliament,
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP
Tel: 0131 348 5186 Fax: 0131 348 5088
e-mail: petitions@scottish.parliament.uk
1. **Petition Text:**

The Petitioner requests that the Scottish Parliament considers and debates the implications of the proposed ship-to-ship transfers of oil (STS) at anchor in the Forth Estuary, specifically focussing upon consideration and debate on the likely impact of such operations upon wildlife, tourism. Local authority funding of clean-up and how it may use its powers within the 12 mile tidal limits to protect the local ecology, scenery, environment and areas of special scientific interest and habitat within the estuary.

2. **Issues Requiring Discussion:**

The Petitioner has undertaken significant research into the proposed STS activities and the likely impact upon the Forth and its constituencies and makes the following key observations:

2.1. Forth Ports PLC, the competent harbour authority has failed to comply with formal requests for information connected with STS operations under either The Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 or The Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 making informed decision about potential or actual risks, historical spill data and past environmental incidents difficult for councils and public alike – it is therefore unclear how Forth Ports would intend to reimburse council for costs of clean-up as no contracts allocating responsibility have been disclosed by Forth Ports PLC.

2.2. The economic benefit is restricted to a commercial operation only, with no direct benefit locally, except for potential impact on the ongoing regeneration of wildlife and tourism within the Forth Estuary.

2.3. There exists, in addition to oil spill risk, the further risk of introduction of foreign marine species through active de-ballasting within the Forth Estuary confines. Other council controlled Port Authorities, in light of scientific advice received, currently require ships to de-ballast at sea to prevent contamination. This presents a commercial disadvantage whilst promoting safe ecological practice.

2.4. Safe alternative solutions already exist at Scapa Flow, within a local authority controlled and confined harbour area, where existing capacity can handle the required tonnage without incremental increase of risk to the environment. The structure, siting and tidal flow of this facility ensures greater likelihood of recovery of spills than could ever occur, with heavy fuel oil in an open estuary, such as the Forth, where fast tidal flows are present.

3. **Proposed Solutions:**

The Petitioner respectfully suggests the following is necessary:

3.1. That the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 and the Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 are amended to include Forth Ports PLC in Schedule 1. In addition, it would be necessary to prevent conflicts of interest between harbour authorities and their commercial operations by insisting that Forth Ports comply with S48A of the Harbours Act 1964, this responsibility is devolved to the Scottish Executive.

3.2. That the Scottish Executive, using its devolved powers, requires Forth Ports PLC to obtain a licence under regulation 44, satisfying such requirements and objections as the Executive may impose, whilst understanding that such requirements may make the existing proposal commercially unattractive. This recognises that there is no overriding public interest for such activities being conducted, the fuel only being in transit to the Far East from Russia, as a consequence of which it is possible that European Protected Species may be disturbed or that damage or destruction of breeding sites or resting places may occur, whether or not such species is present in these places.

3.3. That the Scottish Executive, using its devolved powers over Scottish Coastal Waters, requires all shipping carrying oil or oil products cargoes to discharge ballast water at open sea, recognising that this may provide a level playing field for local authority and commercial operations alike.

3.4. That the Scottish Executive should use all means possible to ensure that STS should be brought within the scope of the Habitats Regulations.

3.5. That the Scottish Executive should ensure inclusion of the Forth Estuary on the short list for candidates for Scotland’s Coastal and Marine National Park.

4. **Additional Recommended Resources for Committee Members:**


4.2. Scapa Flow Alternative as attached.


4.4. Letter from Alistair Darling MP AD/009251/06 to Rhona Brankin MSP dated 27 April 06.

4.5. Questions to the Executive S2W-23473;S2W-26372; S2W-27199.
ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL FOR SHIP-TO-SHIP OIL TRANSFERS WITHIN THE FORTH ESTUARY

Background and current position

Forth Ports PLC is the competent harbour authority with responsibility for operating piers and harbours within the Forth Estuary in a safe and cost effective manner. It has a publicly stated aim to ensure that all operations consider their impact upon and interface with:

- The health, wellbeing and safety of employees
- The local environment
- The global environment
- The local community
- The business environment

Forth Ports PLC wishes to introduce Ship-to-Ship Transfers (STS) within the area of the Forth Estuary and has commissioned a report from Aquatera Limited which sets out the proposed Oil Spill Contingency Plan. This report has been submitted to the Marine & Coastguard Agency (MCA) for approval of its scope, accuracy of risk assessment and contingency plans for dealing with spill incidents - which report has been the subject of open criticism from industry experts, councils, environmental bodies and public interest groups alike.

The primary basis of objection is that STS operations in open estuary have the potential to cause significant damage to the local area by

- oil spills due to pipeline failure, tank overflow, collision, grounding or fire;
- creating ongoing health risks to humans, animals, birds and marine life;
- providing environmental and survival issues for shellfish and other marine life;
- disturbance and, if/when oil retrieval were necessary, possible destruction of areas of irreplaceable archaeological interest;
- insufficient consideration of risks to the marine environment created by the introduction, through de-ballasting operations, of foreign marine life into the Forth Estuary;

In addition, there are a number of fundamental inaccuracies reported within the projection data and assumptions therein, rendering the conclusions of the report potentially unreliable. An example would be that the report does not consider specific threats to key areas of environmental interest such as the Isle of May and the Bass Rock or its impact upon historically important submerged wrecks and seabed damage in areas protected by Historic Scotland.

Legislative and policy issues affecting effective decision making

The following issues frustrate effective diligence and decision making on the effectiveness of regulation governing the proposed STS operations within the Forth Estuary:

- Forth Ports PLC, or carriers using its port facilities, are not subject to the Freedom of Information Act (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOI) or the Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 (EIR) and therefore do not require to comply with transparency obligations imposed upon Governmental or Local Authority Port operators. An example of an authority, which would require to comply with such requests, would be Orkney Harbours (Orkney Harbours controls Scapa Flow and other terminals for the Orkney Island Council.) Forth Ports have, despite being the harbour authority, formally refused - following service of equivalent FOI and EIR documents - to enter into correspondence or disclose documents beyond those currently submitted to the MCA.

- The legislation governing STS operations remains in draft format and is unlikely to be finalised in the foreseeable future.
The Scottish Executive does not have devolved powers to interfere in matters of Marine Shipping (now the responsibility of the Department of Transport in London). Its powers are restricted to dealing with environmental matters arising therefrom within a 12-mile limit offshore and, for oil and gas operations, within a 3-mile limit from the Scottish shores. The Habitats Directive provide for the Scottish Ministers to prohibit development proceeding only for reasons of overriding public interest, in certain circumstances, if an appropriate assessment has shown significant environmental impacts which will not be addressed – such power does not exist in relation to STS transfer of oil and therefore Scottish Ministers do not have power of veto over such operations through this particular route.

It can be seen therefore that it is difficult to enforce compliance within existing legislation.

**Proposed Solution**

It is recognised that Forth Ports and their shareholders seek to benefit by a reported £6m (year 1) revenue and £9m (year 2) revenue to be generated from STS operations from oil in transit from the Baltic to China and onwards. Accordingly, notwithstanding current investigations into the efficacy of the proposed Forth Ports OSCP by the MCA and others, the undernoted data is provided in the hope that a viable alternative can be identified which has a significantly lower environmental impact, and economic benefit to Orkney and indirectly to the Scottish Executive. The information has been obtained through discussion with relevant port authorities. Where information has been withheld as a consequence of lack of transparency, this is identified against the relevant portion of the data.

Below we show an comparative analysis between the two port authorities — Forth Ports PLC (a commercial company) and Orkney Harbours (a council operated facility) — and have highlighted in red areas of potential concern and in green areas of positive benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Forth Ports PLC</th>
<th>Orkney Harbours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorities plans, risk assessment documents, underlying assumptions and models, commercial conflicts and contingency contracts and arrangements open to public view</td>
<td>No. Non-compliant with FOI and EIR, no statutory requirement to respond to requests.</td>
<td>Full compliant, documents etc readily available on request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version of the OSPC used</td>
<td>No comment beyond publication of a standard format &quot;Briggs&quot; template, adjusted for local conditions, contains some inaccuracies and out of date contact numbers etc. Does not consider all of the necessary impact areas i.e. Bass Rock, Isle of May, Archaeological Sites etc.</td>
<td>&quot;Briggs&quot; template. Updated within last month to take account of proposed revisions to service levels and assumptions. Previous plan publicly available, this version is with the environmental bodies and is to be with the MCA within the next 8 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulated by</td>
<td>Apparently self-regulated within the harbour areas. Private shareholder base.</td>
<td>Council regulated and funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of environment operated</td>
<td>Open Estuary with fast flowing tides creating difficulty in cleaning major spills.</td>
<td>Controlled environment with slow tides – oil becomes trapped making cleaning easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current STS capability to handle transfers without additional risks</td>
<td>New operation in open waters, against quay only available at present</td>
<td>Current operations could handle additional 10 million tonnes per annum without additional risk or re-organisation. Current OSCP covers additional capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who would clean up a spill and how fast would notification occur</td>
<td>Recent incident involving petrol tanker, East Lothian Council not informed until 4 days after event. Local councils would be required to clean-up. No other data made available, refusal to identify any contracts agreed with councils in this regard.</td>
<td>Council involved immediately with emergency services with effective multi-agency plan in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of tourism if spill occurs</td>
<td>Could be significant depending on size, direction, type and spread of spill, winds and tides. Fife, East Lothian, Stirling and Edinburgh Council foreshore areas potentially affected.</td>
<td>Relatively high tourism impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained fire-fighting force available</td>
<td>Responsibilities given to non-specialist force. Fire-fighting tug capability not disclosed. Response times untested. Spills history not disclosed.</td>
<td>Fast response, specialist staff. Yokohama tenders used on all operations to avoid unnecessary spills. Good spills history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife impact</td>
<td>High potentially, area is designated as Forth Special Protection Area and a Marine Environment High Risk Area due to risks to sites such as Isle of May etc.</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-ballasting at sea</td>
<td>De-ballasting would occur, as understood, within the Estuary with introduction of foreign species with the ballast water which may endanger local marine ecology.</td>
<td>De-ballasting required to take place at sea to avoid introduction of foreign species. Ships steam out to discharge ballast waste after loading a similar amount of product, then return. Risk of contamination reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Cargo</td>
<td>Heavy fuel oil, similar to that seen in Spain and France after the Erika and Prestige disasters. Area not suited to heavy fuel oil or crude operations. This type of product typically sinks after 12 hours.</td>
<td>Heavy fuel oil, similar to that seen in Spain and France after the Erika and Prestige disasters. Due to enclosed nature of STS facilities, area more capable of handling heavy fuel oil operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Tonnage</td>
<td>Undisclosed – assuming £5m per annum revenue for 7 million tonnes = 86p per tonne</td>
<td>41p per tonne (plus de-ballasting costs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The above represents only a portion of questions that could legitimately be raised when considering which facility could be best used. It is however clear, given the environmental and legal issues which surround the proposed STS transfers, that the Forth Estuary is not suited to such operations. The facilities at Scapa Flow are more correctly geared to receiving the types of oil proposed:

➤ The tugs and fire fighting equipment are either already in place or being augmented to cope with enhanced volumes
➤ The port authority has an integrated and effective approach to dealing with potential spills in an environment, whilst hostile at times, can be controlled and contained
➤ The costs, assuming that we do not wish to see our coastal waters contaminated by foreign species introduced by de-ballasting activities, are likely to favour Scapa Flow.

Going forward, Government agencies should make law the requirement, in all instances, for de-ballasting at sea i.e. outside the 12 mile limit - thereby ensuring consistent levels of safety for marine life and encouraging a level playing field for all port operators.

Your support in responsibly transferring the proposed STS oil transfer operations to the facilities at Scapa Flow is sought as a matter of urgency

Note: The foregoing has been prepared from information received from third parties and is intended for information purposes only. You are recommended to verify any assumptions herein before onward transmission as the writer will be not held responsible for any errors or omissions.
Public Petitions Committee – a template for public petitions

Should you wish to submit a public petition for consideration by the Public Petitions Committee please complete the template below. Please refer to the Guidance on submission of public petitions for advice on issues of admissibility before completing the template. You may also seek advice from the Clerk to the Committee whose contact details can be found at the end of this form.

Details of principal petitioner:
Please enter the name of person and organisation raising the petition, including a contact address where correspondence should be sent to, email address and phone number if available

David Walker

Text of petition:
The petition should clearly state what action the petitioner wishes the Parliament to take in no more than 5 lines of text, e.g.

The petitioner requests that the Scottish Parliament considers and debates the implications of the proposed Agenda for Change legislation for Speech and Language Therapy Services and service users within the NHS

Petition by David Walker calling for the Scottish Parliament to amend the Education (Scotland) Act 1980 to remove the statutory requirement on education authorities to provide religious observance in Scottish schools.

Additional information:
Any additional information in relation to your petition, including reasons why the action requested is necessary, should not be included here. However, it may be appended to the petition and will be made available to the Public Petitions Committee prior to its consideration of your petition. Please note that you should limit the amount of any additional information which you may wish to provide in support of your petition to no more than 4 sides of A4.
Statement supporting Petition

All Children should be taught together, irrespective of their Religious, or non-Religious beliefs. This is the best situation suited to fostering understanding, and acceptance of, the different beliefs, or non-beliefs of others. To provide for the carrying out of the Religious Rites, Celebrations and Practices of a selected Religion is a diversion, and hindrance, to this objective.

In addition there is the unfairness of the adherents of all other Religions, and non-believers, being forced, by means of taxation, to finance this activity. The members of all Religions should carry out their Rites, Celebrations and Practices in buildings, constructed, or hired, for these purposes, at their own expense.

David Walker.
The Committee will consider the following current petitions—

PE863 Petition by Bill Alexander calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to amend the Solicitors (Scotland) Act 1980 to allow limited companies to either be given the right to apply for legal aid or the right to represent themselves in court.

PE930 Petition by Lucy Johnson McDowall calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to amend the Scottish Public Service Ombudsman’s Act to bring all aspects of Local Authority Administration, under the remit of the Public Service Ombudsman, without exception or exemption, and for the ethics and professionalism of local authority officials to be included in the remits of the Ombudsman or Standards Commission.

PE932 Petition by Stella Macdonald, on behalf of CRAG (Citizen’s Rights Action group), calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to review the Supporting People Funding arrangements to ensure that vulnerable adults are in receipt of the responsive services required to keep them healthy.

PE934 Petition by Dr J W Hinton, on behalf of the Meteredparking Organisation, calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to review the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999 to ensure that the local authority consultation in relation to traffic orders is full, meaningful and democratic.

PE825 Petition by Alana Watson on behalf of Rosshall Academy Students’ Council and Higher Modern Studies Section calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to ensure that every Scottish secondary school provides lockers for pupils’ use to stop pupils having to carry heavy bags throughout the school day, potentially causing back problems.
PE936 Petition by Simon Brogan calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to review the public health implications of siting oil depots in residential areas in light of the Buncefield oil depot explosion in December last year.

PE938 Petition by Dr Patrick McNally calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to ensure that clear, transparent and meaningful public consultation takes place when changes are proposed to public health services.