

WATRS

Water Redress Scheme

ADJUDICATOR'S DECISION SUMMARY

Adjudication Reference: WAT/X218

Date of Decision: 18 November 2022

Party Details

Customer:

Company:

Complaint

The customer has a dispute with the company regarding the level of compensation to be paid to him. The customer says that he was without water for approximately thirty hours and thus is entitled to the full compensation amount of £150.00 paid for loss of service greater than twenty-four hours. The customer asserts that the company has paid him only £30.00 as it believes his water was restored in less than twelve hours. The customer claims that despite ongoing discussions with the company and the involvement of CCWater the dispute is unresolved and therefore he has brought the claim to the WATRS Scheme and asks that the company be directed to review the circumstances of the supply failure with a view to increasing the compensation paid to him

Response

The company says its records show that the customer was without a water supply at the regulatory minimum pressure for less than twenty-four hours and the amount of £30.00 was paid as a goodwill gesture. The company has not made any formal offer of settlement to the customer and declines to pay additional compensation.

Findings

The claim does not succeed. I find that the evidence does not support on a balance of probabilities that the company has provided an unreasonably low level of compensation. I find that the company has established that it is not obliged to pay the customer any compensation. I find that the evidence shows that the company has provided its services to a reasonable level and has managed the customer's account to the level to be reasonably expected by the average person.

Outcome

The company does not need to take further action.

The customer must reply by 16 December 2022 to accept or reject this decision.

This document is private and confidential. It must not be disclosed to any person or organisation not directly involved in the adjudication unless this is necessary in order to enforce the decision.

www.WATRS.org | info@watrs.org

ADJUDICATOR'S DECISION
Adjudication Reference: WAT/X218
Date of Decision: 18 November 2022

Case Outline

The customer's complaint is that:

- He has experienced an ongoing dispute with the company concerning issues with water supply problems. Despite the customer's recent communications with the company, and the involvement of CCWater, the dispute has not been settled.
- At approximately 12:00 on Saturday 16 July 2022 the water supply to his property was interrupted.
- The water supply did not return at full pressure until approximately 17:00 on Sunday 17 July 2022. Therefore, the customer estimates that he was without a water supply for approximately thirty hours.
- The loss of water meant he could not use the washing and toilet facilities at his house and that he was forced to queue up for some two hours to obtain bottled water from the company.
- Subsequently, the company paid him the sum of £30.00 in compensation saying that he had been without supply for less than twenty-four hours.
- He contacted the company and informed it that he had been without water for a period in excess of thirty hours, but says the company has refused to increase the £30.00 payment.
- When contacting the company, he was informed that the company had been tankering water and that the company had set up a system with pressure sensors to monitor the supply situation to customers and the system showed that he had his supply restored within twenty-four hours.
- Believing the company had not properly addressed his concerns he, on 05 August 2022, escalated his complaint to CCWater who took up the dispute with the company on his behalf.
- The records show that CCWater contacted the company on 26 August 2022 to request its version of events and to suggest reviewing the level of compensation paid to the customer.
- On 15 September 2022 CCWater advised him that the company had responded to its request for additional information, and that while it acknowledged that it could have kept affected customers better informed it refuses to increase the compensation paid to him as its pressure sensor monitoring showed his supply was restored within twelve hours.
- CCWater concluded that this was the final position of the company, and it could not take any further measures to have the company change its position and was thus closing his case.

This document is private and confidential. It must not be disclosed to any person or organisation not directly involved in the adjudication unless this is necessary in order to enforce the decision.

- Continuing to be dissatisfied with the response of the company he has, on 03 October 2022, referred the matter to the WATRS Scheme where he requests that the company be directed to review the circumstances of the interruption and increase the level of compensation beyond the £30.00 currently paid to him.

The company's response is that:

- It provided its response to the claim in its submission dated 13 October 2022.
- It confirms its obligations in respect of both water supply and water pressure.
- It confirms that on 16 July 2022 a trunk main failed and caused a major loss of supply in the area around the location of the customer's property.
- It implemented a system of supply using alternative piping runs and water tankering, but accepts that the supply did not fully satisfy demand.
- It confirms repairs were fully complete and supplies restored on 18 July 2022.
- It acknowledges that approximately 4000 customers were without water for less than twelve hours while some 3000 were without for a period in excess of twelve hours.
- It confirms writing to all affected customers and stating that it would credit its household customers with £30 for every 12 hours their supply was interrupted, and for those household customers who were off supply for more than 24 hours the company would be crediting their account with £150.
- Its records show that the customer's supply was interrupted for less than twelve hours.
- Under the Guaranteed Standards Scheme [GSS] the customer was not entitled to any compensatory payment. However, it has made a payment of £30.00 to the customer despite there being no legal requirement to do so.
- Following contact from CCWater it reviewed the £30.00 and believes that the amount paid is fair.
- In summary, it says that all the customer's allegations are denied and that he is not due any additional compensation.

The customer's comments on the company's response are that:

This document is private and confidential. It must not be disclosed to any person or organisation not directly involved in the adjudication unless this is necessary in order to enforce the decision.

www.WATRS.org | info@watrs.org

- On 15 October 2022, the customer submitted comments on the company's response paper. I shall not repeat word for word the customer's comments and in accordance with Rule 5.4.3 of the Rules of the WATRS Scheme I shall disregard any new matters or evidence introduced.
- The customer notes the very thorough Response submission from the company. The customer acknowledges that the pressure graph submitted by the company shows that it made three separate attempts to restore full pressure water.

How is a WATRS decision reached?

In reaching my decision, I have considered two key issues. These are:

1. Whether the company failed to provide its services to the customer to the standard to be reasonably expected by the average person.
2. Whether or not the customer has suffered any financial loss or other disadvantage as a result of a failing by the company.

In order for the customer's claim against the company to succeed, the evidence available to the adjudicator must show on a balance of probabilities that the company has failed to provide its services to the standard one would reasonably expect and that as a result of this failure the customer has suffered some loss or detriment. If no such failure or loss is shown, the company will not be liable.

I have carefully considered all the evidence provided. If I have not referred to a particular document or matter specifically, this does not mean that I have not considered it in reaching my decision.

How was this decision reached?

1. The dispute relates to the customer's dissatisfaction that the company has offered a lower amount of compensation for interruption of supply in comparison to other affected consumers.
2. I note that the WATRS adjudication scheme is an evidence-based process, and that for the customer's claim to be successful, the evidence should show that the company has not provided its services to the standard that would reasonably be expected of it.
3. I accept that the company has established its statutory duty under the Water Industry Act 1991 to provide water services to every property in its area.

This document is private and confidential. It must not be disclosed to any person or organisation not directly involved in the adjudication unless this is necessary in order to enforce the decision.

www.WATRS.org | info@watrs.org

4. I can see that the parties agree that an interruption to supply in the customer's location occurred on 16 July 2022 at around midday.
5. It seems to me that the crux of this dispute revolves around the length of time the customer was without water supply at his property. The customer states he was without water for approximately thirty hours whereas the company says it was less than twelve hours.
6. The company has explained its obligations in respect of water supply and water pressure, and has submitted evidence to support these obligations (submission #6 of its evidence bundle).
7. The GSS states at Section 5 – Low Pressure :-

A company must maintain a minimum pressure in the communication pipe of seven metres static head (0.7 bar).
8. The company has submitted into evidence a diagram/graph of the pressure experienced by the customer over the seventy-two hour period of the water interruption.
9. The diagram shows that the customer did not at any time go for a period in excess of twelve hours with water pressure below the prescribed minimum. (submission #10 of its evidence bundle).
10. The GSS states that if the company has not restored supply within a twelve-hour period, then it was liable to pay £30.00 in compensation and a further £30.00 for every additional twelve-hour period.
11. Thus, I find the evidence shows that the company was not obliged to pay the customer any compensation, and that the £30.00 paid to the customer was a goodwill payment and not an obligatory payment.
12. In his application to the WATRS Scheme the customer seeks to have the company directed to increase the £30.00 payment to £150.00 because he believes he was without supply for more than twenty-four hours.
13. I have stated above that I do not find the evidence shows that the customer was without water supply at the prescribed minimum pressure for a period exceeding twelve hours at any time. Thus, I find that the customer's claim does not succeed, and I shall not direct the company makes any additional compensatory payment to the customer.
14. My conclusion on the main issues is that the company has not failed to provide its services to the standard to be reasonably expected by the average person, and the evidence does not confirm that the customer experienced any financial loss.

The Preliminary Decision

- The Preliminary Decision was issued to the parties on 04 November 2022.
- The company has, on 05 November 2022, acknowledged receipt of the Preliminary Decision and confirms it has nothing further to add.
- The parties do not submit any new evidence and thus I am satisfied that the facts upon which the Preliminary Decision was based remain unchanged.
- I find that no amendment to the Preliminary Decision is necessary.

Outcome

The company does not need to take further action.

What happens next?

- This adjudication decision is final and cannot be appealed or amended.
- The customer must reply by 16 December 2022 to accept or reject this decision.
- When you tell WATRS that you accept or reject the decision, the company will be notified of this. The case will then be closed.
- If you do not tell WATRS that you accept or reject the decision, this will be taken to be a rejection of the decision.



Peter R Sansom
MSc (Law); FCIArb; FAArb;
Member, London Court of International Arbitration.
Member, CIArb Business Arbitration Panel.
Member, CIArb Pandemic Business Dispute Resolution Arbitration Panel.
Member, CEDR Arbitration Panel.
Member, CEDR Adjudication Panel.

Independent Adjudicator

----- // -----

This document is private and confidential. It must not be disclosed to any person or organisation not directly involved in the adjudication unless this is necessary in order to enforce the decision.

www.WATRS.org | info@watrs.org