

# MINUTE

‘A’ & ‘B’

## Harbour Board

Port Administration Building, Sella Ness

Thursday 9 August 2007 at 10.00am

### Present:

A T J Cooper	A T Doull
E J Fullerton	I J Hawkins
R S Henderson	J H Henry
R C Nickerson	

### Apologies:

F A Robertson

### In Attendance (Officers):

J T Dickson, General Manager, Ports & Harbours Operations  
B Edwards, Operations Manager, Ports  
P Gray, Superintendent Engineer, Marine  
R Moore, Operations Manager, Marine  
S Summers, Administration Manager  
L Geddes, Committee Officer

### Chairperson:

Mr A T J Cooper, Chairperson of the Board, presided.

### Circular:

The circular calling the meeting was held as read.

### Minutes:

The minute of meeting held on 7 June 2007, having been circulated, was confirmed.

### 15/07 Items of Business for Future Meetings - Composition of the Harbour Board

The Chairperson advised that a report would be presented to the Council on 12 September regarding the Board's composition, and it would also be presented to the next meeting of the Harbour Board. He advised that he would consult with Board members when the report had been written. He went on to say that it had also been felt that it was important that the legal responsibilities of members of the Harbour Board were clearly laid out, and that this would also be discussed further at the next meeting.

### Members' Attendance at External Meetings – Update

There was nothing to report.

### 16/07 Scalloway Harbour Dredging Proposals

The Board considered a report by the General Manager (Appendix 1).

The General Manager summarised the main terms of the report, and outlined the proposals for the dredging of the harbour and the options for the removal of the dredged material. He advised that it was proposed that the channel should be dredged to –9.5m below chart datum, and that the dredged material could be disposed of at sea in a recognised disposal area outside Scalloway or possibly be used to reclaim land in the future.

In response to queries, he advised that it would be marginally cheaper to use the dredged material for reclaiming land and this was an option that should be kept open for the future, depending on the approval of new capital developments in the area. He confirmed that an environmental impact assessment would have to take place in order to get the appropriate consents, so this would be included in the budget. He also confirmed that no maintenance dredging would be required.

Some concern was expressed with regard to the timescales involved, and the General Manager confirmed that the design work had already been completed, and that it would take 2-3 months to receive the necessary consents. In the first instance, it would be necessary to wait and see whom Lerwick Port Authority appointed as dredging contractor before approaching the contractor to request them to provide costs. Then the Capital Projects Review Team (CPRT) could be approached to get a budget for the works. However it would be possible to apply for the consents beforehand, as they were not issued until the project was ready to go ahead.

Members questioned if it was likely that vessels drawing more than 9.5m were likely to use Scalloway Harbour, as it was felt that there were many potential future opportunities for Scalloway Harbour, particularly in relation to the oil industry. In order to maximise these opportunities, it was felt that it may be preferable for the channel to be dredged to –10.0m below chart datum.

The Operations Manager, Ports advised that he did receive enquiries from vessels who would use Scalloway harbour if there was a deeper draught, and he intended to speak to individual companies at next month's Offshore Europe exhibition in Aberdeen in order to advise them of the proposals to dredge the harbour and ascertain if they would be likely to use Scalloway if dredging took place. However he felt that dredging to –9.5m would be adequate as it would be difficult for larger vessels to manoeuvre in the harbour.

The General Manager added that he was not aware of any vessel drawing 10m ever having been in Lerwick Harbour, and that –9.5m was deeper than Aberdeen and would match Lerwick after completion of their dredging programme.

Board members agreed that the option of dredging to –10.0m was worthy of further consideration in order that any potential future business opportunities for Scalloway Harbour could be maximised, and it was felt that work should proceed on applying for the necessary consents up to a depth of –10.0m.

The Chairperson suggested that a report should be provided to the next meeting on the types of vessels that would use Scalloway Harbour following dredging, and if it was possible to handle a vessel drawing 10m in Scalloway Harbour. A final decision could then be made at the next meeting of the Board.

The Board therefore agreed, on the motion of Mr A T J Cooper, that the recommendations in the report be approved with the proviso that work on getting the necessary consents to allow the project to proceed up to a depth of –10.0m below chart datum should be commenced.

Mrs E J Fullerton seconded.

The General Manager advised that he had been in contact with SEERAD and a decision was expected in the next few weeks. In response to a query, he said that there had been no negativity in the discussions to date, so he was hopeful of a positive outcome.

18/07

**Ports Project Monitoring Report**

The Board noted a report by the General Manager (Appendix 3).

Dock – Symbister

The General Manager advised that this project had been hindered through the lack of a report from the conservation engineer but this was now moving ahead, and that he would circulate an update to Board members by email after the meeting.

Plant, Vehicles and Equipment

Board members noted that vehicles were replaced after five years, and that replacement was carried out through the Fleet Management Unit.

Walls Pier

Board members were shown a drawing produced as a result of consultation between the users proposing the facility, the local member, and the Capital Programme Service. The option presented met the requirements of the port users and the next stage was to request a budget from CPRT to carry out the detailed design work and mathematical modelling.

The Chairperson advised that a report would be presented to the next meeting regarding the costs and the socio-economic impact.

Uyeasound

The General Manager advised that the tender documents had now been issued. The planning and other statutory consents could not be applied for until the Harbour Revision Order was in place.

Scalloway

Board members noted that completion of the new warehouse was imminent.

19/07

**Port Operations Report**

The Board noted a report by the General Manager (Appendix 4).

The General Manager summarised the main terms of the report.

The Board agreed to a suggestion from the General Manager that an update on Scalloway pilotage figures should be presented to the November meeting rather than the next meeting.

The Chairperson noted that the port operations report included financial information for Scalloway Harbour and he requested that similar information relating to Sullom Voe was presented to the Board, on an occasional basis. It was suggested that it was also useful to get comparisons with information for the previous year when considering this type of information.

Some discussion took place regarding the current charging system for mussels landed.

(Mrs I J Hawkins declared a non-pecuniary interest in this matter).

Mr A T Doull advised that he had received representations that the current system was unfair. As the value of mussels varied depending on whether they were bought on the ropes or whether they had been harvested, it was felt that the *ad valorem* charge should be applied to the price that the farmer received for the mussels rather than the added value price for mussels that had been processed.

The Board agreed that a report should be presented to the next meeting on an equitable way of charging for mussels landed that was satisfactory for both the industry and the Council.

The Operations Manager, Ports, advised that he had already spoken to Legal Services regarding this matter and he was awaiting some information that could be included in the report.

Mr R S Henderson advised that he had been approached by mussel farmers in Mid Yell requesting that something should be done to improve the pier facilities in Mid Yell as it was extremely difficult landing mussels on the pier when there was a south-easterly gale.

The General Manager advised that money had been spent on upgrading the pier facilities in Cullivoe and he questioned if the farmers could land mussels there, given the close proximity to Mid Yell. However Mr Henderson said that he understood that it would not be possible for the farmers to travel to Cullivoe on a bad day. Whilst he felt that a breakwater would solve the problem, he was aware that it would be a costly option and he questioned if the Board felt there was any merit in considering a breakwater for Mid Yell.

The Board agreed that a short report should be presented in the next two cycles outlining the quantity of mussels landed in Mid Yell, estimated costs for providing a sheltered area and a weather report outlining how often there were problems with south-easterly gales.

The Chairperson then went on to speak about weather radar coverage for Shetland. It was noted that there was no weather radar coverage in Shetland as there were no trunk roads so the government were not willing to fund it. The Chairperson said that in view of changes in weather patterns, and the needs of the inshore and the offshore industries, he felt that it was important to encourage the provision of weather radar coverage in Shetland. He requested that a report be presented to the next meeting looking at the options and considering an industry and political-led initiative to get weather radar coverage.

The Board agreed and it was noted that efforts had been made in the past but had not been successful.

It was pointed out that Richard Lochhead, Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs and the Environment, would shortly be visiting Shetland and it was suggested that a preliminary approach could be made to him through the Council.

The meeting concluded at 11.00am.

CHAIRPERSON