

Part 1 Appraisal Summary Tables

Proposal Details			
Name and address of authority or organisation promoting the proposal: (Also provide name of any subsidiary organisations also involved in promoting the proposal)		Mr Michael Craigie, 01595 744 160, michael.craigie@shetland.gov.uk Shetland Islands Council, Development Service, Transport Planning Service, 6 North Ness, Lerwick, Shetland, ZE1 0LZ	
Proposal Name:	Option CO4 – Develop a new harbour at Mid Yell for the Fetlar service.	Name of Planner:	Stephen Canning, Peter Brett Associates
Proposal Description:	This option would involve the development of a new harbour at Mid Yell with the majority of Fetlar services running direct from the island to Mid Yell. This option would only be taken forward with one of the vessel options C1-C3. Unst services would continue to operate to Gutcher and, on occasions, Hamars Ness. The Yell landfall would therefore be split between Gutcher and Mid-Yell.	Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	<i>Capital costs/grant</i> £6.8 million
			<i>Current revenue support</i> Not applicable
			<i>Annual revenue support</i> Not applicable
Funding Sought From: (if applicable)	Transport Scotland	Amount of Application:	<i>Present Value of Cost to Govt.</i> Costs in this study are all reported in 2016 prices only. The costs would reflect those set out above.
Background Information			
Geographic Context:	<p>The islands of Fetlar and Unst are the most northerly inhabited islands within the archipelago. The island of Unst is separated from Yell by the Bluemull Sound, and Fetlar lies to the south of Unst and east of Yell.</p> <p>Unst is by far the larger of the two islands in terms of population, but both islands have close connections with neighbouring Yell and Shetland mainland.</p> <p>Transport connectivity is wholly delivered by a two-vessel triangular ferry service, which links Fetlar and Unst to each other and to neighbouring Yell. The ferry from Unst – Yell takes 10 minutes; from Fetlar – Yell takes 25 minutes; and</p>		

	<p>from Unst – Fetlar 25 minutes.</p> <p>The ferry terminal on Unst is located at Belmont in the south-west of the island, some way south of the main settlement of Baltasound. Fetlar ferry terminal, Hamars Ness, which has recently benefitted significant investment in a breakwater, is in the north-west of the island. The Yell landfall is at Gutcher, which is in the north-east of the island and around 25 minutes' drive to Ulsta, where the ferry can be caught to Shetland mainland.</p> <p>The MV <i>Bigga</i> currently lies overnight at Gutcher, with her first service of the day being to Belmont. The MV <i>Geira</i> lies overnight at Hamars Ness, with her first service of the day being to Gutcher.</p>
Social Context:	<p>Population in Unst declined following the closure of RAF Saxa Vord in 2006 but is now relatively stable at the 600-650 mark. The availability of housing on Unst is reasonably good (although there are some local issues) but there are concerns that housing is of the 'wrong type' for retaining and attracting families. Healthcare in Unst is seen to be of a high standard, although there is a community concern about the lack of some resident specialist services. The school roll in Unst declined sharply with the closure of RAF Saxa Vord, but has recovered slightly since 2006.</p> <p>Fetlar has experienced a significant recent decline in population (81 residents in 2013, down to 59 in August 2015) and the community is now very fragile. Limited on-island economic opportunities, a lack of appropriate housing and the closure of the island shop are amongst a number of factors cited as an issue. The lack of appropriate housing is deemed to be a problem on Fetlar. The island continues to have an on-island primary school and nursery, which is critical, but the roll in each is very low.</p>
Economic Context:	<p>The economic activity rate in Unst also declined with the closure of RAF Saxa Vord and the out-migration of a number of young and economically active families from the island. Whilst the standard of living remains good, the community highlighted the significant economic challenges faced by the island in the longer term.</p> <p>Unst has had its economic challenges in recent years but has now stabilised to some extent, albeit with a much smaller population. It was noted by HIE that there are some promising signs of growth in the local economy, with tourism and food & drink being key growth industries, although the community note that this is small scale in nature.</p> <p>Fetlar currently has a shortage of viable economic development opportunities, an issue the Fetlar Development Plan is seeking to address. The island has limited economic opportunities, with the bulk of employment concentrated in agriculture, small scale tourism and the public sector – travel to neighbouring islands and mainland is therefore essential. Overall, the Fetlar community explained that the reinstatement of fares on the Bluemull Sound coupled with the reduction in service provision as part of the 2013 budget cuts is seriously undermining the sustainability of the island.</p>
Planning Objectives	
Objective:	Performance against planning objective:
TPO1: The capacity of the services should	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Minor Negative

not act as a constraint to regular and essential personal, vehicular and freight travel between the island(s) and Shetland Mainland	This option would have a minor negative impact on capacity as it would remove capacity from the busier Gutcher – Belmont leg of the route. The current timetable on Gutcher – Belmont could therefore only be maintained with a three vessel solution (Option C3).
TPO2a: Where an island has a 'commutable' combined ferry or drive / public transport / walk time to a main employment centre (e.g. 80 minutes), the connections provided should reliably facilitate commuting	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This objective is not considered relevant for Unst & Fetlar.
TPO2b: Where an island does not have a 'commutable' combined ferry or air / drive / public transport / walk time to a main employment centre (e.g. 80 minutes), the connections provided should reliably permit at least a half day (e.g. 4 hours) in Lerwick 7 days a week, all year round.	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This option would have no impact on this objective.
TPO3: The scheduled time between connections should be minimised to increase flexibility for passengers and freight by maximising the number of island connections across the operating day.	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Minor Negative The diversion of Fetlar services to Mid Yell would reduce service frequency (and the number of connections over the day) unless combined with a three vessel solution.
TPO4: The level of connectivity provided should minimise the variation within and between weekdays, evenings, Saturdays and Sundays.	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Moderate Negative The splitting of the current triangular route would reduce the service frequency and likely make the timetable more irregular.
TPO5: Where practicable, islanders should be provided with links to strategic onward transport connections without the need for an overnight stay on Shetland mainland.	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This option would have no impact on strategic connectivity.
Rationale for Selection or Rejection of Proposal:	This option has been excluded from further consideration for a number of reasons including: the splitting of the Yell landfall; the reduction of capacity on the Belmont – Gutcher route (unless a three vessel solution is taken forward); and the scale of the costs given the very limited benefits.
Implementability Appraisal	

Technical:	Requirement for construction of an entirely new harbour – potential delays surrounding consents and planning permission.	
Operational:	If packaged with a less than three vessel ferry option, this option would reduce services on the main Gutcher – Belmont crossing.	
Financial:	A new harbour at Mid-Yell would cost around £6.8m excluding contingency and optimism bias.	
Public:	There was very little engagement from the Unst public with respect to replacement ferry options. The majority of comments on the options were concerned with fixed links. No obvious support for this proposal.	
STAG Criteria		
Criterion	Assessment Summary	Supporting Information
Environment:	xx	<p>Overall, this option would record a negative moderate impact as the works would have the potential for significant effects involving the construction of a new Ro-Ro berth in an as yet undeveloped area. The long-term impact may be slightly less negative providing the works are implemented sensitively.</p> <p>The following impacts have been identified in terms of environmental sub-criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise & vibration: short-term impacts at closest properties and on wildlife during construction. • Local air quality: No significant long-term effects predicted but potential for dust during construction. • Water quality, drainage & flood defence: Some short-term impacts on marine water quality including shellfish water during construction and from dredging activity, but unlikely to be significant in the longer-term. • Geological features: Some loss of marine sediment where dredging is required. • Biodiversity & habitats: Short-term impacts on otter and / or marine mammals etc. • Landscape: New works of major scale with potential for significant effects, including the need for a new access road. • Visual amenity: Short-term impacts during construction. • Cultural heritage: Some impacts on setting of nearby designated buildings and monuments.
Safety:	-	This option would have no impact in terms of the STAG safety criterion.
Economy:	-	This option would have no impact in terms of the STAG economy criterion.
Integration:	✓	The provision of a new harbour at Mid Yell would record a positive in terms of transport integration for Fetlar residents, who would have foot passenger access to services in the village. There would however, be a reduction in integration with services in Unst.
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	-	This option would have no impact in terms of the STAG accessibility & social inclusion criterion. The benefits associated with Fetlar residents having improved access to Mid Yell are offset by a reduction

		in connections to Unst and the reduced service frequency on the busier Gutcher – Belmont route.
--	--	---