

## 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, <a href="mailto:michael.craigie@shetland.gov.uk">michael.craigie@shetland.gov.uk</a>  Shetland Islands Council, Development Service, Transport Planning Service, 6 North Ness, Lerwick, Shetland, ZE1 0LZ	
Proposal Name:	Option CO1b: Replace the MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> with a like-for-like vessel but materially faster vessel.	Name of Planner:	Stephen Canning, Peter Brett Associates
Proposal Description:	This vessel would be a like-for-like replacement for the MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> . However, this vessel would travel at 10-12 knots, significantly reducing current crossing times.  This option would not require harbour works assuming that the current arrangements for taking the vessel out of the water could continue.	Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	<i>Capital costs/grant</i> £1.25M.
			<i>Current revenue support</i> £315k (rounded) per annum.
			<i>Annual revenue support</i> £351k (rounded) per annum.
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:	Fair Isle lies about 20 miles south-west of the imposing Sumburgh Head. Just five kilometres long and three kilometres wide, it is mostly surrounded by cliffs, rising over 100 metres at Sheep Rock and almost 200 metres on the heavily indented west coast. The National Trust for Scotland took over ownership of the island in 1955 and prospective in-migrants must apply to the Trust for residency. Facilities include a shop & Post Office, the high quality bird observatory with accommodation, museum, pier, airfield and marina.		

Social Context:	<p>Fair Isle's population had shown relatively strong growth between 1981 and 2011, but the cumulative growth was wiped out between the 2011 and 2015, with the population now down to 55. The Fair Isle population is also both ageing and declining. Fostering population growth is a key element of the island's Development Plan</p> <p>Fair Isle is owned by the National Trust for Scotland and anyone who wishes to move there must apply to the Trust. The 2011 Census noted that Fair Isle has 26 households. The Community Profile suggests that housing in Fair Isle is in relatively low demand, although it is believed that consultation is required to identify the island's future housing need.</p> <p>Health indicators for Fair Isle are generally good, although there are concerns over various aspects of health provision consistent with other rural communities.</p> <p>The roll at Fair Isle primary school and nursery has declined in recent years, which is in keeping with the general decline and ageing of the population.</p>
Economic Context:	<p>The economic &amp; occupational structure of Fair Isle reflects the predominance of self-employment and cottage industries on the island.</p> <p>The Fair Isle Development Plan has set out a number of ambitious projects to secure the future of the island. The aim is to reverse the recent population decline and address the issue of an ageing population and the threat which that poses to the sustainability of services.</p> <p>The plan's proposals for developing the island include attracting up to 10 new people to the island in the next three to five years (growing the population by almost 20%), as well as creating and improving properties in the isle. There are also plans to upgrade and future-proof the island's electricity supply, whilst the islanders are working with Community Broadband Scotland to improve digital connectivity. Fair Isle will also continue to be attractive to tourists, particularly those visiting the high quality bird observatory on the island.</p> <p>Whilst there are a range of ambitious plans for Fair Isle, the Development Plan and numerous consultations over the years have highlighted the current transport connectivity of the island as a key constraint. The capacity limited air service coupled with the long, exposed and relatively uncomfortable ferry crossing is seen to be a deterrent to growing the population and attracting investment into the island. It can be argued that this issue requires to be resolved if the objectives of the development plan are to be delivered.</p>
<b>Planning Objectives</b>	
Objective:	Performance against planning objective:
TPO1: The capacity of the services should not act as a constraint to regular and essential personal, vehicular and freight	<p><b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b></p> <p>As the proposed vessel would be a like-for-like replacement, this option would have no impact on capacity.</p>

travel between the island(s) and Shetland Mainland	
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	<b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b> This objective is not relevant for Fair Isle.
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.	<b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Minor Positive</b> The provision of a materially faster Lo-Lo vessel would make a minor contribution to this objective. Working on the basis of the same departure time from and arrival time to Fair Isle, a materially faster vessel would marginally extend time on mainland. In addition, a faster vessel may provide limited opportunities for taking greater advantage of weather windows.
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.	<b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b> This option would have no impact on the frequency of the service.
TPO4: The level of connectivity provided should minimise the variation within and between weekdays, evenings, Saturdays and Sundays.	<b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b> This option would have no impact on the timetable.
TPO5: Where practicable, islanders should be provided with links to strategic onward transport connections without the need for an overnight stay on Shetland mainland.	<b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b> This option would have no impact on strategic connectivity.
Rationale for Selection or Rejection of Proposal:	This option will not be retained for further consideration. It is considered that this option is technically infeasible as it would not be possible to design a vessel which achieves higher speeds with the same hull form. This option also makes very little contribution to the objectives and STAG criteria.
<b>Implementability Appraisal</b>	

Technical:	It is considered that this option is technically infeasible as it would not be possible to design a vessel which achieves higher speeds with the same hull form.	
	There is an issue of design obsolescence surrounding the current vessel – it is unlikely that a like-for-like would be a technically appropriate solution.	
Operational:	There would be no operational feasibility issues associated with this option.	
Financial:	The capital cost would be £1.25m, with annual revenue support estimated at £351k, an increase of £36k per annum on the current day figure.	
Public:	A faster and higher capacity vessel would be acceptable to the public.	
<b>STAG Criteria</b>		
Criterion	Assessment Summary	Supporting Information
Environment:	✓	<p>The replacement of the MV <i>Good Shepherd</i> with a more modern vessel would give rise to a potential reduction in emissions, although this could to some extent be offset by the increase in operating speed. There would be no other environmental issues associated with this option.</p> <p><b>Environmental Constraints</b> The environmental constraints for the Fair Isle route are provided below for information</p> <p>Fair Isle Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential properties within 200m to the west of the harbour and Bird Observatory within 400m of harbour</li> <li>• Core path CPPD06 Fair Isle Circular adjacent to harbour</li> <li>• Sloagar GCR site located within 200m east of harbour</li> <li>• Fair Isle is entirely within a National Scenic Area (NSA)</li> <li>• Harbour located within Fair Isle Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• One listed building within 250m of harbour</li> <li>• Coastal flooding risk</li> <li>• Generally good air quality</li> </ul> <p>Grutness Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential properties within 200m of the harbour</li> <li>• Core paths CPPD01 &amp; 02 within 100m of harbour</li> <li>• Sumburgh Head Special Protection Area (SPA) boundary adjacent to harbour</li> <li>• Sumburgh Head SSSI within 50m to the east (seabird assemblage)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easter Rova Head Geological SSSI approximately 4km north</li> <li>• Listed buildings within 400m of harbour</li> </ul>
Safety:	✓	This replacement of the MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> with a more modern vessel would give rise to a minor safety benefit as it is assumed that any new tonnage would be twin-screwed.
Economy:	✓✓	<p>This option would deliver a minor positive impact in terms of the economy criterion. The reduction in journey times associated with a faster vessel would provide TEE benefits, whilst there may also be marginal enhancements to reliability if a faster vessel can take better advantage of weather windows.</p> <p>The improved perception of the vessel and the crossing to Fair Isle (particularly for tourists), coupled with reduced journey times, could also encourage increased sea-based travel, but any such impact would be very minor.</p>
Integration:	✓	This option would support the Fair Isle Development Plan through reducing journey times to the island and potentially providing a marginal improvement to reliability.
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	✓✓	This option would offer a moderate positive in terms of accessibility as it is assumed that access would be improved (as far as is reasonably possible with a Lo-Lo vessel operating within the existing infrastructure). However, any such impact is likely to be very minor.