

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 CO3: Replace the MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> with a Lo-Lo freight vessel shared with Foula.	Name of Planner:	Stephen Canning, Peter Brett Associates
Proposal Description:	This vessel would be based on the current MV <i>Snolda</i> which has a track record of accessing Fair Isle and Foula.	Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	<i>Capital costs/grant</i> £3m excluding any works required at Walls or Grutness and dredging at Foula.
	The new vessel would be 25m long and would carry 12 passengers and 6 PCUs. The vessel would operate at 9 knots.		<i>Current revenue support</i> £315k (rounded) per annum.
	Both the <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> and the MV <i>New Advance</i> would no longer be required. It is assumed the vessel would be mainland based, either at a new facility at Grutness (although there are significant technical challenges here) or Walls, or using an existing berth at Scalloway. There would be no need for harbour works at Fair Isle AS Lo-Lo operations would continue. However, dredging would be required at Foula, where there would be tidal restrictions.		<i>Annual revenue support</i> Costs would be determined based on vessel overnight berth and timetable.

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 & 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</p>		

	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.
Planning Objectives	
Objective:	Performance against planning objective:
<i>TPO1: The capacity of the services should not act as a constraint to regular and essential personal, vehicular and freight travel between the island(s) and Shetland Mainland</i>	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Moderate Positive The provision of a shared freighter with Foula would make a moderate positive contribution to this objective. The current MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> can carry 1-2 small cars, which have to be craned on. The proposed shared freighter therefore offers a significant uplift in capacity.
<i>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</i>	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This objective is not relevant for Fair Isle.
<i>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.</i>	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This option would have no impact on time on the mainland. However, it is worth noting that a key benefit of an island-based vessel & crew is that it allows the service to take advantage of weather windows. This flexibility would be reduced if the only service was offered by a shared freight vessel.
<i>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.</i>	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This option would have no impact on the frequency of the service.
<i>TPO4: The level of connectivity provided should minimise the variation within and between weekdays, evenings, Saturdays and Sundays.</i>	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This option would have no impact on the timetable.
<i>TPO5: Where practicable, islanders should</i>	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral

be provided with links to strategic onward transport connections without the need for an overnight stay on Shetland mainland.	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. A shared freighter would materially affect the potential to sail during weather windows affecting the viability of the island, and is therefore rejected.	
Implementability Appraisal		
Technical:	The freight vessel could overnight at Scalloway, Walls or potentially Grutness. Dredging would be required at Foula but no harbour works would be required at Fair Isle.	
Operational:	A mainland based crew would be required for the new vessel. There would be uncertainty over the future of the current Fair Isle and Foula based crews. The freighter could not currently enter Ham Harbour – dredging would therefore be required.	
Financial:	Capital cost of £3m excluding any works required at Walls or Grutness and dredging at Foula. Revenue costs would be determined based on vessel overnight berth and timetable.	
Public:	No obvious support for this proposal was identified through the public engagement.	
STAG Criteria		
Criterion	Assessment Summary	Supporting Information
Environment:	x	<p>The replacement of the MV <i>Good Shepherd</i> with a freight vessel would have a minor negative environmental impact, principally associated with the required dredging work at Foula.</p> <p>The reduction of the Fair Isle and Foula services to a single vessel could potentially lead to a reduction in emissions but it is anticipated that any such reduction would be offset by the new freighter, which would be operating a similar number of operating hours as the existing two vessels combined.</p> <p>The following impacts in relation the harbour works at Grutness have been identified in terms of the environmental sub-criteria (impacts in relation to Foula are considered in the Appraisal Summary Table for that island):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise & vibration: Short term impacts at closest properties and on wildlife during construction but unlikely to be significant in context of existing harbour operations. Local air quality: No significant effects predicted.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality, drainage & flood defence: Some short term impacts on marine water quality during construction and from dredging activities (if required at Grutness) but unlikely to be significant in longer term. • Geological features: Some loss of marine sediment if dredging is required (at Grutness). • Biodiversity & habitats: Potential for disturbance of qualifying features of SPA during construction which could trigger HRA, consultation required. Short term impacts on otter and/or marine mammals etc but unlikely to be significant in context of disturbance in existing harbour. Impacts on marine habitats likely to be limited as new works in existing harbour. • Landscape: New works of small scale and if implemented sensitively unlikely to be significant effects on NSA. • Visual amenity: Short term impacts during construction. Permanent works unlikely to be significant in the context of working harbour if implemented sensitively. <p>Environmental Constraints</p> <p>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"> • Residential properties within 200m to the west of the harbour and Bird Observatory within 400m of harbour • Core path CPPD06 Fair Isle Circular adjacent to harbour • Sloagar GCR site located within 200m east of harbour • Fair Isle is entirely within a National Scenic Area (NSA) • Harbour located within Fair Isle Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) • One listed building within 250m of harbour • Coastal flooding risk • Generally good air quality <p>Grutness Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential properties within 200m of the harbour • Core paths CPPD01 & 02 within 100m of harbour • Sumburgh Head Special Protection Area (SPA) boundary adjacent to harbour • Sumburgh Head SSSI within 50m to the east (seabird assemblage) • Easter Rova Head Geological SSSI approximately 4km north • Listed buildings within 400m of harbour
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 increased capacity of the vessel would alleviate a current constraint on Fair Isle.</p> <p>However, this benefit would, to some extent, be offset by the loss of important island-based ferry jobs. There would also be a loss in service flexibility if the vessel was not based on the island.</p>
Integration:	✓	<p>This option would support the Fair Isle Development Plan through enhancing the capacity of the service to Fair Isle. However, this benefit would again be offset by the loss of island jobs and reduced service flexibility.</p>
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	✗	<p>This option would give rise to a minor negative in terms of accessibility. Whilst physical accessibility to the new freight vessel is likely to represent an enhancement on the MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i>, the loss of flexibility to take advantage of weather windows (due to the vessel not being based on the island) would negatively impact on the community.</p>