

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: Replace the MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> with a passenger vessel and a freight vessel shared with Foula.	Name of Planner:	Stephen Canning, Peter Brett Associates
Proposal Description:	<p>The MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> would be replaced by a dedicated Fair Isle passenger catamaran and a freight vessel shared with Foula (as per option C3).</p> <p>The passenger catamaran would be based on Fair Isle. It could be based on a vessel such as the Wildcat 53 design (e.g. the MV <i>Orca III</i> which runs to St Kilda), which is 16.5m LOA and is a Category 0 (unrestricted vessel) which operates at 20 knots and can carry 12 passengers.</p> <p>The freight vessel would be based on the current MV <i>Snolda</i> which has a track record of accessing Fair Isle and Foula.</p> <p>The new vessel would be 25m long and would carry 12 passengers and 6 PCUs. The vessel would operate at 9 knots.</p>	Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	<i>Capital costs/grant</i> £4m.
			<i>Current revenue support</i> £315k (rounded) per annum.
			<i>Annual revenue support</i> Revenue support would be a combination of options.

	<p>Both the <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> and the <i>MV New Advance</i> would no longer be required.</p> <p>It is assumed the vessel would be mainland based, either at a new facility at Grutness (although there would be significant technical challenges here) or Walls, or using an existing berth at Scalloway.</p> <p>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.</p>		
Funding Sought From: (if applicable)	Transport Scotland	Amount of Application:	<p><i>Present Value of Cost to Govt.</i></p> <p>Costs in this study are all reported in 2016 prices only. The costs would reflect those set out above.</p>
Background Information			
Geographic Context:	<p>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.</p>		
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 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>
Planning Objectives	
Objective:	Performance against planning objective:
<p><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></p>	<p>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Moderate Positive</p> <p>A passenger only vessel based on Fair Isle would continue to offer the current levels of passenger capacity and could also likely take very small pieces of freight (i.e. parcels and packages).</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><i>TPO2a: Where an island has a 'commutable' combined ferry or drive / public transport / walk time to a main</i></p>	<p>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</p> <p>This objective is not relevant for Fair Isle.</p>

<p>employment centre (e.g. 80 minutes), the connections provided should reliably facilitate commuting</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Minor Positive</p> <p>The provision of a materially faster passenger vessel would make a contribution to this objective. Working on the basis of the same arrival / departure times to and from Fair Isle, a materially faster vessel would extend time on mainland. In addition, a faster vessel would provide opportunities for taking greater advantage of weather windows.</p> <p>The shared freight vessel would have no impact on time on mainland.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Minor Positive</p> <p>This option would effectively represent a two vessel solution for Fair Isle. It is assumed that the passenger only vessel would operate at least the current timetable, although the higher speed of this vessel may provide flexibility for additional connections over the week.</p> <p>Calls by the freight vessel would be additional to the current timetable and would thus represent an increase in frequency.</p>
<p>TPO4: The level of connectivity provided should minimise the variation within and between weekdays, evenings, Saturdays and Sundays.</p>	<p>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</p> <p>This option would have no impact on the timetable.</p>
<p>TPO5: Where practicable, islanders should be provided with links to strategic onward transport connections without the need for an overnight stay on Shetland mainland.</p>	<p>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</p> <p>This option would have no impact on strategic connectivity.</p>
<p>Rationale for Selection or Rejection of Proposal:</p>	<p>This option will be retained for further consideration. The rationale for rejecting Option C3 (a shared freight vessel only) is also appropriate to this option. However, a dedicated passenger vessel would provide a faster bespoke option for Fair Isle, mitigating somewhat against potential supply issues with the freighter. A shared freighter would provide capacity to cater for heavier items / vehicles etc. Further analysis of sailing patterns would be required to quantify the extent of the reliance on 'weather windows'.</p>
<p>Implementability Appraisal</p>	

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 as Lo-Lo options would continue.	
	The passenger vessel would be based on Fair Isle.	
Operational:	A mainland based crew would be required for the new freight vessel.	
	The freighter could not currently enter Ham Harbour – dredging would therefore be required.	
Financial:	Capital cost of £4m. Revenue costs dependent on vessel options chosen.	
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>In addition, by adding an additional vessel to those already calling at Fair Isle & Foula (and enhancing the timetable), it is likely that total emissions would increase.</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. • 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

		<p>significant in the context of working harbour if implemented sensitively.</p> <p>Environmental Constraints 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:	✓	<p>This replacement of the MV <i>Good Shepherd IV</i> with more modern vessels would give rise to a minor safety benefit as it is assumed that any new tonnage would be twin-screwed.</p> <p>There would however be a marginal increase in total sailing hours with this option, which would have a negative safety impact. However, the scale of this impact is likely to be extremely small.</p>
Economy:	✓✓	<p>This option would deliver a moderate positive impact in terms of the economy criterion. The reduction in journey times associated with a faster passenger vessel would provide TEE benefits, whilst there may also be enhancements to reliability if a faster vessel can take better advantage of weather windows. There would also be one or more additional connections over the course of the week.</p> <p>The improved perception of the vessels and the crossing to Fair Isle (particularly for tourists), coupled</p>

		<p>with reduced journey times, could also encourage increased sea-based travel, but any such impact would be very minor.</p> <p>The increased capacity of the freight aspect of the service would also alleviate a current constraint on Fair Isle.</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. There would also be an increase in capacity (passengers and freight).
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	✓	<p>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 passenger vessel operating within the existing infrastructure).</p> <p>The increased carrying capacity of the freighter compared to the current vessel would also enhance freight based accessibility to the island. However, as the vessel would not be based in the island, there would be a loss of flexibility to take advantage of weather windows.</p>