

## 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 CO1a: (Do Minimum): Replace the MV <i>New Advance</i> with a like-for-like vessel.	Name of Planner:	Stephen Canning, Peter Brett Associates
Proposal Description:	This vessel would be a similar replacement for the MV <i>New Advance</i> in terms of dimensions and carrying characteristics. The vessel would carry 12 passengers and one PCU, and would have a workboat classification.  This option would not require harbour works other than remedial dredging at Foula.	Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	<i>Capital costs/grant</i> £950k.
			<i>Current revenue support</i> Revenue costs not available as service contracted out
			<i>Annual revenue support</i> Revenue costs not available as service contracted out
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:	The island of Foula lies 20 miles to the west of Walls on the Shetland mainland. The island, which is still lairded, is about 2.5 miles long by 3.5 miles wide.  Transport connections are provided by the workboat MV <i>New Advance</i> and an air service from Tingwall.		
Social Context:	The population of Foula is small but has been relatively resilient over the years, despite limited on-island opportunities. The population was recorded as 38 in the 2011 Census.  The shortage of housing stock in Foula is a key constraint on population sustainability and growth.		

	<p>Foula retains its primary school and recently attracted a teacher to go and live on the island. The school roll has increased over the last two years.</p> <p>Health provision on Foula is limited, although this is perhaps to be expected given the remoteness of the island. The main need of the island appears to be enhanced emergency cover.</p> <p>The lack of on-island services is a challenge for Foula residents, although this is not a new issue and has not had a noticeable impact on the population level (although it may be a deterrent to in-migration).</p>
Economic Context:	<p>Employment opportunities on Foula are limited, with employment concentrated in public sector posts, small scale crofting and seasonal tourism.</p> <p>Given the geography, population and industrial base of Foula, there is unlikely to be any significant developments on the island over the period of the plan. The key for Foula is likely to be maintaining the population base, lowering the average age of residents and retaining key services.</p>
<b>Planning Objectives</b>	
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>	<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>
<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>	<p><b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b></p> <p>This objective is not relevant for Foula.</p>
<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>	<p><b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b></p> <p>This option would have no impact on time ashore.</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><b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b> This option would have no impact on the frequency of the service.</p>	
<p>TPO4: The level of connectivity provided should minimise the variation within and between weekdays, evenings, Saturdays and Sundays.</p>	<p><b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b> 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><b>Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral</b> 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. Given the constrained nature of the harbour and overnight berthing arrangements at Foula, this option cannot be ruled out.</p>	
<p><b>Implementability Appraisal</b></p>		
<p>Technical:</p>	<p>There would be no technical feasibility issues associated with this option.</p>	
<p>Operational:</p>	<p>There would be no operational feasibility issues associated with this option.</p>	
<p>Financial:</p>	<p>Capital cost – £950k.</p>	
<p>Public:</p>	<p>The initial community council and subsequent public consultation noted that this option would be acceptable.</p>	
<p><b>STAG Criteria</b></p>		
<p><b>Criterion</b></p>	<p><b>Assessment Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Supporting Information</b></p>
<p>Environment:</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>The replacement of the MV <i>New Advance</i> with a more modern vessel would give rise to a potential reduction in emissions. There would be no other environmental issues associated with this option.</p> <p><b>Environmental Constraints</b> The environmental constraints for the Foula route are provided below for information</p> <p>Foula Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential properties in proximity to ferry terminal and airstrip</li> <li>• Core path CPPWS03 in proximity to pier and to the runway location</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foula GCR follows island coast in proximity to runway location (but at Ham Harbour)</li> <li>• Foula is entirely designated as Special Protection Area (SPA) and SSSI</li> <li>• Foula is entirely within an NSA</li> <li>• One listed building within 50m of pier</li> <li>• Coastal flooding risk</li> <li>• Good air quality</li> </ul> <p>Walls Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential properties within 50m of the pier</li> <li>• Walls Harbour within Vaila Sound Shellfish Water Protected Area and Grunting Voe Shellfish Water Protected Area approximately 4km south of Walls</li> <li>• Scheduled monument and listed buildings in proximity to the harbour</li> <li>• Coastal flooding risk</li> <li>• Good air quality</li> </ul>
Safety:	Neutral	This option would have no impact in terms of safety.
Economy:	✓	This option would deliver a minor positive impact in terms of the economy criterion. The improved perception of the vessel and the crossing to / from Foula (particularly for tourists) could encourage increased sea-based travel, but any such impact would be very minor.
Integration:	Neutral	This option would have no impact on integration.
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	✓	This option would offer a minor 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.