

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 CO2 – Replace MV <i>Dagalien</i> and MV <i>Daggri</i> with two larger vessels	Name of Planner:	Stephen Canning, Peter Brett Associates
Proposal Description:	<p>The working assumption with this option is that the MV <i>Dagalien</i> and MV <i>Daggri</i> would be replaced by two TYPE 4 vessels at life expiry.</p> <p>However, differing vessel combinations could be considered and analysis of demand in the Final Business Case (FBC) would be used to determine this.</p> <p>There remains an element of doubt as to whether a 75m vessel could access the lay-by berth at Ulsta. Ulsta Harbour Drawing (Box 3 – Larger Vessel) includes a manoeuvre path which Beckett Rankine believes is feasible and safe under reasonably calm conditions, although some dredging would be needed (costing around £300k). This manoeuvre does require the vessel to lean against the existing row of piles, so these would need to be checked and possibly new fenders will be required. If this manoeuvre path is</p>	Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	<i>Capital costs/grant</i> £30.35 million.
			<i>Current revenue support</i> £2.27m (rounded) per annum.
			<i>Annual revenue support</i> £2.22m (rounded) per annum.

	not feasible, a breakwater would be required at Toft so that the second vessel could lie there. The costs of the breakwater are outlined under Option CO3.		
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 island of Yell is situated between the north of Shetland mainland and the islands of Unst and Fetlar. The island is separated from Shetland Mainland by a narrow strait of water known as Yell Sound. The majority of the settlements on Yell are in the north and east the island.</p> <p>The ferry from the island to Shetland mainland operates from Ulsta (to Toft), a very small settlement on the south-west coast of the island. The larger settlements on Yell, such as Mid Yell and Cullivoe tend to be located in the east and north of the island, meaning that an onward car or public transport connection is typically required from Ulsta.</p>		
Social Context:	<p>Yell is the second most populous of the isles, with a population of around 1,000. The island has a relatively stable population, supported by good access to job opportunities and local services. However, forecasts suggest that the population will decline in the years ahead. In addition, whilst Yell has a stable population, it is also an ageing one, which is reflected in the proportionally lower economic activity rate and higher number of retirees relative to the Shetland Islands generally.</p> <p>Health provision on the island is of a high quality, whilst there are stable rolls at the island nursery, the two primary schools and the Junior High. The island also has a high level of community cohesion, with a very active third sector on the island.</p>		
Economic Context:	<p>The Yell economy is relatively healthy, with a number of indigenous businesses in the valuable aquaculture sector, good commuting opportunities and a strong public sector presence (in terms of both direct jobs and as a facilitator of other opportunities).</p> <p>Yell has very high levels of household car ownership and a significant proportion of its residents travel in a car to work. This reflects the importance of commuting to the island, particularly to Sullom Voe and Lerwick. The amount of people working from home has increased in recent years.</p> <p>The availability of housing on Yell and the North Isles generally is seen to constrain the growth of the community.</p> <p>Overall, Yell is in a relatively favourable position overall, with a stable population, reasonable industrial mix and good</p>		

	connectivity. Maintaining and potentially improving this level of connectivity in years to come will be of importance to the island.
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 introduction of two larger vessels would significantly increase capacity across the Yell Sound – each individual sailing could accommodate nineteen additional cars over and above the current vessels. This would alleviate the relatively minor capacity peaks identified on this crossing (e.g. the 0915 and 1045 ex Toft and the 0715 ex Ulsta).
<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 option would have no impact on connectivity.
<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 objective is not considered relevant for Yell.
<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

<p>be provided with links to strategic onward transport connections without the need for an overnight stay on Shetland mainland.</p>	<p>This option would have no impact on strategic connectivity.</p>	
<p>Rationale for Selection or Rejection of Proposal:</p>	<p>This option is retained for further consideration. The case for two larger vessels would need to be revisited at the life expiry of the current Yell Sound vessels.</p>	
<p>Implementability Appraisal</p>		
<p>Technical:</p>	<p>There remains an element of doubt as to whether a 75m vessel could access the lay-by berth at Ulsta. Ulsta Harbour Drawing (Box 3 – Larger Vessel) includes a manoeuvre path which Beckett Rankine believes is feasible and safe under reasonably calm conditions, although some dredging would be needed (costing around £300k). This manoeuvre does require the vessel to lean against the existing row of piles, so these would need to be checked and possibly new fenders will be required. If this manoeuvre path is not feasible, a breakwater would be required at Toft so that the second vessel could lie there. The costs of the breakwater are outlined under Option CO3.</p>	
<p>Operational:</p>	<p>There are no operational feasibility issues with associated this option beyond training the crew on the new vessel.</p>	
<p>Financial:</p>	<p>The capital cost would be £30.35 million, with annual revenue support estimated at £2.22m, a decrease of £50k per annum on the current day figure.</p> <p>A further £6.6m of capital expenditure would be required if a breakwater is needed at Toft.</p>	
<p>Public:</p>	<p>Given the relative youth of the current vessels and the fixed links issue, there was very little public engagement in the ferry based options. A fixed link is however identified as the preferred option of the community</p>	
<p>STAG Criteria</p>		
<p>Criterion</p>	<p>Assessment Summary</p>	<p>Supporting Information</p>
<p>Environment:</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>The replacement of the MV <i>Daggri</i> and MV <i>Dagalien</i> at life expiry with more modern vessels gives rise to a potential reduction in emissions, although these benefits may be offset by the use of larger tonnage.</p> <p>This minor benefit would be offset if a breakwater is required at Toft.</p> <p>The following impacts of the new breakwater at Toft 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local air quality: No significant effects predicted. • Water quality, drainage & flood defence: Some short term impacts on marine water quality during construction of breakwater at Toft. Indirect impacts on Hamna Voe Shellfish Water Protected Area considered unlikely due to distance (this would need to be confirmed in more detailed work). • Biodiversity & habitats: Potential for disturbance of qualifying features of Yell Sounds SAC 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 Toft harbour. • Landscape: Impacts on seascape from new breakwater but fitting in the marine working environment of the harbour. • Visual amenity: Short term impacts during construction. Permanent works could be significant particularly on completion of construction. • Cultural heritage: Works unlikely to significantly affect setting of scheduled monument. <p>Environmental Constraints The environmental constraints at the Yell Sound ports are provided below for information.</p> <p>Toft Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential properties within 100m • Scheduled monuments within 500m • Coastal flooding risk • Good air quality <p>Ulsta Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential properties in close proximity to terminal • Yell Sound SAC and SSSI within 500m of terminal • Hamna Voe Shellfish Water Protected Area within 2km (east) • Listed buildings within 50m of harbour • Coastal flooding risk • Good air quality
Safety:	Neutral	This option would have no impact in terms of safety.
Economy:	✓	The provision of two larger vessels would alleviate the relatively minor capacity issues identified on the Yell Sound route. This would give rise to minor TEE benefits, where residents can now travel on a ferry they could not previously travel on.

		Moreover, two large and modern vessels would improve the perception of Yell as a place to live work and do business.
Integration:	Neutral	This option would have no impact in terms of integration.
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	✓	The provision of two larger ferries would improve community accessibility through reducing the minor capacity issues identified on the Yell Sound route.