

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>Dagalien</i> and MV <i>Daggri</i> with three TYPE 3 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 three TYPE 3 vessels. However, various vessel mixes could apply and the final decision should be informed by analysis of demand in the Final Business Case (FBC), which would be used to determine this.</p> <p>One of the three vessels would need to lie overnight at Toft. This would require the construction of a 210m detached breakwater to provide shelter from northerly or easterly waves allowing vessels to safely overnight. There would also need to be a small investment in improved parking / waiting facilities at Toft.</p>	Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	<i>Capital costs/grant</i> £38.8 million.
			<i>Current revenue support</i> £2.27m (rounded) per annum.
			<i>Annual revenue support</i> £3.49m (rounded) per annum, although it should be noted that frequency would be increased with this option.
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 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.		
	The ferry from the island to Shetland mainland operates from Ulsta (to Toft), a very small settlement on the south-west		

	<p>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 connectivity. Maintaining and potentially improving this level of connectivity in years to come will be of importance to the island.</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>From a capacity perspective, when all three vessels are operating, the vessels would offer a capacity of 93 PCUs compared to the current 62. Perhaps more importantly, a three vessel solution would offer an almost turn-up-and-go frequency on Yell Sound, significantly reducing the scheduled time between connections. Finally, a third vessel would make a contribution to minimising timetable variation, providing flexibility and standing in during e.g. meal breaks, scheduled maintenance, drydock periods etc.</p>

	This option would also have a benefit for Unst and Fetlar.
<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: Moderate Positive The provision of a three vessel solution on Yell Sound would offer an almost 'turn-up-and-go' timetable. The current day boat on Yell Sound offers nine return sailings per day on a typical weekday, with the shift vessel offering up to sixteen return sailings. The third vessel would add a further 9-16 connections per day (or more if run more intensively) and would ensure at least the current Tuesday – Friday timetable is maintained during periods of refit, scheduled maintenance etc. This option would also have a benefit for Unst and Fetlar.
<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: Major Positive A three vessel solution would provide sufficient flexibility to allow for the maintenance of a two vessel service during scheduled maintenance meal breaks, ensuring consistency across the working week. This option would also have a benefit for Unst and Fetlar.
<i>TPO5: Where practicable, islanders should be provided with links to strategic onward transport connections without the need for an overnight stay on Shetland mainland.</i>	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This option would have no impact on strategic connectivity, although the service frequency would be higher for residents travelling to / from Sumburgh and Lerwick.

Rationale for Selection or Rejection of Proposal:	This option will not be retained for further consideration. The step-change in both capital and revenue costs, combined with the environmental impact, cannot be justified in the context of current and likely future demand. This option could be revisited in the Final Business Case if the demand for the Yell Sound service materially changed.	
Implementability Appraisal		
Technical:	At present, both the MV <i>Dagalien</i> and MV <i>Daggri</i> berth overnight at Ulsta on Yell, as there is no suitable overnight berth at Toft. A three vessel solution would require the construction of an overnight berth at Toft. This would take the form of an approximate 210 metre long detached breakwater to provide shelter from northerly and easterly waves allowing vessels to safely overnight. The breakwater would allow vessels to access the berth from both the north and south sides.	
Operational:	Additional crew would be required for the third vessel. The exact number of crew would be determined by the timetable which would be operated. However, as a minimum, it is assumed that a crewing numbers equivalent to the current 'day boat' would be required.	
Financial:	The capital cost would be £38.8 million, with annual revenue support estimated at £3.49m, an increase of £1.22m per annum on the current day figure, albeit with a higher service frequency offered.	
Public:	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	
STAG Criteria		
Criterion	Assessment Summary	Supporting Information
Environment:	xx	<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 would be offset by the addition of a third vessel.</p> <p>The required harbour works at Toft would also have a negative impact.</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. • 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

		<p>detailed work).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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:	x	<p>A three vessel solution could potentially have a marginally negative impact on safety. In previous examples where the service frequency has been increased, there has been an uplift in car carryings. Whilst increased car journeys are likely to increase with this option, any impact is likely to be marginal.</p> <p>Moving to a three vessel solution would statistically increase the possibility of marine accidents (due to more ferry journeys being undertaken), although the risks associated with this are extremely small. In addition, a new breakwater at Toft would make this berth more sheltered.</p>

Economy:	✓✓	<p>A three vessel solution would contribute positively to the STAG economy criterion. The frequency increase would offer minor TEE benefits.</p> <p>Perhaps more significantly, a three vessel service would offer moderate wider benefits, particularly if the third vessel was used to fill existing gaps in the timetable (e.g. Monday maintenance, lunch breaks, weekend connectivity etc). Benefits would accrue in terms of residents (particularly in terms of commuting), tourism and locally traded services. Given the prominence of the aquaculture sector on Yell, a higher frequency service would support the manufacturing & processing sector, and could encourage further inward investment into the island.</p> <p>This option would also have a benefit for Unst and Fetlar.</p>
Integration:	✓	<p>This option would improve public transport integration through offering a potentially increased service frequency. It would also support a wide range of policies targeted at sustaining and developing the islands.</p> <p>This option would also have a benefit for Unst and Fetlar.</p>
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	✓✓	<p>The provision of a three vessel service would significantly enhance the community accessibility of Yell through potentially offering a higher frequency. The third vessel could fill gaps in the timetable and offer additional day, evening and / or weekend sailings on Yell Sound.</p> <p>From a comparative accessibility point of view, Yell would become one of the best connected islands in Scotland (albeit that link would be to the Shetland rather than the Scottish mainland).</p> <p>This option would also have a benefit for Unst and Fetlar.</p>