

MINUTE

A & B

Shetland Island Council
Main Hall, Town Hall, Lerwick
Tuesday 14 December 2010 at 10 a.m.

Present:

A J Cluness	L Angus
L Baisley	J Budge
A Cooper	A Doull
A Duncan	B Fullerton
F Grains	R Henderson
J Henry	A Hughson
W Manson	C Miller
R Nickerson	F A Robertson
G Robinson	J Simpson
C Smith	J Wills

Apologies:

I Hawkins	A Wishart
-----------	-----------

In Attendance:

A Buchan, Chief Executive
G Greenhill, Executive Director – Infrastructure
N Grant, Head of Economic Development
I McDiarmid, Head of Planning
J R Riise, Head of Legal and Administration
J Smith, Head of Organisational Development
B Hill, Acting Divisional Manager – Legal
J Holden, Development Management Manager
T Morton, Communications Consultant
H Nelson, Development Plans Manager
P Peterson, Project Manager - Communications
A Taylor, Heritage Manager
L Adamson, Committee Officer
A Cogle, Service Manager – Administration

Chairperson

Mr A J Cluness, Convener of the Council, presided.

Circular

The circular calling the meeting was held as read.

Mr Cluness welcomed everyone to this special meeting of the Council which had been arranged to consider the Council's response to the application for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 submitted by the Viking Energy Partnership to the Scottish Ministers. He said that Members will have received the report as circulated, and additionally two further papers released yesterday (one from Planning and one from Economic Development). He said he believed it was important that the Council had the fullest information available to it and for that reason he ruled that these papers be considered as a matter of urgency.

Declarations of Interest

Mr A Cluness made the following declaration:

“Members will have received an advice note from the Head of Legal & Administration. Using that advice I declare an interest because I am a Trustee of Shetland Charitable Trust. I have declared a non-financial interest and intend to participate. In reaching that decision I have taken account of the following circumstances, I am an ex officio Trustee of Shetland Charitable Trust by virtue of being a Councillor, along with all other Councillors. SCT is a charity set up to provide public benefit to the people of Shetland. The purpose of SCT is solely in the wider interest of the Shetland community as a whole. As a trustee I receive no direct or indirect personal benefit. I believe it is in the public interest that Shetland Islands Council as a statutory consultee should be able to provide its views to Ministers. The application is not to the Council nor is the Council the deciding body. If I and all other Councillors were excluded it would not be possible for the council to make its views known. I do not believe that a member of the public acting reasonably, or my constituents, would consider the public interest would be satisfied were the Council not to be able to make its views known. Looking at the totality of the circumstances I do not view any conflict or perceived conflict to be of sufficient significance as to set aside the public interest in allowing the views of my constituents (whether they are in favour of the development or otherwise) to be represented to Ministers. In considering this matter I wish to make it clear that I will act in the capacity of councillor in the interest of the wider community, and not as a trustee.

It is of course a matter for each Member individually to consider whether or not they have an interest to declare, the nature of that interest and whether that interest requires them to leave the meeting or in the case of a non financial interest whether the Member considers they may continue to participate.

If other Members who intend to declare a non financial interest consider they wish to continue to participate for the same reasons as my own, would they now declare that interest and indicate accordingly, as well as any additional reasons.”

Mr F Robertson declared an interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, adding that he intended to take part in the debate because he felt that as an elected Member he represented the people and interests of Shetland, and it was essential that a decision was made today. Mr Robertson also submitted written confirmation of his declaration.

Mr J Simpson declared an interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, adding that he intended to take part in the debate and vote, for the same reasons as Mr Robertson had stated, as he had been voted by the people of Shetland and his Ward. Mr Simpson also submitted written confirmation of his declaration.

Mr A Doull declared an interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, and indicated that he intended to take part in the debate and voting. Mr Doull also submitted written confirmation of his declaration.

Mrs B Fullerton declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, adding that she intended to take part in the debate and voting, in order to represent those who had voted for her and for the people of Shetland. Mrs Fullerton also submitted written confirmation of her declaration.

Mr C Smith declared an interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, although he referred to the advice given 18 months ago, and said that circumstances had not changed, and he would not be taking part and would leave the meeting.

Mrs L Baisley declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, but added that she intended to take part in the debate and voting. Mrs Baisley also submitted written confirmation of her declaration.

Mrs C Miller declared a non-pecuniary interest in this proposal as a Director of Viking Energy, and therefore would be leaving the meeting.

Mr W Manson declared an interest as a Director of Viking Energy, which was the applicant, and would therefore be leaving the meeting. Mr Manson added that he also had a second and financial interest as Chairperson of the Shetland Charitable Trust. Mr Manson also submitted written confirmation of his declarations.

Dr J Wills declared interests as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, as a Trustee of Shetland Amenity Trust which was an objector, as Councillor because of the Council's interest as a landowner, and he declared an interest as an objector in the interests of his constituents. He added that he would take part in the debate but not in the vote, but he had put forward a motion which he believed would get Members out of these problems regarding conflicts of interest.

Mr L Angus declared an interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, although adding that he had some difficulty with the advice given 18 months ago that Councillors had an irreconcilable conflict. However, he said that a change in circumstances was the most recent advice relating to the overwhelming community interest. Mr Angus said, with that advice, he intended to take part in the meeting.

Mr J Budge declared an interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust and intended to take part and vote. Mr J Budge also submitted written confirmation of his declaration.

Mr R Nickerson declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust and would also be taking part in the meeting. Mr Nickerson also submitted written confirmation of his declaration.

Mr A Hughson declared an interest as his son's business was a contractor to Scottish and Southern Energy, and although Mr Hughson said he received no personal benefit, he would not be taking part and would leave the meeting.

Mr A Cooper declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Director of Viking Energy, and would leave the meeting.

Mr R Henderson declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, but would be taking part in the meeting, and voting. Mr Henderson also submitted written confirmation of his declaration.

Mr G Robinson declared a non-financial interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust, and also acknowledged the local authority interest in this application. Mr Robinson also submitted written confirmation of his declaration.

Mr A Duncan declared an interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust and as a Councillor, and that it was such a conflict of interest that he had decided to take no further part and would leave the meeting.

Mrs F Grains declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Trustee of the Shetland Charitable Trust and said she intended to take part and vote. Mrs Grains also submitted written confirmation of her declaration.

Mr J Henry declared a financial interest as Vice-Chairperson of the Shetland Charitable Trust, and would be leaving the meeting. Mr Henry also submitted written confirmation of his declaration.

[Accordingly, Mr C Smith, Mrs C Miller, Mr W Manson, Mr A Hughson, Mr A Cooper, Mr A Duncan, and Mr J Henry left the meeting.]

Process for the Meeting

Mr A Cluness went on to say that, as regards the proposed process for the meeting, he intended to proceed as follows:

- (a) The Head of Planning would present the report which has been circulated for this meeting. He said there was reference in the report to the fact that the Planning Service had not assessed the economic impacts of the proposed development, and so the Head of Economic Development had prepared a paper on that aspect and he would be asked to address the meeting.
- (b) The objectors will be invited to make a statement:
 - 1 Sustainable Shetland – Billy Fox;
 - 2 RSPB – Pete Ellis;
 - 3 Iain Malcolmson;
 - 4 James Nicolson;
 - 5 Evelyn Morrison;
 - 6 Richard Rowland;
 - 7 Caroline Henderson
- (c) The supporters of the proposed development will be invited to make a statement:
 - 1 Wind Farm Supporters Group – Bobby Hunter
 - 2 Pelamis Wavepower – Laura Carse
 - 3 Dan Thompson
- (d) The applicant will be invited to make a statement (Viking Energy Ltd)

Mr Cluness added that, at the end of each statement Members may ask questions of Officers and the parties, and once everyone has made their contribution, Members will then discuss the application and come to a conclusion about any views or recommendation they may wish to make to Ministers. Mr Cluness added that parties were being asked to limit their presentations to no more than ten minutes and to avoid repetition of points already made, and that parties were asked to participate constructively during the process.

199/10 **Consultation on Section 36 Application Etc on the Viking Wind Farm**

The Council considered a report by the Head of Planning (Appendix 1) which provided information to allow the Council, as Planning Authority, to consider the proposed application, as a statutory consultee, and to make a recommendation to the Energy Consents Unit, taking account of all relevant Council policies and the views of the community. An addendum to the report by the Head of Planning relating to an assessment of the ornithological interests had been circulated and was also considered (Appendix 2), and an additional paper by the Head of Economic Development which had also been circulated, was considered, which provided information to Members on the economic impacts of the development (Appendix 3).

The Head of Planning introduced his reports, outlining the method and process which officers had followed in order to consider the application and its impacts in order to reach a balanced and considered report for presentation to the Council. The Head of Planning said he did not intend to detail the report, but said that it should be considered in conjunction with the Environmental Impact Assessment. He said the report addressed the key issues set against the Council's policies, but he would answer any questions from Members in order to deal with such matters in greater detail, if necessary. He went on to say that the report addressed all the issues raised by objectors and supporters through detailed information in sections 6 and 7 of the report. In conclusion, the Head of Planning said he wished to acknowledge the amount of work done by Planning officers in relation to this application, but that as the application did not comply with the Council's Development Plan, and as it was not without an unacceptable level of environmental impact, the proposal was contrary to the Development Plan, although it was a matter for the Council to consider all the relevant information.

The Head of Economic Development introduced and then summarised the content of his report. He briefly outlined the approach taken to evaluate the project, and conclusions reached in terms of value to the Shetland economy, including income and employment, and he referred to the benefits in relation to the renewable energy sector in Shetland into the future and the impact on investments in this area in relation to the Council's strategic priorities.

In response to questions from Members, the Head of Planning confirmed that the Interim Planning Policies were at different levels, from adopted down to the drafting stage, and as such had different weights attached to them depending on what stage the consultation was at. He advised that they were all relevant in terms of the assessment of this particular proposal.

The Head of Economic Development, in response to questions, said that he was of the view that the application was a community project in that significant profits would flow back to the community and would support sustainable development. He said that he was unable to find a similar model elsewhere which had this level of community investment and which created this level of community benefit.

Mr A Cluness invited the objectors to make their statements to the Council, in support of their submissions to the Planning Service. Mr Fox, Mr Ellis, Mr Malcolmson, Mr Nicolson, Mrs Morrison, Mr Rowland and Mrs Henderson each made a submission, summarised as follows:

Mr Billy Fox, Sustainable Shetland - Mr Fox said he would not be going over the environmental arguments, but advised that Sustainable Shetland endorsed the objections also made by SNH, RSPB, and the Scottish Wildlife Trust. He said that overall the proposed development was inappropriate in scale, was contrary to the development plans, and that the economic benefits being stated were misguided. He said the main concern in the community was with regard to the environment, and that a community project can only be that if supported by a majority of the community, but there was unclear or no information in relation to the funding or costs of the project, from building through to transmission costs, and these could have wide-ranging impacts on community funds and so remained a high risk investment. He said it was inconceivable that a project of this size should not be subject to a public local inquiry, and therefore urged the Council to support the recommendation in the report. Regarding community opinion, Mr Fox said that the

Energy Consents Unit had received 2300 letter of objection, and 900 letters of support and this, he said, showed the community opinion.

Mr Pete Ellis, RSPB – Mr Ellis said that whilst RSPB Scotland supported the development of renewable energy in response to climate change, this particular project would be detrimental to the habitat and population of various species of birds, some of which were protected under EU Directives. He recognised that the applicant's addendum had reduced the number of turbines by 23 in order to reduce the affect on birds, but he said that the impact still remained, and the deletion of further turbines was important. Mr Ellis said that he remained concerned about some proposals to removed excavated peat and methods of calculation relating to carbon payback times. In conclusion, Mr Ellis said that insufficient changes had been made, the application did not accord with Shetland development plans, and recommended that the Council do not support the application.

In response to queries from Members, Mr Ellis confirmed that whilst a smaller development may be acceptable to RSPB Scotland, it was difficult to give a definitive answer or suggest alternative sites, as much depended on the design, layout and geography of any revised plan. He said that RSPB Scotland had, and would be, willing to work with the developers to find a solution that was less damaging, but that had not been successful in this case.

Mr Iain Malcolmson: Mr Malcolmson said that he was also representing members of the South and North Nesting communities. He said he wanted to stress that he was a natural supporter of renewable energy, and promoting a green environment, but he could not support this particular application which they believed to be flawed. Mr Malcolmson went on to refer to the recommendations from the Planning Service, which he agreed with, adding that the report confirmed that the scale of the development was too big for the Shetland landscape. In particular, Mr Malcolmson said that the development would be detrimental to the health and well-being of those in the area, particular of children, and he referred to the effects of noise pollution and flicker impacts and associated issues such as sleep deprivation. He said that SPP6 and PAN45 recommended a safe distance of 2 km between housing a wind turbine, but this development would have turbine as close as 1 km. Mr Malcolmson said that there were arguments on both sides of these particular issues, but until such time as they were proven beyond reasonable doubt, he was unable to accept the development as proposed. He said there was no regard being given to the health and well-being of the residents in those areas affected, and in this regard he agreed that there must be a public inquiry. Mr Malcolmson said that a smaller development could be considered that would generate the same electricity, and this would have less of an impact on individuals and infrastructure. He said this would not be the last chance for a wind farm but it would be the last chance to get it right, and that there should have been a scheme put forward that all Shetland can feel proud of, not just a few, and in this respect he urged the Council to object to this application.

In response to questions, Mr Malcolmson said that he was unable to comment on the technical aspects of a smaller turbine, but it appeared that the applicant was not willing to consider that aspect. Regarding possible mitigation of the effects of noise and flicker on residents, Mr Malcolmson said that each development had to be considered in its own right, but there were probably options that could be looked at, but these would only be considered once the windfarm was up and running.

Mr James Nicolson: Mr Nicolson said that he was also representing the community of Aith. He said the Community Council had carried out a household survey which showed that only 13% of households supported the windfarm. Mr Nicolson said that the environmental impact was the real concern. He said that there would also be a detrimental visual impact which would be within 200m of some of housing schemes and the school in Aith, and placing the masts on the ridges would mean them totally dominating the area and the skyline. Mr Nicolson said that whilst he favoured renewable energy, he believed this proposal was much too big and would affect the quality of life of those around it, and was therefore not in the interests of the people of Shetland. He said that mention had been made of the jobs to be created, but given other projects such as the new Anderson High School and more housing, the Council was in danger of over-heating the economy, and may have detrimental effects on those projects. Mr Nicolson urged the Council to maintain the process it had put in place, and to support the recommendation of the Planning Service to object to the proposal.

[Dr J Wills and Mr R Nickerson left the meeting.]

Evelyn Morrison

Mrs Morrison advised that she was speaking against the proposal, and was also speaking on behalf of Donnie and Charlotte Robertson. She said that the Council had to understand what it would be like to live in close proximity of the development and a construction site, and said that the first duty of councillors was toward their constituents, not developers. Mrs Morrison said that there was concern about being exposed to a major disruption of their lives, and no consideration was being given by Viking Energy to this. She added that there was concern regarding the operation of a huge construction site, and her home would be within 1.6km of the nearest of the 17 turbines being planned. Mrs Morrison went on to explain further concerns regarding the detrimental effects on health, property and quality of life. She asked Members, as Councillors and as fellow Shetlanders, to look to their conscience and reject the application.

[Mr R Nickerson and Dr J Wills returned to the meeting.]

Richard Rowland

Mr Rowland referred to the process of considering planning applications and matters that were material, and also referred to the lack of community support which had been displayed in terms of the Shetland Times poll and the numerous objections lodged on the application. He went on to refer to the perceived conflicts of interest by Councillors, and said that the only solution would be a public inquiry, where the relevant issues could be raised before an independent tribunal, and in this regard he commended the recommendation in the report to object to the proposal.

Caroline Henderson

Mrs Henderson briefly covered a range of concerns, including conflicts of interest, economic, health and environmental issues, and recommended that the Council object to the application.

The Convener then invited the supporters to make their statements to the Council, in support of their submissions to the Planning Service. Mr Hunter, Ms Carse and Mr Thompson each made a submission, summarised as follows:

Bobby Hunter, Wind Farm Supporters Group

Mr Hunter referred to the issues raised by the Planning Service in the report, and said that many of them were resolvable. In particular, he referred to the impact of turbines on the landscape and said that this would be a matter of taste and perception. He went on question the comments made by objectors regarding impacts on wildlife and birds, and he also disputed the views made regarding the carbon payback period. Mr Hunter referred to the benefits of community ownership which he said would add greatly to the safeguards that everyone wanted. He addressed issues regarding economic and employment opportunities, and in conclusion was critical of the number of submissions in support of the application which had already been made to the Energy Consents Unit, but which had not been addressed in the report. Mr Hunter sought approval from the Council for the application.

[Mr A J Cluness left the meeting during consideration of the following item, and Mr J G Simpson, Vice-Convener, assumed the Chair.]

Laura Carse, Pelamis Wavepower

Ms Carse began by explaining the background and experience of Pelamis in renewable energy projects, and confirmed its support for the application. Ms Carse provided technical information relating to the interconnector and its capacity, and explained how this would provide substantial opportunities for renewable projects into the future. She went on to support the economic impact assessment, and the opportunities that the proposal would provide both locally and nationally, and urged the Council to take all of these into consideration.

[The Convener returned to the meeting, and re-assumed the Chair.]

In response to questions from Members, Ms Carse said she was unable to comment on the detailed commercial model, but confirmed that there were various funding mechanisms in place and Pelamis would be liable for underwriting part of the project associated with them, but would not on their own be responsible.

[Mr L Angus left the meeting.]

Dan Thompson

Mr Thompson said that he had been a supporter from the start, and said that without Viking Energy there would be no interconnector, so the proposed windfarm developments in Yell would not happen. He said that the application was vital to the future of Shetland, particularly in terms of ensuring ongoing opportunities for young people and the economy of Shetland. He asked that the Council support the application.

The Convener then invited the applicant to make their statements to the Council, in support of their submissions to the Planning Service. Mr C Marden, SSE, and Mr A Priest, Viking Energy made a joint submission, summarised as follows:

Chris Marden, SSE

Mr Marden outlined the organisation of Viking Energy Partnership, and summarised way in which the partnership had developed, highlighting in particular the use of local knowledge and consultation in keeping people informed, and he also referred to the continuing dialogue with SEPA and Historic Scotland during this process. He went on to explain that one of the objectives was to minimise the impact on the environment, and in this regard they had compromised on scale and activities, recognising also the concerns raised regarding the view from settlements. Mr

Marden said the applicant recognised the importance of balancing the impacts of the development when assessing its compliance with the Development Plan, but also that the development would be of prime economic importance to Shetland. In response to questions, Mr Marden confirmed that as part of the development control process, planning conditions would limit the number of masts in terms of their location to housing, and that the applicant would ensure specifications were met and compliance with the limits imposed. Mr A Priest said, in response to a further question, that if there were enough shared users of the cable, the costs would be shared through those multi-users.

Mr A Priest went on to say that today marked a point of historical magnitude for the community, and as the electricity regulator would not approve the connection without the windfarm, therefore the Council's decision today would send a clear message to the outside world that Shetland was a progressive and vibrant place, and one where strategic thinking flourished. Regarding renewable resources, Mr Priest said that this application represented another opportunity to maximise the economic benefits to the community and that the decision of the Council today would have great significance. In response to questions from Members, Mr C Marden said he was unaware of any better turbines that could replace the type they were suggesting in order to reduce the number of turbines and having them further apart, although if they could source such a type it would still occupy a similar area. Regarding the funding, Mr A Priest confirmed that the transmission charging system was under review by OFGEM and the findings would be in place by the middle of next year, but it was not clear at this stage as to how much, if any, material difference this would make to the project.

The Council adjourned at 12.10 p.m.

The Council reconvened at 12.25 p.m.

Present:

A J Cluness	L Angus
L Baisley	J Budge
A T Doull	B Fullerton
F Grains	R Henderson
R Nickerson	F Robertson
G Robinson	J Simpson
J Wills	

199/10

Consultation on Section 36 Application Etc on the Viking Wind Farm (continued)

Mr R Nickerson moved that Shetland Islands Council re-affirms its support for the Viking Energy Project on the basis that it has taken into account the views of the community, the socio economic issues, as well as environmental impact, and asserts that the benefit to the Shetland economy and community outweighs any negative impacts that the project may produce. Shetland Islands Council urges the Scottish Minister and other relevant agencies and bodies to ensure that appropriate conditions are included in any consents issued to ensure that the project minimises any environmental impacts which might occur during its construction, operation and ultimate decommissioning phases. Mr A Doull seconded.

In support of the development, and in favour of the Motion, some Members were of the view that whilst any large development will have social, environmental and

economic impacts, consideration had to be given as to what was best for the community. Members agreed that the difficulty lay in balancing the need for development and infrastructure and the long term economic benefit, including employment opportunities, against the need to protect the built and natural environment, but that alternative sources of economic development had to be looked at, and which attract not only new business, but young people returning home. Members noted that they were today acting as consultees in the process, and that the final decision would be taken by the Energy Consents Unit, but accepted that any decision today would be of significant importance to the future of the Shetland community. Several Members expressed concern regarding the comments made on the proximity of the windfarm to settlements and the possible effects on health, and noted that there possible measures that could be taken to measure these effects or minimise their impact. In this regard, Mrs B Fullerton, asked that “and health” impacts be added to the motion, in order that any consents also address community concerns relating to the proximity of the turbines to homes. Mr R Nickerson, with the consent of his seconder, agreed to this addition.

Mr G Robinson moved that the Council adopt the recommendation in the report, namely that the Council object to the proposed development, as it is contrary to Policy GDS1 of the Shetland Structure Plan. Mrs F Grains seconded.

Speaking against the development, and in favour of the amendment, some Members said they had received a number of representations against the application, citing mainly the visual impact, but also the environmental impacts. Some Members advised that they remained unconvinced as to where the balance of the socio-economic impacts were, and expressed surprise that the removing of turbines for visual impact had already been undertaken as part of this new application. It was suggested that the visual impact in Aith and Nesting was of more concern, and if any were to be removed, that is where they should be removed from, as most people expected the turbines to be contained within the Lang Kames area. Members said that the submissions made by the objectors had been well thought out, and addressed many of the factors upon which comment had already been made over the past few months, and prior to the meeting today. It was stated that the Council should uphold its own planning policy and therefore uphold an objection to this application, adding that this was also based on the professional judgement of its Council Planning officers, and in this regard the right conclusion would be reached.

Dr J Wills gave notice of a further amendment.

On the motion of Mr G Robinson, seconded by Mrs L Baisley, the Council unanimously resolved to vote by roll call vote.

Following summing up, voting took place by roll call, and the result was as follows:

R Nickerson	Motion
F Robertson	Amendment
G Robinson	Amendment
J G Simpson	Motion
J W G Wills	Abstention
L Angus	Motion
L Baisley	Motion
J Budge	Motion

A J Cluness	Motion
A Doull	Motion
B Fullerton	Motion
F B Grains	Amendment
R Henderson	Motion

Motion (R Nickerson)	9
Amendment (G Robinson)	3
Abstention	1

Dr J Wills moved as a further amendment that this Council resolves as follows:

1. To reaffirm its support for a large windfarm development in the islands.
2. To acknowledge the efforts made by the Viking Energy project to meet the concerns of objectors.
3. To recognise that the Shetland community and the Council remains divided over this application, with many unresolved conflicts of fact and opinion.
4. To accept that there is now a public perception, in some quarters, that councillors have conflicted interests in this case, due to the multiple and overlapping roles as representatives of the community.
5. Therefore to recommend to the Energy Consents Unit that the best way to resolve the questions arising from the Viking Energy application is to hold an independent public inquiry prior to the ECU making a recommendation to the Scottish ministers.

Mr G Robinson seconded.

Following summing up, voting again took place by roll call, and the result was as follows:

R Nickerson	Motion
F Robertson	Further Amendment
G Robinson	Further Amendment
J G Simpson	Motion
J W G Wills	Further Amendment
L Angus	Motion
L Baisley	Motion
J Budge	Motion
A J Cluness	Motion
A Doull	Motion
B Fullerton	Motion
F B Grains	Further Amendment
R Henderson	Motion

Motion (R Nickerson)	9
Further Amendment (J Wills)	4

Accordingly, the motion by Mr Nickerson was declared the finding of the meeting.

The Convener acknowledged that it had been a difficult meeting, but thanked everyone for attending and for the contributions made.

Decision:

The Council **RESOLVED** that:

Shetland Islands Council re-affirms its support for the Viking Energy Project on the basis that it has taken into account the views of the community, the socio economic issues, as well as environmental impact, and asserts that the benefit to the Shetland economy and community outweighs any negative impacts that the project may produce.

Shetland Islands Council urges the Scottish Minister and other relevant agencies and bodies to ensure that appropriate conditions are included in any consents issued to ensure that the project minimises any environmental and health impacts which might occur during its construction, operation and ultimate decommissioning phases.

The Council concluded at 13.35 p.m.

.....
A J Cluness
Convener