

**Shetland Islands Council****24 February 2016****Town Hall Sub-Committee****CRP-05-16-F****Report Presented by Director – Corporate Services****Corporate Services****1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 This report proposes the establishment of a Sub-Committee to oversee progress on the conservation project relating to the Town Hall.

2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 That the Council **RESOLVE** to: -
- a) Establish a short life Sub-Committee to undertake the remit set out in Appendix 2;
 - b) Appoint Councillors as described in paragraph 4.2; and
 - c) Seek Community Council representation as described in paragraph 4.2 and held as appointed those representatives as members of the Sub-Committee.

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 At the time of restoration works to the Town Hall, a consultative committee called the Lerwick Town Hall Consultative Committee was established with a focus on the following : -
- Providing comment on proposals and subsequent monitoring of the restoration and improvement or construction works on the Town Hall;
 - Comment on proposals for the public use of the Town Hall and its facilities, including charging;
 - To consider the civic nature of use of the Town Hall particularly with regard to safe keeping and display of civic gifts, etc.

- 3.2 Although it might have been intended that the Committee would exist only so long as the construction works, which spanned most of the 1980s, were ongoing, the Committee continued to meet intermittently and its remit was later expanded to include Lystina house when that property was purchased, in the early 1990s.
- 3.3 As part of the May 2011 review of Shetland Islands Council's constitutional arrangements and establishment of functional Committees and regulatory Boards, a decision was taken to end all Sub-Committees / Forums / Panels. Any that were required to continue, therefore, could only do so if re-established by further decision of the Council. No such decision was taken in respect of the former Consultative Committee. Nevertheless, the Council was invited to make new appointments to the old Committee in the course of making appointments in accordance with a list of appointments at its statutory meeting in 2012 following the ordinary election of Councillors in May of that year. It is a moot point as to whether the act of appointing members to a Committee which had ceased to exist was sufficient to reconstitute the Committee but suffice to say that, in the following years, it never met.
- 3.4 Over the last 18 months, the Council has been receiving periodic reports on the need for further restoration / conservation works to the Town Hall, some three decades after the last significant restoration was undertaken. Although the focus has, of course, been on the cost and extent of such works, the importance of the Town Hall to Shetland as a community asset, has also been discussed. The extent of its use as such and the potential to increase its utility, caused Members from North and South wards of Lerwick and from rural wards to seek a meeting of the Consultative Committee which drew attention to the question over its status and whether its terms of reference continued to be fit for current purposes.
- 3.5 Responding to such overtures, the Convener invited Members to an informal meeting along with representatives of Lerwick Community Council towards the end of last summer. A note of the Convener's opening remarks is attached as Appendix 1. The meeting was well attended and included Councillor A Manson who recalled serving on the Committee in the 1980s and Councillor Frank Robertson who described the original origins of the Committee and the role it played given his former appointed position as County Surveyor with responsibility for the restoration of the Town Hall in the 1980s / 90s. Their accounts were supported by evidence from investigations undertaken by other Councillors, such as Councillor Wills, in relation to how, when the building was first constructed, it had benefited from substantial injections of funding from lairds / land owners and businesses in the rural areas and notable retailers from the town of Lerwick itself.
- 3.6 A part of the discussion held at the informal meeting considered the name to be given to any re-established Committee and it was overwhelmingly agreed that the term "**Lerwick** Town Hall" was seldom heard in usage and all concerned agreed that essentially the Town Hall was for the use and service of the whole of Shetland community but

that the title “Shetland’s Town Hall” was overly clumsy and simply “the Town Hall” was probably the best usage.

- 3.7 The conclusion of the informal gathering was that there was much to benefit the establishment of a formal Sub-Committee, the focus for which should be promoting the historical and cultural background to the Town Hall itself but with a strong focus on its future use and marketing the capacity of the Town Hall and all of its facilities to public of Shetland in a more active manner. All agreed that this focus would be particularly timely in view of current conservation project. The recent announcement that the building has been re-categorised as a Grade A listed building is also noteworthy.
- 3.8 The proposal that the Sub-Committee be established for the period of two years would give it sufficient time to fulfil the above objectives and would allow its work to be undertaken in parallel with the project of conservation works. It is also proposed that the membership of the Sub-Committee operate as a background steering group undertaking oversight and monitoring and periodically commenting on the progress of the project in terms of meeting its project deadlines, cost envelope, and the outcomes expected for future community use. The proposal to establish the Sub-Committee for an initial period of two years will also allow its existence to straddle two terms of the Council and any decision to continue the Sub-Committee beyond that life span would rest with the new Council and would be taken in the context of the completed project.

4.0 Proposal

- 4.1 The proposal is to establish the Sub-Committee with the attached terms of reference, attached as Appendix 2.
- 4.2 In terms of Membership, the previous Committee had involved all of Lerwick’s Members, three Members representing rural interests and two from Lerwick Community Council. In order to improve the balance and reflecting the earlier comments recognising that the building is for the use of all Shetland residents, it is proposed that the Sub-Committee should consist of: -
- Two Members from each of Lerwick South and Lerwick North wards;
 - Five Members from the remaining five wards, one from each;
 - One Community Councillor representative nominated by Lerwick Community Council (and one named substitute); and
 - One Community Councillor representative nominated by the Association of Shetland Community Councils (and one named substitute).
- 4.3 It is not intended that the Sub-Committee be given delegated powers and it will operate very much in a consultative fashion seeking input as required from other agencies with an interest in developing use of the Town Hall. However, when sitting as a Sub-Committee, its deliberations will be subject to the Council’s Standing Orders for Meetings, including proper notification procedures and open to the media and public in line with statutory requirements. Although this is a

Sub-Committee appointed by the Council it is anticipated that recommendations emanating from the Sub-Committee would be proposals that would fall within the delegated authority of the Council's Policy and Resources Committee in relation to its functional remit for all matters pertaining to Council property.

- 4.4 As a formal sub-committee of the Council, the non-elected members and substitutes will be required to abide by the rules contained in the Councillors' Code of Conduct, and will be required to register, and declare, any known interests.

5.0 Implications

Strategic

- 5.1 Delivery On Corporate Priorities – D4 – community ownership; F5 – standards of governance; F10 – communication.
- 5.2 Community /Stakeholder Issues –Community Councillor Representation is being sought for membership of the Sub-Committee.
- 5.3 Policy And/Or Delegated Authority – In terms of the Council's Scheme of Administration and Delegations, only the Council may establish a Sub-Committee of the Council.
- 5.4 Risk Management – There are no corporate or service risks associated with the establishment of the Town Hall Sub-Committee. The existence of the Sub-Committee may seek to mitigate some of the risks associated with the ongoing works in terms of ensuring stakeholder involvement and communication with the public.
- 5.5 Equalities, Health And Human Rights – None.
- 5.6 Environmental – None.

Resources

- 5.7 Financial – As an approved duty, any appointed elected Members will be entitled to claim expenses for attendance at meetings. This may result in an increase in expenditure in relation to the Members' Expenses budget. To reduce this impact, every attempt will be made to schedule meetings on the same day as other Council meetings that those Members attend. There is no provision for allowable expenses to be paid in relation to other members of the Sub-Committee.
- 5.8 Legal – None.
- 5.9 Human Resources – The decision required in this report will have some, but not a significant, impact on the resources required in Capital Programme Services [report writing] and Committee Services [servicing meetings].
- 5.10 Assets And Property – Membership of the sub-committee will form a useful steering group for matters relating to progress of the Town Hall and associated works, prior to formal reporting to the Sub-Committee.

6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1 The establishment of a formal Town Hall Sub-Committee will ensure renewed and active focus on promoting the historical and cultural background and future use of the Town Hall and all of its facilities for the benefit of the public of Shetland.

For further information please contact:
Jan Riise, Executive Manager – Governance & Law
(01595) 744551
jan.riise@shetland.gov.uk
19 February 2016

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Proposed terms of reference of establishment of the Sub-Committee

Background documents:
None.

END

Town Hall Sub-Committee

1.0 Terms of Reference

- 1.1 To consider and provide comment on proposals for restoration/improvement or essential construction works on Town Hall, Lystina House or their environs, where appropriate.
- 1.2 To consider and provide comments on any proposals relating to public use of the Town Hall, Lystina House and their facilities. This may include providing comment on the level of charges and type of promotions required to be undertaken.

[Note this excludes statutory fees or services provided by the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Service.]

- 1.3 To consider reports relating to the civic nature of the Town Hall and Lystina House, in particular with regard to the safe-keeping and display of civic gifts and other items of interest.

2.0 Delegated Authority

- 2.1 The Sub- Committee shall have no delegated authority, but shall make recommendations via the relevant officer to the appropriate Committee or to the Council regarding any proposals within the terms of reference of the Sub-Committee.

3.0 Membership

- 3.1 The Consultative Committee shall consist of:
 - Two Members from each of Lerwick South and Lerwick North wards;
 - Five Members from the remaining five wards, one from each;
 - One Community Councillor representative nominated by Lerwick Community Council (and one named substitute); and
 - One Community Councillor representative nominated by the Association of Shetland Community Councils (and one named substitute).
- 3.2 The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be an elected member, appointed by the Council from amongst those members appointed to the Sub-Committee.

4.0 Administration

- 4.1 Meetings of the Sub-Committee shall be held in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders for Meetings.

5.0 General

- 5.1 The Sub-Committee will be established for two years from the date of approval, and its continuance and/or terms of reference will be reviewed no later than February 2018.

| Version | Purpose/Changes | Author | Date |
|---------|-----------------|---------|------------|
| 0.1 | First draft | A Cogle | 19/02/2016 |
| | | | |

**Shetland Islands Council****24 February 2016****Asset Investment Plan, Gateway Process – Service Need Case Report****Report No: CPS-04-16-F****Report Presented by Executive Manager –
Capital Programme****Capital Programme Service****1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 This report presents a Service Need Case (SNC) report relating to proposed road safety proposals at Mill Brae, in Scalloway. This has been considered by the Council's Corporate Management Team (CMT) and is now being referred to the Council for a decision on funding and implementation. The SNC Report is attached as an appendix to this report.

2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 That the Council RESOLVES:
- a) To approve the project as described in Appendix A to this report for immediate implementation; and,
 - b) To agree that the Council's contribution to the cost of the project be funded from the Scottish Government's "Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets" specific grant and the projected capital underspend on equipment purchase at the Energy Recovery Plant during 2015/16.

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 On 24 March 2010 (min ref 47/10), the Council adopted a 'Gateway' process, drawing on national and best practice guidance, to ensure the robustness of all capital projects.
- 3.2 Subsequently, on 19 May 2010 (min ref 75/10), the Council agreed a procedure for prioritising those projects that have been approved through the Gateway process. A key principle in that procedure is that

the Council's AIP is re-prioritised on an annual basis, however SNCs can be processed at any time. When approving SNCs, Members are agreeing that the project should go ahead, but are not usually making a decision as to the timing or agreeing that funding is available to allow them to commence.

3.3 Due to the timescales dictated by the external funding available to part fund this project, approval is being sought in this case to proceed with the project with immediate effect.

3.4 In order to develop this project, a number of work streams have had to be pursued:

3.4.1 Design

The design was necessary to be able to estimate the scheme cost and secure the funding offer from Sustrans Scotland and incorporates the removal of the existing parapet wall on the east side of the road, construction of an earthwork embankment and the provision of a new kerbline and 2.0 metre wide footpath on said embankment. This is now complete and the project put out to tender to obtain a contract price, and to be able to make an immediate start to comply with Sustrans budget requirements to have works complete by mid May 2016, should the Council's funding element be approved. The tenders are due back on 23 February 2016.

3.4.2 Sourcing External Funding

The opportunity to fund part of these works from external funding arose during a visit by Sustrans Scotland to inspect the footpath/cycleway around the Clickimin Loch, which was 50% funded by them, following its successful completion. The estimated **total cost** for the Mill Brae works is **£167,000**. However, Sustrans Scotland has agreed to provide 50% of this total in the form of a match funded grant. This charitable organisation recognises that the scheme would contribute to their aims of "encouraging people to travel more sustainably within communities to workplaces, schools, etc" and "providing safe routes to everyday destinations." It is proposed that the council's contribution to the project will be funded from **£35,000** "Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets" specific grant from the Scottish Government and **£48,500** from a projected capital underspend on equipment purchase at the Energy Recovery Plant in 2015/16.

3.4.3 Land Acquisition

The costs associated with land acquisition have been included in the total cost of £167,000. Negotiations with the landowner have been ongoing for some time but verbal agreement has now been reached. The matter has been passed to Governance and Law to finalise the acquisition.

3.5 These activities will shortly be concluded and there is the opportunity to achieve a long-awaited road safety improvement that takes advantage of significant external funding.

4.0 Implications

Strategic

- 4.1 Delivery On Corporate Priorities – The Gateway Process contributes to maintaining a 5-year Asset Investment Plan that is financially sustainable. The project and budget proposed in this report supports ‘Our Plan 2016 to 2020’ by helping to ensure that “There will be transport arrangements in place that meet people’s needs and that we can afford to maintain in the medium term”.
- 4.2 Community/ Stakeholder Issues – Improvements to pedestrian safety in this area have been a long standing aspiration of the Scalloway community.
- 4.3 Policy And/ Or Delegated Authority – Approval of the financial strategy and budget framework is a matter reserved for the Council.
- 4.4 Risk Management – There have been concerns from the local community in terms of pedestrian safety in this area for many years. A recent accident has heightened concerns.

Failure to secure a sustainable use of reserves will result in the Council's financial policy not being achieved.

- 4.5 Equalities, Health And Human Rights – None.
- 4.6 Environmental – None.

Resources

4.7 Financial –

- 4.7.1 The project in this report has been assessed against the objectives of the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- 4.7.2 The estimated total cost of the works and land at Mill Brae is £167,000. Sustrans have agreed to fund 50% of the project. The Council will be required to contribute the remaining funding. It is proposed that the council’s contribution to the project be funded from £35,000 “Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets” specific grant from the Scottish Government and £48,500 from a projected capital underspend on equipment purchase at the Energy Recovery Plant in 2015/16. Members should consider whether this project is in line with Council priorities prior to agreeing to accept the funding.
- 4.8 Legal – Governance and Law provide advice and assistance on the full range of Council services, duties and functions including those included in this report.
- 4.9 Human Resources – None.

- 4.10 Assets And Property – The proposals referred to in this report are dependent on the acquisition of sufficient land. Negotiations relating to that acquisition have been progressed by the Asset and Properties team, based on a design produced by Roads Service. This design has been carried out using existing in-house resources.

5.0 Conclusions

- 5.1 This report presents a project that CMT has approved for consideration by Members. The Council is asked to approve the proposals, as set out in Appendix A for immediate implementation.

For further information please contact:

Robert Sinclair, Executive Manager – Capital Programme

Tel: 01595 74 4144 Email: robert.sinclair@shetland.gov.uk

Appendices:

Appendix A – Service Need Case

END

Service Need Case – A970 Millbrae, Scalloway Footway Improvements**1. Introduction**

- Brief history: Road safety on the A970 Lerwick to Scalloway Road at Millbrae has been a cause of concern for a number of years. The Community Council has regularly expressed its concerns regarding the relatively narrow carriageway and the single narrow footpath that runs along its east side. The main issue being that Millbrae is on the route between the new housing developments at East Voe and Scalloway School. Due to the narrow footway there is at the very least a perceived safety problem when pedestrians meet and are required to pass each other. This can be exacerbated when larger vehicles, on route to the harbour, also meet on the relatively narrow carriageway. The addition of pupils walking to and from the school to this situation is a safety concern. A further concern is that the narrow footway, together with a wall adjacent to it on the landward side, makes it difficult for the footpath gritter to spread grit or clear snow from the path in the winter months.
- Background: The safety concerns came to prominence again in 2010 with a letter from residents of East Voe requesting a reduced speed limit, Pelican crossing and/or a school crossing attendant. A part-time 20 mph limit was already in place in the vicinity of the school and national guidance indicated that it would not be appropriate to extend this. Neither did Millbrae meet the criteria for the provision of a Pelican crossing. However, I understand that those making these representations were satisfied when it was confirmed that their children would be allocated the spare seating in the school bus from Sundibanks and Uradale. It was also at this time that the existing 30 mph limit was extended into the B9074 towards Eastvoe and along the A970 to the B9074 junction to Asta. The 40 mph speed limit on the approach to the East Voe junction was also extended up the hill to the Scord bend.
- Brief description of issues to be resolved: Improvements to Millbrae were assessed and included in the prioritised list of capital road schemes approved by the Environment and Transport Committee on 21 January 2015. Its position on this list, having been scored on a number of criteria (including cost, safety, environment, corporate aims), is third out of a total of 120 identified schemes. Therefore, the issue to be resolved is a widening of the footway from its current width of 1.2 metres to a more standard width of at least 1.8 metres that would be used if the road and footway were constructed today or wider if it is to attract external funding. This would address the perceived and real safety concerns associated with the existing narrow footway and its location on the route to Scalloway School. The opportunity would also be taken to repair approximately 50 metres of damaged kerbline that has over the years subsided and now has an upstand less than the desired 125mm.

2. Statutory Requirements

- The Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 requires the Council to manage and maintain the public road network. The former would include road improvements when considered necessary.

- Section 25 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 places a duty on the Roads Authority to “provide, wherever it appears to them necessary or desirable for the safety or convenience of pedestrians so to do, proper and sufficient footways for public roads.”

3. Full Definition and Justification of Service Need

- Widening of the Millbrae footway would meet the statutory requirement detailed in section 2.
- The project is required to maintain or improve the level of service currently provided which contributes to accessibility, social inclusion and road safety.

4. Project Option Appraisal to Meet Identified Service Needs

- **Do nothing:** This would result in continued safety concerns and negative implications for accessibility, social inclusion and revenue expenditure.
- **Undertake maintenance:** Maintenance to the kerbline has been in abeyance while attempts have been made to identify a funding source for improvements to Millbrae. The revenue expenditure would be in the region of £5,000 but the repair of this defect would not address the safety concerns presented by the narrow footway.
- **Footway widening:** This is the removal of the existing parapet wall on the east side of the road, construction of an earthwork embankment and the provision of a new kerbline and 2.0 metre wide footpath on said embankment. This would address all of the actual safety issues and the majority of the perceived concerns. The estimated **total cost** for these works is **£167,000**. However, Sustrans Scotland has agreed to provide 50% of this total in the form of a match funded grant. This charitable organisation recognises that the scheme would contribute to their aims of “encouraging people to travel more sustainably within communities to workplaces, schools, etc” and “providing safe routes to everyday destinations.” It is anticipated that the council’s contribution to the project be funded from **£35,000** “Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets” specific grant from the Scottish Government and **£48,500** from a projected capital underspend on equipment purchase at the Energy Recovery Plant in 2015/16.
- **Carriageway re-alignment and footway widening:** This is similar to the above scheme but would re-align the carriageway to the west between its junctions with East Voe and the Upper Scalloway roads to create space for widening the footpath. This would again address all the actual safety issues and most of the perceived problems. It would remove the need for an embankment on the north section of the scheme but this would still be required at the south end opposite the school buildings. The re-alignment would have to extend beyond the East Voe junction to enable a tie-in to be made that complies with design guidance. The opportunity would be taken to widen the re-aligned section from 6.0 to 6.5 metres. This scheme would also require less land take from the park on the east side of the road. Therefore, the estimated cost for these works is **£410,000**. It is possible that the

grant awarded by Sustrans would still be 50% match funding but the larger the carriageway element in a scheme the less likely it is to be successful in competition with other schemes. The “Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets” funding would still be available to contribute to this scheme. Therefore, in the best case the funding required from the Council’s Capital Programme would be **£170,000** but **£375,000** in the worst case.

The “**Footway Widening**” is the preferred option as the minimal additional benefits of the “Carriageway Re-alignment and Footway Widening” do not justify the substantial additional cost.

5. Funding

- Statement as to likely source(s) of funding for:
 - Future studies: The preliminary design for the two proposed improvement schemes has already been done. The detailed design of any approved improvement scheme would still be required.
 - Implementation: The total estimated cost is **£167,000** for design completion, land acquisition and construction in 2015/16. Sustrans Scotland has agreed to provide 50% of this total in the form of a **match funded grant**. The remaining costs are to be requested to be funded from the Scottish Government’s “Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets” specific grant of £35,000; and £48,500 from a projected Capital underspend on equipment purchase at the Energy Recovery Plant.

- Assessment of revenue implications:

The short term revenue costs would be reduced as there would no longer be a need to repair 50 metres of kerblin at a cost of **£5,000**. The existing parapet wall is in need of immediate repair in places due to crumbling blockwork. These spot repairs would also cost in the region of **£5,000**. Therefore, the total short term revenue savings would be **£10,000**. In addition there would be long term savings of up to **£1,000** per annum due to a reduction in the time spent clearing snow. This is dependent on weather conditions.

- Assessment of further capital implications:

There is also a need to replace several existing streetlights at the south end of this proposed widening. The proposal would require these to be swapped to the east side of the road to free up space on the west footpath at the frontage of the school. The capital “savings” for these streetlights would be **£4,000**.

There would in the medium term be a requirement for a “service need case” to fund the maintenance and “life extension” of the parapet and retaining sections of the wall. There is a need to render the south face of the wall as it is showing signs of deterioration along its entire length and would need to be protected to prevent the loss of numerous blocks and the eventual complete replacement. Rendering the

300 metre long parapet wall would cost approximately **£15,000**. The cost of rendering the higher retaining wall would be an additional **£20,000**. Failure to do so may require the installation of galvanised steel pedestrian barriers to replace the parapet costing in the region of **£50,000**. Rebuilding the parapet wall with blockwork is not an option due to the problem of snow building up against the wall when it is ploughed. Should the retaining wall be allowed to deteriorate the most appropriate option would be to demolish the entire wall and replace it with an embankment. The outcome and cost would be as per the “Footway Widening” option detailed above.

In summary the funding source and future revenue and capital cost avoidance associated with this project is shown below:

| | £ |
|---|------------------|
| Total Capital Cost | 167,000 |
| Funding Source: | |
| Sustrans 50% Grant Funding | (83,500) |
| Scottish Government Cycling Walking Safer Streets Grant | (35,000) |
| SIC 15/16 Capital Savings | (48,500) |
| Total Funding | (167,000) |
| Revenue and Capital Expenditure which will not be required if project were to proceed | |
| Kerblin Repairs | 5,000 |
| Parapet Wall Repairs | 5,000 |
| Streetlight Replacements | 4,000 |
| Parapet Wall Rendering | 35,000 |
| Total Avoided Cost | 49,000 |

6. Reference to Corporate and Service Plans

- Shetland Transport Strategy. Improvements to all aspects of the local road network are supported in Section 7.
- Shetland Local Plan. The Project will sustain the transport links highlighted in the Local Plan.
- Shetland Single Outcome Agreement. This project is in line with the need to ensure good, safe access for all.
- Roads Service Plan. This identifies the need to maintain the existing road network and make improvements where appropriate.
- Roads Service Plan. This identifies the need to make the most economic, efficient, and effective use of our physical assets in a way that reflects local needs.

7. Impacts on Other Services (Internal/External)

- Benefits: Pedestrians will benefit from the improved safety of the having a wider path, limited benefit to any Council employee using or working on the footway (eg on their way to the school, cleansing, winter maintenance).
- Adverse effects: No adverse affects for individuals or other services have been identified.

8. Socio- Economic Considerations

- A widened footway would improve pedestrian safety thereby reducing actual and perceived safety concerns. This would encourage more walking which is recognised as the most sustainable method of travel. Increased walking rather than the use of a car or bus may also have health benefits.
- Social inclusion may also be improved for those who do not have ready access to a vehicle and are currently reluctant to use the narrow footway.
- Higher maintenance costs for the parapet/retaining walls, streetlighting, kerbing and winter service if the footpath widening scheme is not done.

9. Stakeholder and Client Consultation

- Discussions with Scalloway Community Council, on their concerns regarding the narrow footway, have been held already at a number of meetings. There has also been regular correspondence over the years with the Community Council and the public. There is no requirement for a “formal” consultation process for this type of work.

10. Participation by Others

- Sustrans have already agreed to provide 50% match funding for the footway widening scheme. The Scottish Government have already allocated £35,000 to Shetland Islands Council for “Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets” that would be requested to be used to part fund this scheme.

11. Risk Analysis

- A high level risk is the continued road safety issue for pedestrians, including school pupils, if the footway is not widened to a suitable width.
- There would also be a continuation of “perceived” road safety concerns if improvements are not progressed.
- The unnecessary expenditure of revenue funding for maintenance works could be avoided if the widening scheme is done.
- There is a risk that the land may not be available in time to meet the funding deadlines. **The land purchase can only be progressed following agreement of funding.**

12. Timing

- **Legislative Drivers:** The legislation requires the local roads authority to provide proper and sufficient footways, where desirable for the safety of pedestrians. This would indicate that the replacement of the existing inadequate footway is urgent.
- **Availability of funding and other resources:** Funding would be sought to place the improvement in the Capital Programme probably as a “named scheme.” Match funding in the form of a 50% grant has been agreed by Sustrans Scotland. Design and supervision staff are available in the Roads Service.
- There are no linked projects but if this scheme did not progress there would be a requirement for a separate “service need case” to fund the maintenance of the parapet and retaining walls.

13. Brief for Future Study

- **Site Investigation:** This has been done.
- **Preliminary Design/Investigation of Identified Options:** The preliminary design for each option has been done. More detailed design would be required to facilitate land acquisition.
- **Budget Estimates for Identified Options:** The estimates for both options are the final version.
- **Assessment of Likely Planning Implications:** The Planning Service has advised that planning consent would not be required for the proposed scheme.
- **Utilities:** The proposal has little excavation so these are unlikely to be affected. However, the various companies would be consulted prior to commencement on site.

14. Third Party Review

- There is normally no requirement for a third party review for this type of work.
- Sustrans Scotland, a charitable organisation, is involved as a funding provider.

15. Recommendations

The total cost of the scheme to widen the Millbrae footway from 1.2 to 2.0 metres would be **£167,000** with a 50% match funded grant already agreed with Sustrans Scotland (requiring completion of works by May 2016). I recommend on practical, technical and socio-economic grounds that **£35,000** funding should be requested to be allocated from the Scottish Government’s “Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets” specific grant and **£48,500** be allocated from Council savings anticipated on a projected Capital underspend on equipment purchase at the Energy Recovery Plant. In addition to the pedestrian safety benefits the proposal would realise revenue savings in excess of **£10,000**. It would also avoid the need for a separate “service need case” of up to **£70,000** for the maintenance and “life extension” of the wall. Failure to maintain the wall may, within 10 years, require funding of **£167,000** at current rates to remove the wall and replace it with an embankment.

16. Appendices

- None.



Shetland Islands Council

24 February 2016

Chair's Report – Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016

Asset Investment Plan, Gateway Process – Service Need Case Reports

Report No. SIC-0224-CPS-01-16

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider recommendations from the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee, in relation to a report requiring a Council decision.
- 1.2 The Committee considered a report from the Executive Manager – Capital Programme which presented two projects that have been considered by the Council's Corporate Management Team (CMT) based on the submission of Service Need Case (SNC) reports, namely the Toft Pier and the A970 Levenwick Capital Improvements.
- 1.3 Following discussion and a vote on both projects, the Policy and Resources Committee recommended approval of both projects, subject to the availability of funding.

2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 That the Council **RESOLVES** to adopt the recommendations from the Policy and Resources Committee, namely that:
 - A new build Toft Pier be approved and scheduled in any future Asset Investment Plan (AIP) subject to the availability of funding.
 - The A970 Levenwick Capital Improvements project be approved and scheduled in any future Asset Investment Plan (AIP) subject to the availability of funding.

3.0 Report

- 3.1 The Committee noted the comments and/or recommendations from the author and CMT as follows:

3.2 Toft Pier

- Toft Pier is nearing the end of its working life and it has proved necessary to close the pier to vehicular traffic due to its structural condition. The pier continues to be used by small fishing craft, but income recovered by the Council as a result of this activity is minimal averaging around £2.5k per annum.
- Four options have been considered in the SNC, namely:
 - Do nothing (£50k)
 - Demolish (£500k-£750k)
 - Repair inner quay face and rock armour outer face (£950k)
 - Replace with new structure of similar size (£1.5m-£2m)
- Even if measures were put in place to increase income, there is no financial case to support either of the repair options, but recognising that the pier provides a berthing facility for 5 fishing vessels the SNC identifies an alternative to maintain the facility at lower cost, that of adding a berthing pontoon. It recommends a variation to the 'Do Nothing' option by decommissioning the existing pier but also adding a berthing pontoon.
- The estimated cost of this pontoon is £100k, over and above the £50k decommissioning costs, but feasibility work would be required to verify the practicality of this proposal and to ensure that the cost estimate is accurate.
- If income estimates for landing fees were at increased levels, as described in the SNC, then the estimated cost of £100k would only be recovered over a period of 7 to 8 years. At current levels of income the payback period is 40 years. These estimates exclude ongoing revenue costs that may need to be taken into account.

3.3. A970 Levenwick Capital Improvements

- In 2009 a "Road Safety Check" was undertaken on the A970 Lerwick to Sumburgh Road above Levenwick following a traffic accident that had resulted in expressions of concerns from local Councillors and members of the public.
- Following another incident in 2015, Environment and Transport Committee asked that a service needs case, taking account of the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) process, be prepared and submitted for the funding required to design a major capital improvement scheme to tender ready stage.
- The STAG appraisal has been completed. It has concluded that the most expensive option considered, which would improve the A970's alignment and width to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standard over a 2.26 kilometre section of the road above Levenwick would achieve more of the planning objectives than the other options, but that the safety, economic, social and environmental benefits to be gained from this high cost project are all minimal.
- On that basis, the scheme cannot be recommended by officers for capital investment.

- 3.4 Copies of the report have been previously circulated or can be accessed via the Council's website at the link shown below, or by contacting Committee Services.
- 3.5 The Chair will present any further information to the Council as to the debate or issues that the Committee considered.

4.0 Implications

- 4.1 Detailed information concerning the proposals was contained within the report already circulated to Members, including the strategic and resources implications for the Council.
- 4.2 There are no additional implications to be considered by the Council.

For further information please contact:

Mr G Robinson, Chair of Policy and Resources Committee
17 February 2016

Background documents:

Report CPS-01-16-F to Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016

<http://www.shetland.gov.uk/coins/submissiondocuments.asp?submissionid=18883>

END



Shetland Islands Council

24 February 2016

Joint Chairs' Report:

Environment and Transport Committee – 20 January 2016

Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016

Policy for the Construction of Roads Suitable for Adding to the list of Public Roads Adoption of the National Roads Development Guide and Local Variations

Report No. SIC-0224-RD-02

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider recommendations from the Chairs of the Environment and Transport Committee and Policy and Resources Committee, in relation to a report requiring a Council decision.
- 1.2 The Committees considered a report which presented proposals for the Council to change the current design guidance document from the 'Strathclyde Design Guide' to the 'National Roads Development Guide' with 'Local Variations for the Shetland Islands Council Area'. The design guidance document governs the design and construction standards of development roads suitable for adding to the list of Public Roads (i.e. adopted by the Council).

2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 That the Council **RESOLVES** to adopt the recommendations from the Environment and Transport Committee and Policy and Resources Committee, namely to:
 - adopt the National Roads Development Guide as policy;
 - approve the National Roads Development Guide: Local Variations for the Shetland Islands Area document as policy amendments to the National Roads Development Guide;
 - NOTE that the National Roads Development Guide is an evolving document that will be updated;

- INSTRUCT the Roads Service to update the National Roads Development Guide: Local Variations for the Shetland Islands Area document as amendments to the National Roads Development Guide as appropriate; and
- NOTE that the Roads Service will consult, where appropriate, with the Executive Manager – Planning Service and representatives of the local construction industry over any future amendments to the local variations to the National Roads Development Guide.

3.0 Report

- 3.1 The adoption of the NRDG and local variations as clear policy on both the design process and technical requirements for development roads helps to promote existing Council policies, meet statutory requirements, and supports a more holistic and integrated approach to the planning and approvals process.
- 3.7 Copies of the report have been previously circulated or can be accessed via the Council's website at the link shown below, or by contacting Committee Services.
- 3.8 The Chairs will present any further information to the Council as to the debate or issues that the Committees considered.

4.0 Implications

- 4.1 Detailed information concerning the proposals was contained within the report already circulated to Members, including the strategic and resources implications for the Council.
- 4.2 There are no additional implications to be considered by the Council.

For further information please contact:

Mr M Stout, Chair of Environment and Transport Committee
 Mr G Robinson, Chair of Policy and Resources Committee
 17 February 2016

Background documents:

Report RD-02-16-F: Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016

<http://www.shetland.gov.uk/coins/submissiondocuments.asp?submissionid=18882>
 END



Shetland Islands Council

24 February 2016

Joint Chairs' Report:

Education and Families Committee – 19 January 2016

Environment and Transport Committee – 20 January 2016

Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016

Review: School Transport Policy

Report No. SIC-0224-CS-02

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider recommendations from the Chairs of the Education and Families Committee, Environment and Transport Committee and Policy and Resources Committee, in relation to a report requiring a Council decision.
- 1.2 The Committees considered a report which presented a reviewed and updated School Transport Policy.

2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 That the Council **RESOLVES** to adopt the recommendations from the Education and Families Committee, Environment and Transport Committee and Policy and Resources Committee, namely to approve the proposed updated School Transport Policy.

3.0 Report

- 3.1 The Shetland School Transport Policy has not been reviewed since 2007.
- 3.2 The updated School Transport Policy does state that school transport will only be provided from one address and will not be provided from multiple addresses, in line with the Council's Admissions Policy.

Parents who choose to send their child, through a placing request, to a school other than their designated school will be responsible for their child's transport. The exception to that is for any pupil in Secondary 4, who will qualify for school transport as a result of a placing request.

- 3.3 The updated School Transport Policy sets out the process to be followed for parents wishing to access vacant seats on school transport vehicles for their children. Education Authorities are required to offer any vacant seats on school transport to pupils who live on a route but within walking distance of their school.
- 3.4 The updated School Transport Policy sets out the process to be followed where a Road Safety Audit may be required on any given route, or part of a route.
- 3.5 The updated School Transport Policy also gives a commitment that where alterations to school transport arrangements are necessary, pupils and parents/carers will be given as much notice as possible and unless there are safety reasons, changes will take effect as soon as practicable, or when the contract becomes due for renewal.
- If the change is significant pupils, parents, transport operators and communities will be consulted in line with the objectives of this Policy. The Council will try, where practicable, to give a term's notice of any change.
- 3.6 No change in entitlement to school transport has been proposed within the updated School Transport Policy.
- 3.7 Copies of the report have been previously circulated or can be accessed via the Council's website at the link shown below, or by contacting Committee Services.
- 3.8 The Chairs will present any further information to the Council as to the debate or issues that the Committees considered.

4.0 Implications

- 4.1 Detailed information concerning the proposals was contained within the report already circulated to Members, including the strategic and resources implications for the Council.
- 4.2 There are no additional implications to be considered by the Council.

For further information please contact:

Ms V Wishart, Chair of Education and Families Committee
Mr M Stout, Chair of Environment and Transport Committee
Mr G Robinson, Chair of Policy and Resources Committee
17 February 2016

Background documents:

Report CS-02-16-F to Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016
<http://www.shetland.gov.uk/coins/submissiondocuments.asp?submissionid=18881>

END



Shetland Islands Council

24 February 2016

Chair's Report – Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016

Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2016/17

Report No. SIC-0224-F-004

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider a recommendation from the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee, in relation to a report requiring a Council decision.
- 1.2 The Committee considered a report from the Executive Manager - Finance, which presented an Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy for the Council for the financial year 2016/17. The report also included certain clauses, policy statements and practices to be adopted in line with the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Services 2011.
- 1.3 In line with the Scottish Minister's consent under The Local Government Investments (Scotland) Regulations 2010 an Annual Investment Strategy must be reported to the Council.

2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 That the Council **RESOLVES** to adopt the recommendation from the Policy and Resources Committee, namely to:
 - Approve the Annual Investment Strategy Statement to be followed for the financial year 2016/17.
 - Approve the Treasury Management Strategy to be followed for the financial year 2016/17.
 - Approve the Treasury Management Prudential Indicators for 2015/16 to 2018/19.
 - Review the four clauses within the CIPFA Code of Practice.
 - Review the Treasury Management Policy Statement.
 - Review the Statement of Treasury Management Practices.

3.0 Report

- 3.1 The Investment Strategy meets the requirements of the Minister's consent and complies with CIPFA's Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Services 2011.
- 3.2 The CIPFA Code also suggests that the Council should review its approved clauses, its Treasury Management Policy Statement and its Treasury Management Practices Statement.
- 3.3 Copies of the report have been previously circulated or can be accessed via the Council's website at the link shown below, or by contacting Committee Services.
- 3.4 The Chair will present any further information to the Council as to the debate or issues that the Committee considered.

4.0 Implications

- 4.1 Detailed information concerning the proposals was contained within the report already circulated to Members, including the strategic and resources implications for the Council.
- 4.2 There are no additional implications to be considered by the Council.

For further information please contact:

Mr G Robinson, Chair of Policy and Resources Committee
15 February 2016

Background documents:

Report F-004-F to Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016

<http://www.shetland.gov.uk/coins/submissiondocuments.asp?submissionid=18880>

END



Shetland Islands Council

24 February 2016

Joint Chairs' Report:

Special Education and Families Committee – 11 February 2016

(including Shetland College Board members)

Shetland College Lecturers' JCC – 11 February 2016

Employees' JCC – 12 February 2016

Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016

Review of Tertiary Education in Shetland – Integration Proposals Report

Report No. SIC-0224-DV-11

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider recommendations from the Chairs of the Education and Families Committee (including Shetland College Board), Shetland College Lecturers' JCC, Employees' JCC and Policy and Resources Committee, in relation to a report requiring a Council decision.
- 1.2 The Committees considered a report which presented the Shetland Tertiary Education, Research and Training (STERT) Draft Integration Proposals Report.

2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 That the Council **RESOLVES**, having taking account of the views of the Committees, to confirm the proposed next steps towards a single governance and delivery model for Tertiary Education in Shetland, as set out in section 3.4 in the original report, namely by :
 - Implementing an **Integrated Management Structure** across all local institutions;
 - **Joining up Governance Arrangements** better between the Shetland College Board and the NAFC Board;
 - **Promoting Collaborative Working** on the ground across and between all our staff and students, and;
 - Establishing as much confidence as possible about **Medium Term Funding** from all of the key public funding bodies for Tertiary Education in Shetland.
- 2.2 The Council **RESOLVES** to delegate authority to the Director of Development Services to progress their implementation.

3.0 Detail

3.1 Below are the decisions from the Committees:

Special Education and Families Committee – 11 February 2016: *(and members of Shetland College Board)*

The Education and Families Committee noted the information in the report concerning the proposed next steps towards an integrated governance and delivery model, as set out in Section 3.4 of the report. The following points were made:

- The Committee commented on the need to focus on the following, and to ensure that they were seen as a priority for the immediate future and the way forward:
 - Establishing the appropriate governance arrangements, and looking to other models – such as the Integration Joint Board Shadow Board arrangements – to ensure that there was parity in delegated authority between both the College Board and the Shetland Fisheries Training Centre Trust.
 - Moving ahead with the recruitment of a Joint Principal, ensuring that they are given the opportunity to consider the best way to finalise the new management structure, taking into account the views of staff.
 - Ensuring that Council funding will be available for the medium-term transitional phase.

Shetland College Lecturers' JCC (CLJCC) - 11 February 2016:

The CLJCC noted the information in the report concerning the proposed next steps towards an integrated governance and delivery model, as set out in Section 3.4 of the report, and noted the comments made by the Education and Families Committee.

The CLJCC commented on the following:

- It was requested that a staff and learner survey, similar to the Council's recent employee survey, be carried out over a period of time – around one year - after the new structures have been put in place.
- The Partnership Board had agreed that an amendment should be made to Section 18 of the key findings of the Draft Integration Proposals Document appended to the report, namely that "...the annual efficiency savings released by having a more streamlined senior management team *should* be available to support further change.". In addition, it was felt that it was misleading to state that the £200k annual savings from the reduced employee costs, referred to in this document, would be efficiency savings, as they would require to be reallocated as part of the change process. It

was further commented that it would be difficult to make informed decisions whether the proposed changes would be more effective/cheaper given that most of the key details had yet to emerge.

- Concern was expressed regarding the inclusion of the financial forecasts, as it was felt that they were illustrative and aspirational rather than absolute forecasts.
- The financial results of Shetland College for the three years ended 31 July 2014 were also questioned, as it was noted that expenditure included IAS 19 pension costs, but the narrative relating to these results indicated that IAS 19 pension costs were excluded. It was understood that IAS pension costs were not reported to the SFC by any other colleges in Scotland and given that the figure for 2014/15 was £741,447, this would give an unfavourable financial picture of the College.
- It was commented that the previous joint headship of the colleges had been unsuccessful because governance from the two separate Boards of Management had not provided effective support and supervision, and that any new governance arrangements should be in place before the appointment of a new joint principal.

Employees' JCC (EJCC) – 12 February 2016:

The Union side put forward a number of questions, comments and suggestions which were responded to by the Director of Development Services.

The EJCC noted the information in the report concerning the proposed next steps towards an integrated governance and delivery model, as set out in Section 3.4 of the report.

Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016:

The Committee noted the information in the report concerning the proposed next steps towards an integrated governance and delivery model, as set out in Section 3.4 of the report, and supported the comments made by the Education and Families Committee.

- The Committee also stressed the urgency for a decision to be made, and to go forward to appoint a Joint Principal.

3.2 Copies of the report have been previously circulated or can be accessed via the Council's website at the link shown below, or by contacting Committee Services.

3.3 The Chairs will present any further information to the Council as to the debate or issues that the Committees considered.

4.0 Implications

- 4.1 Detailed information concerning the proposals was contained within the report already circulated to Members, including the strategic and resources implications for the Council.
 - 4.2 There are no additional implications to be considered by the Council.
-

For further information please contact:

Ms V Wishart, Chair of Education and Families Committee
Mr G Smith, Chair of the Shetland College Lecturers' JCC
Mr C Smith, Chair of the Employees' JCC
Mr G Robinson, Chair of Policy and Resources Committee
16 February 2016

Background documents:

Report DV-11-16 to Policy and Resources Committee – 15 February 2016
<http://www.shetland.gov.uk/coins/submissiondocuments.asp?submissionid=18878>
END