

Lerwick Community Council

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 4 MAY 2026
AT LERWICK TOWN HALL MEETING ROOM/MS TEAMS AT 6.00PM

1. Chair's Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed all attendees.

2. Apologies for Absence

Present

Jim Anderson (Chair)
Shayne McLeod (Vice Chair)
Brian Harris
Scott Nicolson
Andy Carter
Karen Fraser
Amanda Hawick
Diana Winfield
Cheryl Palmer-Johnson
Brian Smith
Duncan Swainston
Graham Nicolson
Ian Walterson

In attendance

Dawn Ratter (Clerk)
Steve Mathieson
Michael Duncan
Nicole Sim
Shetland News
*Shetland Times
Neil Hutcheson

Apologies

Robert Leask
Talitha Lee
Panda Anderson
Police Scotland

Ex-Officio

Cllr. Dennis Leask (arrived 18.15)
Cllr. Stephen Leask
*Cllr. Neil Pearson
Cllr. Gary Robinson
*Cllr. Cecil Smith
Cllr. Arwed Wenger (arrived 18.25)

3. Declarations of Interest

Item 6 - DW

Item 11 - Cllr. C Smith

4. Minutes from meeting held for approval

4.1 Monday 7 April 2026

The minutes were approved.

Approved by: SN

Seconded by: AC

JA advised that in relation to the Marine Works Licence for the Tagdale site, a small section of the red line boundary extends into the Lerwick Community Council area. It was noted that Planning has confirmed that this section does fall within the LCC boundary.

5. Police Report

5.1 February/March 2026

BH be interested to know if the 5 cases of fraud were connected or unrelated.

6. SIC Roads – 20mph Limits in Lerwick (Attendance from Neil Hutcheson)

The Chair advised of a late addition to the agenda and welcomed Neil Hutcheson to the meeting.

Mr Hutcheson noted he was providing an update ahead of preparing his next report to Committee, having last attend approximately two years ago when initial proposals were discussed.

Mr Hutcheson outlined that proposals are driven by Scottish Government policy promoting 20mph limits and Active Travel, with the aim of improving safety and encouraging walking and cycling. He advised that reducing speed limits along typically results in only marginal reduction in speeds, and that physical traffic calming measures are generally required to achieve compliance.

Mr Hutcheson further advised that proposals relating to traffic calming on Gilbertson Road had previously been presented to Council. While there were a number of objections, the overall view of Councillors was that the proposals should be supported, with particular emphasis on the need for a 20mph limit in the vicinity of the school.

Members expressed general support for 20mph limits but raised significant concerns regarding the extent and necessity of associated traffic calming measures.

Burgh Road

Mr Hutcheson outlines proposals including a flat-topped hump with a zebra crossing and additional measures between Montfield Lane and King Haakon Street. It was noted that 11 households had objected and that there have been no recorded accidents in this area over the past 25 years.

BS noted he was not aware of complaints regarding reduced speed limits, but there was clear unhappiness about traffic calming measures such as humps.

GN expressed concern at the number of proposed crossings, suggesting this may be excessive.

BH expressed support for a crossing between Cockatoo Brae and Burgh Road.

South Road

Mr Hutcheson advised that proposals include a 20mph limit extending south of Cairnfield Road, alongside traffic calming measures. Consultation generated a significant number of responses, many relating to this section.

BS reiterated that objections centre on traffic calming rather than speed limits.

DW raised concerns regarding accessibility at the Sletts Road/Bell's Road junction, particularly for wheelchair users due to gradients and pavement conditions. Mr Hutcheson acknowledged these concerns and advised that accessibility considerations would form part of the detailed design process.

GN queried the necessity of certain crossings, particularly out with school hours. Mr Hutcheson advised that crossings are intended to support safer pedestrian movement generally and encourage active travel, not solely at school times.

AC highlighted safety concerns at the Sletts Road/Burgh Road crossing, particularly vehicles accelerating after leaving the 20mph zone. Mr Hutcheson advised that traffic calming measures are intended to maintain lower speeds consistently along the route, rather than at isolated points.

Mr Hutcheson indicated that, given the level of objections, traffic calming measures on South Road were unlikely to be recommended at this stage.

Gilbertson Road / Bell's Brae Primary School

Members raised ongoing concerns about safety around Bell's Brae Primary School, including congestion, unsafe parking, and pedestrian risk.

CPJ queried implementation timescales. Mr Hutcheson advised that timescales are dependent on Committee approval and prioritisation within the wider programme of works.

CLlr. S. Leask asked whether the measures would encourage active travel among pupils; Mr Hutcheson advised that the intention is to improve safety perception and encourage walking. Mr Hutcheson advised that improving perceived safety is a key factor in encouraging walking, alongside complementary measures such as improved paths.

AH stressed that a crossing at the south end of Gilbertson Road is essential, noting increased traffic and insufficient parking since the school was built.

GN described the area as particularly challenging for drivers.

There was strong consensus that targeted measures in the vicinity of the school are necessary and should be prioritised.

King Harald Street

Mr Hutcheson outlined proposals to introduce a 20mph limit and associated traffic calming measures.

Members noted that only three slight injury accidents have been recorded over a 25-year period.

SM queried why measures were located close to junctions. Mr Hutcheson advised that the proposals are within the limits of current guidance. He noted that parking is already prohibited near junctions, which helps minimise any additional impact on parking, and that these factors are considered and balanced as part of the design process.

AH raised concerns regarding winter conditions and whether humps could create additional hazards, while supporting safety improvements in principle.

DW highlighted accessibility concerns, particularly for those with visual impairments or using guide dogs, suggesting fewer, clearly identifiable crossings would be preferable. Mr Hutcheson advised that while multiple crossings can present challenges, they are intended to provide more frequent safe crossing opportunities and would be designed in accordance with relevant accessibility standards.

GN, speaking as a professional driver, raised concerns regarding passenger comfort and the cumulative impact of multiple traffic calming features.

Cllr. A. Wenger suggested a compromise approach of introducing a 20mph limit without physical measures initially. Mr Hutcheson advised that evidence indicates signage alone typically results in only a small reduction in vehicle speeds, and that physical measures are generally required to achieve compliance.

DS emphasised the need for more robust data, suggesting greater use of speed monitoring data before introducing physical measures, and questioned whether proposals were sufficiently evidence-based. Mr Hutcheson advised that additional data can be analysed and that new software will allow more comprehensive monitoring of vehicle speeds across the network.

Cllr. D. Leask highlighted that traffic levels and on-street parking have increased significantly over time, and that 20mph limits are likely to be necessary.

General Discussion

A number of broader issues were raised:

- AH and others expressed concern that the proposals appeared disproportionate to Lerwick, suggesting they were more suited to larger urban settings. Mr Hutcheson advised that the proposals are based on national guidance and safety considerations, though acknowledged that local context and feedback would be taken into account.
- DS and GN highlighted the need for better use of available data, including “smiley face” speed monitoring, to inform decisions, and suggested a more evidence-led approach. Mr Hutcheson advised that speed data can be analysed and that new software is being introduced which will allow more comprehensive monitoring across the road network. He noted that data for some roads is already available and can be reviewed.

- BS raised concerns that traffic calming measures may divert vehicles onto adjacent side roads. Mr Hutcheson acknowledged that displacement can occur and advised that this is considered as part of wider traffic management planning.
- KF and DW highlighted the wider benefits of encouraging active travel, including health and wellbeing, and the need to create conditions that support people choosing to walk. Mr Hutcheson advised that the proposals are intended to support these aims by improving safety and encouraging behavioural change.
- JA suggested alternative approaches such as build-outs and central islands to narrow roads and assist pedestrian crossing, rather than relying solely on vertical calming measures. Mr Hutcheson advised that such measures are used where appropriate and confirmed that a build-out is proposed on Gilbertson Road.
- AH also suggested improved road markings and defined parking bays to better manage parking and road space. Mr Hutcheson advised that additional road markings could be considered as part of future works programmes.

Members queried how 20mph limits would be enforced and monitored. Mr Hutcheson advised that monitoring is primarily undertaken through traffic data collection, including speed monitoring devices, and that Police Scotland enforcement is dependent on available resources.

Following discussion, Lerwick Community Council agreed the following position:

- Supports the introduction of 20mph limits in Lerwick
- Considers the proposed level of traffic calming to be disproportionate in a number of locations
- Supports targeted and proportionate interventions, particularly in high-risk areas such as around schools
- Greater use be made of data and monitoring to inform decisions
- Consideration be given to a phased approach, including trialling 20mph limits prior to introducing physical measures
- Accessibility requirements are fully considered in the design of crossings.

Mr Hutcheson thanked Members for their contributions and confirmed that all comments would be taken into account in preparing the report to the Environment and Transport Committee.

7. Actions from last meeting

7.1 Action tracker spreadsheet

Sletts Sea Wall

The Sletts Sea Wall works have been completed.

Leog Sea Wall

Mr Hutcheson advised that these works are still planned for Summer 2026.

Railings in the Lanes

- **Hillhead** – works nearly completed.
- **Charlotte Street** – works completed.

- **Harbour Street** – Nortech Marine are going to refurbish the railings. This is imminent.

Payphone Kiosks

The kiosks have been removed from outside the Town Hall and Freefield.

Runestone Placement

AH advised that the runestone will be positioned outside the new tourist office. The stone will be mounted on a wheeled base, allowing it to be moved as required and taken indoors if necessary.

Tesco Roundabout – Manholes

Concerns were raised regarding the condition of manholes at the Tesco roundabout on South Road, which were reported to be deteriorating. Mr Hutcheson advised that these are not the responsibility of SIC Roads, however, the issue can be reported to the appropriate body for repair.

Commercial Street - Pothole

Cllr. A. Wenger raised a health and safety concern regarding a pothole which has formed on the section leading northwards towards Commercial Street, around The Shetland Times Bookshop. It was noted that traffic overrunning the area has caused both the pothole and surrounding brick to become uneven, presenting a potential hazard.

7.2 Staney Hill Development – Ongoing Concerns

Members noted the response received from Environmental Health.

GN highlighted concerns regarding potential health impacts, particularly in relation to silica exposure and the risk of silicosis and the type of rock being processed on site.

BS expressed dissatisfaction with the response received, and raised concern that the absence of air quality monitoring was unacceptable given the volume and duration of complaints, and raised concern regarding potential health implications for residents.

AH queried whether SIC has any legal obligation to undertake air quality sampling. It was further noted that residents have sought external advice and may be considering independent air sampling due to ongoing concerns.

Cllr. G. Robinson queried whether construction regulations were the most appropriate framework, suggesting that quarrying regulations may be more relevant given the nature of works being undertaken.

Cllr. D. Leask advised that both Garriock Bros. Ltd. and Hjaltland Housing Association have implemented a range of mitigation measures on site, although these do not include direct quantitative air quality monitoring. It was noted that some complaints relate to the use of water cannons for dust suppression, which can appear similar to dust. Reference was also made to the particle size and the presence of silica within the rock. Members noted that an

open invitation has been extended by Hjalmland Housing Association for LCC members to undertake a site visit to view dust suppression measures.

BS noted that the issue has been ongoing for approximately two years, with a high level of complaints, and raised concerns that similar issues may arise at future developments. It was suggested that, alongside a site visit, consideration be given to inviting representatives to visit affected residential areas.

DS queried whether residents may be directing complaints to Community Councillors rather than Environmental Health, potentially limiting formal investigation.

Members noted that there remains underlying concern that potential health and safety impacts may not be fully evidenced or addressed, particularly given the duration of the issue and the volume of complaints reported.

→ ACTION: Clerk to arrange a site visit with HHA and reply to SIC Environmental Health based on points discussed.

8. Correspondence/ Discussion Points

8.1 Town Hall Closure – Summer 2026

Agreed.

8.2 Active Travel Update – April 2026

Noted.

9. Finance

9.1 Financial Update

Noted.

9.2 SIC Community Council Core Funding 2026/27 – Grant Offer Letter

Noted.

9.3 LPP Funding Allocation Proposal

It was noted that £122.73 of funding remains from the previously approved budget of £2,500, with further engagement events still to be held, including meetings at Islesburgh and St Magnus Episcopal Church.

Proposal:

To approve an additional budget allocation of £500 towards the LPP project.

Decision:

Proposed by: GN

Seconded by: AC

BS noted that the majority of the remaining funding would be used to support the survey as part of the public engagement process.

9.4 VCF Application – Lerwick Spurs Football Club

£660

Proposed by: BS

Seconded by: DW

10. Disabled Parking

10.1 Cheyne Crescent

No objections.

10.2 King Harald Street

No objections.

11. Planning (all plans can be viewed at: <https://pa.shetland.gov.uk/online-applications/>)

11.1 Local Place Plans – update from LPP Group

KF advised that significant work has been undertaken to prepare the flyer and survey and, thanked members for their contributions to reaching this stage, with particular acknowledgement to TL for the artwork on the flyer. The flyer will be issued to all residential and business address in Lerwick between 11 and 18 May and a public engagement drop-in event will be held at Islesburgh on 23 March.

The LPP Steering Group aims to have the draft Place Plan ready to present to LCC at the July meeting. It was further noted that the deadline for completion of Local Place Plans has been extended to the end of October, allowing an additional month for completion.

BS and KF encouraged members and the wider community to complete the survey and to share the flyer information via social media.

BS further advised that Diane Cassidy has been provided with a draft of the Place Plan and was impressed with the progress made to date. It was noted that survey data is required to support and inform the final document. Members commended the LPP Steering Group on the planned mail drop, noting that it would ensure wide awareness and that residents could not reasonably claim they had not received or been aware of the opportunity to participate.

11.2 To demolish the existing rear vest/storeroom and erect a new single storey extension

84 Sandveien Lerwick Shetland ZE1 ORT

Ref. No: [2026/084/PPF](#) | Received: Tue 21 Apr 2026 | Validated: Mon 27 Apr 2026 | Status: Pending Consideration

No objections.

11.3 Change of use of part of building form Class 10 (non-residential institution) to sui generis (1 no. flatted dwelling)

Mountalt House, Bank Lane, Lerwick, Shetland ZE1 OEB

Ref. No: [2026/076/PPF](#) | Received: Wed 01 Apr 2026 | Validated: Thu 02 Apr 2026 | Status: Pending Consideration

DW raised concerns regarding the proposed change of use, noting that part of the building is to remain classified as Class 10 (non-residential/community use). It was highlighted that while a large meeting space remains on the ground floor, the associated toilet facilities are

proposed to be relocated upstairs, effectively removing toilet provision from the Class 10 area.

She queried the rationale for this, noting that there was no information provided on the intended use of the downstairs space. Concern was expressed that retaining a Class 10 classification without appropriate facilities, such as a WC, could compromise the useability of the space for community purposes.

It was suggested that the current proposal may not be appropriate unless there is an intention to reclassify the downstairs area.

→ ACTION: Clerk to submit a request for clarification.

11.4 Replace cast iron radiators with new cast iron radiators to match existing as closely as possible and install pipework within building to connect to District Heating

Town Hall Hillhead Lerwick Shetland ZE1 0SE

Ref. No: [2026/033/LBC](#) | Received: Tue 17 Feb 2026 | Validated: We 08 Apr 2026 | Status: Pending Consideration

No objections.

12. AOB

Car Parking (Old Swimming Pool Car Park)

JA raised concerns regarding the number of SIC pool cars and vehicles being parked in the public car park at the old swimming pool car park. It was questioned whether this would be acceptable practice if undertaken by a private business using a public car park as a base for company vehicles. Concern was expressed that SIC is effectively using a public facility as a vehicle compound.

CPJ strongly supported this concern, describing the situation as unsatisfactory and suggestion that vehicles should instead be located at Gremista.

Cllr. D. Leask agreed that correspondence to SIC would be appropriate, but noted that alternative arrangements are being explored and that identifying suitable option is not straightforward.

DS added, referencing a point raised by GN, that Police Scotland have advised parking matters are primarily a local authority responsibility, with police enforcement generally limited to cases such as obstruction or parking on pavements.

→ ACTION: Clerk to write to SIC to request alternative arrangements be identified for parking SIC vehicles.

Garden Competition

KF asked if LCC would approve funding for an advertisement in The Shetland Times to promote the Garden Competition. It was noted that LCC has previously allocated £100 towards prize money for the competition. Proposed by JA and seconded by AH.

Proposed by: JA
Seconded by: AH

Community Council Member Conduct

AH read the following statement:

“I would like to raise a concern regarding conduct and communication between members of the Lerwick Community Council.

Over the past few months there have been repeated instances where discussions from our meetings have been taken out of context and shared publicly on social media with individual members being named and criticised.

In some cases those very public statements have not accurately reflected what was said and have included personal accusations.

Healthy discussion and different views are an essential part of this council. However, when members choose to take issues directly to social media rather than raising them during meetings or through appropriate channels it creates a number of problems:

It risks misrepresenting discussions and damaging the reputations of fellow members and undermines trust within the group, it also discourages open and honest participation.

Some members have indicated to me they feel less willing to contribute and speak freely due to the risk being targeted by these members leading to them being mischaracterised online and this is not acceptable.

This LCC operates on mutual respect, good faith, and an aim of serving the community. We are all volunteers, giving our time and effort, and we should be able to do so without worrying that our contributions will be taken out of context and used against us publicly by fellow members.

I would also remind members that we are expected to adhere to the Community Council Code of Conduct. This includes treating one another with respect and not bringing the council into disrepute.

Publicly naming and criticising fellow members, particularly where information is, false inaccurate or incomplete is not in keeping with those standards.

As the Chair has now made clear, if any member has concerns about discussions in a meeting, those concerns should be raised at the appropriate time during that meeting or privately with the Chair afterward, that is the correct and constructive way to address issues.

It is important for us to know and realise that some members are now feeling uncomfortable being in the Council and are even reconsidering their involvement as a direct result of this behaviour, that should concern all of us.

I would ask that we collectively agree to uphold respectful communication, both within meetings and outside of them. If members are not willing to engage constructively within those expectations, they should reflect on whether this is the appropriate forum for them.”

Digital Signage

DW informed members of new digital signage which incorporates a multicolour border designed to assist visually impaired users, allowing mobile devices to detect the sign more easily.

→ ACTION: DW to share links with the Clerk for distribution to members.

Aggregate - Sletts

AC complimented SIC on recent work undertaken on the sea wall at Sletts. However, concern was raised regarding the opposite side of Sletts, which has developed into a dumping area for excess materials, including concrete, tarmac and rocks, particularly at the end of the coastal walk. It was noted that this is an area frequented by visitors and that its current condition detracts from its amenity value.

Members discussed that the stockpile may have resulted from the recent works on the Sletts Sea Wall.

It was agreed that LCC would write to SIC to request that “no dumping” signage be installed in the area and to seek clarification on the use of the site.

→ ACTION: Clerk to write to SIC Roads.

13. Date of Next Meeting

13.1 The next meeting will be held on Monday 1 June 2026.