Part 1 Appraisal Summary Tables

Proposal Details					
Name and address of authority or organisation promoting the proposal:		Mr Michael Craigie, 01595 744 160, michael.craigie@shetland.gov.uk			
		Shetland Islands Council, Development Service, Transport Planning Service, 6 North Ness, Lerwick, Shetland, ZE1 0LZ			
Proposal Name:	Option RO1 – Increase the service frequency of the current Foula ferry.		Stephen Canning, Peter Brett Associates		
Proposal Description:		Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	Capital costs/grant		
			£0.00.		
			Current revenue support		
	This option would involve increasing the service frequency to 3-4 weekly rotations year round.		rRevenue costs not available as service contracted out		
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Annual revenue support		
			Revenue costs not available as service contracted out		
		Estimated Total Public Sector Funding Requirement:	Capital costs/grant		
Funding Sought From: (if applicable)	Transport Scotland		Costs in this study are all reported in 2016 prices only. The costs would reflect those set out above		
Background Information					
Geographic Context:	The island of Foula lies 20 miles to the west of Walls on the Shetland mainland. The island, which is still lairded, is about 2.5 miles long by 3.5 miles wide.				
	Transport connections are provided by the workboat MV New Advance and an air service from Tingwall.				
Social Context:	The population of Foula is small but has been relatively resilient over the years, despite limited on-island opportunities.				
	The population was recorded as 38 in the 2011 Census.				
	The shortage of housing stock in Foula is a key constraint on population sustainability and growth.				

increas	retains its primary school and recently attracted a teacher to go and live on the island. The school roll has ed over the last two years.				
	provision on Foula is limited, although this is perhaps to be expected given the remoteness of the island. The eed of the island appears to be enhanced emergency cover.				
	The lack of on-island services is a challenge for Foula residents, although this is not a new issue and has not noticeable impact on the population level (although it may be a deterrent to in-migration).				
	Employment opportunities on Foula are limited, with employment concentrated in public sector posts, small scale crofting and seasonal tourism.				
island (Given the geography, population and industrial base of Foula, there is unlikely to be any significant developments on the island over the period of the plan. The key for Foula is likely to be maintaining the population base, lowering the average age of residents and retaining key services.				
Planning Objectives					
Objective:	Performance against planning objective:				
TPO1: The canacity of the services should	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Moderate Positive				
not act as a constraint to regular an	This entire would provide a significant step up in the current convice to Fould as would in turn generally				
travel between the island(s) and Shetland Mainland	significantly increase the available capacity in any given week. It therefore provides a moderate positive in terms of this objective.				
Mainland TPO2a: Where an island has	significantly increase the available capacity in any given week. It therefore provides a moderate positive in terms				
Mainland	of this objective. A Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This option is not relevant for Foula.				
Mainland TPO2a: Where an island has 'commutable' combined ferry or drive public transport / walk time to a mail employment centre (e.g. 80 minutes), the connections provided should reliably facilitate commuting	of this objective. Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Neutral This option is not relevant for Foula. Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Moderate Positive				

Criterion	Assessment Summary	Supporting Information		
STAG Criteria				
		unity does not consider an increase in the use of the current ferry service as appropriate as it would pact on the other jobs undertaken by island residents.		
Financial:		This would be a relatively low cost option given the small vessel, low crew compliment and small increase in the number of sailings.		
Operational:	There would	d be a need for additional crew hours and fuel.		
Technical:	There are n	There are no technical feasibility issues associated with this option.		
Implementability Appraisal				
Rationale for Selection or Rejection Proposal:	residents, i	This option is retained for further consideration. Whilst this option has human resource implications for Foula residents, increased ferry-based connectivity should not be ruled out. It should be noted though that a basic requirement of the RSM is the provision of a 7-day service which Foula does not currently have.		
	s <i>hould</i> onwardThe addition eed forcould poten	Performance against Transport Planning Objective: Minor Positive The additional connections proposed would operate on days where there is not currently a ferry connection (and could potentially be timetabled to fill gaps in the air service). This would enhance the number of days when an onward connection to the Scottish mainland by air or ferry could be made.		
TPO4: The level of connectivity pr should minimise the variation with between weekdays, evenings, Sat and Sundays.	in and The addition	Performance against. Transport Planning Objective: Minor Positive The additional connections proposed would operate on days where there is not currently a ferry connection (and could potentially be timetabled to fill gaps in the air service).		
connections should be minimise increase flexibility for passengers freight by maximising the number of connections across the operating day.	ed to s and This option island summer and			

Environment:	×	There is likely to be a very minor negative impact associated with the increased emissions from operating extra sailings.
Safety:	×	There would be a small negative safety impact associated with the additional sailings generated under this option. Any impact would however be minimal.
Economy:	✓	There would be minor TEE benefits associated with this option associated with the increased frequency and capacity of the service. There would also be wider positive impacts for island residents and businesses, whilst tourist access would be enhanced.
Integration:	√	This option would support a range of policies focussed on island sustainability and development. It would also move Foula closer to the RSM defined service levels. This option would also make a minor contribution to strategic transport integration (see TPO5)
Accessibility and Social Inclusion:	√ √	This option would enhance the accessibility and social inclusion of Foula. Residents could travel more frequently to Shetland mainland, whilst tourists would also benefit from these connections, supporting different durations of stay.