

ANNEX B

CONSULTATION DIARY

Annex B Bressay Link STAG 2 Consultation Feedback

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
A Jarmson (Shetland) Ltd.	Andy Jarmson	07.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of meeting was to discuss the options for the Bressay Link with stakeholders in the Gremista area and is one of a number of meetings being held with those who may be affected by the options currently undergoing detailed appraisal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions ongoing
Bressay Community	Bressay Community Meeting Bressay Hall (Attended by 30 to 35 members of the public)	28.04.08	<p>Questions and Issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60 years is conservative, if FL can last 120 years • Are costs not, now, the overriding consideration, given the figures? • There need to be changes and improvements now – the STAG process has demonstrated the need • How many ferry changes would there be over 60 year period? • How realistic is it for SIC to find £13.5mn (if the SG fund 50%)? • We should be travelling over a fixed link by now – shouldn't we have free fares? • Why has the bridge come out as being more expensive than the previous bridge? • Is there an issue with the portal being so close to sea level on the Lerwick side? • Would there be extra car parking spaces in Lerwick • Jobs would be lost on the ferry • Will the Heogan road have space for walking and cycling – particularly given the national drive for physical activity • Can the budget not be increased now to ensure the necessary road improvements are made? • What will be the impact on local services – school shop, PO? • Would utilities be able to use the tunnel? • Elsewhere, fares are based on distance • Fares should not have been increased recently, until this study was complete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information taken into account in study
George Robertson Ltd.	Andrew Simpson, Anna Moar, Lewis Moncrieff	08.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of meeting was to discuss the options for the Bressay Link with stakeholders in the Gremista area and is one of a number of meetings being held with those who may be affected by the options currently undergoing detailed appraisal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions ongoing

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
Health and Safety Executive	Cameron Adam HM Principal Inspector of Health and Safety	02.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSE has no information which would be useful in the preparation of an environmental appraisal for proposed development Recommends contacting SIC Planning Service regarding any Consultation Zones around notifiable major hazard installations in the vicinity of the development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Discussions have taken place with SIC Planning Service on 12.03.08 (see below)
Historic Scotland (HS)	William Kidd Development Assessment Administrator	27.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For regional or local information suggest contact Council Archaeological Service: Val Turner <p>General Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic environment issues should be taken into consideration as part of the site selection process and alternatives considered Recommend engagement of suitably qualified consultants to advise on , and undertake the detailed assessment of impacts on the historic environment. Their advice should also be sought on appropriate mitigation strategies to address any adverse impacts. Desk assessment of existing historic environment records and other sources of information should be used to gather baseline information. Baseline information should identify the site and setting of the historic environment assets both within the boundary of the development area and within the Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI). A ZVI may be useful in giving initial consideration of setting issues and should include information on: scheduled monuments, archaeological sites and landscapes, listed buildings, historic gardens and designed landscapes and conservation areas A non-invasive site walk over survey and field evaluation should be undertaken to augment this information. It should also assess the area's potential for the discovery of further, as yet unrecorded sites Refer to NPPG 5, NPPG18, SHEP 2 and the Memorandum of Guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (1998) <p>Potential Direct Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm that there are no scheduled monuments, listed buildings, historic gardens or designed landscapes within the search area: information on the location of all scheduled monuments, listed buildings, historic gardens and designed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contacted (no response as yet) Noted

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			<p>landscapes can be obtained on www.pastmap.org.uk</p> <p>Impact on Setting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible that the High Level Bridge (Option 2) in this location could affect the setting of cultural heritage resources across a wide area beyond the boundary of both your search area and development site. It is not possible for HS to provide definitive information on any of the options at this stage but they are happy to discuss options with the project team as the assessment progresses • HS are happy to discuss the details of visualisations such as wirelines or photomontages which may be required to illustrate the nature and degree of impacts on key sites • For further information contact Katrina Biggs: 0131 667 8657 or Katrina.biggs@scotland.gsi.gov.uk 	
HNP	Ian Walterson	15.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of meeting was to discuss the options for the Bressay Link with stakeholders in the Gremista area and is one of a number of meetings being held with those who may be affected by the options currently undergoing detailed appraisal 	
JWG Plc.	George Hepburn	08.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of meeting was to discuss the options for the Bressay Link with stakeholders in the Gremista area and is one of a number of meetings being held with those who may be affected by the options currently undergoing detailed appraisal 	
Lerwick Community Council	Katrina Semple	16.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing to add as community feel that consultation has been thorough throughout the STAG process 	
	Lerwick Community Meeting, Town Hall, Lerwick (Attended by 3 members of the public)	29.04. 08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • why is the cost of the bridge higher than in the past • would tolls be introduced • the wind, particularly from NW direction, which gusts, at the Point of Scotland would not make the bridge a good option • there are a number of folk on Bressay without a car, and it is difficult for them to plan to get to opportunities in Lerwick, with a fixed link they could get the bus • Bressay wouldn't develop with a ferry • Bressay's high dependence on Lerwick, which was fine when fares were free in the 1970s, but that is no longer the case • people's aspirations have changed and increased over the 	

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> years, and we need to respond to that how would this be funded? 	
Lerwick Fish Traders	Michael Stark	16.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose of meeting was to discuss the options for the Bressay Link with stakeholders in the Gremista area and is one of a number of meetings being held with those who may be affected by the options currently undergoing detailed appraisal 	
Lerwick Port Authority	Sandra Laurenson	16.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided links for baseline information in the report Confirmed LPA has sufficient land in current land bank to meet near term needs but could have further land needs in long term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information taken into account in appraisals
	Sandra Laurenson	11.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Sloan/Iain Salisbury met with LPA to discuss the fixed link proposals. In relation to the tunnel, the main point of discussion related to the portal position on the Lerwick side. LPA were positive about the tunnel and were happy to see tunnel spoil used to reclaim part of the marina as they could see the benefits to the marina and local environment. LPA were also informed of the need to demolish one of their warehouses 	
	Sandra Laurenson	29.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Sloan and Jennifer Anderson met with LPA to discuss the potential requirement to future-proof the tunnel corridor by dredging to -10m below CD and to discuss various economic aspects (recorded separately) The tunnel cover has been increased to 25m below -10m to allow for future dredging requirements SL advised that it was LPA's intention to dredge to -10m at some point in the future but the date was not fixed. This is the maximum practicable dredge depth because it is the limiting depth set by existing quays and jetties LPA advised that the dredging company will be in Shetland until late summer/autumn 2008 and LPA would be willing to consider varying the contract to dredge above the tunnel alignment if a decision was made to construct the tunnel in the next few months LPA has concerns about deepening the harbour after a tunnel has been built in its location AS confirmed that there would be no technical reason making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No technical reasons to dredge in advance of LPA dredge to -10m. Further discussions needed between SIC and LPA to allay LPA concerns about the future dredge and any restrictions imposed by the tunnel

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			<p>future proofing necessary. It might be that it would make dredging slower in that location but this would depend on the detailed design of the tunnel and of the dredging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SL explained that it was not just technical concerns but LPA would be concerned about but any possible restriction to its deepening of the harbour i.e. could the tunnel operator impose restrictions on dredging adjacent to the tunnel • No final outcome agreed • LPA indicated that tunnel spoil could possibly be used to reclaim and improve the public amenity of the marina area and also adjacent to Arlanda/Gremista Quay area for which LPA has developed plans. They confirmed that development on Bressay that could utilise tunnel spoil was possible but that could not rely on this development to use spoil.(i.e. spoil would need to be used to improve the harbour at the Lerwick portal) 	
Northern Constabulary		January to April 08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing discussions and security statistics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted
RSPB Scotland	Peter Ellis Area Manager	17.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main concern we might have would be the possibility of collisions between eiders and other seabirds with any structures over the sea, such as a bridge • Paul Harvey at the Shetland Biological Records Centre will be able to supply any biological data for the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information taken into account in appraisals
Scottish Natural Heritage	Simon Smith Area Manager	18.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no statutory natural heritage sites likely to be directly affected by the proposals. The nearest SSSI is Easter Rova Head (HU474453) which is notified for a geological feature (Stratigraphy: non-marine Devonian) • European Protected Species that may be affected include otters and cetaceans. The latter are particularly sensitive to subterranean acoustic disturbance and vibration. The impact during any construction works may extend to several kilometres from the sound source • Local Biodiversity Action Plan interests include eider (5% to 5.5% of the Shetland population can winter in Bressay Sound) and harbour porpoise. Breeding waders may be affected by any new roads on Bressay. Some elements of the emerging marine LBAP may also be relevant - suggest contacting Kelda Hudson at SIC • Suggests contacting SBRC for data on individual species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information taken into account in appraisals

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			<p>present in the area which should identify whether any further surveys are required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fixed links may present access for polecat ferrets which we do believe are currently extant on Bressay. SNH's concern would be potential for them to cross the shallow waters of Noss Sound to the important seabird colonies of Noss itself, and SSI, SPA and NNR. It is possible that the design of any fixed links could mitigate this SNH wishes to reserve judgement on landscape issues until they have received further details of proposed methodology SNH does not have any geological or pedological information further to the published Geological Survey and Soil Survey maps for the area SNH has assumed that only broad impacts are being considered 	
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	David Okill (DO)	19.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEPA has no direct interests in this area but there are a number of PPC authorised premises in the vicinity. Including the Power Station, Shetland Catch, LFT, Viola, and the Waste to Energy Plant and on the Bressay side SFP. There are a number of abstractions especially from the Power Station, SFP, Shetland Catch and LFT. Some of these premises also have their own discharges The main Lerwick sewer discharges some 2 km to the north SEPA will be involved in maintaining water quality during any construction phase and the disposal of any waste which would be significant if a tunnel were to be built 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information taken into account in appraisals
		30.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DO agrees flood risk can probably be designed out but should be taken seriously and if real risk realigned There is a lot of made ground at foreshore and he thinks we could encounter some and suggests check further with LPA etc No real environmental issues as long as noise and vibration controlled and no materials with high fines used for reclamation-would affect water quality too much in harbour Any disposal of rock to landfill would be top rate Any disposal of rock below MHWS would be under FEPA and Harbour Revision Order required As soon as reach MHWS becomes a planning issue and need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information taken into account in appraisals

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			<p>permission in advance and can then apply for waste management exemption if to be used as beneficial means (harbour land etc though DO queried how much more do they want in those areas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other beneficial means could be (for example) as aggregate for windfarm roads 	
Shetland Biological Records Centre	Paul Harvey Manager	18.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role of the Records Centre is to provide biological information that may assist in the development planning process or with mitigation measures should the development proceed SBRC have already supplied information for this proposal several years ago 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
Shetland Catch	Simon Lieper, Graham Davey, Magnus Rendall	15.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose of meeting was to discuss the options for the Bressay Link with stakeholders in the Gremista area and is one of a number of meetings being held with those who may be affected by the options currently undergoing detailed appraisal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions to continue
Shetland Island Council (SIC)	David MacNae	11.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Sloan/Iain Salisbury met with the roads department to discuss the fixed link proposals. Discuss design requirements of road within tunnel and space provision allowed for. Salient points were that the alignment was to be designed for a design speed limit of 40mph, with a speed limit of 30mph. The tunnel would have sufficient space for a cycleway/footpath 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information taken into account in appraisals
	David MacNae	18.04.08	<p>The following is an assessment of the benefits which would be gained by the Council as Roads Authority if there was either an improvement to the existing Bressay ferry service, or the introduction of a fixed link:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Road Maintenance. SIC would normally have a squad in Bressay for one or more periods per year totalling 10 to 12 weeks. The squad usually consists of 3 road workers and a pick-up travelling daily to the island, a Council truck kept on the island for most of the period, a JCB hired on the island, and various materials. The work consists of patching, ditching, and many other maintenance tasks. The travelling to work arrangements result in 7 hours of work in an 8.5 hour working day (including 0.5 hour overtime to suit the return ferry). This compares with 8 hours of work in an 8.25 hour working day (including travelling time) in equivalent rural areas of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taken into account in appraisals

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			<p>Mainland. The work is therefore about 18% more expensive, it takes about 14% longer, it ties up a truck which could otherwise be used elsewhere at times, and is subject to disruption if additional materials or equipment are required at short notice. (Under the Best Value regime, whereby the Council has an internal trading arrangement for roads maintenance, the rates for carrying out all road maintenance and improvement work in Bressay are set at 13.9% higher than those for working on the adjacent parts of the Mainland. This is almost in line with the above calculations.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reactive Maintenance, and Minor Improvement Works. These are subject to the same working conditions as above, but the disruption and additional costs are often greater, due to them being at short notice, or of shorter duration, or both. • Surfacing, Surface Dressing, and Major Improvement Works. This work does not occur every year, but is subject to the same additional costs as the above. Timeous delivery of materials can be a particular problem. • Winter Service. At present we station a gritter on Bressay, and employ a driver and "second man" who live there. In the past, we have had some difficulty in recruiting to these part-time posts, and this situation could easily arise again due to the shortage of HGV Licenced drivers in such a small population. In addition, as the gritter's route is one of the 2 shortest in Shetland (Fetlar is the other), it is an inefficient operation. The introduction of a fixed link could allow us to rationalise this route along with the adjacent ones, in order to produce an overall improvement to the service throughout the area. On the other hand, if we were required to make spending cuts, we might be able to reduce the total number of gritters by one. • Surveys, Inspections and Supervision of Works. If there was a fixed link, cost savings would arise from reduced travelling time by staff visiting the island for various purposes. We might also make use of this time to provide a better service by visiting the island more often. • Therefore I estimate that about 15% of current costs could be saved by us (and presumably also by organisations and companies doing similar work) if there was a fixed link. At present this would give a saving of about £10,000 per year, plus about £40,000 during the next few years on programmed improvement works. There would also be a number of 	

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			<p>improvements to the quality of the service provided, especially with regard to response times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be similar gains, on a lesser scale, if there was an enhancement of the current ferry service. The timing of the relevant morning and evening sailings is critical to an organisation such as ours which often works for several days or weeks at a time on the island. In addition, many of our operations would benefit if the ferry sailed every half hour from each side, instead of every hour as at present 	
<p>Shetland Islands Council</p> <p>Planning Service</p>	Iain McDiarmid	12.03.08	<p>Key feedback included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Council wish to encourage population growth in Shetland and wish to see some 3000 new houses in Shetland; • most economic and housing demand is in and around Lerwick; • SIC Planning is producing a Main Issues Report later this year focussing on the 'town and country' balance (or centralisation/decentralisation) and how issues can best be addressed including transport; • the new Corporate Plan also addresses some of these issues as well, as a desire to decentralise but this is not backed up by employment opportunities; • a fixed link to Bressay could increase demand for housing etc on Bressay but it is considered that demand could be greater in the Gulberwick area; • it was not considered that Bressay would be the most attractive option for large scale development with or without a link because of the existing infrastructure, school capacity, bus routes, employment opportunities etc. • there is some allocation for new housing in Bressay at present in the Plan and this could be reconsidered in the next plan; • the previous Council considered there were still sites available in Lerwick for development (eg Stainey Hill and between Sound and Gulberwick); • a future facility such as a deep water berth on the Bressay side could be a catalyst for more development in Bressay; • a fixed link could service the existing community and encourage car based commuting but could also then lead to some private housing development; • construction of the bridges to Trondra and Burra have led to a large increase in private housing developments in recent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information taken into account in appraisals

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			<p>years; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removing ferry fares all together would be unlikely to be sustained in the longer term. 	
Shetland Islands Council	Jim Dickson	17.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to look at overall costs over say, a 50 year period, for the three options. A high initial cost may be better value for money if annual running costs are substantially lower 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See TEE
Shetland Islands Council	Seminar with Councillors, Islesburgh	28.04.08 9.30am	<p>Questions and Issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> concern over limited road improvements that have been accounted for could put shallow water around bridge piers to prevent marine accidents and issues false assumption about 20 years life of ferry: could operate until 2022, with a new engine concerned about the geology and whether a tunnel would be feasible as the costs are known about the ferry, there would not need to be such a contingency and OB applied has the impact of job losses on Bressay been taken into account? a tunnel would lead to an increase in fuel use has there been planning for the impact of increased car parking spaces required in Lerwick? – 150. nothing mentioned about social contact of ferry, which can't be quantified the landowner is not keen on land for development, has that been taken into account? concern about SG funding and whether that would have a negative impact on the Council's funding ferry costs of £6mn is conservative experience in Faroe of long-term increase in population why are the costs different for tunnels here, compared to Scandanavia must be sure that rock is disposed properly tunnel has to be cost effective to customer and community STAG process should be used for other projects Concern over plans for upgrade of Heogan road, would like to know more but roads elsewhere in Shetland (Waas) are also needed to be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information taken into account in appraisals

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Contents	Response/Comments
			improved	
Streamline	Mike Davies	09.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose of meeting was to discuss the options for the Bressay Link with stakeholders in the Gremista area and is one of a number of meetings being held with those who may be affected by the options currently undergoing detailed appraisal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions ongoing
Sustrans	Tony Grant National Cycle Network Development	28.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bressay is a popular walking and cycling destination from Lerwick for recreation and leisure. It is characterised by its tranquillity due to relatively low levels of traffic and roads which do not allow high speed traffic. A fixed link would no doubt destroy this attractive travel environment and bring unacceptable development pressures Sustrans therefore prefers to see the ferry service retained rather than a bridge or tunnel. It is doubtful whether a 24 hour service is viable and we therefore recommend that an enhanced ferry service is considered together with better integration with other modes including cycling and walking access routes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information taken into account in appraisals