

Whalsay Link
Choice of Site for Whalsay Ferry Terminal

Report on Consultation Exercise
29 October 2009

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Study Background	3
3. Consultation Process	5
4. Consultation Outcomes	8
5. Summary of Findings	16

Appendices

Appendix 1 Drop-In Session Comments	18
Appendix 2 Workshop Flip Chart Records	33

Report Author: Paul Finch
Issue Date: 20 November 2009
Revision 1

1. Introduction

1.1 This report details the overall approach and key findings of a community consultation exercise on Whalsay regarding options for the future location of the island's ferry terminal. The focus of the consultation activity was a drop-in session, and evening workshop held on Thursday 29 October 2009, although correspondence was received prior to, and following this event. A number of related meetings also took place following 29th October.

1.2 This report sets out:

- The background to the consultation exercise;
- The methodology employed for the community consultation; and
- The key outcomes of the various consultation activities.

1.3 Copies of this report will be made available to members of the Whalsay community, posted on-line, and also placed in the Members Room at Shetland Islands Council. No comments have been attributed within this report.

1.4 This report was prepared by AECOM on behalf of Shetland Islands Council.

2. Study Background

2.1 The current ferry link between Whalsay and Shetland Mainland is facing critical issues related to vehicle carrying capacity; an ageing vessel (*MV Hendra*); and deteriorating ferry terminals. Recognising the range of options available for the link, the importance of the link for the island's economy, and the potentially significant capital and revenue implications of the choices that could be made, Shetland Islands Council commissioned an initial STAG¹ study of the link in 2005.

2.2 Progress on the STAG study was put aside to enable the development and approval of the ZetTrans Regional Transport Strategy, which was submitted in March 2007. The Whalsay STAG study recommenced in autumn 2007, and was finalised in May 2008². Options for both North Voe and options of a re-configured Symbister Harbour were considered within the STAG report.

2.3 SIC's Infrastructure Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Study in June 2008:

- Retention and maintenance of *MV Linga*;
- Introduction of a larger sized vessel (31 vehicle capacity with the Yell "B600" vessel being the likely vessel type);
- Upgrading of Laxo to accommodate larger sized vessels;
- Construction of a new ferry terminal at North Voe on Whalsay; and
- Upgrade of Vidlin to remain as diversionary port capable of accommodating the larger ferry and *MV Linga*.

2.4 Ongoing debate in the community regarding the location of the terminal on Whalsay, along with the ongoing development of both North Voe and Symbister options prompted further community consultation, providing the opportunity for any new information and views to be expressed that had not previously been considered in the STAG report. (Infrastructure Committee 16 June 2009).

2.5 Outcomes of the consultation exercise were reported to Infrastructure Committee on 01 September 2009. Whilst officials recommended that the key

¹ STAG stands for Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance, and is the guidance recommended by the Scottish Government for detailed transport options appraisals. It is a requirement that any proposal requiring Scottish Government support or funding applies this guidance; the approach promoted by the Guidance now represents common practice. Details are available from <http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/stag/home>

² Final STAG report available at <http://www.zettrans.org.uk/Implementation/Whalsay.asp>

recommendations of the STAG report be confirmed, the Committee decided to promote the retention of Symbister as the preferred location for the ferry terminal on Whalsay.

2.6 At Full Council on 16 September, the decision of the Infrastructure Committee was revisited, with Members deciding to allow a further short period of consultation, with the Community, in a public meeting to answer questions about the decision made and explain the detail of the report.

2.7 A methodology for a consultation event was subsequently developed with the aim of ensuring that all members of the Whalsay community had an opportunity to put their views forward. It is the outcomes of this consultation event that form the subject of this report.

3. Consultation Process

Introduction

3.1 With an awareness of the importance of this issue for the residents of Whalsay, and also respecting the range of deeply held views on the issues, three objectives for the consultation exercise were identified as follows:

- To provide an opportunity for the whole community to contribute to the decision making process;
- To provide an opportunity for the community to understand the breadth of issues and constraints relating to the provision of the transport link to Whalsay; and
- To provide an opportunity for Members to be fully informed regarding the key issues when making their decision.

3.2 In order to deliver these objectives, a robust consultation programme was developed, which focussed on the following elements.

- An all-day drop-in session at Symbister Hall between 10.00 hours and 18.00 hours on Thursday 29 October 2009; and
- A facilitated consultation workshop at Symbister Hall held between 19.00 hours and 21.00 hours on Thursday 29 October.

Publicity

3.3 Information on the consultation exercise was communicated in a number of different ways, as follows.

- A letter was issued to all households on Whalsay outlining the background to consultation event, providing details on the consultation activities, but also providing contact details (phone, email, address) for any comments that members of the community would like to make prior to the event;
- A press release was issued with details of the consultation event;
- Notices of the event were broadcast on BBC Radio Shetland;
- Press notices were placed in the Shetland Times; and
- Posters were placed in a variety of locations across Whalsay in the week prior to the consultation event.

Pre Workshop Correspondence

3.4 The invitation to provide comments or queries that was offered in pre-event publicity elicited a number of individual responses, sent either to Councillors of Shetland Islands Council, or the Head of Transport. Each piece of correspondence was logged.

Drop-In Session

3.5 The Drop-In Session was held in Symbister Hall between 10.00 and 18.00 on Thursday 29th October. During the day, the Head of Transport, and officers from the Ferries Service, and the Capital Design were available to answer questions, and discuss the options. Support was provided by two consultants from AECOM who had previously been involved in the preparation of the STAG reports.

3.6 Plans of the option for North Voe, and the option for Symbister Harbour were available for inspection, as were cost estimates for the two options on display. During the course of the day, a lap top was set up which displayed the results of the "Tank Testing" which was undertaken during the development of the North Voe option.

3.7 Paper and pens were made available during the day, and visitors to the drop in centre were encouraged to post any comments / questions into a sealed comments box. Staff facilitating the event also recorded the comments of visitors to the session.

3.8 During the day, a member of the community who had come in to discuss potential options, returned with a laptop computer and photo-montages showing alternative options for Symbister Harbour, and was also able to discuss these options with any interested party attending the drop-in session.

3.9 Shetland Islands Councillors also undertook site visits to the North Voe and Symbister sites on the afternoon of Thursday 29 October 2009. They attended the Drop-In Session during the late afternoon, and also had the opportunity to view and discuss all information that was available within the Hall.

Facilitated Consultation Workshop

3.10 The consultation workshop was held in Symbister Hall between the hours of 7.00pm and 9.00pm. Following welcome / introductions by Cllr Hawkins (Chair of Infrastructure Service Committee), and the Head of Transport, the format and "ground rules" for the workshop were confirmed. The "ground rules" were communicated to all attendees, to ensure that all participants had the opportunity to listen, contribute and have their views and opinions respected.

3.11 The attendees were then split into 9 groups, on the basis of a number that was placed on the back of each chair. Each group was chaired by an independent facilitator, trained and qualified in Community Mediation techniques. Two workshop sessions were held as follows.

- Session 1 – In the first session, groups confirmed the key issues for their community, with respect to the future of the Whalsay transport link. These issues were then formed into priorities; and
- Session 2 – The priorities identified in Session 1 were then rated against each of the two options for the Whalsay ferry terminal. Views for and against each option were also recorded.

3.12 Following the completion of the two group sessions, the floor was opened to receive any feedback and answer questions.

Post-Workshop Correspondence

3.13 In the week following the workshop, further pieces of correspondence were received.

Other Meetings

3.14 A number of specific meetings also took place in the week following the community workshop.

- Meeting with Ferry crews took place on 30 September 2009 at 1930 aboard the Linga.
- Two meetings were held with members of the Fishing Fleet; one on 03 November 2009 with three members of this sector; another on 05 November with nine members of this sector.

4. Consultation Outcomes

Pre Workshop Correspondence

4.1 During the run-up to the consultation workshop event, eight elements of correspondence were received by the Head of Transport and / or Councillors.

Item	Method/Date	Comment
1	Letter, 06/10/09	Letter referenced the May 2008 STAG report, and argued that the arguments put forward in this document remained valid, and that North Voe should remain as the preferred option.
2	Letter, 11/10/09	Letter which urged Councillors to adopt the original STAG proposals. Argues that South Voe is ultimately for the betterment of some sectors of the fishing community, rather than for the whole of the community.
3	Email, 14/10/09	Email, arguing that North Voe is the correct option, because of current congestion in Symbister Harbour, and the potential for expansion of marina / fishing activities if the ferries are relocated. North Voe would also not constrain future ferries developments.
4	Letter, 22/10/09	Letter arguing that North Voe is the correct option, as Symbister is too congested; North Voe safer for all harbour users; concern about a "Linga Accident" occurring adjacent to the marina.
5	Telephone, 22/10/09	Concern about current ill feeling on island.
6	Email, 24/10/09	Email arguing that Symbister is the correct option, principally due to benefits for the maintenance of Peerie Dock; Marine Safety; Better utilisation of space within Symbister.
7	Email, 27/10/09	Email correspondence which argues the case for a direct link to Whalsay between Bonidale and Symbister.
8	Telephone, 27/10/09	In support of Symbister – impact of removal of Salmon Farm; impact on Wildlife; concern re: feasibility of North Voe; queries need for 65m vessels for Whalsay; potential benefits for Pelagic Fleet if Symbister option development; support for tunnels.

Comments Raised During Drop-In Session

4.2 Just over 100 members of the Whalsay community visited the all-day drop session held at Symbister Hall, with the busiest period occurring between 3pm and 5pm.

4.3 Visitors to the drop-in session were encouraged to leave comments in a comments box; also facilitators took notes of the concerns of visitors. All the comments received have been collated and analysed. Details of all the comments received are presented in Appendix A.

4.4 Each of the comments have been summarised, and then categorised into comments which supported North Voe, comments supporting Symbister Harbour, or general observations. These are presented in the table overleaf. The number of times a particular comment was raised within the responses is noted in brackets after each comment.

4.5 Whilst a wide variety of comments were received supporting both the options presented at the drop session, a significant majority of comments were made which highlighted the following points:

- No space within Symbister Harbour;
- No room for future expansion at Symbister Harbour;
- Congestion for Harbour Users within Symbister Harbour; and
- Detrimental impacts during construction of the Symbister Harbour option.

4.6 The most dominant arguments put forward in favour of the Symbister Harbour option related to Environmental concerns. A variety of arguments were also put forward in relation to developing the existing harbour in a way that would benefit both the ferry service, as well as the fishing industry. There was particular concern that if a significant amount of money was invested in a new facility at North Voe, it would not be possible for any money to be found at a later date for investment at Symbister.

(i) Issues/Comments Supporting North Voe	(ii) Issues/Comments Supporting Symbister/South Voe	(iii) General Issues/Comments
No space at South Voe (28)	Environmental concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visual impact of North Voe terminal (3) - Visual impact of North Voe terminal if a fixed link is later built (1) - Visual impact of cars queuing at North Voe (1) - Bad for nearby North Voe residents (1) - North Voe ecology (1) - Sewage impacts and associated health impacts (North Voe) (1) 	Service reliability is important (15)
More space (at Symbister) by moving to North Voe (21)	Safety concerns (North Voe road) (2)	Whalsay Fixed Link (6) Once a voe is developed specifically for one purpose, the chance of getting a fixed link could be lost (1)
Congestion at South Voe (19)	Better weather protection (South Voe) (1)	Cost implications of two harbours (4) Cost implications – alterations to Symbister looks less but the costs are coming out the same (1)
Construction disruption at South Voe (19)	Concern for a worse ferry service at North Voe in bad weather in a North wind (1)	Either option, but with no detriment to existing service (4)
Addresses Safety Concerns at South Voe (16)	Exploration of Symbister option which can accommodate 2 x B600s & Filla & provide operational benefits. Various images produced which appeared to illustrate “conceptual” feasibility of this in either “outer harbour” extension, or longer breakwater within inner harbour (1)	Long term solution required (4)
Relieves Road congestion in Symbister (11)	Fishing industry needs the piers and needs to keep them maintained for the future. (1)	More ferry capacity (4)
Protection of heritage (11)	Safety concerns (pedestrians North Voe) (1)	Access to toilets and waiting room is very poor (1)
Car parking capacity at South Voe (10)	South Voe is safe (1)	Big vessels necessary? (1)

(i) Issues/Comments Supporting North Voe	(ii) Issues/Comments Supporting Symbister/South Voe	(iii) General Issues/Comments
More space by moving to North Voe (ferries) (9)	Terminal could be accommodated in South Voe (1)	Congestion at the shop is a red herring (1)
Development opportunities (North Voe) (5)	Water comes over road at North Voe (1)	Cost of commuting (1)
Poorer service at South Voe in bad weather (4)	Whitefish fleet depleting – may not be any need for more berths in the future (1)	Environmental concerns - Impact of big ferries (1)
Improved traffic at Symbister (if North Voe terminal) (3)	Improve shelter and open up the harbour for the ferry (1)	Implications of a one ferry service? (1)
North Voe is safer (3)	Move ferry to white fish fleet area (1)	Preferred the earlier scheme the meadow area for marina area (1)
Better weather protection (North Voe) (2)	New breakwater outside the harbour for ferries (1)	Length of journey time (1)
North Voe is the only option (2)		Bonidale terminal option? (1) No need for larger vessel(s) – build an alternative mainland terminal nearer Whalsay (1)
North Voe more accessible (2)		New terminal at Laxo (1)
Residents close to ferry (North Voe) (2)		Consultation not an even representation of the island – absence of fishing fleet representatives (1)
Environmental concerns - South Voe pond (1); Hanseatic Booth (1)		Unreliability in winter (Laxo/Vidlin), problems if car is left on Mainland and service switches terminals (1)
Less service disruption North Voe (1)		What are the parking options for North Voe? (1)
North Voe gives earlier access to main road and splits north and south traffic (1)		Trial B600's to see if there is room (1)
People will still use the amenities in Symbister (1)		Hook on North Voe outer seems unnecessary (1)
Proceed with professional opinion of ferry masters and the STAG report (1)		Shelter small boats at North Voe (1)
Safety concerns (pedestrians South Voe) (1)		
South Voe unsustainable in the long term (1)		

Workshop Session

4.7 Notes were recorded on flip-charts within each of the groups. Transcripts of the notes that were made are presented in Appendix B. The initial workshop session was focussed on determining the community's priorities for the transport link to and from Whalsay.

Session 1 - Priorities

4.8 The following outcomes reported to the wider group by individual groups. Whilst the first few groups reporting back highlighted the key priorities, latter groups typically only reported back really important points, or points which had not previously been mentioned.

- Doing Something is very important – a new terminal is required
 - It needs to be reliable and safe
 - The link needs to respond to all the needs of the island
 - It needs to be affordable to get in and off the island
 - It needs to be a long-term solution
 - It needs to have sufficient capacity
 - It is necessary to have room for future expansion – both for fishing and ferries
 - All weather operation is necessary
 - Fixed links were highlighted within the group
-
- It needs to be affordable
 - It needs to take account of weather and wind direction
 - It needs to take account of short term and longer term environmental impacts
 - It needs to consider the future of young folk on the island, the link could make the difference between them staying or leaving
 - It is important that technical considerations such as ferry size, capacity and manoeuvrability are fully considered
-
- Need to ensure that ferry service grows with the island's population
 - Safety is a vital consideration
 - Needs to take account of capacity / sizes / issues such as beam roll
-
- Safety / Capacity / Affordability
 - Need to fully understand the impacts of legislation
 - Population has changed – more folk are now travelling to and from Mainland, this means the ferry service in the future will need to be improved.

- Island depends on its ferry service
 - Offer young people discounts
 - More later runs in the timetable
-
- Long operating hours important – help keep families together
 - Ferry service needs to develop in line with changes in the community
 - It's important that Whalsay can keep up with changes elsewhere on Shetland, such as access to later flights, events etc
 - The decision making process has to be thorough, and really well thought through.
-
- Safety is really important for all harbour users, and the ferry
 - Reliability is important – now and in the future – it can't be reduced
 - Decision needs to be made in the best interests of the whole of the Whalsay community, particularly the young folk
 - Commuting in and out will become more and more important
-
- It is important to keep the ferries on the isles
-
- Really important to keep young people on the island
 - There is a sense of urgency regarding this decision, can't continue as it is, we have to move forward

Session 2 – Applying the Priorities to the Terminal Options

4.9 During the workshop, only very limited group feedback was possible on the second session, and this was limited to the key questions that need to be answered.

4.10 A review undertaken of each group's flipchart notes demonstrate that within each group, the key priorities identified in session 1 were then applied to the option of development at North Voe, or development at Symbister Harbour.

4.11 Interrogation of the comments reveals the range of key issues that were discussed within each group, the key questions that the attendees were raising, as well as the key points for and against each option.

4.12 On balance, the views within each group, and at the workshop as a whole, tended to favour the North Voe option, principally as it was felt that this provided better for the longer term future for the island.

4.13 However, this view was not unanimous, and arguments were put forward for development in Symbister during the course of the discussions.

Key Questions Emerging from the Workshop Discussions

4.14 A series of key questions have been compiled from the workshop feedback; and the notes taken in each of the groups, and are presented below. Section 5 of this report has this same table but with answers added.

Ferries	Why do we need a bigger ferry? Is this because of EU Rules? Can a 50 – 60m ferry operate from existing site? What happens when <i>MV Hendra</i> gets to the end of its life (around 2010)?
Fixed Link	What about a tunnel?
Construction Impact	What disruption would occur during construction of either of the two options?
Service Pattern	Would one of the two Whalsay Ferries ever be based on Mainland, if there was no room to berth in Whalsay?
Funding	Is the funding in place for the terminal works? Is the funding in place for the new ferries?
Timescales	What are the proposed timescales for a decision? What are the proposed timescales for implementation?
Process	What will be the process for feeding back information to the community?

Post Consultation Workshop Correspondence

4.15 Following the workshop, four pieces of correspondence were received by the Head of Transport regarding the conduct of the workshop. Three of these expressed concern about how the event had been handled, and also expressed concern that the timing of the event excluded a significant number of Whalsay's fishing community.

4.16 One piece of correspondence expressed the view that the event had been executed in an excellent, and very fair manner, which gave everyone present the opportunity to comment.

Post Consultation Workshop Meetings

Meeting with Ferry Crew

4.17 The meeting with Ferry crew took place on 30 September 2009 at 1930 aboard the Linga. The meeting was chaired by Cllr Robert Henderson (Chair of the Inter Island Ferries Board) and Cllrs Iris Hawkins (Chair of Infrastructure Committee) and Allan Wishart (Vice Chair of Infrastructure Committee) were at the meeting. The Marine Superintendent and the Head of Transport were also in attendance.

4.18 Almost all of crew from the Hendra and the Linga were in attendance and the issues discussed were about the compromises to the operational capability of the Symbister option compared to the North Voe option. There was a unanimous view that North Voe was the preferred option and a very strongly expressed set of concerns around the operational limitations of the Symbister option and unacceptable compromise of safe operations.

Meetings with Representatives of the Fishing Fleet

4.19 The Head of Transport had two meetings with representatives of the fishing fleet. One took place on 3 November 2009 from 1400 to 1730. 3 members of this sector of the community met and also in attendance were two officers of the Capital Projects Unit. The purpose of the meeting was to ensure that the ideas coming from this group were clearly understood by all.

4.20 A subsequent meeting with a further 9 representatives of the fishing sector (giving 12 in total) took place on the evening of 5 November from 1630 to 1900. This was also attended by Head of Transport, two officers of the Capital Projects Unit, but also included the Director of Infrastructure Services. The meeting was predominantly about the configuration of the option they would like to see explored further but there was a strong message that they felt they had not yet had an adequate opportunity to engage in the process and even felt excluded.

Meeting with the Community Council

4.21 The planned meeting with the Community Council did not go ahead and this was their decision.

5 Summary

Introduction

5.1 A community consultation exercise on Whalsay regarding options for the future location of the island's ferry terminal was held on Thursday 29 October 2009. The focus of the consultation activity was a drop-in session, and evening workshop.

5.2 During the drop-in session, visitors were encouraged to post any comments / questions into a sealed comments box. Staff facilitating the event also recorded the comments of visitors to the session. The evening workshop took the form of discussions within groups, with each group chaired by an independent facilitator.

5.3 Additional correspondence was also received prior to, and following the consultation event. A series of meetings were also held with the ferry crews, and with groups of fisherman following the workshop.

Summary of Key Findings

5.4 A range of comments were received during the consultation event with both North Voe and Symbister Harbour receiving support as the preferred location of the Whalsay ferry terminal.

Support for North Voe option

5.5 The main arguments in favour of constructing a ferry terminal at North Voe are outlined below.

- Lack of space in Symbister Harbour for future growth of the ferry service, thus constraining growth of the island;
- A move to North Voe could create more space for Marina users, and white fish fleet;
- The option would increase conflict between harbour users, causing congestion in the harbour and leading to marine safety concerns;
- Concern over the impact of the Symbister Harbour option on local heritage;
- Road congestion at Symbister and a strain on car parking capacity;
- Disruption at Symbister during the construction period of a new ferry terminal if the Symbister Harbour option was taken forward.

5.6 Regarding the North Voe location, several residents stated that the ferries would have more room to manoeuvre than if the terminal was located at Symbister.

Support for South Voe option

5.7 The main arguments in favour of constructing a ferry terminal at South Voe are outlined below.

- The majority of those comments in support of the South Voe option expressed concern over the visual and environmental impact of constructing a ferry terminal at North Voe.
- There were also concerns over road safety, particularly at the junction where the North Voe terminal would take access.
- Arguments were also put forward for the re-development of Symbister Harbour, in order to benefit both the ferry services, as well as the fishing industry.
- It was also argued that any investment in North Voe would effectively reduce opportunities for future investment in Symbister Harbour.

Key Questions

5.8 A series of key questions have been compiled from the workshop feedback; and the notes taken in each of the groups, and are presented below.

<p>Ferries</p>	<p>Q. Why do we need a bigger ferry? Is this because of EU Rules?</p> <p>A. The principal reason that a bigger ferry (i.e. 65m) is required is to provide the capacity necessary (31 cars) for the current and future needs of the island. Having said that, even if we were to build a ferry of the same capacity as Linga it would need to be around 50m long to accommodate the design standards required under EU Directives for ship design.</p> <p>Q. Can a 50 – 60m ferry operate from existing site?</p> <p>A. A ferry of 50m in length is likely to be wider than any of the current vessels and therefore would not fit on the existing linkspans on the Whalsay route. Also, it would have problems turning within Symbister.</p> <p>Q. What happens when <i>MV Hendra</i> gets to the end of its life (around 2010)?</p> <p>A. <i>MV Hendra</i> had work done in 2004 to ensure a life expectancy of at least 10 years which take us to 2014. The plan is to have a new vessel in place before this date.</p>
<p>Fixed Link</p>	<p>Q. What about a tunnel?</p> <p>A. The Council has established that the Bressay transport link will be the first tunnel in Shetland. The main reasons for this is that it is the project is closer to being affordable (£34 million for Bressay compared to £111 million for Whalsay) and is less technically risky.</p>

<p>Construction Impact</p>	<p>Q. What disruption would occur during construction of either of the two options?</p> <p>A. The North Voe option could be built with no disruption to either ferry or harbour operations.</p> <p>The Symbister option would be highly disruptive to both ferry and harbour operations and the marina would have to be relocated for up to 18 months (only viable place being the pelagic berthing area).</p>
<p>Service Pattern</p>	<p>Q. Would one of the two Whalsay Ferries ever be based on Mainland, if there was no room to berth in Whalsay?</p> <p>A. It is not an objective to base a ferry on mainland Shetland. However, if the Symbister option was chosen then it would not be possible to accommodate a second larger vessel in the harbour and therefore berthing at Laxo or Vidlin would need to be considered.</p>
<p>Funding</p>	<p>Q. Is the funding in place for the terminal works?</p> <p>A. The Council has committed sufficient funding to begin work at Laxo in 2010. It is considering its longer term capital programme over the coming months and this includes plans for funding for Laxo, Symbister and Vidlin.</p> <p>Q. Is the funding in place for the new ferries?</p> <p>A. There is no funding currently in the capital programme for ferries but the Council will be considering this in the preparation of the longer term capital programme.</p>
<p>Timescales</p>	<p>Q.What are the proposed timescales for a decision?</p> <p>A. The Council's Infrastructure Committee will take it's final decision on 2 February 2010.</p> <p>Q. What are the proposed timescales for implementation?</p> <p>A.</p> <p>2010/ 2011 – Detailed design and tendering of Laxo terminal. 2011/ 2012 – Construction of Laxo and Detailed design and tendering of Whalsay terminal. Design and tendering of new ferry.</p>

	<p>2012/ 2103 – Construction of Whalsay Terminal and Detailed Design and tendering of Vidlin terminal. Construction of Ferry</p> <p>2013/ 2014 – Construction of Vidlin Terminal. Conclusion of construction of ferry and delivery.</p>
Process	<p>Q. What will be the process for feeding back information to the community?</p> <p>A. This report provides feedback from the consultation carried out on 29th October 2009. People can continue to provide feedback up until mid January 2010 and this will be included in the reporting to the Infrastructure Committee on 2 February 2010.</p>

Appendix A

Drop In Session – “Comment Box” Responses

1. The only thing I want is a reliable service that doesn't compromise anything in the isle. South Voe is too crowded and I'm worried that it will make service worse to stay here. We need more capacity on the ferry it's hard to get on if you don't book. Road congestion is a real problem. Not enough space for car parking. The pier would look lovely and be more enjoyable if the ferry wasn't there. The whit fish boats don't have enough space.

2. Keeping the ferry here because it's the hub of the community is rubbish. It's sinful that the Peerie Dock is destroyed its where our community started. We want the most reliable services with best safety. Where it goes from doesn't matter. It's the one chance to spend money on the community, we need not to compromise. North Voe is giving chance for expansion. The South Voe has our heritage but the scheme destroys it. Blasting by the Hanseatic Booth could destroy it too. It's important to keep it for the tourism. Lots of visiting yachts, we need space for them. If the ferry goes we'd have more space and can meet the needs. Has there been a meeting with the marina's users group?

3. North Roe – Whalsay has potential to develop & keep it at Symbister stops development. Marina is full and this will make it worse. It's too restricted at South Voe for safety. Conflict of usage at harbour. We need more capacity. We need a bigger ferry to meet community needs but for that we need more space. I want to keep the Peerie Dock. The road layout here is awful; the big trucks get congested here. We need to keep Symbister for fishing and North Voe for the ferries. There is woodworm in North Voe so they can't keep boxes in the North Voe. The café has problems with parking, so if ferry goes there will be more space.

4. No doubt should go in North Voe. For the disruption would be a nightmare in South Voe. It would also protect the historic dock. The boats bet bigger here, not smaller, space I needed. White fish might pick up & the North Voe would clear 4 berths.

5. North Voe would be better. South Voe's only benefit is it shelters the marina I think it could be workable. I would like to see the Peerie Dock repaired. The more space left for fishermen the better we don't know what the future will bring. I favour the North Voe.

6. I think the North Voe has been concerted effort to get it in there. The group that's been pushing it's the Ferrymen. The fishermen weren't involved in these decisions. Its much more construction than could happen at South Voe. There needs to be roads coming in too. I've been looking at outer harbour of South

Voe – I think the views in the stag (report) are limited; they take out more of the rocks than needed. Moving the ferry to the white fish fleet area, would be an option that hasn't been considered. The option the fishermen have proposed hasn't been taken up it would improve the harbour for everybody. (Response: it would still need to get out to deep water.) North Voe – its not going to be as wide an opening.

7. North Voe is clear winner. It's clearer, the ferry would be more reliable. Disruption during work for years. The harbour is too congested. There would be no room for development. It's tight for the boats as it is, and there would be no room for them getting bigger like they are.

8. I am a commuter & the disruption is a nightmare, when work was going on recently it was really hard. I think commuters might move out of the isles.

9. North Voe is only option. No disruption. What will come of everything? Even look at car parking, won't be better at South Voe after. There would be 2 large ferries once the Linga goes. Would not be able to berth 2 ferries so jobs would move to the mainland. There'd be no disruption during works at North Voe. So congested in South Voe. If the Linga accident happened at Symbister, the Isle would have been cut off. Any incident would cause a lot of damage in the harbour.

10. I want a reliable safe service anything that makes it less reliable is a no-no. It has to be for the future not just 5 years time. We need to plan for future development. Need to go to North Voe if not enough space for 2 large ferries. Can' lose the jobs to the mainland. Need to plan for the future, why restrict out marine environment use when we don't know what will be needed in 10 years. We need to use all our space so we have option for the future.

11. If there is going to be 2 ferries (size of Yell) will there be room for all the fishing boats? No. One would have to be based on mainland. That's not an option - must go to the North Voe. It's not going to effect the shop & café – it will still have people coming to Whalsay and using the shop & café. Give us something safe & reliable for 60-70 years to come.

12. I think it should go on North Voe. It's for the future. We'd have 2 harbours. There isn't enough room at Symbister. Leaves the berths for the white fish & for future expansion for any vessels. All the ferry skippers say it's not safe for big boats. All the bairns flying round the harbour in small boats, it's not safe.

13. I think a fixed link is the answer for Whalsay. A fixed link could be done in stages. A terminal could be put in at Bonnydale. Whatever happens for north Voe & South Voe we need an extended timescale – get to 7.30 airport without staying on mainland. Could stay for late events on mainland. What about new terminal at Laxo – we have bottle necks where people can't get bookings. As

regards South Voe it's already crowded at South Voe, huge disruption during the work if it stays at North Voe. The road outside the hall is a bottle neck already it will be worse when work is going on. Ferries aren't an answer in the future. I don't think it will change the community and way of life or the loss of services.

14. I favour North Voe. There would be lots of disruption for South Voe. You could build it then just change over.

15. North Voe, for me & my whole family, it's the way forward, anything else is stepping back. It's for next 50 – 100 years. Lots of mess & congested at South Voe. It means you can get bigger ferries as you need them. Leaves other harbour clear for recreation & fishermen. A ferry harbour that's just for ferries is important.

16. Limited space for future. Symbister limited growth for pelagic fleet, larger vessel cannot be accommodated.

17. It's too congested at South Voe. It's a bottleneck at this road. We should get a new harbour and make it best for the future and bigger ferries. It should be at North Voe. There wouldn't be more traffic, or by more dangerous. I wouldn't want to see the old dock destroyed if money was available in future that could be a tourist attraction like Hays Dock.

18. For North Voe – congestion of South Voe. Can't fill up Peerie Dock which was mainstay of heritage and industry, it must be left it can't be filled in – no way.

19. North Voe – more room. South Voe – struggle with weather. North Voe makes more sense.

20. South Voe – it's a safe harbour that's proved over a number of years. It's safe, there have been no accidents. The expense of North Voe, it's an unknown quantity. It will end up costing more money. There are salmon industry in North Voe – its jobs, it could be developed. What impact will that have on salmon? Upkeep of two harbours is an expense that Shetland as a whole would have to bear. It's handy for lorries to fish factory. This might develop too. It's been assumed that we need a big ferry & that there is an agenda to take it to the North Voe. There has been a smoke screen & it's what the ferrymen wanted. It was always the premise behind the process!

21. For North Voe. The harbour is really overcrowded. It's important for the future and for the young people. Trying to cram too much in the one we have. It's not safe to have a bigger ferry with so little room. For future development it has to be North Voe. We need to listen to what the ferry crews say.

My view is the same; no one knows what the future holds so we need the room for future development. The first pier came & the boats were small, but things develop you can't see where it's going. So when the North Voe is being developed there will be less disruption. We can use the harbour, whereas if it's Symbister being developed there'll be terrible disruption to the boats and ferries.

22. I think South Voe is most practical, the weather in the North Voe is worse. What guarantee is there that there'll be two big ferries? It may not keep the swell out. I think it wouldn't be possible to deliver for 8m.

23. I assumed North Voe was going ahead. I am easy either way. I just don't want a poorer service. 2 harbours – more room to go ahead. It's giving people the chance to think about it & talk about it. I don't think they will stop speaking.

24. I don't want to see it going down to one ferry or being any less that we have already. I don't mind where it goes as long as it's best for the isle.

25. For North Voe. South Voe is at full capacity. It would leave no room for expansion for the future. It could work for South Voe but North Voe has more scope for the future.

26. North Voe for me – the current harbour is too congested. It affects the whitefish and shellfish boats. They need as much space. Look to the future we are being offered two harbours. It's madness to turn it down. Not enough car parking at South Voe. Car parking is bad anyway around shop & hall. It doesn't deal with the conflict between ferries & other harbour uses. Lots of disruption during the works at South Voe. Environmental impact of the ? also on the Hanseatic Booth. Good ferry is really important or we'll lose the young people and then the older people. Latest incident with Linga – if it had been in Symbister it would have cost millions. Hanseatic Booth is best photographed area not North Voe.

27. North Voe is most sensible. Need to keep entrance clear for whitefish boats dolphin will restrict access. The North Voe isn't that far away. It will reduce congestion. Coming into South Voe in a big ferry is a real problem. Listen to what the ferrymen say, its madness not to listen to them. I don't think the traffic will affect the bairns, the cars will be stopping. The beach is still there, no loss of amenity.

28. For North Voe – less congested, would shelter small boats at North Voe and have space for lobster creels. North Voe is most practical. Being close to ferry is a good thing for the residents.

29. For North Voe – it should have been there, its handier for the whole island. There isn't enough room for fishing boats already. Keeping ferry separate would be better. There is not enough parking here. There is a bottleneck by the shop.

The children are having to pass the bottleneck, so it's not safe already. We need more room not less we have options for future if we need a bigger ferry. It's just a one off at South Voe we'd have a problem we'd need to sort again.

30. I don't want it to be worse than the service we have now. Need the space for the other users of the harbour. Don't mind where it goes. Just make a decision and get on with it.

31. Fixed link is what we need rather than wasting more money on ferries. It's essential for the sustainability of the Islanders. There have been accidents on the corner at North Voe. The road is not safe and gets icy in the winter.

32. For North Voe. The South Voe is maxed out and unsuitable mainly due to the entrance. Whatever you create in basin the entrance is the problem. You limit opportunities for other uses. It's mayhem at the road, people parking everywhere, it's tight with all the road congestion by the shop. This Voe being cleared means more berths for whitefish boats & the marina. The North Voe can be developed further. It opens opportunities for the future and makes the best of an empty Voe. Only a fool would turn down a brand new harbour and get the opportunity of two for the price of one. Common sense must prevail. The island is commuter orientated the ferry service must get better. The South Voe + big ferry = worse service especially in worse weather.

33. With big ferries have no option but to go with the North Voe. It's not safe to come in in heavy weather in the South Voe. It's no use for commuters to have ferries that stop in bad weather. It's important to get a final decision so we can move on.

34. My favourite option would be to have a new breakwater just outside the harbour to take the ferries. The local residents in North Voe aren't in favour. I wouldn't want to see the old dock filled in it's been here 100 years and it's part of our heritage. Not one penny has been spent on it. We need to restore it. We should refurbish the harbour and go for a tunnel in the near future. Everyone would like to see that. It will be very congested in this harbour with the big ferries. If they dredge this area the Hanseatic Booth will collapse. The marina dolphins aren't big enough for all the small boats. We need to maximise space for the small boats.

35. We need to clear the harbour for the small boats. Can't have the ferry coming in. it's too busy at the marina. There isn't space for the lobster boxes, they need to keep them for Christmas, selling them sooner makes no money. Let the ferry have a place for themselves.

36. Population has not increased. No need for larger vessel/s. Why not build a mainland terminal nearer to Whalsay?

37. No disruption for the North Voe. South Voe – works would effect ferry service & be disrupted until it's complete. Dolphin at end of pier will affect entry for whitefish boats. It's important they get a much space as possible.

38. The North Voe will be more accessible.

39. I think North Voe gives best ferry service. Not enough space in harbour. If whitefish industry grows then will need more space. Less disruption while work is going on. Ask the ferrymen – they know the answer. X3. If rough & the ferry can't go then it costs for the air ambulance. If its rough and the ferry can't go the children won't get taught. Need to look to future & we need the right ferry service that means in most weather so people can stay in the island. The boats are getting bigger so are need to keep the space for the whitefish boats. Its no safe for the marina & ferry at the same place – see Linga accident, it would have been a disaster.

40. When weather is bad the whitefish boats can't get in. Won't be more traffic as they come this way. It's very congested by shop. Congestion will improve at North Voe. The café etc doesn't mind if it went to North Voe. Should see how congested the pier gets, we need the space. Not enough parking at Symbister. We need a decision now. It's not good enough to put it off again. We need to get it sorted out and do what is best for the island not individuals. It will be fine to watch the ferries coming into the North Voe. Bigger vehicles & caravans on the ferry now, so we need a bigger ferry.

41. No real preference between North & South Voe. What is important to me: Reliable service, Regular service, reasonably priced service, Passenger comfort and safety, Capacity. I would also like to think that the option of a fixed link to Whalsay be seriously considered.

42. I think the South Voe option is too cramped. Starting with a blank sheet in the North Voe would enable you to make a terminal more suited for purpose. North Voe gives earlier access to main road and splits north and south traffic immediately.

43. Where is the parking area on North Voe option? Will need parking for commuters.

44. South Voe compromises future options for the community.

45. It would take less time at North Voe. The ferry won't be disrupted and you could just get on with the work without needing to stop for ferry. Will have less impact on the commuters.

46. In an ideal world I like the North Voe as it is, I don't want it to change. The ferry men have to be confident where they take it. I don't want to see cars and people queuing up and ruining the area.

47. I think North Voe. When it's windy it's not safe to come in such a congested harbour. I can't come home to my family. One boat came in last weekend and it hit another boat. A ferry has to operate all the times. Bigger ferries need a lot of room. Listen to ferry men they know what their job is. If you put a dolphin on small pier it will be tight and in bad weather it will be impossible to manoeuvre into the harbour. Boats get bigger so we need more space not less. The whitefish fleet is getting more boats so get more space.

48. North Voe – 100%. Further development potential. Sheer disruption & congestion for developing the South Harbour. If in South Voe, there is no more chance for development. If it goes to North Voe can develop both Voes.

49. I simply think there is no need to move to the North Voe. The environmental damage that would happen would be horrendous and we would be left with a concrete eyesore. Leave Symbister harbour as it is because in the future tunnels will be here. We simply cannot afford to be constantly replacing ferries every 5-10 years. South Voe is the main hub of Whalsay please leave it that way. The financial and environmental damage needs to be looked at further.

50. North Voe – there isn't enough room in the South Voe. I don't want to see big ferries coming through South Voe harbour entrance – not enough room. No disturbance whilst it's being built. No disturbance to ferry run during works for communities. No room for keeping boxes for lobsters in the South Voe option, this brings money to the community so should be accommodated. Taking ferry out will create space in harbour and will allow more development for future. South Voe – in bad weather the ferry will stop more often, poorer service. Improve things for the future don't make things worse. Need to keep young people in Whalsay, if they can't commute they will leave.

51. As a master on the Whalsay route my views are for the safety and the service and to maintain the service we have at the moment it must go in the North Voe. The South Voe is too small for the proposed size of vessel which is needed for the good of the isle. With certain weather conditions I would be very concerned about taking the vessels in the South Voe compared with the North Voe. Only 1 place for the terminal to go for the good of the isle and that is the North Voe.

52. North Voe – will be designated only for ferries, easier access less chance of collision. Symbister entrance too small especially for the bigger ferries. Moving to North Voe opens up harbour for small boats and fishing. If you keep ferry in South Voe, no expansion in the future, restrict development & marina. Linga accident – if it had happened in Symbister would have taken out marina & could

have had injuries. South Voe lots of traffic in & out esp. in the summer. I prefer the North Voe especially for safety, it's not normal to have ferries in the middle of a harbour.

53. North Voe. Safety – congested harbour already and it will get worse if stay in South Voe. Small boats – boys fly around harbour, at risk with other boats it's too busy. Every red buoy in harbour is a small business, they need amenities. South Voe will limit development, nothing more can be done. Youth need reliable, good ferry service. Ferry won't run so often if stay in South Voe in bad weather. If stay in South Voe one ferry will be berthed in mainland, takes 20 jobs out of island. The Ferries bring people in to live and work.

54. If Linga accident had happened in Whalsay it would have been carnage. It would have cost a lot if it hit the small boats.

55. Congested South Voe, it is hard for ferries to get in. The dolphin will disrupt whitefish boats tying up. South Voe will be big disruption whereas North Voe would just be ready to go. Will be easier to work on site without traffic coming in and out. Not enough room on roads, congested for artics & lorries going into fish factory. Parking and people waiting make the road full anyway. Parking is bad already and won't improve. North Voe is fit for purpose and will be ready to go. Ferry needs to go; I can't not get to work. If ferry isn't reliable then it can't work for commuters and the whole community. I can't always get to work when I need to. I go out earlier than I need to. You can only move back to Whalsay if you get jobs. Commuting will increase & you need to meet more capacity.

56. Does not matter what goes on inside Symbister harbour entrance is too narrow.

57. A tunnel would be best but if there isn't a good ferry service then my kids won't want to live here. Regular service is most important can't have reduced service or schedule. Concern that big boats mean less boats running. Disruption to service when building South Voe will be crazy whereas starting on North Voe will be easier and less problem. North Voe means the marina & fishing can have more space & berths. Pond at bottom – lots of rare birds. Impact of big ferries on the environment.

58. Safety – not enough room for big ferries its too tight at Symbister. Be hard to manoeuvre in bad weather. Berthing easier at North Voe. Takes time to berth, North Voe is easier, more room less congestion. Free up South Voe for development & expansion. North Voe provides best service, I would rather see it stay the same than to end up with a less good service by they South Voe development. North Voe provides best service. Disruption during building the South Voe development. Ferries won't run and they will have to stop work for the ferry. It's important for commuters. If you want isle to develop & have potential for more whitefish boats then need to free up South Voe for expansion.

59. Preferred the earlier scheme the meadow area for marina area. Need more space for the marina & need to reduce congestion in the area. We could improve shelter and open up the harbour for the ferry. Costs can change so this should be revisited as an option. Move on with this to stop divides in the community.

60. The road outside is hellish sometimes, North Voe will improve traffic. The marina of South Voe will leave them exposed. If I want a job on mainland I need a decent service. Teachers & others commute into Whalsay, we need to keep them able to get in. The ferry is not the hub. The services & the buildings matter not where the ferry happens to come in.

61. North Voe is the only place this terminal can go.

62. Please listen to ferry skippers, mates and crew, who by now know what they are speaking about and having to deal with at this time. They are out and in the harbour 244 times a week 12,688 times a year plus extra hire runs. Today you will have seen all the space they have to manoeuvre in and bigger ferries expected in the future, all the space is gained in south Voe will maybe not be significant. Just imagine if the Linga had malfunctioned inside Symbister harbour instead of Laxo maybe that should be thought about.

63. We prefer Symbister. My major concern is where the North Voe road goes. The safety of the bairns really worries me. They will all have to pass the ferry terminal. 28 children in the North Voe area and they walk to school, worry about the dark & ice, it's not safe for them to go there. The cost also worries me. The alterations to Symbister looks less but the costs are coming out the same – it doesn't make sense. Water comes over road at North Voe it comes in with some force. Will there be money to maintain the piers for both Voe's? The fishing industry needs the piers and needs to keep them maintained for the future. Fishing is really important to Whalsay. They need to keep the Pier at Symbister. * Important Concern * The whitefish fleet is depleting so there may not be any need for more berths in the future. Would it not be better to keep in Symbister? North Voe is beautiful, its used by children fishing and swimming bairns come from all over Whalsay to try fishing at Symbister, wildlife would be gone – seals, others. Some concern about possibility that will go down to one ferry in future – what happens in an emergency if only one boat?? * concern re 1 boat * Coming into the 's bend' for the ferry in bad weather, North Voe is more exposed and it's a concern that it will be worse ferry service if it went to North Voe in bad weather especially in a North wind.

64. North Voe. White fish boats tie at other ports as not enough room when bad weather Filla etc. None of men home we feel we need to come in & back them up. Ferryman should be allowed to air view, they know best, along with fishermen. Caravans, bigger cars etc taking up more room, will this keep getting

bigger. Marina & sailing ramp not suitable any further in. Café at pier, WBC, Symbister shop – folk would go anyway – no opposition. Use of North Voe as play area not valid reason these boys will be men needing berths for boats. Traffic around North Voe area would be no worse than it is just now? Symbister shop area impossible at times when goods come in e.g. Tue & Thurs afternoons. If in North Voe this would be eased considerably due to ferry traffic. Lack of fishing boats at pier, better if they would have come up when fishermen were home to air views. Not enough parking area at Symbister. If super ferries are to be how many? & capacity?

65. Don't go with South Voe. Must have a ferry service that can, at the very least, provide a service like what we already have but also have the capacity to provide service for next 40 years. The South Voe option, with possibility of "diminished service in certain weather conditions" should have been thrown out as soon as the words "diminished service" appeared. Heritage – South Voe – filling in Peerie dock and possible damage underwater blasting might do the Hanseatic booth foundations. We should promote heritage & tourism. Safety in South Voe – conflict with other users – the removal of ferries from South Voe would allow young boys who are learning boatmanship in small boats the safety to go about the shelter of Harbour. Biggest fear for 13yr old is that they steer small boat before ferry, as marina & ferry terminal so close. As far as I have seen, those against North Voe option argument is "not in my back door" mentality. These minority must not be allowed to hinder the future viability of living on Whalsay but having to work on mainland and children's education - commuting teacher into Whalsay. In a few years those people will have learnt to live with ferry in North Voe. If ferry goes in South Voe the repercussions will have far reaching consequences for Whalsay as a whole. Listen to ferrymen & stag report and let common sense prevail.

66. Listening to discussions locally and come to the conclusion that it would be best for the isles future for the new ferry terminal to go to the North Voe. Room must be allowed for the development of the harbour in the future for all our young folk and Symbister is too congested already, overcrowded really. Pity you cannot view Symbister Harbour when all the large pelagic boats are in port and all the whitefish boats, not to mention the ferries constantly on the move and the many small craft in the marina.

67. Key point of argument was exploration of Symbister option which can accommodate 2 x B600s & Filla & provide operational benefits. For same/equivalent cost of North Voe. Various images produced which appeared to illustrate "conceptual" feasibility of this in either "outer harbour" extension, or longer breakwater within inner harbour.

68. The cost of North Voe is too big – I think it will go down to one ferry in years to come as council tightens its belts. I don't bide around here but if I did the view

being taken away at North Voe. Lots of children come to school; it's a concern for me. (This is secondary comment to earlier North Voe comment).

69. North Voe – plenty of room it's entirely congested in the harbour. Lots of disruption. Looking into the future for the bairns. Dependable ferry service. It's dangerous with the road congestion at shop and ferry. Peerie Dock – if the ferry wasn't there then there would be more berths. There would be no room for future expansion. The boats are getting bigger, we need more space. We don't want the historic dock filled in its part of its heritage. It's only 300 yards different to the Hall from North Voe compared to Symbister. 13 bairns walking, 8 bairns but most days it's none walking. I've been paying attention.

70. It's the only place for it – North Voe. Need to listen to the ferrymen. If the Linga accident had happened here it would have been a disaster. There really isn't enough space. The white fish boats without thrusters already have problems, worse on new dolphin. There would be less berths, we can't expand the Marina. In years to come North Voe could be developed, at Symbister it's the end of it. North Voe is the best for the future of the Island. Need to listen to the Ferrymen. They are the ones taking the boats in and they know what's safe.

71. North Voe – South Voe is too congested. This can be developed in future whereas Symbister...

72. Concern re future & size of vessels. Sees no necessity for size of vessels. Didn't want the big vessels. Pelagic – very opposed. Hook on North Voe outer seems unnecessary.

73. Congestion at the shop is a red herring. There have been crashes on the road where North Voe pier comes in, due to the camber. There is inadequate gritting at North Voe. Does hook on North Voe have an effect on South Voe? Aesthetics... North Voe...Ecology impacts... No where quite like that on Whalsay. Sewage impacts and associated Health impacts. Believe it could be accommodated in South Voe.

74. South Voe – tight/no space. South Voe – where store things during construction? North Voe easier to construct than South Voe. Waiting list for berths. North Voe gives room for expansion for marina. It enables construction of more berths, bigger berths and opportunities for visitor berths.

75. Not enough room in South Voe - too tight with a 46' vessel, possibly increases the risk. Perhaps unworkable. Northerly...No shelter in northerly wind with South Voe option for some of the marina berths. Visiting yachts constrained. Lots of young boys are doing yacht activities. North Voe enables the Pier to be expanded on.

76. Storage lobsters. Big disruption. Fishing vessel / marina users constrained. Has to be North Voe – no room at South Voe.

77. Why has there been no consultation on this up to now?
Why not try and bring in the B600's to see if there is enough room?

North Voe better serves community – Linga too big for harbour already.

78. 160 commuters, and on the increase. These should be catered for by providing the best and most reliable ferry service possible. All the evidence points towards the North Voe.

Teachers, for example, commuting to work in Whalsay require a good reliable ferry service. The implications of more disruption to the ferry service would have a very negative effect on children's education for obvious reasons. Likewise, teachers commuting from Whalsay need a good service for the same reasons. The same argument can be applied to all commuters.

Ferry men – who are charged with the responsibility of passenger safety and providing an effective service – are strongly of the opinion that the North Voe is best for providing a reliable and safe service.

Duration of crossing – the speed that the Zephyr and others come to the pier is ridiculously slow – without having to negotiate the inner parts of the harbour. These boats have much more power, and much greater bulk under water.

Safety for commuters and other harbour users. The destruction caused by the Linga at Laxo recently illustrates why it would be much safer to remove the ferries from Symbister.

North Voe is effectively expanding Whalsay's harbour potential. This is an opportunity that we must not miss.

It is widely accepted that the South Voe is almost full capacity. Which option would offer most potential for development? For most potential for more whitefish berths? The obvious solution is to move the ferry terminal to the North Voe.

Traffic at Hall & Shop will be eased.

79. North & South Voe Whalsay; Background.

Something that may be difficult to comprehend, for anyone outside Whalsay is, when the great division among its populace re' the sighting of a Ferry Terminal, something that has to serve all.

To understand any such division, there must be an understanding of that community's History. The North and South Voe dispute did not start with the

Ferry Terminals, it started over fifty years ago with the sighting of a fishing harbour.

Lines were drawn and arguments raged, protagonists for North Voe maintained they had the support of the majority of the Islands Population, if they did they were obviously not heard. This of course caused resentment, and I believe is part of what is still fuelling this dispute today, especially when they see some of the same people who made (as they see it) a mistake last time prepared to make the same mistake over again.

I would urge the decision-makers in all this to, listen to the arguments, but to look for a clear consensus of opinion is a vain hope. They must surely therefore go by the professional opinion, of the Masters who operate the Ferries and, the professional opinion contained within the Stag report, to do otherwise is to build on shake foundations.

80. I see this new ferry terminal as being very very important for the future of our island and because of its importance this is a chance we must take to ensure that it be built wherever it enables us to get the more reliable service and with safety in mind for the future get ferries that can make our crossing as fast as possible because a faster reliable service might encourage our youth to remain living in the isle. I do not agree that ferry terminal must be the hub of the community in fact there are more possibilities of accidents arising with it being situated there bearing in mind that youths are often working around in small boats.

I went to the pier today and the ferry traffic was right out passed the head of the dock on the middle of the main road the cars before me and myself had a problem getting passed, also the weekend that they were fixing the terminal at Symbister I had to drop people off at the ferry and was caught up in a traffic jam it was chaos so I wonder what it will be like if the terminal is built in South Voe. I do not want to see the DOCK being filled in.

The ferry could carry on as it is just now while a new terminal is built if it went In North Voe whereas I'm sure there will be a big disruption while being built if it is as the South Voe.

Then we have the T-junction at the hall which causes problems especially when there are functions in the hall and that's after you have come up around the shop corner passed all the cars which are parked outside shop.

The access to toilets and waiting room is very poor.

I am not a North Voe South Voe person but common sense and everything I've seen and heard tells me that the North Voe is the only sensible option and I must stress that it is the ferry men who are taking us across and back so they should have the biggest say in where the new terminal should go.

Most important too is that our fishermen can have their Voe back giving them the must needed room they require I'm sure it would benefit the small boat marina also.

81. Whalsay Consultation: Individual Submission

Structure of the consultation

- Ferryman have already had their consultation with councillors – should they have been involved?
- I expected to be able to put across my views in confidence, without the stress of intimidation.
- We were effectively pitched head-to-head with people with opposite views and interests.
- We understood that councillors were not to enter the discussion. However, in one group, councillor Laura Baisley voiced an opinion.

Commuter issues

- Big-capacity ferries are not the answer to commuters' needs. Even if these ferries were used, we would still encounter the same problems:-
 - the cost of commuting.
 - the length of time the journey takes
 - the unreliability of the service in winter, when it has to swap between Laxo and Vidlin. People who need to leave their cars on the mainland, in order to cut down the cost of travel, face problems when the service switches terminals.
 - one problem is the booking system. At present, people book cars on at peak times and do not use the booking. This is frustrating when you can't get booked on – but you still usually get aboard. However, you don't have the peace of mind that you'll definitely get to work on time.

Environmental issues

- Ferryman are naturally trying to safeguard their future. However, once a voe is developed specifically for one purpose, the chance of getting a fixed link could be lost.
- If the North Voe was developed – and later a fixed link became possible – the islanders would be left with a legacy of concrete.
- As far as I'm aware, no ferry terminal has been constructed within such close proximity to communities of houses. This raises concerns of noise pollution, road safety and invasion of privacy.

I am concerned that the community workers who chaired each table got the impression that the opinion of the island is nearly unanimous in favour of the North Voe. The lady who summed up at the end thanked us for the civilised discussion, where everyone's views were heard. This simply was not the case. A lot of the men in the hall were ferryman, and with the absence of a huge chunk of the fishing fleet, it was not an even representation of the island. There

are many who felt unable to express their views due to the random groupings – and did not find the experience at all positive or comfortable.

On a more positive note, I congratulate the council in seeking the views of the people affected by the decision they are about to make. I just feel that it could have been structured in a less intimidating way. I also feel that it was totally wrong for some groups to have votes on which vote they prefer.

Appendix B – Workshop Flip Chart Records

Group 1

- * Any new ferry will have to be bigger – EU Rules?
 - Bottleneck – if you are not a commute (block booked) you have a problem getting in touch
 - Issues with booking system
 - Ferry capacity will have to grow with population N
- * Is there a difference in cost between North Voe and South Voe option?
 - Not as they are drawn at the moment
 - The recent incident at Laxo - if that had happened in Symbister it would have been carnage – millions of pounds of damage N (either location - Whalsay would be cut off!)
- * Timetabling issues could possibly (?) be resolved with a shorter crossing to the main land (Boniedale)??
 - South Voe - no room for expanding berths N
 - Want to see Whalsay improving – North Voe will help expand amenities N
 - What about a fixed link in the future?
 - Would want to see an equitable service on the ferry like other communities have – so that I could catch an early flight from Sumburgh – without having to stay out of the isle overnight N S
 - South Voe development would disrupt everyday life – fishing boats wouldn't be able to come in N
 - Population will remain steady and probably grow N
 - Timetabling works at the moment – linking with buses working hours – larger ferries in South Voe couldn't dock as quickly – commutes would be disrupted N
 - Concern about the marina N
 - Marina is simply not big enough N
 - Ferry service is good as a commuter N S
 - Size of ferries is okay – for demographics N S
 - Big vehicles – better timetabling
 - To lose North Voe – visual impact S
 - Population will grow – we'll need bigger ferries N
 - Safety is priority – bigger boats in Symbister safety will go N
 - Ferry now every 45 minutes – bigger ferries won't be able to keep to that timetable – massive impact on community N
 - Small entrance to Symbister is an issue N
 - We have to think about the bigger ferries coming – it would be a shame to spend £10M on South Voe for ferries not to get in

Group 2

- 1). Need a new terminal and bigger ferry or fixed link
- 2). Doing nothing is not an option
- 3). Reliable / Safe
 - Frequent
 - Sustainable
- 4). Can operate in all reasonable weather conditions
- 5). Needs to be fit for purpose – specific for transport link (65m ferry new regs)
- 6). Affordable for commuters sustaining the community, and in the long term for Shetland
- 7). Needs to meet everyone in the community's needs from old to young
- 8). Capacity sufficient
 - Could be fixed link
- 9). Needs to have room for expansion (this includes potential growth of fishing fleet)

Group 2

QUESTIONS RAISED

1. Is there room for 50 – 60m ferry to operate from existing site?
2. How much do we know about safety aspects in relation to North Voe / South Voe

NORTH VOE

Needs to happen and need to happen now

SOUTH VOE

Both sites lend themselves to being affordable for commuters and sustaining the community

Reliable?

Safe?

Questions to be answered to everyone's satisfaction

Needs to be fit for purpose

Group 3

Negative

N/A

3) NORTH VOE

Positive

Reliability / Safety

- When service is being developed in North Voe South can continue including emergency services
- More room to manoeuvre – no small boats
- Better in northern winds
- Room to expand – develop service – able to cope with bigger ferries
- More likely to run to timetable – easier access
- Similar access to all services – School, Hall, Leisure Centre
- Time to move on

3) SOUTH VOE

Positive

Reliability / Safety

N/A

Negative

- Constraints of existing harbour
- Not enough car parking
- General congestion of small boats
- Ferry would limit any expansion of marina
- Concern about safety and ferry maintenance in poor weather

Service fit for future demands

N/A

- Limited space if ferry cabins were to grow in size
- If the Voe is at capacity now how can it develop
- Development would disrupt fishing fleet
- How would emergency services be maintained with the new harbour development?

Group 4

- ✓ Reliable service
- ✓ Good in poor weather
- ✓ More capacity
- Able to cope with peak times
- Better Sunday service
- Later service on demand similar to Yell
- ✓ Safe service
- ✓ Passenger comfort
- ✓ Service fit for future needs, able to develop
- Bookable first ferry service to enable first flights to be accessible
- ✓ A service that enables folk to commute
- Keep the crossing time to 30 minutes
- Keeping to timetable
- ✓ Discount for commuters and regular passengers
- Young people and students get reduced rates to enable them to access college, etc
- A service that allows businesses to flourish
- The future on the isle is dependent on its ferry service
- Reliable emergency service

Group 5

A

- Commuting population has grown
- Local business transport
- Fewer folk working locally
- Better links / frequency for trips to the mainland
- Comfort – crossing
- Depopulation – possibility
- Increase opportunity for development business / community projects / social opportunities
- Terminals we have grumbling into the sea
- Not enough capacity on the ferry cars / commuting. Hendra is coming to the end of it's life – legislation
- We have to get a bigger ferry
- So we need more space / onshore / in the harbour
- Need a service that meets the legal agreement / requirements

B

- Quality of living on the island: sports / activities – access to events both incoming to Whalsay and outgoing, etc
- Change of lifestyle - more reliant on the ferries now
- Must maintain flexibility of service – extended hours & late runs
- To meet the demands for the future years – next 40 years
- Provide opportunities for incoming workers / trades people
- To increase population / encourage young people into the community
- Keep young people in the isle
- Encourage tourism
- Safety and fare affordability – practiced and workable
- Equality of service
- Tunnel? – We can't wait for the tunnel!

C

- Population commuting
- Safety / comfort / capacity / frequency / affordability / legislation / timetable
- Future – increase employment opportunities / young people settling

NORTH VOE

Positives:

- Ferryman / people recommended – professional opinion for this site
- Safety point of view – space, better entrance, no other vessels
- Blank canvas – more purpose build – new build / construction
- Could be built without disrupting existing service
- Ferry would be tied up less due to bad weather
- Heart of the community – potentially
- There will be room for improvement, possibly future marine developments
- Room to extend South Voe marina
- Increase / better facilities / berths for visiting vessels

Negatives:

- N/A

More positive points:

- Enhance the community
- Maintain ferry service jobs
- Free up space at Symbister for future developments
- Safer
- Keep the lobster boxes where they are
- Access onto the main road would be better
- Sailing boats would retain better access at Symbister
- 15 people want North Voe!!

SOUTH VOE

Positives:

- Heart of the community
- Environment impact

Negatives:

- Congestion of traffic
- Lack of parking
- Lack of space in Symbister passing hall
- Disruption to harbour / ferry
- Peerie dock – heritage site
- White fish boats / boats lack of room in the harbour
- Narrow entrance
- Cameron's house is nearby!

Concern about the crews being able to handle vessels in extreme weather in a confined space – safely

Group 6

Assuming a 65m ferry

NORTH

- A bigger ferry would meet most priorities & would be suitable
- Would free up berths for whitefish boats and other boats too
- Need new harbour anyway

SOUTH

- South Voe could still be considered for bigger ferry
- Disruption during development
- If larger boats came in it may be a more restricted service
- Fishing boats may be pushed out of benefits
- Crowded in bad weather

- The need for a better service is more important than location
- Importance is in decision making being very thoroughly involving all views
- Need more information – any other options – Whalsay folk need to be fully informed
 - In any case need two ferries

Group 7

* * NEEDS TO CHANGE TO A BETTER SERVICE

1. Longer operating hours, shorter and more often crossings (working, health)
2. Stop people leaving – keep families together
3. Run in bad weather, safe, reliable
4. Service develops with changes in community
5. Keeping Whalsay up with rest of Shetland
6. Decision making very thorough & consider all views including technical

7. No change will restrict future
8. Community developing all time – better service is essential – don't restrict the future
9. Keep families together
10. Long overdue
11. Linking with other Shetland transport and community events
12. Changes in working patterns e.g. fishing, the need to get to mainland for work
13. Need to consider all views (including technical) and community needs to be satisfied, but change is needed
14. People forced out because of service now

15. Stop people leaving
16. Better service
17. Run in bad weather
18. Run safer
19. Commuters – timekeeping – work – healthcare
20. Regular, continuous & reliable
21. Keeping community sustainable – employment
22. Staying same NOT an option
23. Bigger ferry (cars especially)

Group 8

KEY ISSUES

- Reliable ferry service including weather
- Conflict between ferries and fishing boats
- Safety issues
- Frequency – needs to be increased to meet demands and capacity
- Need to get where you want, when you want
- Fare cost – keeping fares reasonable
- Room for expansion and development of ferry service and harbour area
- Keep ferries in the isles
- Stop out migration
- Also important to be reliable for people coming in to isle for work
- Time tabling issues – currently a compromise – needs to be improved
- Road traffic – Symbister – already busy
- Disruption to ferry service during works
- Stag report
- Avoid loss of heritage
- Keep two ferries
- Comfort of crossing

TOP PRIORITIES

- Safety – Bigger ferries in future – people on marina
 - All harbour users & ferry users
- Reliable – Can't have reduced service
 - Now and into future
- Best for Whalsay – Keep young people
 - Sustainable for future
 - Option of second berth
 - Commuters both in and out to work etc
 - Both ferries to be operated from Whalsay – not to be based on mainland
- Confident Crew – Operation of ferry
- Disruption to small boat users in Symbister
- Need room for expansion – physical space limits options for future
- No operational argument – for North Voe cosmetic
- Decision should be what is best for Whalsay
- Best structure and safest surrounding for terminal
- Need for bigger ferries (to suit sea conditions)

Group 8

NORTH VOE

SOUTH VOE

Reliable	Weather North Voe more reliable. But this option has been tank tested.	
Frequency	Turnaround time faster. Terminal designed for the ferry. No restriction.	
Expansion development (Ferry service) /	No competition for space. Could get two big ferries.	Fishing impact. Lack of car parking spaces. No room for lay by berth for ferries. No room for expansion of the marina.
Expansion development (Harbour area) /	Less conflict between users. Fishing fleet could expand. Would allow for bonny development at Symbister.	
Stop out migration	Depends on reliability.	
Safety	No congestion, better road layout and pavements.	
Disruption	Greenfield site so little or no disruption.	Lots of disruption during construction. Loss of heritage site.
STAG Report	Favours North Voe. Don't feel that there would be a major impact on wild life – as many seals etc in Symbister now.	

NORTH VOE

SYMBISTER

Safety	Ferry - out of way – gets rid of congestion. Safer, reliable service. More room – run more regularly. Safety in construction phase.	Too much cars and boats congestion. Potentially not safe during construction. Built as fishing harbour not ferry harbour. Detrimental to small shellfish business.
Reliability	Clear Voe – no obstructions. No other vessels – more manoeuvrability. STAG report suggests North Voe suitable. Potential for greater service.	STAG report says Symbister not viable in certain weather. Possibility of reduced service in bad weather.
Best for Whalsay	Room for expansion in future. Purpose built ferry terminal. Room on shore for structures. Two ferries suitable for community and growth.	Impact on factory.

Group 9

NORTH

SOUTH

Young people	If not reliable + running at night times then young people will leave	
Reliability	Ferry crew say it's better & we trust who is taking us over	Congestion, margins of error
Safety	Ferry wouldn't go if not safe. Footpaths for roads to get there as foot passengers	Ferry wouldn't go if not safe. Congestion. Young users of harbour. Traffic concerns

1. Make sure ferry crews voice is heard, they know + run the service + we trust them
2. If ferry has to be bigger – needs to keep it in isles for employment
3. Expansion – marina expansion / fishing – more berths
4. Keep the different users segregated – space + safety
5. Meeting needs for next forty years – capacity – development needs – ferry traffic space

Group 9

QUESTIONS

- Q: what happens to ferry boys if the ferries have to move to mainland? – Redeployment
- A: we don't want that – SIC needs to confirm this won't happen
- Q: what will the impact be on jobs if the work on the South Voe interrupts ferry sailings?
- Q: is the funding in place?
- When can it start?
- How long will it take to complete?

ISSUES TO FEEDBACK ON

- Why not a tunnel (Timeframe if it was possible)
 - What is the timescale
 - What is going to happen when Hendra gets to end of life ~ 2010?? *Key date
 - Needs to be done now – the problems happening now
 - Booking system – people book days ahead, block booking, online pay at time so you use it?
 - Need an answer now
 - Get up and running by 2014?
-
- Allow further development
 - Employ local people based on Whalsay and not on mainland – economics of island
 - Bring in services
 - Maintain two ferries
 - No reduction to timetable
 - Bigger ferry sizes seems to lower service – not Whalsay
 - Maintain emergency service
 - Maintain the population – not reduce
 - Protect environment
 - Maintain history and heritage

- No need to fall about it
- Vital lifeline service
- Reliable - 3
- Faster
- Safe - 2
- Enhance the community - 4
- Capacity – meet the peak time size
- Keep the youth in island - 1
- Not dictated by timetable and weather
- Protect existing industry – fishing – tourism – fish factory
- Wider picture
- Best for whole community for next 40 years