

## Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

(i) Comments Supporting North Voe	(ii) Comments Supporting Symbister	(iii) General Comments
SHOULD BE BUILT IN NORTH VOE AS OLD VOE DOESN'T SORT OUT THE LACK OF SPACE / CONFLICT.	SYMBISTER A SENSIBLE PLAN – CARRY ON	WHERE IS THE REGATTA BOAT RAMP? THE DOCK HAS BEEN WELL USED BY BOATS FROM DAY 1 AND SHOULD BE RESTORED. NO MONEY HAS EVER BEEN SPENT ON IT.
NORTH VOE – MUCH BETTER FOR FERRIES & FISHING FLEET ARGUMENTS AGAINST DO NOT HOLD MUCH WATER. THE SOONER IT IS RESOLVED THE BETTER.	SYMBISTER PLAN BEST OPTION – GOOD FOR NEW COPE CAFÉ, COULD HOUSE NEW BOOKING OFFICE AND POSSIBLE NEW INFORMATION CENTRE. DOES NOT DESTROY NORTH VOE.	SYMBISTER – WOULD NEED TO LOOK AT EXISTING SEPTIC TANK FOR BOATING CLUB – TOO CLOSE TO PEERIE DOCK – WOULD HAVE TO BE REPLACED.
BOTH OPTIONS HAVE SOME MERIT BUT NORTH VOE GIVES THE BEST OPTIONS AS LONG AS ALL FERRIES ARE REMOVED FROM SYMBISTER.	SYMBISTER – GOOD FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT.	WOULD HAVE CONCERN OVER LOSS OF SPACE BY FILLING IN PEERIE DOCK.
TOO MUCH CONGESTION/CONFLICT IN SOUTH VOE ALREADY.	NORTH VOE USED CONSTANTLY BY CHILDREN OF THE ISLE. LOCAL CHILDREN DO NOT GET TRANSPORT TO/FROM SCHOOL SO ROAD SAFETY A BIG CONCERN. PLANS FOR SOUTH VOE LOOK IDEAL.	SYMBISTER OLD DOCK AND BOOTH – COULD THIS BE AFFECTED BY DREDGING?
MOVE TO NORTH VOE – LEAVE SYMBISTER SMALL DOCK TO BE REPAIRED AS IT IS A TOURIST ATTRACTION BEING SO OLD. ALSO SMALL DOCK WELL USED BY SMALLER BOATS.	IN VIEW OF BAIRNS REQUIRING TO WALK ON THE ROAD PAST NORTH VOE TERMINAL, ROAD TO HAVE A FULL PAVEMENT AND RAILINGS TO SEGREGATE PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR TRAFFIC	SYMBISTER – EXTEND THE SHEET PILING WHICH WOULD GIVE GREATER AVAILABILITY OF BERTHS WHICH WOULD ALLOW MORE BOATS TO BERTH – ONE AREA WOULD PROVIDE LESS SHELTER BUT COULD BE USED FOR 'VISITING BOATS' IN SUMMER, WOULD INCREASE REVENUE FOR MARINA WHICH MAY COVER COST OF MORE SHEET PILING.
PREFER NORTH VOE – SYMBISTER MARINA ALREADY TOO SMALL – MAY EVEN BE SMALLER FOLLOWING WORKS.	NORTH VOE WASTE OF TIME AND MONEY. TOO MUCH MOTION IN THE WATER – WINTER WOULD BE A MAJOR PROBLEM MAY HAVE TO	FILLING IN PEERIE DOCK IS TAKING AWAY A LANDMARK - MAY AS WELL TAKE AWAY ALTOGETHER.

## Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

	<p>MOVE TO SYMBISTER FOR SHELTER. SHOULD NOT RUIN NORTH VOE FOR CHILDREN WHO PLAY ON THE BEACH AND SWIM. WHY RUIN TWO VOES? PREFER SYMBISTER – TANK TESTING DID NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT NORTHERLY WINDS – BELIEF IS THAT NORTH VOE OPTION EXPOSED TO SUCH SWELL AND WIND</p>	
<p>NORTH VOE – EASIEST AND MORE STRAIGHTFORWARD SOLUTION OF ALL.</p>	<p>SYMBISTER WOULD ENSURE A WORKABLE SHELTERED HARBOUR. FILLING IN SMALL DOCK IS SENSIBLE. SOME WORK WILL NEED TO BE DONE TO SECURE PIER CURRENTLY USED BY LINGA. ANY POSSIBILITY OF MORE BERTHS IN MARINA AS WAITING LIST LONG. SYMBISTER WOULD PROVIDE A SHELTERED HARBOUR WHEREAS NORTH VOE MAY OR MAY NOT. THE EXISTING LINKSPAN SHOULD BE RETAINED IN CASE OF FAILURE OF NEW RAMPS – WITNESS TOFT/ULSTA/HAMARSNESS.</p>	<p>SYMBISTER – EXTEND THE DREDGING WHICH WOULD GIVE MORE SPACE FOR WHITEFISH BOATS.</p>
<p>PREFER NORTH VOE – CONCERN COMING IN TO SYMBISTER – NO ROOM FOR ERROR. NORTH VOE MORE OPEN WITH LITTLE OTHER TRAFFIC</p>	<p>SYMBISTER SHOULD BE DEVELOPED LEAVING NORTH VOE AS IS.</p>	<p>SYMBISTER – DREDGE FURTHER AND LAUNCH PONTOONS OFF THE SHORE. DISTANCE BETWEEN PONTOONS NEEDS TO BE 2 BOAT LENGTHS.</p>
<p>NORTH VOE ALLOWS CAPACITY FOR EXPANSION IN THE FUTURE.</p>	<p>SYMBISTER ALREADY HAS MOST OF THE AMENITIES IE PIERS TO TIE UP. NORTH VOE OPTION WOULD TAKE AWAY FROM CHILDREN OF WHALSAY THE ABILITY TO SWIM/SAIL/LEARN TO ROW/HANDLE BOATS IN A RELATIVELY SAFE ENVIRONMENT.</p>	<p>SYMBISTER – CAN THE LINKSPAN MOVE UP AND CREATE A LAY BY BERTH WHICH WOULD RELEASE MORE SPACE FOR FISHING BOATS. THE NEW DOLPHIN MAKE MANOEUVERING FOR WHITE FISH BOATS MORE DIFFICULT</p>
<p>STAG REPORT INDICATES NEED FOR ONE OR</p>	<p>NORTH VOE THE ONLY</p>	<p>CANNOT BELIEVE THAT NORTH VOE IS A</p>

## Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

<p>TWO NEW LARGER VESSELS OVER NEXT 20 YEARS OR SO. SYMBISTER OPTION WILL ALLOW [ONLY] ONE LARGER VESSEL TO OPERATE, BUT WITH NO LAY-BY BERTH FOR REPAIRS. TWO LARGER VESSELS NOT AN OPTION SO RESTRICTING POTENTIAL FUTURE TRAFFIC GROWTH. NORTH VOE DOES NOT HAVE THIS RESTRICTION ON GROWTH</p>	<p>NATURAL/UNDISTURBED VOE IN WHALSAY – WOULD INVOLVE NEW ROADS/PARKING FACILITIES ETC WHICH ARE ALREADY IN SYMBISTER.</p>	<p>CHEAPER OPTION THAN SYMBISTER.</p>
<p>LATEST OPTION ALLOWS NO ROOM FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN HARBOUR ACTIVITIES IN WHALSAY AND WILL REDUCE CURRENT PROVISION.</p>	<p>SYMBISTER – BENEFIT TO ALL – MAIN HUB OF WHALSAY. [NORTH VOE] WOULD CAUSE AN UNNECESSARY SPLIT.</p>	<p>PROPOSED PIER AT NORTH VOE TO BE EXTENDED BY A FEW METRES TO ALLOW BOTH LINGA AND FILLA TO LAYOVER ON NORTH SIDE</p>
<p>SYMBISTER HARBOUR WILL BECOME DANGEROUSLY CONGESTED FOR ALL HARBOUR USERS.</p>	<p>DISTURBANCE BY NOISE &amp; POLLUTION DURING WORKS IF BUILT AT NORTH VOE.</p>	<p>MOVE EXISTING RAMP FROM SYMBISTER ONCE NORTH VOE FULLY OPEN TO NORTH SIDE OF NEW PIER – WOULD ALLOW TWO VESSELS TO OPERATE AT ONCE (SOMETIMES SKERRIES AND MAINLAND BOATS QUEUING IN SYMBISTER AT PRESENT) AND WOULD ALLOW FOR BLOCKING OF RAMP BY FAILED VESSEL – MINIMAL COST AS RAMP AND HYDRAULICS IN GOOD CONDITION, ONLY ADDITIONAL COSTS WOULD BE CONCRETE INFRASTRUCTURE AND RAMP TRANSPORT FROM SYMISTER</p>
<p>POTENTIAL OPTIONS FOR SALVAGING THE 'AULD DOCK' IN SOME FORM WOULD BE LOST FOREVER.</p>	<p>NORTH VOE – WOULD NEED TO DREDGE ALL THE TIME – WITH WEATHER CONDITIONS – SAND AND SILT WILL COME IN ALL THE TIME WHICH WILL MEAN HAVING TO KEEP ON DREDGING – HUGE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS.</p>	<p>SYMBISTER - EXTEND NEW PIER IN SYMBISTER TO EAST NORTH EAST TO IMPROVE PROTECTION OF MARINA, EVEN BETTER TO PUT SHORT STUB BREAKWATER FROM JUST NORTH OF HANSEATIC DOCK TO MAKE MARINA ENTRANCE NARROWER – WOULD THEN ALLOW WHOLE AREA TO BECOME A MARINA WITH MANY ADDITIONAL</p>

## Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

		BERTHS. MAY REQUIRE A TRAFFIC LIGHT SCHEME TO AVOID FERRY / MARINA USERS CONFLICT
THE CONGESTED HARBOUR AND TRAFFIC AREA WILL NOT BE CONDUSIVE TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE ISLE.	SYMBISTER – SCALLOP BOATS COULD USE BACK OF NEW PIER IF MARINA WAS MOVED. COULD THE FERRY SERVICE BE COMPROMISED BY FOG/WIND?	IN VIEW OF BAIRNS REQUIRING TO WALK ON THE ROAD PAST NORTH VOE TERMINAL, ROAD TO HAVE A FULL PAVEMENT AND RAILINGS TO SEGREGATE PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR TRAFFIC
DISRUPTION TO SYMBISTER DURING CONSTRUCTION WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE ISLE.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SHOULD BE SOUTH VOE – WHY USE MONEY TO DEVELOP ANOTHER VOE WHEN IN THE FUTURE THERE MAY BE A FIXED LINK BY THAT TIME THE WORKS ARE IRREVERSIBLE.</li> </ul>	SYMBISTER – PUT MARINA OUT FROM BEACH. WOULD POTENTIALLY ALLOW FOR LONGER TROTS AND MORE BERTHS. THERE IS ALREADY A SIGNIFICANT WAITING LIST FOR MARINA BERTHS.
<p><i>Reasons why Symbister Harbour is not the best option:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The safety risks from the conflict of use in Symbister Harbour are of grave concern</i></li> <li><i>It appears that several folk have noted a need to extend the marina provision and there is so little room there already - moving the ferry to the North Voe would allow for this</i></li> <li><i>Development of use of smaller boats should be encouraged and supported for traditional, cultural and economic reasons</i></li> <li><i>Children need to learn road safety in general and whether the ferry is in the North Voe or Symbister, traffic management should be safe for all pedestrians wherever they are walking</i></li> <li><i>Children play where they will whatever</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IF BUILDING WORKS TAKES PLACE AT NORTH VOE THIS WOULD CAUSE MAJOR DISRUPTION ON THE MAIN ROAD BETWEEN SKAW AND SYMBISTER.</li> </ul>	IMPROVING THE SOUTH VOE PIERS FOR ALL THE FISHING BOATS AND THE FERRIES BY BUILDING OUT AT THE BACK OF THE OUTER BREAKWATER. NORTH VOE SHOULD NOT BE AN OPTION.

## Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

<p><i>developments occur. For many years children were never seen playing on the North Voe beach even when there was no prospect of a ferry terminal, trends change over time</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>We should be looking at the long-term future not just the current issues</i></li> <li>• <i>We have just had the annual Regatta in Whalsay which is the main local holiday week - we need to maintain a regatta ramp provision which is manageable for this major local event</i></li> </ul>		
<p><i>"It is pathetic to even think about filling in 'peerie dock' at Symbister. If this had been situated in Lerwick this never would happen. It is removing a picturesque tourist attraction and also would be removing the history behind this. No room at Symbister should build new Terminal at North Voe but failing that if Symbister then keep 'peerie dock'."</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOUTH VOE – SAFETY FOR NORTH VOE A GREAT CONCERN – THE ACCESS TO THE TERMINAL WILL BE ON A CORNER. 28 CHILDREN CURRENTLY WALK TO SCHOOL WHEN TRAFFIC WILL BE INCREASED FROM BOTH SIDES.</li> </ul>	
	<p>- Any "Economic Development" of the isle will be dependent on a tunnel, not on the development of either South or North Voe i.e. upgrade the South Voe.</p> <p>- An "Economic Development" is proposed in the conversion of the net store, at Symbister, into a cafe (Cope). Its success will be dependent on catching the incoming and outgoing traffic from the ferries. This point also applies to existing businesses. The passing trade must surely be important to the Boating Club (e.g. visiting sporting</p>	

**Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation**

**Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments**

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

	<p><i>teams en route to the ferry) and to the Symbister shop. Both provide jobs for people in the isle. The "Current Economy" of the isle must be safeguarded. The ferry should stay at Symbister.</i></p> <p><i>- Is the Symbister Harbour congested? At times it is almost empty. But like most harbours it has its busy periods. Skippers and other boat handlers stress the importance of approaching any harbour at a safe speed with good seamanship skills.</i></p> <p><i>- Safety/Congestion. The Symbister terminal is ideally sited for the Fish Factory. Lorries are able to come and go from the ferry avoiding the main roads. Re-siting the terminal would surely have cost implications to the factory (fuel costs).</i></p> <p><i>- One point not mentioned in the handout is the invasion of privacy which any ferry terminal in the North Voe would cause to the <u>existing</u> homes. Houses surround this Voe, with a number at a low level. Siting the ferry terminal here would mean <u>permanent</u> noise and visual pollution.</i></p>	
	<p><i>"I am in agreement with the persons who says the 'road safety for the North Voe is a great concern' as my children are among the 28 that walk past that area every day to school. I think the ferry should be left in the South Voe."</i></p>	
	<p><i>"Please do not put the ferry in the north voe because I lic to swim ther with my wetsoot on"</i></p> <p>From Whalsay resident Aged 8 years</p>	

## Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

	<p><i>“DO NOT PUT THE FERRY IN THE NORTH VOE.</i></p> <p><i>I have a new wetsuit and I go for dips, if the ferry came to the North Voe it would ruin my fun.”</i></p> <p>From Whalsay resident aged 8 years</p>	
	<p><i>“We got new wetsuits from our granny and most of my holiday I have been playing with my friends in the north voe and it was all fun until YOU made that silly idea that you HAD to make another pier but if you put it in the north voe you will ruin my fun for the rest of my life so thank you very very much”</i></p> <p>From Whalsay resident aged 10 years</p>	
	<p><i>Would like to comment on a few matters following recent feedback of some comments from meeting. Firstly we feel Symbister Voe should be used and adapted to accommodate all aspects of vessels being used from small pleasure boats to ferries, keeping everything together as one comment said main hub of Whalsay. Local shop, boating club and proposed COPE cafe's trade would be greatly affected if the terminal was moved outwith Symbister location.</i></p> <p><i>We feel strongly against North Voe being developed also due to massive increase of traffic. Mainstream traffic occupies this road at present to add to this would be creating an extremely busy and dangerous road for all road users but especially children! Regardless of pavements etc. children still have to cross roads. You will be developing dangerous roads in an area that could be left untouched. Surely safety of children should</i></p>	

## Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

	<p><i>be considered when there is already a functional harbour in Symbister Voe, which could be altered and improved on leaving North Voe area undisturbed.</i></p> <p><i>It was commented that North Voe would be more straightforward. It would not be straightforward at all! It will cause major disruption and pollution to the environment and introduce danger to roads that is avoidable if it is maintained at Symbister harbour where roads etc. are all in place and out of the way of the majority of road users.</i></p> <p><i>The North Voe is a landmark! It is also a tourist attraction. It was used as an advert for Whalsay on one of the tourist booklets not so long back. The effects of disruption to wildlife in their natural environment should also be considered. Seals, otters, turricks, scarfs, ducks and trout are seen in the North Voe.</i></p> <p><i>It was commented that there was a concern coming into Symbister Harbour no room for error north voe more open with little other traffic. Then later another comment saying north voe allow capacity for expansion in the future! Surely this is a contradiction! If allowing voe expansion this would presumably increase traffic and would end up the same outcome with the same problem! There will be vessels in and around the entrance to a harbour wherever it is.</i></p> <p><i>North Voe will not make a better entrance with bad weather. If you get SW gale and north tide with SE ground swell motion after a SE gale an then a gale from the SW your approach will not be good. North Voe too much motion in the water. Winter will be a major problem and ferries may have to move to Symbister for shelter. This would make it worse</i></p>	
--	--	--



**Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation**

**Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments**

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

	<p><i>than ever. Ferries would have to go back in South Voe for shelter creating a worse problem. Leave it in Symbister Voe where it is proven to work. Congested harbours are all over the world. From Hong Kong to Cullivoe. Speaking from experience it is a requirement of the vessels masters and skippers to command their vessels and act in a responsible manner. All this comes down to good seamanship. You don't see vessels in any other harbour steaming through pier heads at 8 knts when you can't see what's coming out of the harbour, when it's not a VHF controlled harbour!! This is very poor seamanship, which has been pointed out to management at Sellaness more than once over the years! Not an argument for re-routing ferries!</i></p> <p><i>Whalsay has no good beaches as is. The North beach is popular with children all over the isle. If taken away from them and adults there will be nothing left.</i></p> <p><i>When the tank testing was carried out did it take into consideration the different depths within the North Voe. The outcome would possibly be very different taking into account the difference of the depth of the Voe throughout and the deeper sound out by the salmon cages along with swells and the amount of water pushing into the north voe.</i></p>	
	<p><i>"Some points I would like to make regarding the proposed terminal for Whalsay</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Nothing has been put in place for the sea site in the entrance to the north Voe, or where this might be relocated. Four men have fulltime employment and on occasion</i></li> </ul>	

## Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

	<p><i>four casuals .This is one of the best sights in Shetland the quality of the fish is excellent.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Residents living near and around the South Voe harbour area, to date have not voiced any objections to the proposed development in the inner harbour.</i></li><li><i>Residents living near around the North Voe harbour are almost 99% against any development in the inner harbour area.</i></li><li><i>South Voe inner option if this is the preferred option there is a huge area in harbour that can be used for future developments for example inside the north breakwater along the shore to the Hansiatic booth.</i></li><li><i>Congestion in the harbour mouth. Not one incident or accident has ever been recorded or yet have I ever seen any close quarter situations, visibility on the ferries is excellent, speed should always be reduced entering harbours as good common practice and good seamanship.</i></li><li><i>If the Filla was removed from the harbour and relocated to a more appropriate berth, Vidlin, Skerries, Lerwick or Sullom Voe this would solve many problems congestion, berthing arrangements and overall cost for the new Whalsay terminal.</i></li><li><i>The option in the North Voe does not allow any future development in anyway.</i></li></ul> <p><i>I hope the points I have made can be helpful and useful on the future ferry terminal Proposal for the South Voe Area.”</i></p>	
--	---	--

**Appendix 5 – Summary of Issues Raised in the Consultation**

**Categorised into (i) Comments in Support of North Voe (ii) Comments in Support of Symbister (iii) General Comments**

Text in UPPER CASE denotes comments/ issues raised at the consultation meeting

Text in *Italics* denotes comments/ issues raised after the consultation meeting through email or telephone calls

--	--	--