

Name of Responsible Authority	Shetland Islands Council
Title of Plan, Programme or Strategy (PPS)	Sullom Voe Harbour Area Masterplan
Contact Name	Simon Pallant
Job Title	Coastal Zone Manager
Address	Planning, Council HQ, 8 North Ness, Lerwick, Shetland
Telephone Number	
Email	simon.pallant@shetland.gov.uk

Signature	Simon Pallant
Date	20 February 2023

Responsible Authority	Shetland Islands Council
Title of PPS	Sullom Voe Harbour Area (SVHA) Masterplan
Purpose of PPS	<p>Following its adoption by Shetland Islands Council in March 2022, the SVHA Masterplan forms non-statutory planning guidance and will sit alongside the Shetland Islands Regional Marine Plan (once it is adopted later in 2023*¹).</p> <p>The Masterplan will be a material consideration in planning decisions for Council marine planning (aquaculture) and works licence applications. It will also be used to inform future leasing decisions, thereby contributing to the future regulation and management of the SVHA. This is anticipated to include leasing decisions that will be taken by Shetland Islands Council under the Crown Estate Leasing Pilot Project for the SVHA.*²</p> <p>*¹ It had been originally been considered that the Shetland Islands Marine Plan would be adopted in Summer 2022, however this process has been subject to delays. As of February 2023, the Marine Plan was moving towards submission to Scottish Ministers for adoption.</p> <p>*² Whilst the Masterplan was officially published by the Council in July 2022, work on the Crown Estate Leasing Pilot is ongoing.</p>

What promoted the PPS	Following a Council decision in November 2018, NAFC Marine Centre UHI (now Shetland UHI) were appointed by Shetland Islands Council (SIC) to undertake a master planning process for the Sullom Voe Harbour Area (SVHA).
Subject	<p>The Masterplan will be used to guide future marine development in the SVHA, including those covered by planning applications (aquaculture), works licences (non-aquaculture works, such as renewables, cables, piers etc.) and Crown Estate/SIC leasing decisions. It identifies a number of potential areas for development, alongside constraints. It shall provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan-led approach to the future management of the SVHA. • Clear information on opportunities and constraints in the SVHA. • The basis for integrated and informed future decision making.
Period covered by the PPS	Upon its adoption in March 2022, it was agreed by Shetland Islands Council that a review of the SVHA Masterplan would commence within 5 years (before 16 th March 2027), or earlier if directed by the Council.
Area covered by the PPS	The Sullom Voe Harbour Area which lies in Yell Sound, Shetland. This area is detailed in the Masterplan.
Date Adopted	16 th March 2022. Published July 2022.

1. Introduction

This document (the post-adoption statement) has been prepared in accordance with Section 20 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (Scotland) Regulations 2005.

The Sullom Voe Harbour Area Masterplan, hereafter referred to as the “SVHA Masterplan” has been subject to environmental assessment, as required under The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (Scotland) Regulations 2005. This has included the following activities:

- Taking account of the views of the Scottish Environment Protection Agency, NatureScot and the Historic Environment Scotland with regard to the scope and level of detail appropriate for the Environmental Report.

Preparing an Environmental Report on the likely significant effects on the environment, this included consideration of the following:

- the baseline data relating to the current state of the environment;
- links between the SVHA Masterplan and other relevant plans, programmes and environmental objectives;
- existing environmental problems affecting the plan or programme;
- the SVHA Masterplan's likely significant effects (including cumulative effects) on the environment, both positive and negative;
- the mitigation measures envisaged for the protection, reduction and offsetting of any significant adverse effects;
- an outline of the approach taking to dealing with alternatives;
- monitoring measures to ensure that any unforeseen environmental effects will be identified allowing for appropriate remedial action to be taken;
- consulting on the environmental report;
- taking into account the environmental report and the results of consultation in preparing and finalising the SVHA Masterplan.
- committing to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the SVHA Masterplan, identify any unforeseen significant environmental effects and to take appropriate remedial action or enhancement.

A 6 week period of public consultation on the SVHA Masterplan and the accompanying Environmental Report was undertaken, running from 2nd July to 13th August 2021. A total of 15 responses were received, of which 2 focused solely on the SEA consultation. Both documents were available for inspection online and at Council premises.

The Masterplan together with the Environmental Report and Post-Adoption Statement can be inspected free of charge during office hours (9-5) at:

Shetland Islands Council – Planning Service, 8 North Ness, Lerwick, Shetland
Or on the web: <https://www.shetland.gov.uk/coastal-marine-planning>

2. Response to Environmental Issues

The table overleaf recaps the key environmental issues identified in the Environmental Report as being of relevance for the SVHA Masterplan and is updated to take account of additional issues identified through the consultation. How these issues have been taken into account has also been summarised.

Topic	Key Issues Identified within the SEA
Soils, Geology and Coastal Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to sedimentary processes resulting in changes to erosion or accretion patterns and/ or increase the chance of coastal flooding due to sectoral or habitat enhancement policy. • Physical loss, damage or disturbance of geological features due to sectoral or habitat enhancement policy. • Climate change resulting in increased risk from sea level rise and/ or increase in 'storminess', resulting in flooding and/ or coastal erosion. • Protection of areas designated for geological features. • Discharges (current and historic) and diffuse pollution can lead to sediment contamination, subsequently impacting marine species and habitats.
Cultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to cultural heritage including positive effects due to policy protection (including setting), and potential negative effects such as loss or damage due to sectoral or habitat enhancement policy. • Protection of designated and non-designated marine historic assets from inappropriate development. • Developments have the potential to uncover, disturb or destroy unexplored/unknown archaeological remains. • Cultural heritage effects may also be linked to human health (wellbeing).
Seascape & Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to landscape/ seascape, potentially positive and negative due to sectoral policies. Effects will be development specific and dependent on the type of development/ activity, its location and setting. • Terrestrial and marine policy will need to align to ensure that the sensitivity of coastal sites and communities to visual impacts from marine developments/ activities and onshore/ offshore development are considered. • Landscape/ seascape effects may also be linked to human health (wellbeing).
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments within or adjacent to international, national and local sites have the potential to have a positive/ negative impact on the sites' integrity or character. • Direct and indirect potential impacts of development and activities are wide ranging and species and habitat specific but can include loss of habitats, disturbance, and introduction of invasive non-native species (INNS).
Air	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments have the potential to contribute to air pollution directly but also lead to indirect impacts for example re-routing shipping can increase fuel use. • Developments can also reduce overall carbon use by providing low carbon alternatives (e.g. renewables).
Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases in waste due to developments and activities in

	<p>the coastal zone. Waste generation requires management to prevent marine litter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine litter can cause adverse environmental effects and affect local businesses from fishing to marine recreation
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that developments or activities do not cause any water body to deteriorate in condition status nor prevent the achievement of established objectives as set out in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). • Where possible, new developments will contribute towards objectives to improve the ecological status of coastal waterbodies.
Climatic Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring local communities and visitors have continued or enhanced access to leisure and recreation assets. • Encouraging sustainable new marine developments and safeguarding existing developments from incompatible uses. • Minimising and mitigating development with the potential to cause a health risk or a nuisance i.e. pollution (including microbial contamination and marine litter), noise, vibration. • Wellbeing can be impacted by changes to cultural and natural heritage including seascape/ landscape, built heritage and biodiversity loss. • Opportunities for new developments within the Harbour Area may affect areas of economic growth which may have positive and negative effects on local population levels, including population movements and maintaining rural communities.
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both job losses and creation from different types of development. • The need for diverse skill sets with job creation in local areas. • In some instances, refusing development can help to secure a more diverse economic base by supporting the local distinctiveness of an area. • Support for island and remote community connectivity and transportation.
Material Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to consider potential effects of new infrastructure on other users or uses of the marine environment, e.g. physical disturbance of fishing grounds; or impacts on navigational safety. • Need to consider the effects of development on opportunities for other types of development. • Need to ensure adequate protection of natural resources to allow full community and economic function.

3. Consultation comments and how they have been taken into account

The table below provides a summary of the comments received from the Consultation Authorities and from other organisations and individuals on the SVHA Masterplan SEA, and summarises how those comments have been considered and taken into account.

Consultation Responses on Environmental Report

Responder	Comments	Response
1 SSPO (now Salmon Scotland)	In respect of monitoring, Section 8, we ask that the specific metrics that underpin the indicators outlined in table 4.3 (page 22) are expanded and explicitly stated in Table 5.1 (page 31). This would allow baseline information, needed for Section 5.3.2 (page 60) to be updated for finfish aquaculture. In line with this, and in the context that it is already acknowledged that aquaculture is now one of Shetlands largest employers (page 61, para. 3), we ask that the impact of finfish aquaculture on the Shetland Islands economy and environment is analysed and included in the revised Sustainability Assessment.	Noted. A further period of consultation followed on the Masterplan took place in February 2022, at which point the SSPO emphasised the value of the finfish industry on Shetland's economy and the need to consider expanding the Masterplan to identify additional sites for aquaculture. This was presented to Council in March 2022. However the Council took the decision at committee in March 2022 not to expand or alter the potential areas for development at this present time, but agreed to an addition that the Masterplan is subject to a 5 year review or earlier if required.
2 - SOTEAG	Greater consideration to material assets needed (need for infrastructure and holistic assessment). Page 18: It would be useful to see what is planned for the monitoring of environmental, social and economic effects of the Master plan. Support is required to promote peoples enjoyment understanding and appreciation of natural heritage. A plan should be considered for decommissioning projects - material assets.	Noted. The Council and UHI Shetland, who prepared the Masterplan, shall engage closely with SOTEAG in deciding appropriate monitoring for the environmental, social and economic effects of the Masterplan. We are aware of the range of monitoring and expertise held by SOTEAG.

2	<p>section 4.5.1: temporal change should be taken into consideration when considering the environmental baseline and not just depending on a snap shot in time. SOTEAG data could be a valuable resource here.</p> <p>Throughout the document it states that may development opportunities will be considered on a case by case basis which is sensible, however there is an opportunity for multiple developments to take place at the same time - how will these impacts be considered - holistic assessment will be required.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council and UHI Shetland shall engage closely with SOTEAG in deciding appropriate monitoring for the environmental, social and economic effects of the Masterplan. We are aware of the range of monitoring and expertise held by SOTEAG.</p> <p>Regional Marine Plan Policy requires that we take account of the cumulative impacts of future development, and this will be done during the relevant planning application and works licence stages.</p>
2	<p>Page 37: Erosion is not currently an issue and was therefore not considered, however with future development this situation may change and so future planning to mitigate any occurrence would be sensible.</p>	<p>We shall engage with the Council's planning engineer to consider and monitor impacts on future development, where considered relevant and necessary. We shall also use resources such as Scotland's Dynamic Coast for this purpose.</p>
2	<p>Table 5.6: a gap analysis would be useful to determine any missing data and support the information available to future development plans. SOTEAG holds data for Great Northern Diver, and Slavonian Grebe and would be happy to assist fill any data gaps.</p>	<p>Noted. We shall engage with SOTEAG to ascertain where data could be shared.</p>
2	<p>Page 52: how is the 250m buffer zone regulated?</p>	<p>This is a matter for the Regional Marine Plan and will be covered in the soon to be adopted Regional Marine Plan policy.</p>
2	<p>Page 55: surprising that the Sullom Voe SAC was not mentioned as incompatible with development to avoid the pollution of coastal</p>	<p>Noted. However the inclusion of the SAC as being potentially</p>

	and marine environments.	incompatible with development was welcomed by NatureScot. Only 2 small areas are identified and future development would be subject to appropriate considerations of impacts.
2	Table 5.7: How are 'important mud habitats' defined?	These are Priority Marine Features.
2	Page 56: The introduction of a Master Plan is not expected to improve ecological/environmental status of the waters - surely this could be an opportunity to try and improve the waters through responsible stewardship of the environment through well planned development.	Noted. Impacts will be considered at application level and supporting well planned development and early engagement with relevant bodies. E.g. SEPA for finfish developments and impacts.
2	Page 69: the do nothing scenario results in a minor negative impact for biodiversity flora and fauna. Is this because it is believed there is a gradual decrease over time currently - if so we believe this could be an opportunity to improve the waters where possible without any decline in environmental status.	Yes, this is the case and is noted.
2	SOTEAG is willing to assist in any way to provide data or background information. SVA Ltd is rarely mentioned within the document despite having a long term role in the stewardship of the area. Both organisation could be more heavily involved where appropriate.	Noted. We shall engage with SOTEAG on these aspects.
3 – Scottish Sea Farms	<p>Our comments on individual sections of the SEA are as follows.</p> <p>Section 2.1 Purpose and Scope of the Draft Sullom Voe Harbour Area Masterplan</p> <p>The purpose and scope must be included within the masterplan itself. We do not consider that the draft masterplan in its current form will achieve this purpose.</p>	Noted. A further period of consultation followed on the Masterplan took place in February 2022, at which point SSF responded and emphasised the value of the finfish industry on Shetland's economy and the need to consider expanding the Masterplan to identify additional sites

		<p>for aquaculture. However the Council took the decision at committee in March 2022 not to expand or alter the potential areas for development at this present time, but noted their concerns and agreed to the addition that the Masterplan is subject to a 5 year review or earlier if required.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Section 5 – Sustainability Appraisal – Topic Appraisal</p> <p>We do not consider that the masterplan as currently drafted will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to the growth of marine activity and development without detriment to another <p>Navigation and fishing have been protected to the exclusion of fish farming. The proposed 'Potential Development Zones' are not viable sites for fish farming development and therefore cannot be described as such. Our suggested changes to the masterplan will facilitate sustainable growth of fish farming while still protecting large areas for navigational purposes and fishing interests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help to promote employment creation and therefore support the local economy <p>The opportunity to provide new employment opportunities in fish farming is essentially non-existent. Our suggested changes to the masterplan will allow the realisation of additional job creation without necessarily having significant negative impacts on existing industries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote engagement in marine planning <p>We appreciate that the consultation process engaged with a wide range of participants from industry, government and non-government organisations, and the general</p>	<p>Noted. A further period of consultation followed on the Masterplan took place in February 2022, at which point SSF emphasised the value of the finfish industry on Shetland's economy and the need to consider expanding the Masterplan to identify additional sites for aquaculture and removing the protection afforded to navigation and fishing. However the Council took the decision at committee in March 2022 not to expand or alter the potential areas for development at this present time, but noted their concerns and agreed to the addition that the Masterplan is subject to a 5 year review or earlier if required.</p>

public. However, feedback from that engagement has not considered potentially conflicting views/aspirations or activities/sensitivities with the aim of identifying guidance to manage or address conflicting priorities or activities and maximise opportunities for sustainable use and development. The masterplan as currently drafted effectively maintains the status quo by restricting the development of fish farming.

• Promote co-existence and co-use of marine space

The extent of areas designated for navigation and fishing is extensive and the co-existence of aquaculture within these areas was considered unsuitable for development and these areas have been excluded from search. Therefore, the masterplan as currently drafted does not facilitate engagement with navigation or fishing interests to agree compromises which would allow sustainable economic development without compromising navigational safety or fishing livelihoods respectively.

• Promote the efficient and effective sustainable use of environmental resources.

Farmed salmon has a lower carbon footprint than most other farming sectors, uses less freshwater and produces more edible meat for every tonne of feed used. Farmed salmon is a healthy source of protein, with a low environmental impact and one of the lowest greenhouse gas profiles of all animal protein sources, offering an eco-friendly alternative to meat. Environmental impacts of fish farming are often smaller than terrestrial developments with developments carefully matched to environmental carrying capacity and any impacts being temporary/reversible in nature. The low profile of fish farms and careful siting and appropriate scaling minimise visual impacts.

The effective exclusion of fish farming will not

	<p>result in the efficient and effective use of environmental resource. The masterplan should be used as an opportunity for fish farming to complement and grow in parallel with other industries such as tourism and fishing, contributing to a diverse and thriving economy.</p>	
3	<p>Section 5.4 Assessing Alternatives</p> <p>Option 1, the 'do-nothing' scenario suggests that aquaculture development would not be permitted in Sullom Voe in principle and that economic benefits from aquaculture development would not be possible. Option 2, to 'create spatial guidance' states that the masterplan will guide developments to the most appropriate areas whilst avoiding conflict with other marine users.</p> <p>However, as already covered in detail, the masterplan as currently drafted effectively prevents the development of fish farming as the areas identified are not suitable and therefore they cannot be regarded as 'Potential Development Zones' in that regard.</p>	<p>As above. It was also considered during the approval process that a number of the areas identified for potential development could actually accommodate finfish, and also shellfish, aquaculture development.</p>
4 – NatureScot	<p>I refer to your Environmental Report consultation in respect to the above Plan submitted to NatureScot via the Scottish Government SEA Gateway on 2nd July 2021</p> <p>The SEA provides a clear and well laid out analysis of the issues. We have a number of comments on details of the ER which are set out in Annex A. Please note that this response is in regard only to the Environmental Report. Our comments on the Master Plan itself and the associated Habitat Regulations Appraisal will be provided separately</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
4	<p>Annex A - Table 3.2, under 'Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna', should recognise that developments have the potential to affect important habitats and species outwith designated sites, including particularly PMFs, both static and mobile. Developments can also affect distant designated sites, for</p>	<p>Noted. Such potential impacts would be considered as part of the planning and licensing process and where relevant, we will engage with NatureScot on such</p>

	example those that support birds with a wide foraging range, not just adjacent ones.	matters to seek their views.
4	<p>Some of the proposed indicators in Table 4.3 are assessed over too wide an area to be useful measures of the effectiveness of the plan. Developments elsewhere in Shetland are likely to have an effect greater than, and possibly opposite to, those influenced by the plan. These indicators should be revised to focus on those elements that are most likely to be affected by developments in the harbour area rather than elsewhere.</p> <p>Also in Table 4.3, under 'Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna' there is a disparity between the SEA Objectives for ecosystems ("protect, maintain and where appropriate enhance") and important habitats and species ("prevent damage where possible"). We would suggest that protection, maintenance and enhancement of ecosystems would require that habitats and species are also protected, maintained or enhanced.</p>	<p>Noted. We will consider how to ensure that monitoring of impacts is implemented at a more local level, relevant to the Masterplan area.</p> <p>The additional point is noted and shall be applied to marine planning applications in line with application of the Shetland Islands Regional Marine Plan policy and the recently adopted NPF4.</p>
4	Page 38: Priority Marine Features are important in their own right, not just for stabilising the seabed. In some cases they are also important sinks for blue carbon.	Noted.
4	Page 44: Shetland has one National Scenic Area made up of seven sections. The description should therefore read "...and designated as an NSA". Similarly, page 46 should say "The National Scenic Area designated for its coastal landscapes	Noted. The Masterplan was amended as a result of this.
4	Pages 45 and 46 should refer to "Wild Land Areas", not "Wildland Scotland Areas". WLA is not a designation so page 45 should say that they are identified (rather than designated) by NatureScot.	Noted. The Masterplan was amended as a result of this.
4	Table 5.6: Ronas Hill - North Roe and Tingon Ramsar Site is designated for blanket bog, common seal (<i>Phoca vitulina</i>), otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>) and the Arctic water flea <i>Eurycercus glacialis</i> . The other species listed on page 49 aren't relevant to this designation. Ronas Hill	Noted. The Masterplan was amended as a result of this.

	- North Roe SSSI is notified for breeding red-throated diver (favourable, declining), scrub (favourable, maintained) and Quaternary geomorphology (favourable, maintained) in addition to those features listed on page 51.	
4	Page 55: Sullom Voe SAC is potentially sensitive to pollution so we recommend its inclusion as potentially incompatible with development.	Noted.
4	Page 64: We question whether the “do nothing” option would have negative impacts in all areas. Under this option the current planning and regulatory systems would remain in place which would imply that most or all the impacts would be neutral. The Master Plan acknowledges, for example, that “The introduction of a Master Plan for the Sullom Voe Harbour Area is not expected to improve ecological/environmental status of its waters but through compliance with the policies within the draft SIRMP, water quality shall not be allowed to deteriorate and developments are actively encouraged to contribute to the improvement of water quality...”	Noted. Impacts upon water quality will be an important consideration at the planning and works licensing stage.
5 – Historic Environment Scotland	<p>We welcome that our comments at the Scoping stage have been addressed and would offer the following comments on the information contained within the Environmental Report.</p> <p>Table 5.3: Scheduled Monuments within and adjacent to the Sullom Voe Harbour Area</p> <p>It is unclear from this table why some scheduled monuments are reported as not being of national importance. We would advise that all scheduled monuments should be considered of national importance.</p>	Noted and agreed that all scheduled monuments will be of national importance.
5	Will the Masterplan Protect and maintain the historic environment within the Sullom Voe Harbour Area’s coastal and marine areas?	Noted. Furthermore, impacts upon scheduled monuments will be an important consideration at the planning and works

	<p>We welcome the recognition that development has the potential for adverse impacts on the site and setting of scheduled monuments. We note that identified archaeological views have been taken into consideration in the creation of the potential development zones.</p> <p>As the report notes, project level assessment will be required to consider these issues in greater detail. This should include assessment of any potential impacts on the setting of historic environment assets beyond the identified archaeological views that formed the development zone identification exercise. For example, views between archaeological sites such as SM2091, Holm of Copister, broch and SM2080, Fugla Ness, broch have been recognised but it will also be important to consider the potential for setting impacts from potential surface development as part of Zone B to the west of Holm of Copister broch.</p>	licensing stage.
5	<p>Review of relevant Plans, Policies and Strategies – Cultural and Historical Heritage</p> <p>UNESCO Convention on Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001)</p> <p>As you will be aware, the United Kingdom Government has not ratified the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage at this point but has adopted the principles set out in the annex to the Convention as best practice in the management of underwater cultural heritage.</p> <p>None of the comments contained in this letter constitute a legal interpretation of the requirements of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005. They are intended rather as helpful advice, as part of our commitment to capacity building in SEA</p>	Noted.

4. Reasons for choosing the Sullom Voe Harbour Area Masterplan as adopted, in the light of other reasonable alternatives

The SEA of the Masterplan reports that it will have an overall positive impact on the environment and provides positive impacts across all topic areas. By identifying relevant policies in the soon to be adopted Shetland Islands Regional Marine Plan, Local Development Plan (2014) and related aquaculture Supplementary Guidance (2017) the Masterplan ensures that environmental considerations will be taken into account, when decisions on planning applications and works licences are taken by Shetland Islands Council. It shall also help ensure effective pre-application engagement. Given that the Masterplan identifies a number of potential areas for development it shall guide future development types to the most suitable areas within the Sullom Voe Harbour Area in order to ensure that current uses, natural resources, environmental designations and community values are protected.

Through its development, the Masterplan has been subject to detailed environmental assessment and has drawn on extensive consultations with the general public and stakeholders at different stages.

The reasonable alternative of a 'do-nothing scenario' was considered. The approach selected, to create spatial non-statutory planning guidance in the form of a Masterplan, balances the needs of the environment with competing social and economic needs. By doing so the Masterplan enables the creation of zoned areas for development by taking account of existing uses and constraints and therefore providing spatial guidance to guide potential developments to the most appropriate areas whilst avoiding conflict with other marine users.

5. Measures that are to be taken to monitor significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan

Upon adoption in March 2022 it was agreed that the Masterplan would be subject to review in 5 years, or earlier if agreed by the Council. As part of the review process the Council's Coastal and Marine Planning Team will prepare a monitoring report to accompany this review. This will examine significant changes in the principal environmental characteristics of the Masterplan area, where applicable, and the impacts of Masterplan as part of this process.