

**Uig Harbour Redevelopment
COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP**

Minutes taken on [Thursday 24th February at 1800hrs.](#)

1	Present	Actions
	<p>Cllr Calum Munro (CM) – (Highland Council) Chair, Cllr. Drew Millar (DM), Garry Smith (GS)– Lead Officer for Infrastructure (Highland Council, Andrew MacIver (AM) – Principal Engineer (Highland Council), Caroline Connolly (CC) (Transport Scotland), Ruaridh Campbell (RC) (CMAL), Kevin Smith (KS)– Site Agent (RJ McLeod), Sean Melville – Sub Agent (RJ McLeod) Duncan Macdonald – Sub Agent (RJ McLeod) Donald Beaton (Calmac), Angus Ross (AR) (Local), Martin Madigan (MM) (Local), Sandy McLean (SMac) (Local), Vicki McLean (VM) (Local), Margaret Freestone (MF) (Local), Andrew Macrae (AMac) (Local), Stuart Macpherson (SM)(Local & HIE Representative)</p>	
2	Apologies	
	<p>Cllr. John Finlayson, Iain MacLennan (The Highland Council), Steve Scott (SS) – Project Manager(RJ McLeod),</p>	
3	Approval of Previous Minutes	
	<p>No changes required.</p> <p>Approved by – Angus Ross Seconded by – Vicky Maclean</p>	
4	Matters Arising	
	<p>To be covered in AOCB</p>	
5	Presentation & Open Forum	

	<p>KS presents RJM slideshow attached. Questions:</p> <p>AR asks why open piled structure is being used on the approachway works but not the berthing structure works. KS explains that the new berthing structure shall provide better protection for the ferries while berthing. SMac notes that the waves coming over the pier appear to be worse since the installation of the new berth structure.</p> <p>MF queries why rock fill from Kingsburgh quarry is stockpiled at the entrance to the site before being moved to the berthing structure. KS explains that this allows RJM to infill to the berthing structure during short periods of high winds when the cranes have stopped working at short notice.</p> <p>AR questions if local rumour is correct that ‘panic inspections’ are required to be carried out at the existing linkspan GS clarifies that as the project requires piling next to the existing dolphin structures, the linkspan and dolphins are under monitoring and will be recommissioned prior to the end of the outage works to ensure that the linkspan is fit for its return to service.</p> <p>GS presents slides on Terminal building proposal attached</p> <p>AMac and SMac question why there is only one 24h accessible toilet when Uig has possibly the highest demand for public toilets due to the ferry. AM explains that there is one toilet to reduce risk of vandalism and that the remaining toilets in the Calmac building will be open during normal working hours. GS further confirms that this toilet is in addition to the current toilet block. GS adds that there are currently no firm plans in place to remove the existing toilets, that there is possibility to rationalise however this will go through consultation. MF asks if the best way to express opinions is on the planning application online? It is confirmed this is the best way to raise opinions but again clarified that this is a separate process to the closure of the existing toilets.</p> <p>DM floats the idea that there could be a possibility for the local community to take over the local toilet as has been done in Broadford. SM adds along with some funding from the highland council this could become a great asset to the community.</p> <p>AR questions the timescale for the terminal building AM states that the tenders are due to go out in April with the construction starting in September. Current project completion is due to be around July 2024</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Speed Limit</p>	
	<p>CM asks what the latest update is in terms of speed limit? KS explains that RJM have purchased the paint required to cover the existing roundalls and the 40mph signage can be removed once this painting is complete. The speed limit shall then remain at 30mph for the duration of the works. SM questions what is to remain after the completion of the works?</p>	

	<p>AM explains that THC's view is that the 30mph should remain after the completion of the works. GS is to meet with Transport Scotland's roads department prior to the next meeting and should have more clarity on the speed limits following this meeting. Meeting has been agreed for the 15th of March.</p> <p>DM asks if THC's plan for 20mph through all villages shall still apply in Uig as the main road through Uig is a trunk road. AM responds that Transport Scotland's 20mph policy is currently being reviewed however an update is yet to be received.</p> <p>SM asks if the main road cannot become a 20mph due to being a trunk road is there a possibility that the road to Kilmuir could become a 20mph? GS states that THC have requested to become early adopters of 20mph limits through villages and are constructing an early adopter policy. GS is unsure of what roads in Uig would be in the policy due to the main road being a trunk road but the plan is under development and GS shall clarify if the A855 Kilmuir road is within the plan.</p> <p>MM explains that he has requested information from BEAR for the traffic speeds from the tubes that were installed in the village over the past couple of weeks. SM requests the dates the tubes were installed to and from as it doesn't seem right that this data is being collected in a time with no ferry traffic.</p> <p>AR asks CC if there is an explanation as to why the temporary speed limit could not be imposed back in July when requested and has taken until now? CC explains that her position is head of infrastructure and vessels for transport Scotland for ferries and does not have any direct dealings with the roads department but can help push queries in the right direction and assist where possible.</p> <p>AR raises that since the last meeting he has been in contact with CityLink buses regarding the service from Uig as they stopped the current service at two days' notice questioned what consultation had taken place prior to the service being stopped. Citylink explained that consultation had been had with THC and HiTrans but not the public. Citylink have now offered to restart one service on the route if the local community could agree which service would suit everyone best. AR asks if everyone could share their views on which service would suit then he will share these views with CityLink.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>AOCB</p>	
	<p>SM asks AM if there has been any update on the new bus route? AM explains that he has spoken with THC's transport team and stagecoach. They are content with the new proposal, the swept path is still to be checked as there is a possibility for a 15m bus service to be put in place. AM to check if both Stagecoach and CityLink have been consulted.</p> <p>SM explains that he has been in touch with CMAL regarding the existing shed site. CMAL have explained that they can't commit to any plans for the shed site until the new terminal building is complete. SM adds that early engagement with the local community is essential if community</p>	

	<p>ownership is to be a possibility and 6 months before the new terminal building is ready is not enough time.</p> <p>RC explains that CMAL are open to early discussion regarding the existing shed site however usually no commitment would be made until around 6 months before the shed site would be made redundant.</p> <p>AR asks for clarity on what the plans currently are for the shed site as it sounds like CMAL's current plans consider the potential of someone purchasing the shed site?</p> <p>RC explains that CMAL consider the building as life expired, that CMAL do not leave liabilities and if there is an empty asset then it is removed.</p> <p>CC adds that the building will be removed unless another interested party expresses that they would like to take on the building.</p> <p>SM explains that this is why early dialogue is essential as if community ownership is desirable amongst the community and it works financially, the conversation could evolve around the community having an asset in the clear area of land and CMAL would remove their liability in the building. However, it would be beneficial to begin dialogue now as opposed to wasting a year and waiting until the new building was 6 months from completion.</p> <p>AMac asks if there could be conformation that the LNG tanks will be removed from the harbour redevelopment plans.</p> <p>CC confirms</p> <p>AMac then questions what shall happen with the money that would have been used to fund the LNG tanks as it would be nice to use this money for something positive towards the community?</p> <p>CC explains that the money would be saved by the Scottish Government and would be put to use on other projects that have a budgetary pressure and would not be used as community benefit.</p> <p>SMac adds that even though the tanks have been removed so a lot of the infrastructure will still be installed so savings would only be for the cost of the tanks.</p> <p>CM requests the latest regarding the new fire service building</p> <p>SM states that he would need to check with the fire service.</p> <p>RC confirms they are aware of the plans for the new terminal building.</p> <p>AR gives an update on the plans for pontoons in the harbour. AR explains that he has tidied up the paper that shall be presented to the council and hopes that this will allow the project to move to a feasibility stage and hopefully allow the project to be priced.</p> <p>KS extends an invitation to all for a site visit prior to the next CLG meeting so everyone can see the progress on site which is well received.</p>	
8.	Date of Next Meeting	
	20th April @ 1800	

