

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
1	<p>They would seem to be a good compromise allowing all interested parties to participate. Not dominated by commercial interests.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>As a leisure sailor using this area I would hope that any new rules or controls would be as light touch as possible and would like to point out that the proposals aim to address “current perceived safety issues” not an actual history of incidents.</p>
2	<p>RYA Scotland agrees there is a need for an agency with overall responsibility and authority for managing safety across the Oban Bay area.</p> <p>We support options 4,5 and 6 and are willing to assist the progression of the actions in any way we can.</p> <p>We remain of the opinion that a Trust Port is the only equitable and transparent option for the secure future of the Oban Bay area and look forward to seeing this progressed.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>We note the harbour limits in the proposal and support the northern limit as described. However, the interim proposed harbour limits are weak at the S of Kerrera. For them to be effective the limits should extend to the SW of Cutter Rock, perhaps on a line set west to east, so as to be able to control all potential anchorages and the southern access to the harbour. This was the outcome of the user consultation 2-3 years ago.</p>
3	<p>As part of the OBMG and as an existing Statutory Harbour Authority of a small part of Oban Bay, CMAL have been working with all partners for many years to improve the safety of navigation for all users within the overall Oban Bay. The Argyll & Bute Council Municipal Harbour proposals for the wider Oban Bay meet with CMAL's expectations of how the navigational safety around Oban can be improved and managed. The proposals also meet the outstanding recommendations of the navigational risk assessment carried out for Oban Bay on behalf of OBMG, which relates to areas of the bay that are currently not under the control of any authority. CMAL consider that Argyll & Bute Council have a proven track record in managing Municipal Ports/Harbours and have a well established governance set up, as well as suitably experienced technical team. CMAL therefore fully support Argyll & Bute Council's proposal for the formation of an Oban Bay Municipal Harbour and look forward to continuing to work with them to improve the navigational safety around Oban.</p>
4	<p>I support the principal of establishing a municipal port for Oban, however, ultimately its management must reflect the diverse range of users of the harbour, and in particular must not be restricted to any single interest group. To put it plainly, whist ferry operations by CalMac and CMAL are clearly important, these players must not be able to dictate the mangement of Oban Harbour.</p>
5	<p>Having a single authority controlling the port of Oban and bringing all areas within the vicinity under a single point of control makes perfect sense.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>No single user, especially a commercial organisation, should be the controlling authority. The needs of leisure users should be fully taken into account as Oban is a strategic port of refuge and provisioning.</p> <p>I would prefer to see a Trust Port established but accept that control by the Municipal Authority might be a sensible interim measure.</p> <p>There should be strong community and OCHDA representation on the new board (including leisure sailors).</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	It should be possible to contact the new port authority by VHF at the very least during normal working hours. Sadly, some other ports either do not monitor or simply ignore calls from non-commercial users - arguably those with the greatest need of help and guidance.
6	<p>It is important to have an independent body like a Municipal Authority able to consider the needs and requirements of all the users of Oban Harbour, whether commercial, like ferries, freight and fishing vessels as well as leisure, like trip operators and private yachts. It is quite possible for all to co-exist enjoying this wonderful harbour if all parties make allowances for other users needs. I understand that a Port Trust would be even more likely to achieve this, so would see a Municipal Authority as an expedient step while the requirements for a Port Trust are considered.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>Given that the recently installed pontoons for leisure yachts is already often used to capacity, it would be good to consider expanding these facilities either extending the location but maybe also considering any alternative locations to spread the benefit to other parts of the town?</p> <p>I have no current knowledge of the status of the marina facilities on Kerrera, but believe that it is important to help maintain that marina and an active workshop given the excellent travel links to Oban, again attracting good business to the harbour.</p>
7	<p>If Oban Bay is to have a harbour authority, that authority needs to recognise the multiple users of the Bay. Thus it needs to be independent of any sectional interest.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>A harbour trust, representing all Bay users, and not dominated by any single faction, would seem to be the ultimate solution. I would see this proposal as an interim solution.</p>
8	<p>Coherent management of the harbour by a single authority can only be a good thing, and is well overdue</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>As a leisure user, I would fully support any proposed transition to Trust status but would NOT support management by commercial interests alone, such as the harbour being wholly managed by CalMac</p>
9	<p>There is a need for an overall harbour authority, and it should NOT be managed by a single user (eg Calmac ferry operator). Whilst a Trust Port would be the preferred option, in the absence of this the proposed Municipal option is the best interim solution</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>The preferred final outcome should be a Trust Port</p> <p>The option of a harbour authority run by a single user (eg Calmac ferry operator) should not be permitted</p> <p>There should be board representation from all users, including leisure and charter users</p>
10	<p>We agree that the most effective short term route is a Municipal Harbour Authority, which will become a Trust Port with time. We are strongly against a CMAL controlled harbour authority.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>Our 6000+ members of cruising sailors are very supportive of getting the safety situation resolved but strongly against the biased corporate control that is likely with CMAL. Leisure use of Oban Harbour has sky rocketed in recent years and believe a strong voice is required for leisure users and the Community. We believe organisations such as OCHDA should be fully represented as we strongly support their approach. Ultimately we strongly support a Trust Port route but recognise the timing issues. Trust Ports have been very successful elsewhere particularly where there are a variety of competing interests.</p>
11	<p>We support this in principle acknowledging that one body has to be responsible for enforcing safety measures within the bay. That one body though has to have an unbiased attitude</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>which does not promote their own interests to the disadvantage of other stakeholders. Since the recent report by Caledonian Economics was instrumental in ruling out the Oban Community Harbour Development Association OCHDA to be the Harbour Authority at this time then we must agree to accept the Council's proposal. The non-acceptance of this proposal would lead to CMAL being the favoured Authority which we believe would lead to management biased wholly in favour of their operations.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>The proposal lacks any depth on how it would be put into practice when the OCHDA proposal itself was criticised for the same failing,</p> <p>There is no mention of how a Harbour Order in favour of the Council would be used to promote harbour use leading to better utilisation of the facilities therein and to the town in general through reinvestment of surplus income.</p> <p>At a time when Councils' are stretched financially and are generally offloading non core operations the question has to be asked "what is in it for the Council to take this on".</p>
12	<p>It is necessary for the whole of Oban to be controlled by a single authority. In the long term I strongly support the creation of a Trust Port but I understand it is expedient to form a Municipal Port in the short term. I do not live in Oban nor am I a stakeholder in the port but I have always taken a keen interest in the harbour and I hope that my background below will show that I have some relevant experience which could be of use.</p> <p>I am a retired Civil Engineer having specialised in the design and construction of ports and harbours many of which have been on the west coast and within Argyll and Bute I was involved in the design and construction of the first RO-RO terminals at Brodick, Gourock and Dunoon. Within Argyll and Bute I was Engineer for RO-RO terminals at Port Askaig and Craignure and the second link span and terminal building in Oban. I also worked on the Old and New Piers in Campbeltown and ferry slips at Colintrave, Rhuboidach, Gigha, Tayinloan, Fishnish, Lochaline, Fionnphort, Iona and Tobermory as well as numerous other places on the west coast around the Scottish coast and minor works within Argyll and Bute.</p> <p>In the 1970s and 80s I lead a unit Strathclyde Regional Council which undertook Head Office responsibilities for all the Piers and Harbours throughout the Region which of course included Argyll and Bute. Whether this was a good arrangement or not is open to debate but it did give me a valuable insight into the management of Municipal Ports. After retiring in 2009 I served 11 years on the board of Montrose Port Authority which is a Trust Port including 3 years as it's Chairman and in between times I had a 5 year spell in the late 80s as Engineer and Deputy Chief Executive of Dundee Port Authority which at the time was a Trust Port.</p> <p>In the course of my work I have been involved in the promotion of several Harbour Orders. Finally, I have spent all my life sailing on the West Coast.</p> <p>I am a member of OCHDA and I have noted their response to the Consultation Document but I would like to add a couple of comments of my own.</p> <p>I apologise for this long winded introduction but I felt it was necessary to establish my credentials.</p> <p>I am firmly of the belief that Oban will ultimately be best served by the formation of a Trust Port. Having said that I understand that in the short-term it is expedient that the Council should form a Municipal Port since it has the resources and experience to promote the necessary Harbour Order and staff already in position to operate the Port. However I am concerned that while the possibility of creating a Trust Port is mentioned in the Harbour Board meeting notes it is not strongly promoted in the Consultation document as an ultimate goal.</p> <p>I am not suggesting the Council cannot run a port because of course it can, but the necessary constraints based upon a Local Authority make it less suitable to control the interests of a</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>multi user commercial port such as Oban which is very much larger than the other ports managed by the Council.</p> <p>The Management of a Trust Port is wholly concerned with the operation and development of the Port without reference to any other party. It is bound by its rules to hold regular stakeholder meetings and all income generated by the Port is used to its benefit. It appears that the Municipal Port as proposed would not have any stakeholder representation. More disturbingly I note that income from Oban would be applied to all the Harbours of Argyll and Bute and would not be specifically applied to Oban. In any event it is difficult to define the operating costs of a Municipal Port as some management functions will overlap with other facilities.</p> <p>I would ask you to keep to the forefront the concept that ultimately the port will become a Trust Port and build in to the Harbour Order a governance structure of the Municipal Port which would ease the transfer of the Municipal Port to a Trust Port.</p> <p>With this in mind I wonder if you could consider the creation of a subgroup of local interests and stakeholders reporting to the Council Harbour Board. This subcommittee could possibly also form the nucleus of a future Board of a Trust Port.</p> <p>I hope my comments are of interest and I would be happy to elaborate on them at any time.</p>
13	<p>There is a pressing need for regulation of marine traffic in the wider Oban Bay area to enhance safety given the steadily increasing level of traffic.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>There is a disconcerting lack of detail in the Council's proposals making it difficult to give unequivocal support to the proposals. In particular, two areas of concern to me are: Representation of the entirety of the diverse community of interested parties; from ferry operators to kayakers on the water as well as residents and businesses in the area. All of these have valid interest in the operation of the harbour. How will their views be known and acted upon; how will conflicting interests be reconciled?</p> <p>While the Code of Practice is helpful, it is, in my experience, often flouted. The speed limits, in particular the 6 knot limit, are at times breached by vessels from ferries to jet skis. Recreational craft can often be seen not observing the guidance in the North entrance. How will the Code of Practice or a successor be enforced?</p>
14	<p>Long overdue - this is the principal asset of Oban and it needs to be better managed than it has been to date.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>I would encourage the committee to undertake a desktop study to provide commercial wharf facilities on the mainland side of the bay. Argyll whose maritime assets, are almost more than France, has few if any commercial wharfs, making it almost impossible for new maritime businesses to scale their emerging businesses. This study should form part of wider strategic piece of work, which is required to fully comprehend both the maritime assets we presently enjoy, so as to set out a clear policy for their future protection, enhancement and sustainable development. I would be happy to discuss this with the committee members.</p>
15	As a sensible solution to the current situation.
16	to further enhance safety for all users.
17	<p>The idea is correct but Argyll and Bute should not be taking this forward. A port Trust has had wide support, and while it might take a little longer is better long term. It should also regulate Cal Mac who are being particularly pedantic about the channel being clear. There was always an understanding that if you were outside the buoyage system it was safe. We are now getting 5 blasts routinely when not required. I think they are just being difficult so they can log an incident.</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
18	<p>The control elements promote safety. The decision to have the Council as the harbour authority rather than CMAL keeps the focus on the needs of all users, not one dominant affiliated commercial user/interest.</p> <p>The ultimate goal of trust port status is the ideal and should be pursued.</p>
19	<p>Best long term solution</p>
20	<p>These proposals should improve safety in the bay. The bay and environs become crowded at peak times and the lack of a harbour authority with responsibility for the whole area makes an accident likely. The proposals outlined here will help to remedy the problems and the decision to progress seems to have been arrived at in a logical and well informed manner.</p> <p>Any additional comments The sooner the better.</p>
21	<p>Not ideal but a way forward</p>
22	<p>There isn't a lot to specifically comment on - document is high level and does not currently cause any undue alarm.</p>
23	<p>It would make a clearer safer operation for arrivals and departures and would be similar to other busy ports that we use with our other vessels.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>A bigger issue for our operation is berth availability in this area and any proposal for increased berthing would be a great advantage for our operation considering the wellboat sector is growing and vessel size on average is increasing.</p> <p>Salmon Scotland would be helpful in pushing to get support to provide increased berthing for this growing industry.</p>
24	<p>A logical safety control mechanism which outwardly seeks to better define without limiting access to all users.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>If this aids the use of Oban port for CALMAC vessels to the Western Isles then it is better for all concerned. If it support pleasure craft then so much the better as we do see quite a lot of usage in particular from Eriskay/South Uist vessels.</p>
25	<p>There is an important need to ensure the busy (and growing so) Oban Harbour under more systematic management. The Council has extensive experience with other harbours in the area, is the accountable body to the Argyll & Bute people and therefore has my support for its proposals for Oban Harbour.</p>
26	<p>This is a very busy harbour with a large range of public service and private (commercial and pleasure) users that requires enforceable direction of use for both vessel passage and anchorage. Disruption following collision and sinking in the Corran Narrows would greatly affect not only proximal Firth of Lorne traffic, but also the Inner and Outer Hebrides.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>There has been too much delay in establishing an Authority. The risks have been assessed and are present now. Were there a collision tomorrow, there will be no reasonable excuse for not having established a regulatory authority.</p>
27	<p>As a water sports enthusiast based locally I regularly operate in the Oban Bay area and am aware that discussions have been ongoing for some time about establishing a Municipal Harbour Authority. In my opinion, the need has been obvious for some time and it is good news that the Council now recognises this.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>I would have concerns about CMAL becoming the authority for the unmanaged sections on the basis that the links to Caledonian MacBrayne ferries present a conflict of interest. It does not feel right to have a frequent harbour user and the owner of the largest vessels responsible for enforcing standards and safety on other users (and themselves?). Careful procedures need careful procedures to be outlined to ensure fairness if this were the case.</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>It would make sense for Argyll & Bute Council to be the relevant authority as there would be greater independence, however based on current information I do not see a credible plan for managing these areas safely and effectively, and the council has no track record in this regard. I would like to know more about how the council plans to fulfil these new responsibilities in practice.</p>
28	<p>We do need to have a greater degree of control over vessels and their intended actions with this being more than just the compliance with the present code but enforceable to effect control and aid near miss situations where speed / timing is a contributory factor. In the longer term I would very much like the control of the port to be under the control of a trust port so that there is a far greater local focus on the management and future developments of the bay and its infrastructure. Monies raised by the port of Oban should rightly be applied back to the port of Oban which is not how the municipal port will operate.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>The proposed northern harbour limit will work well enough as control of anchored vessels and transiting vessels can be fully monitored at a suitable distance and speed prior to the narrowing waters of the entrance. Wash from speed has little bearing at this limit. The southern limit I think should be moved to the SW to the line of the underwater cable crossing poles SW of horseshoe bay. Why? In this area there are a number of users and speed and ship wash is a concern. The Little Horseshoe bay as an anchorage is in part protected by a reef but the main Horseshoe bay is unprotected and is used as an anchorage and mooring site. On the opposite side of the sound is the dive school with small vessels operating there and being launched on a slipway. This area would benefit from a speed reduction. I have seen full well the result of the Clansman at speed coming into the sound and the significant wash on the water and shoreline which could be easily reduced. The limits would thus be easily seen and recognised visual markers, rather than not as planned presently. It also creates a 'holding area' that is within harbour jurisdiction prior to the kerrera ferry and bouyage and rocks close by.</p> <p>What size of commercial vessels are going to be subject to the limit of harbour dues? It is not the easiest thing to decide if a small vessel, yacht or motor boat, is or is not commercially operating and the money gained from small size would be very minimal and probably not worth the effort. I think at this stage of the consultation the council should come clean on who is to pay, for what size, and what the levels of payment might reflect.</p> <p>The marina over on Kerrera in Ardentrive bay, is it to be fully included in the harbour jurisdiction? Should there be a limit to exclude that commercial entity?</p> <p>In the next publication or update of the Code it might be worth mentioning that the bay between the North spit marker pole and the first red can buoy at the entrance makes a good holding area for smaller vessels if they want to await a clearer passageway to entering the bay. Leaving has priority over entering. You can from this bay see some more of the action within the bay but not in full; hence a place to stop or slow before proceeding.</p>
29	<p>I don't believe waiting for a major accident to happen is a sound basis for change; the NRA for Oban Bay has already underlined the very high amount of traffic using the bay, which itself surely dictates a need to implement management before an incident should occur.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>I am born and bred Oban, and still live there to this day. I grew up on the shirt tails of my Dad, an AB with Cal Mac, and spent all my spare time on the boats with him. Now, it pains me to admit Oban is widely seen as an also-ran in terms of visiting ships (cruise liners etc). Looking at similar models in Stornoway, Kirkwall and Invergordon, Oban is falling rapidly behind and missing a golden opportunity to add a significant string to it's bow. The absence of management of the bay and harbour is not an attractive prospect to cruise operators, amongst other owner/operators.</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>There really needs to be an overseeing authority to the non-managed parts of the bay and upon this can be built great opportunities for the Bay, the town and the local council.</p>
30	<p>The very large number of ferry, commercial and leisure vessels that use Oban Bay do so without any overall management beyond the existing small harbour areas immediately adjacent to the North, South and Railway Piers. This makes for an inherently unsafe situation which places the environment, vessels, their passengers, crew and cargoes at risk of the consequences of collisions. For at least the past 10 years this situation has been recognised and although significant informal improvements have been made through the Oban Bay Management Group formalising matters by establishing a harbour authority for the whole Bay and approaches is long overdue.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>The narrowness of the Sound of Kerrera and its use by the full range of vessels, including ferries, make it essential in my view that the southern harbour limit should be just seaward of Rubha Seanach and Mizard Point, at the extreme southern end of the Sound. To only be able to manage vessels transiting Kerrera Sound, once they are close to Kerrera ferry as per the proposed southern limit, risks any advice and/or directions given to vessels being disregarded due to the inability of these vessels to do anything other than maintain their intended passage. However if the limit was seaward of the Sound entirely vessels could abort or amend their intended passage if so required by the Harbour Master. This logic has been applied to the Northern entrance to Oban Bay and resulted in the proposed limit significantly beyond Maiden Island.</p>
31	<p>We do not have enough detail to support the draft proposals but in principle we support the council's decision to create a municipal harbour authority for Oban Bay. However we have concerns regarding the governance, finance and future position of the harbour as we believe that the best long term solution would be the creation of a Trust Port for Oban. Oban harbour is a complex and busy stretch of water with a wide and diverse range of users. The community of Oban universally rejected plans by CMAL to extend its authority beyond Railway Pier as this was seen as a threat to other harbour users and indeed those in the community who do not directly use the harbour as the bay is so central to the life and economy of Oban. A municipal harbour authority must balance the needs of all users whilst maintaining safety and ensuring that the harbour continues to provide a visual amenity and economic benefits for all those in the community. We assume that there will be protected provisions for existing harbour users in the full submission and that the council will also outline its business case for the harbour, as investment will be key to its sustainability and future success? Our position remains that an independent Oban Harbour Trust would be the better strategic option, but if the council is able to address our concerns regarding governance structure and finance then we would support the move to create a Municipal Harbour as an interim measure in preparation for a move towards a Trust Port.</p>
32	<p>Oban Community Council feels there is not enough information available to assess the proposal fully.</p> <p>We're happy to recognise this is a skeleton document & welcome the opportunity for full consultation on the final version before it is submitted to Transport Scotland. We also welcome signs that the council is beginning to take a more coproductive/collaborative approach to the process.</p> <p>Oban is one of the most complex harbours in Scotland with a wide variety of users of all sizes from large cruise ships to small paddle boarders & divers. All have a part to play in the economy & life of the town. Each therefore must be reflected in proper balance in the future management of the bay. A powerful local management committee involving a wide variety of stakeholder representatives or individuals with valuable skills & expertise is essential, as is stated in Statutory Guidance.</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>We are fortunate that in Argyll & Bute, and in the Oban area, there are a number of individuals with a level of relevant expertise which the council could not reasonably be expected to have in house.</p> <p>We will be looking to see in the full document details of a governance structure which fully reflects the diversity of users & is consistent with Statutory Guidance and Scottish Government Policy on community involvement.</p> <p>Even for those in the community who do not directly use the harbour it is still the centre of life and therefore everyone in Oban has a legitimate interest & investment in the bay from assuring safe operations to visual amenity and response to fuel spills & other environmental & ecological concerns.</p> <p>In the full submission we look forward to further details of the protected provisions for existing harbour users.</p> <p>We further look forward to a breakdown of the cost to the council & details of the business plan including anticipated revenue streams.</p> <p>We welcome the fact that council officials have recognised the need to address the lack of investment in the council's commercial infrastructure in the harbour over many decades.</p> <p>We believe that the level of capital expenditure that this will require is more than can easily be provided by the council and that therefore a move to an independent Oban Harbour Trust, financially independent of the council, would be more strategic, if not essential.</p> <p>We look with admiration at the continuing effective investment by the harbour trusts in Mallaig & Stornoway.</p> <p>In principal we support the establishment of the municipal port as a stepping stone and the fastest means of implementing the Revision Order but the final HRO must make reference towards this being an interim stage in the move towards a Trust Port.</p>
33	<p>I do not think that this document includes enough detail of how the Council proposes to manage the harbour, specifically relating to conservancy charges.</p> <p>With regards to the harbour limits I think the proposed polygonal shape is too complicated for many mariners to follow or draw on charts.</p> <p>The assumption that CalMac ferry timetables should have priority over all other harbour user needs is quite wrong.</p> <p>I do not believe that the management of Oban Harbour, which is unique within Argyll and Bute in terms of size and variety of users, can be governed within a blanket provision covering all Argyll and Bute harbours.</p> <p>I am unhappy that the Council proposes to submit a Harbour Order, asking for general approval from the Scottish Government, for a structure which it expects will need details changed, without subsequent reference to either Transport Scotland or elected representatives of the local community.</p>
34	<p>In principle the Municipal Port is a good approach but the proposal currently has very limited detail of many aspects of the proposal, specifically relating to charges, Harbour Master powers and enforcement and the apparent suggestion that ferry traffic has some overall priority. Some specific details provided regarding the harbour authority limits are problematic (difficulty for mariners to understand/use) and the governance proposals fail to recognise the unique features of Oban within the Council's responsibilities for other piers, slipways and harbours. Far more detail is required before I can support the proposal.</p>
35	<p>I wish to make the following points.</p> <p>1 Not long ago Argyll and Bute council stated that they had neither the inclination nor the expertise to run Oban Harbour. While the former has changed, for whatever reason, the latter is certainly true as evidenced by the superficial nature of statements emanating from Kilmory. Oban is a complex harbour with numerous stakeholders whose needs require to be identified and addressed. Such a harbour cannot be run successfully as an adjunct of the Roads</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>Department and it must be recognised that considerable expertise will be required and that at considerable expense.</p> <p>2 I suspect that the smell of money has created this sudden enthusiasm. If, indeed, this new found enthusiasm is triggered by the prospect of nett revenue it is confirmation that a Trust Port would be viable. Such could greatly benefit Oban and the harbour though this is unlikely if Kilmory prevails and squirrels away the cash.</p> <p>3 I have the distinct impression that Kilmory is in "non cooperation" mode with regard to OCHDA. Perhaps there is no longer sufficient weight given to the word "servant" in the term "Civil Servant." Such information as is required should be submitted promptly and in full but prevarication and obfuscation seem to be the order of the day apparently in order to render a detailed and complete proposal by OCHDA late and more difficult. Lip service is given, vaguely, about the possibility of a Trust Port sometime in the future but there is no suggestion as to the conditions to be fulfilled by OCHDA to render this change a possibility. I believe the suggestion to be a sop.</p> <p>4 There has been recent talk of an extension to the North Pier. In the present climate it is unlikely that the council could fund, or even attract the funding for such a project. However, it is much more probable that such funding might be obtained by a Trust Port in due time, or, in the future, from revenue.</p> <p>5 There is plenty of precedent for a harbour such as Oban operating successfully as a Trust Port. I am not aware of anywhere where a complex port is operated by a Roads Department and the somewhat vague signals emanating from Kilmory do not suggest an understanding of the difficulties. This compares poorly with the vast amount of work already completed by OCHDA. A trust Port is the only practicable and viable way forward. Our civil servants have a duty to support the aspirations and wishes of our Councillors and Community Councillors who endeavour to represent the views and aspirations of the people of Oban. That is how democracy works.</p>
36	<p>I am concerned that there should be a local management structure for Oban's new harbour authority.</p> <p>It is essential that that there is proper locally based advisory committee, giving local communities and interests real influence on management decisions.</p> <p>Profits from harbour dues etc should be reinvested in the harbour or related local projects.</p>
37	<p>There seems lack of detail in certain areas to support this proposal. Our opinion remains that Oban Port/Harbour should be for the community and run by the community</p>
38	<p>The governance of the harbour is very unclear. The proposed harbour limits ignore the result of a previous consultation which was widely supported by harbour users. The deployment of excess funds, assuming the harbour makes a profit, is not clearly to the benefit of the harbour. I could list a number of other issues but these are the main ones</p>
39	<p>I live on the Isle of Coll and am a "user" of the bay insofar as I am a regular passenger on our CalMac ferry. I assume from the documentation here that no impact will arise to lifeline ferry traffic like this. I am pleased that CMAL is not going to be assuming responsibility for the whole harbour area as it is not clear to me what their motives are in taking over harbours and seabeds - and not just confining themselves to ferry infrastructure - such as they have done on Coll. I would wish to see authority over these assets kept in local hands, albeit in the Council's hands which we can oversee via our elected local councillors. My only concern is how effective the Council is going to be with regard to this proposal.</p>
40	<p>Thank you for asking my views which are:</p> <p>1. Oban Harbour is distinct and far more complex than other harbours currently managed by A&BC. The existing harbour force may therefore not necessarily have the full range of expertise and experience required for Oban.</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>2. It is essential that there is a formal and continuing process for consultation with, and involvement of, the considerable and continuously changing range of stakeholder users of Oban Harbour</p> <p>3. Maintenance of efficient and effective Calmac ferry services must at all times be protected by the new Harbour Authority.</p> <p>4. Progress on this matter is now urgent after too many years of discussion and argument. Summer 2023 should be set as a target for implementation.</p>
41	<p>My use of Oban Bay is confined to being a ferry passenger. It never strikes me that the bay is particularly busy, though I did once see three Calmac ferries there at the same time. From my perspective the existing arrangement seems to work well. Is this proposal being put forward with the full support of the existing key players, or is it just a power grab?</p>
42	<p>I am seriously concerned in the way this matter has evolved over the past years. I am not convinced that Argyll & Bute Council has the necessary expertise and resources to manage a complex and busy multi user harbour. It is important that the local community should have full control over the management of its harbour so that an efficient, safe and well balanced operation is achieved to the benefit of all users.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>After several years of Argyll & Bute Council claiming they didn't have the expertise or finance to run a complex and busy harbour, it now appears to displace the community's efforts (OCHDA) to develop a trust port that would properly reflect the interests of all stakeholders. Calmac dominate the greatest volume of marine traffic using the harbour and it is important to ensure that other users are not disadvantaged in their use of Oban's bay and waterfronts simply to accommodate Calmac/ CMAL commercial interests.</p> <p>There has already been a consultation several years ago on this matter where the local community and stakeholders overwhelmingly rejected the prospect of Calmac/CMAL running the harbour. I really can't understand why this decision on that consultation is being ignored?</p>
43	<p>I have a mooring for my boat in Oban bay and have been sailing the area for a long time. I've never had any cause for concern regarding safety, traffic or freedom of movement within the bay. My experience with the local council trying to manage matters is limited to parking meters being installed on Gallanach road which appears to be a complete disaster as the road is now empty of cars and parking has to be sought outside someone's house, often a long distance away, which is clearly no good for them or me. No provision was ever considered for long term boat users. In addition the complete failure of the council to repair the once very attractive walls and balustrades along Gallanach park which has been fenced off for safety reasons for a number of years leaves me with no alternative but to consider the local council incompetent and therefore I feel I can not support any council involvement with the running of Oban Bay harbour authority.</p>
44	<p>I am not in favour of it becoming a Municipal Harbour at the moment because there is not enough information as to how the Municipal Harbour will be founded and operated.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>Judging by the state of George St and other places in the town I find it hard to see how a Municipal Harbour could be run effectively by the Council. I think that George St is unsafe for people to walk along with the risk of falling debris, choked drains and clearly no effective Council inspection of buildings. For that reason I fail to see how the Council could run a safe harbour.</p>
45	<p>WHAM believes that the harbour should be set up as a Trust Port with an appropriate Board to oversee the operation.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>Our additional comments are four questions as follows:</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>1 - WHAM are concerned to note the absence of mention of the governance processes that will be applied to the proposed Municipal Harbour Authority. Can the Council please confirm what arrangements will be developed and put in place?</p> <p>2 - If it is reasonable to assume that the Municipal Harbour Authority will generate a profit on an annual basis, can the Council confirm where such profits will go and how they will be used i.e. will they be reinvested for the benefit of the Municipal Harbour Authority, used for the wider benefit of the Oban community or allocated across other Council projects? If losses are made, how will they be funded over time?</p> <p>3 - Will the Municipal Harbour Authority geographical limits detailed in the consultation be final or are they likely to change and if so, when will they be finally defined and made public?</p> <p>4 - Running a large Municipal Harbour Authority is a significant undertaking. Can the Council clarify the number of staff to be employed, the hours that they will operate and how the competence and skills of officials tasked with managing the Municipal Harbour Authority will be determined and assessed to ensure the smooth running of the harbour recognising the need to promote and maximise safety at all times? Will staff report to the Council, a committee of elected members or a specific Board with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience?</p>
46	<p>Insufficient detail provided to make an informed decision. Specific issues requiring clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Governance, noting government guidance on local management committees. b. Resourcing plan: start up and annual running costs, sources of income and/or cost to taxpayers. c. Staff recruitment, numbers and competences. d. Protective provisions. e. Explanation behind thinking of harbour limits shown. f. Proposed controls on ship movements within the bay and through north and south channels, and any restrictions on boating activities, eg sailing, rowing, in these areas. g. Impact on existing legislation. <p>Any additional comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Why is consultation being undertaken before results of NRA known? b. Reference to transition to a Trust Port should be included, the preferred option of the majority of OBMG Members. c. When will there be full consultation on the draft HRO before its submission to the Government?
47	<p>A completely unnecessary waste of money, how much has already been wasted on consultants waffle. All safety aspects are covered by col regs and common sense. Are you going to employ a fleet of large ribs manned by large numbers of council staff to patrol the area? Ridiculous scheme for your own benefit.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>Council run equals squandering taxpayer's money. More staff, more charges and no advantages. No knowledge, no concepts of value just looking to expand departments and pensions.</p>
48	<p>I support the proposal for improved management of Oban Bay and the technical detail laid out is perfectly reasonable. However despite the claims I do not believe that the Council has any good track record in management of their resources and particularly their maritime assets. Indeed their earlier disinterest in controlling Oban Bay has only changed as they can see revenue potential but again I know of no evidence that the Council has a history of commercial success. Should the Council succeed in their proposals would any profits be reinvested in the Harbour or Community or just get lost in the Council's general running costs?</p> <p>Any additional comments</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>It would also be a major error to let CalMac or Cmal have control of the Harbour as their interests are purely selfish. While the option of a Community Trust Port has many potential problems it is also the option with the best potential for Oban Bay and it's users.</p> <p>I used to sit on the West of Scotland Safety Group which looked at CalMacs original plans and we developed the original Code of Practice about 16 years ago.</p>
49	<p>Build a proper Oban pier by filling in the unsightly Oban town pier frontage and creating one continuous Oban pier stretching as one complete unit instead of having a North and South Pier.</p> <p>If you approach the Drax Electric power Co.they will probably give the "spoil" from the new power station at Cruachan to fill in the eyesore, just like the Hydro offered when they built Cruachan away back in the early 1960s, Unfortunately the powers to be at that time couldn't see the Wood from the Trees and missed a golden opportunity to make Oban Town Centre a free flowing Plaza for pedestrians and traffic, opening it up for all sorts of opportunities, business and entertainment</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>Don't be short sighted like the 1960s Councilors; look out to the future, and I'm talking 50 years, not like the next couple of weeks that seems to be the "normal " time frame.</p>
50	<p>This should be left out of council hands</p>
51	<p>To much control already</p> <p>Any additional comments Leave it be ,</p>
52	<p>The creation of a trust port should be pursued rather than rushing to get another inadquet solution in place that does not represent all harbour users.</p>
53	<p>I am not satisfied that future management as you describe it will fully reflect the intererests of local stakeholders and local community.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>It is important that the commercial interests of CMAL and Cal-Mac do not compromise safety, proper environmental compliance and the wide diversity of harbour users.</p>
54	<p>The interests of the population of Oban and the wider area would be better served by an independent locally elected and accountable harbour authority such as in Tobermory or Tarbert.</p>
55	<p>Better to be set up as a Trust Port for the benefit of all water users. A huge amount of work was done by the folks behind the Trust Port and that arrangement was going to be better than A and B Council running the port and certainly way better than CMal running the harbour</p>
56	<p>If safety is the priority then regulation is not the issue. Enforcing maritime COLREGS is.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>The proposals, as they stand, go too far. All you need to do to enhance safety is to extend the Harbour Master's authority to enable them to take action in response to a breach of COLREGS leading to a near-miss or incident. Powers to levy fees over the entire area, as shown in the maps, are a disincentive to visiting vessels who may not even use any built facilities.</p>
57	<p>I can foresee that eventually ABDC will want to hand over to CalMac to reduce their costs. I consider that having a commercial operator in charge of everything would not be a good idea. The bay has done perfectly well for as long as anyone can remember. So if it ain't broke don't fix it?</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>I hope the Council will just drop this silly (and costly) idea and let people go about their business and leisure pursuits unhindered by red tape and hoops through which to jump ?</p>
58	<p>My preference would be a community led harbour Trust port such as that suggested by Oban Bay Management Group. I have no confidence in Argyll & Bute Council to run the harbour with wider community benefits in mind; I expect that Argyll & Bute Council will continue to line its pockets at the expense of locals and local business. I would strongly advocate that</p>

Oban Bay as a Municipal Port: Comments from consultation

No.	Comment or question
	<p>steps continue to progress that transfer of harbour control from ABC to a community led board.</p> <p>Any additional comments</p> <p>I believe the Land Reform Act 2003 should be referenced and upheld in the 'Protected Provisions', specifically the right of access and FREE launching of unpowered craft in Oban bay. Kayaks are a specific part of the character of Oban, kayaks in Oban bay are featured and pictured every day. The right to unimpeded launching and landing of these craft should be maintained at all costs, Oban is a world centre for paddlesports with literally thousands of visitors including hundreds of international visitors each year using this area for the sport of Sea Kayaking.</p> <p>I do believe there is a need for speed enforcement in Oban bay.</p> <p>I do believe there is a need for coordination of larger boat movement within Oban bay.</p>