



## Minutes

Client:	Argyll and Bute Council
Project:	Craignure Pier OBC
Meeting date:	11 June 2025
Meeting location:	MS Teams
Meeting title:	Craignure Marine Infrastructure Liaison Group (CMILG) Meeting

## Attendees and Apologies

Full name	Company name / Representing	Initials	Present/Apology (P/A)
Allan Finlay	Argyll and Bute Council	AF	A
Scott Reid	Argyll and Bute Council	SR	P
Kelly McKellar	Argyll and Bute Council	KMcK	P
Edward Lacey	Project Development Group (T&T, Ramboll)	EL	P
Lynsey McNeilly	Project Development Group (T&T, Ramboll)	LM	P
Russell Scott	Project Development Group (T&T, Ramboll)	RS	P
Cllr Andrew Kain	Oban South and the Isles	AK	P
Cllr John Armour	Policy Lead - Roads, Transport and Amenity Services	JA	P
Cllr Kieron Green	Oban North and Lorn	KG	P
Cllr Ross Moreland	Argyll and Bute Harbour Board (Chair)	RM	P
Michael Stirling	Argyll and Bute Council	MS	P
Vicki McKenzie	Argyll and Bute Council	VMcK	P
Caroline Connelly	Transport Scotland	CCo	P
Graham Patrick	Transport Scotland	GP	A
Declan MacDonald	CMAL	DMacD	P
Doug Mackay	CMAL	DMacK	P
Michael Sinclair	CMAL	MS	P
Colin Campbell	CalMac	CCa	A
Fraser Wallace	CalMac	FW	P
Martin Cullinane	CalMac	MC	P
Billy McClymont	Mull Community Council	BMcC	P
Chris James	Craignure Landowner	CJ	P

Minutes

Full name	Company name / Representing	Initials	Present/Apology (P/A)
Finlay MacDonald	Mull & Iona Ferry Committee	FMacD	P
Joe Reade	Mull & Iona Ferry Committee	JR	P
Norman Hickson	Represents the local community	NH	P
Keith Robbie	TBC	KR	P

Signed: *L McNeilly*

Date: 11/06/2025

## Minutes

Discussion topic		Action	Action Date
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cllr John Armour welcomed everyone to the meeting, explained the proposed layout &amp; handed over to SR to complete introductions, requesting as people raise questions they introduce themselves before doing so.</li> </ul>	Note.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Update on Craignure Pier Project</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ KMCK provided an updated as listed below.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ April 2025. OBC submitted to Argyll &amp; Bute Council from T&amp;T Ramboll</li> <li>▪ April 2025. RIBA 2 Final design drawings &amp; documents submitted.</li> <li>▪ Ongoing. EIA Scoping report review.</li> <li>▪ Ongoing. Procurement process ongoing for management &amp; design consultant.</li> </ul>	Note	
<b>3</b>	<b>Update on PAS replacement. Argyll and Bute Council</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ KMCK provided an update confirming that the tender review was ongoing in relation to the PAS works</li> </ul>	Note	
<b>4</b>	<b>Update on website and document sharing</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SR provided an update that the website should be updated in the coming days.</li> <li>▪ SR explained the format of the CMILG query register, that this will also be used as a decision log. It is understood not all decisions on the project will have full agreement, therefore the document will record major decisions, who made them, and any outstanding questions, queries or objections.</li> <li>▪ SR updated that the project approach is to keep the design as flexible as possible at this stage to incorporate amendments once decisions on vessel design are confirmed.</li> </ul>	Note	
<b>5</b>	<b>AOB and questions: JA/SR.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ JR email regarding PAS was issued in advance of the meeting. JA confirmed JR could explain his view/position for 10minutes during the AOB stage of the meeting.</li> </ul>		
	<b>Questions raised</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Substantial questions are recorded in document 2025 CMILG Q and A</li> </ul>	Note	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BMCC asked What service requirement are we working on here with current design</li> <li>▪ SR confirmed we remain as flexible as we can until vessel design is confirmed. A big task was confirming the GI &amp; agreeing the footprint, that how far the project has progressed. Project size/scale depends on vessel design is developed. We are focused on ensuring the infrastructure is fit for purpose for the vessel deployment. It is important that</li> </ul>	Note	

## Minutes

Discussion topic	Action	Action Date
<p>we keep momentum going for the project, with the option to build in flexibility in final design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CC added TS are aware of the communities ask for a 3 vessel service, nothing is set in stone &amp; there is nothing new to share. Still working through the service requirements. Service requirements papers have been received from community groups &amp; these are being considered.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR raised a point regarding his email issued. There is an important step in the process in danger of being skipped over - which is defining the requirements of the service. This should shape the design solution, of pier &amp; ferry. Suggests more time is spent on service requirements to feed into the design.</li> <li>Noted. No query</li> </ul>	Note	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR queried why is the pier continuous &amp; does it need to be?</li> <li>EL responded: Until the regular vessel is known, it is difficult to do a study of comparing a dis-continuous pier. From resilience point of view, the design is looking at accommodating other larger vessels in CalMac fleet. A study will be done once vessel design is more advanced, and this will need to consider all vessels which may use the pier. If made discontinuous pier now in the design, this would be an issue with permitting changes if it changed later.</li> </ul>	Note	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR queried Would it be possible to form an opinion of a cost saving for a dis-continuous V continuous pier.</li> <li>SR responded: Cost is not just in savings in materials, it is also in relation to construction, mobilising of plant. Cannot provide a ball-park figure right now. Material cost would be expected to be cheaper, however need to consider what resilience would be sacrificed if changed to a dis-continuous pier, for example in relation to what range of vessels can use the pier.</li> </ul>	Note	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR queried if design decisions were made based on commercial opportunities, as the service will be paid for based on ferry service fees.</li> <li>ER responded Design approach is to maximise flexibility later on, it is important to maximise footprint &amp; continuous pier design, to enable us to reduce it than make it bigger.</li> </ul>	Note	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BMcC noted he is happy to hear a 3-vessel service is still a vision. He requested drawings to be amended to show how this would work.</li> <li>SR responded: this is an ideal questions for this stage of the project.</li> <li>One of the biggest targets from Craignure was to minimise the length of the pier, to be max only required for longest vessel. This will all be reviewed as the design progresses &amp; service details become known/defined.</li> </ul>	Note	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR queried if the pier does need to be longer, and continuous deck is best solution, will that be possible within the current permitting applied for?</li> <li>ER responded: It depends on how much longer the pier would be. The scoping assessment defines what assessments need to be carried out in full. At this stage it could be made longer.</li> </ul>	Note	

## Minutes

Discussion topic	Action	Action Date
This length needs to be determined before the EIA is completed, and need to ensure sufficient GI information to do the design.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BMcC raised concern from the people of Craignure is the size &amp; scale of the pier. Suggest investigating a nested berth on the South side, less intrusive piece of work.</li> <li>Noted, see next response</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CJ queried would it be possible to maintain 1/3 of existing pier to access a nesting pier parrallel to coast.</li> <li>SR &amp; EL responded: Preference is not to rely on existing infrastructure which requires removed.</li> <li>A nested berth can be reviewed, does not appear suitable to produce plans to include use of the old pier.</li> <li>This was considered in the STAG appraisal &amp; OBC - they were not preferred options by CalMac. A lot more exposed to waves, beam on to waves, movement of vessels would be significant. The berth would be of limited use.</li> </ul>	Note	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR raised a point regarding visual impact - the other major point is the PAS. 2nd comment - comparative costing of PAS options should be investigated.</li> <li>EL responded. In terms of integration of PAS with linkspan. This has been done before, one example in Ireland. Either need signifcant lift capacity on the vessel, or a 2-level connection, so on lower is cars &amp; higher is passengers. This all ties into the vessel design. In terms of visual impact, it is still significant, with a 2 level linkspan, a significant structure above the pier level.</li> <li>2nd comment. Noted.</li> </ul>	Note	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AK raised that the project is building a pier which fits in with a network. That ships need to be able to dock at the pier, and unload. That will define the PAS.</li> <li>Noted, no query.</li> </ul>	Note	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR queried does the RNLI berth have other purposes?</li> <li>Primarily for RNLI evacuation, it reduces the length of linkspan required to get down to the level of lifeboat at low tide at a safe gradient. Also removes potential operational conflict as RNLI is removed from location of CalMac vessel. It may have other uses as well.</li> <li>BMcC stated: "There hasn't been a life boat in Craignure for years".</li> <li>Noted, no query.</li> <li><i>Post-meeting note: JR has volunteered to take an action to speak to the Tobermory RNLI Operations Manager regarding the requirement for a medical evacuation pontoon. Email 11/06/25.</i></li> </ul>	JR	October 2025
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH raised 3 points in relation to design. When will community be able to put in design considerations. Items to consider in future.</li> <li>1. Traffic Management on A849, even with recent improvements still get a lot of traffic jams, could a filter lane be considered, and/or a really good review.</li> <li>2. Adequate passenger pick up &amp; drop off, with a cover. Weather conditions require a covered area.</li> </ul>		

## Minutes

Discussion topic	Action	Action Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. An all-weather access to bus pick-up &amp; drop-off point.</li> <li>Please keep in consideration in future design.</li> <li>Noted, this will be considered/reviewed during the next stage of design</li> </ul>	Project team	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to pre-meeting email from JR 11/06/2025 11.19 titled Re: Craignure Marine Infrastructure Liaison Group (CMILG) June 2025 Agenda</li> <li>Points in email to be reviewed at next stage / in advance of next CMILG</li> </ul>	Project team	October 2025
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to follow-up email from JR 11/06/2025 17:52 titled Re: Craignure Marine Infrastructure Liaison Group (CMILG) June 2025 Agenda</li> <li>Points in email to be reviewed at next stage / in advance of next CMILG</li> </ul>	Project team	October 2025
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Actions from previous minutes &amp; updates</b></li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR asked are minutes being taken.</li> <li><b>SR</b> confirmed yes. SR provided an update on where minutes will be available on the A&amp;BC web-page. This will include minutes from this group CMILG, and the CPDWG. Minutes will be uploaded once they are approved at the next meeting.</li> <li>JR queried were there minutes from the previous meeting.</li> <li>SR will check this &amp; all minutes held currently will be uploaded &amp; maintained going forward. <i>Post-meeting note: Website is still in progress and minutes will be uploaded and all parties made aware once completed</i></li> <li>NH. Will the latest update of the plan be available, would be useful to have it in advance of meetings.</li> <li>SR confirmed that yes it will be available &amp; will be issued in advance of the next meeting.</li> </ul>	SR – ongoing, imminent	May 2025
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Next meeting.</b></li> <li>SR shared the date of the next meeting as 21 October 2025. Any set questions which anyone would like detailed answers to, would be beneficial to receive early/mid-April. The project team will commit to issuing information in advance of the meeting.</li> </ul>	All	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JA confirmed that this will be the proposal for the next meeting, and no objections or other proposals were noted.</li> </ul>	Noted.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of minutes.</li> </ul>	End.	

© Turner & Townsend Project Management Limited. This document is expressly provided to and solely for the use of **Error! No text of specified style in document.** on the **Error! No text of specified style in document.** and takes into account their particular instructions and requirements. It must not be made available or copied or otherwise quoted or referred to in whole or in part in any way, including orally, to any other party without our express written permission and we accept no liability of whatsoever nature for any use by any other party