

Minutes

Client:	Argyll and Bute Council
Project:	Craignure Pier OBC
Meeting date:	21 October 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)
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	A
Ross Tait	Project Development Group (T&T, Ramboll)	RT	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 & Bute Council	MS	P
Vicki McKenzie	TBC	VMcK	A
Caroline Connelly	Transport Scotland	CCo	P
Graham Patrick	Transport Scotland	GP	P
Andrew Boyd	Transport Scotland	AB	A
Liz Jack	Transport Scotland	LJ	A
Declan MacDonald	CMAL	DMacD	P
Doug Mackay	CMAL	DMacK	P
Michael Sinclair	CMAL	MS	A
Ramsay Muirhead	CMAL	RM	A
Morven Bridges	CMAL	MB	A
Colin Campbell	CalMac	CCa	A
Fraser Wallace	CalMac	FW	P

Minutes

Full name	Company name / Representing	Initials	Present/Apology (P/A)
Martin Cullinane	CalMac	MC	P
Gordon McKillop	CalMac	GM	A
Billy McClymont	Mull Community Council	BMcC	P
Chris James	Craignure Landowner	CJ	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
Graham Bryce	West Coast Motors	GB	P
John Maughan	CalMac	JM	P

Signed: *R. Scott*

Date: 21/10/2025

Minutes

Discussion topic	Action	Action Date
1 Welcome and Introductions		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cllr John Armour welcomed everyone to the meeting, explained the proposed layout, requested everyone present introduce themselves (in person and online) & handed over to SR to complete introductions, requesting as people raise questions they introduce themselves before doing so. 	Note.	
2 Update on Craignure Pier Project		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KMck provided an updated as listed below. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ April 2025. OBC submitted to Argyll & Bute Council from T&T Ramboll ▪ April 2025. RIBA 2 Final design drawings & documents submitted. ▪ Sep 2025. EIA Scoping report completed. ▪ Ongoing. Procurement process ongoing for management & design consultant. ▪ KM clarified the MDC role, and ECI (early contractor involvement) in the design process. ▪ SR provided some additional clarification regarding the EIA process and programme of EIA works, noting that the recently completed works had been undertaken in order to maximise efficiencies. Further winter season works are planned by the consultants undertaking the works (RPS). 	Note	
3 Update on website and document sharing		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SR provided an update that the website should be live imminently ▪ SR explained the CMILG query register will be uploaded to the website with the intent of the document being to record major decisions, who made them, and any noted questions, queries or objections. ▪ 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. ▪ JR noted that his email from June 2025 had not been responded to – SR confirmed that there was a written response coming following input from all concerned parties. 	Note	
4 CMAL/TS/CALMAC Updates		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TS Updates – GP confirmed that community feedback consultations were ongoing. AB confirmed that Community Needs Assessment is out for procurement at present. ▪ CMAL Updates – DMacD gave an overview of new Mull ferries and Oban 1 project. DMacD confirmed that Public Engagement meetings are planned for early December 2025 and announcements will be issued soon. Procurement of a Naval Architect will be considered in early 2026. ▪ CALMAC Updates – FW indicated no new updates other than discussions are ongoing regarding vessel and pier designs. 	Note	
5 AOB and questions: JA/SR.		

Minutes

Discussion topic	Action	Action Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questions raised 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ JR noted that CMAL indicated 2 ferries, not 3, were being planned for and queried if this was a new development. GP confirmed that the stance had not changed since previous meetings and that a 3rd vessel would be based on future demand as/when required. More input would be forthcoming from community engagement meetings. ▪ JR requested more clarity on what CMAL state as a small ferry. GP confirmed that the new vessels would be intermediate class with size still to be determined based on capacity requirements. Then a concept design will be produced. ▪ JR stated that given that it is almost a certainty that there will be 3 vessels based on CalMac projections the project should be planning for a 3 vessel design. GP noted that TS did not disagree with this concept and noted that there will come a point soon where the pier design needs to start and will require vessel information. However, the 2 vessel approach for now is felt to be the right approach incorporating an option for a 3rd vessel as / when required with the necessary funding. ▪ SR noted that given that the life expectancy of a vessel will be less than the pier the infrastructure should be designed to be as non-specific as possible. It should be possible to build in opportunities for modifications as / when needed. ▪ JR asked how a 3 vessel set-up would work with the current pier design. GP noted that this had all been discussed previously and they are looking at a 3 vessel option for likely around 2035. No point in building infrastructure 10 years ahead of when it is needed. They will look at the proposed infrastructure design with the aim that it will be future proofed for any future changes required. ▪ BM stated that looking at a lay up for a 3rd vessel would not be a waste of time. JR confirmed that a 3rd vessel needs planned for now and why would you go through the whole process in 5 to 10 years after the pier opens. That may affect pier length. EIA and therefore this would be cost effective. SR confirmed that the 3rd vessel is part of the project discussions and why the Ground Investigation was maximised. The scale of project has to be sensitive to local community and community needs at this time. Need some balance. It will be part of design considerations. Agreed pier needs to be flexible enough ▪ FMacD noted the 2 linkspan option had been discussed previously and enquired about whether if 1 linkspan and a slip can the slip be used by proposed vessels? SR confirmed that it is possible to retrospectively fit a 2nd linkspan if needed but that the slip option provides some redundancy – e.g. if power failure. ▪ JR requested that the 2nd linkspan option be costed so a cost/benefit analysis can be undertaken. SR/KM noted and would discuss further. 	Note	

Minutes

Discussion topic	Action	Action Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FMacD asked if length of slip is same as linkspan. KM noted there may be some restrictions re very low/very high tides. ▪ FW noted that from an operator’s perspective they see very little need for concrete berth if linkspan maintained properly. Having ‘backup’ of the concrete link/berth is a suitable option. ▪ FW noted that need to factor in both sides Mull/Oban and capacity to handle number of ferries. He also confirmed Ferry Masters are involved in design process. Concrete slip is typically put in for design resilience and also used for lay up and ability to bring in other goods/vessels. ▪ JR reiterated the need for a cost/benefits analysis on cost of a second linkspan. ▪ JA noted that given present financial situation it may be prudent to push back additional costs 5 to 10 years and see if required at that point. ▪ SR noted that at some point A&BC need to start the design process and that the footprint has already been maximised. A&BC will review feedback and incorporate as much as possible. Present design allows for 1 linkspan and 1 concrete ramp. 2 linkspans will cost more than 1. ▪ NH enquired about the planning process – what does consent involve? KM confirmed timescale would be dependant on the MDC and that there may still be objections and anticipates further CMILG meetings to review and feed into design process. Public meetings to gain public input are also anticipated. ▪ 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Next meeting. ▪ SR indicated that the next Harbour Master meeting is March 2026 and would like to see the next meeting before then. The project team will commit to issuing information in advance of the meeting and that responses to JR’s 22 points would be uploaded to the website shortly. 	All	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ JA confirmed that this will be the proposal for the next meeting, and no objections or other proposals were noted. 	Noted.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ End of minutes. 	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