DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
HARBOUR STREET AND SHORE STREET, KIRKWALL
PROPOSED STREET AND PAVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS
CONSULTATION REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION

1.1 On 15 November 2016, the Development and Infrastructure Committee considered proposals for street and pavement improvements to Harbour Street and Shore Street and recommended that the proposals should be subject to public consultation, including businesses on Harbour Street and Shore Street and Kirkwall and St Ola Community Council.

2. METHODOLOGY

The following consultations were carried out:

2.1 Peter Bevan addressed Kirkwall and St Ola Community Council giving the reasons behind the scheme. Feedback forms were distributed.

2.2 Individual meetings were held with the following businesses:
   2.2.1 Kirkwall Hotel
   2.2.2 St Ola Hotel
   2.2.3 The Shore Hotel
   2.2.4 Helgi’s
   2.2.5 former Chicken George

2.3 A public drop in event was held on 31 January 2017 from 12noon to 6pm at the Shapinsay Ferry waiting room as advertised:
   2.3.1 in The Orcadian on 30 January 2017;
   2.3.2 announced on Radio Orkney on the morning of the event; and
   2.3.3 posted on the Council’s, Radio Orkney’s and The Orcadian’s facebook.

2.4 A letter drop was carried out by posting a copy of the notice used in The Orcadian, a plan showing the proposal and a feedback form; through all letter boxes on properties along Shore Street and Harbour Street. (including both S&JD Robertson and Highland Fuels).

2.5 Emails were sent to the following describing the proposals with a copy of the plan and a feedback form to:
   2.5.1 Craigie’s taxi
   2.5.2 Bob’s taxi
   2.5.3 Fire and Rescue
   2.5.4 S&JD Robertson
   2.5.5 Stagecoach

2.6 Feedback forms were asked to be returned by 3 February 2017.
3. **COMMUNITY COUNCIL FEEDBACK**

3.1 There was a healthy discussion with the Community Council with only a few members voicing concern. The Community Council decided, rather than a collective response, individuals could make responses, which were their own views and not that of the Community Council.

3.2 Three responses were returned by 3 February.

3.3 One was very supportive offering many good observations on the scheme and hoping the proposals go ahead.

3.4 One suggested judicious use of concrete setts rather than flags to the walkways.

3.5 The third wrote warning over the potential consequences if the right turn lane to Bridge Street were lost; congestion in surrounding streets, difficulties for emergency services. In summary, leave most of the road alone.

4. **INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS**

4.1 Individual meetings were held with the hotels and former takeaway on Harbour Street and Shore Street.

4.2 Businesses on Harbour Street were generally supportive of the proposals including the review of car parking arrangements. The consensus was that a wider footway would improve the appearance of the harbour front making it more appealing to locals and visitors.

4.3 We were advised that The Shore carried out a trial of outside seating and concluded that there was appetite from the public for such and the businesses suggested that they would therefore make use of space if allowed.

4.4 Tour buses and deliveries would need to be catered for within the design.

4.5 Reducing the speed of traffic would improve the area.

5. **PUBLIC DROP-IN EVENT**

5.1 25 people came to the public consultation event.

5.2 The feedback ranged from a request to make no changes because the road is very busy and the whole width is needed, to a request to reduce the road width as shown plus removal of all parking and taxis allowing businesses to set tables out.

5.3 Four attendees were strongly against any change; however when engaged two were supportive of one or two elements and their objections were more based on a broader political view that money should be spent elsewhere first.
5.4 Most attendees can be described as ‘those who think there are great opportunities to improve the appearance and usability of the waterfront’. They welcomed some of the design elements and made constructive suggestions for further betterment from their perspective.

5.5 A few agreed wholeheartedly with the scheme and only criticised that the design did not go far enough.

5.6 Feedback forms were issued.

5.7 Four feedback forms were completed or returned, all supporting the scheme in its entirety or in part.

5.8 A list of the comments expressed at the drop in session is attached as Annex 1.

6. **LETTER DROP RETURNS**

6.1 The letter drop requested responses by 3 February 2017.

6.2 To date there has been no feedback forms from the letter drop, however the letter drop did suggest that people should attend the public consultation; 2 did.

7. **EMAIL RESPONSES**

7.1 Responses were sought by 3 February 2017.

7.2 To date there have been no returns.

8. **ANNEX**

8.1 Annex 1 – Public consultation feedback
Annex 1

Public Consultation notes.

Red denotes generally against the scheme;
Yellow was a neutral response;
Green were suggestions from attendees who were supportive of a scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Great Western Road junction with Picky Rd first as it is more needed.</td>
<td>Move south side parking on Harbour St to north side of road.</td>
<td>Increase footway widths in front of buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why should businesses be given the space! Will they pay rates?</td>
<td>Keep parking out of town as traffic on network generally from parking.</td>
<td>Review parking; prioritise drop off and disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses will need to stop in street and traffic will build up.</td>
<td>Ensure fire engine access to west pier.</td>
<td>Move Taxi and create a promenade on harbour side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave alone, it is still a working Harbour.</td>
<td>Provide loading bay as a non road surface for St Ola / Helgi’s</td>
<td>The parking is abused on Harbour St, so not needed. Use the space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would rather speed bumps to narrowing road; if speed was an issue.</td>
<td>Would the road be wide enough if more housing developments come to north west.</td>
<td>Move parking away from Harbour St to make more room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very busy road and the width is needed.</td>
<td>Cars are parking wrong at Bridge St junction in front of Kirkwall Hotel. Stop them.</td>
<td>Very keen on extra space / footways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move the business away to turn the properties back to residential.</td>
<td>Make zebra on pedestrian desire line at top of Bridge St</td>
<td>Make tourist bus stop in taxi rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will not be nicer; it is not Kirkwall.</td>
<td>Slowing traffic in the area would be helpful.</td>
<td>Like idea. Move taxi rank behind Orkney Ferries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme would push out traffic causing pressure on Weyland area etc</td>
<td>Need more parking on the Ayre side; more land reclamation.</td>
<td>Yes. We need to encourage more pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will traffic manage on busy days when cruise liners come.</td>
<td>Make Harbour entrance off the roundabout.</td>
<td>Good idea but provide for buses and deliveries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not narrow. Think about emergency vehicles.</td>
<td>Stop taxi doing U turn</td>
<td>Can speed limit be added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more slabs, use tar.</td>
<td>One consultation event is not enough.</td>
<td>Good. Reduced width = reduced speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not narrow the street.</td>
<td></td>
<td>First impression; nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Get rid of zebras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add cycle racks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>