

Oban Bay stakeholder questionnaire June 2018

Free text responses

What activities, events, facilities, areas or management considerations you think the new harbour legislation should accommodate or exclude? Please add all your thoughts and considerations. If you wish to add comment with regard to previous questions please also add them here.

Answered **354**

Skipped **199**

Respondent	Response Date	Responses
1	Aug 02 2018 09:56 PM	Annual events.□ Leisure provisions that have controlled parameters.□ Fishermen report scheme for lack of compliance.□ Ferry drivers who have consideration for all users despite their size and limited routes due to manoeuvre.□ Liaison with leisure groups to ensure good information flows.□ Trial period of coastal control boats to ensure closer control of marine movements.
2	Aug 02 2018 04:13 PM	Total control of the harbour area and ALL users.Only one body having representation from ALL harbour users should be considered.
3	Aug 01 2018 05:59 PM	The management should legislate for all users, not just the main commercial companies such as calmac, smaller sailing biats bring much needed people to the west of Scotland, thisis much needed for all. The danger is one bug company over ruling to the detriment of smaller users.
4	Aug 01 2018 03:14 PM	surely cmal running the Oban bay area would represent a conflict of interest. It should be a legally neutral entity of which cmal and calmac should be a part of.
5	Aug 01 2018 12:00 PM	A new hatbour authority should include all vessels that use the harbour and try too accomodate all of them. As is suggeted in the prose of this report there are 20,000 leisure craft using the bay. This brings considerable revenue to the town and surrounding district and therefore should be given a place on the board to represent this sizable group. I would think a group such as WHAM could act as a representative for the leisure craft. It is noted that Dr Tony Bennett sat in on one of the meetings and perhaps he could be approached as a representative of the leisure craft.
6	Aug 01 2018 08:33 AM	Improved marina facilities to draw more visitors and give a wider range of stopping off points when running down the Firth of Lorne.

7	Jul 31 2018 09:18 PM	I believe commercial interest are being put front and centre without adequate consideration of many of the other groups that use the Oban Bay area.
8	Jul 31 2018 03:21 PM	I recommend the Fisher Associates Report which will best represent the wisest range of stakeholder interests.
9	Jul 31 2018 02:53 PM	Port VTS - to better control traffic through the North Channel.
10	Jul 31 2018 02:31 PM	<p>harbour master/VTS to direct traffic or Harbour lights to say is safe or not to enter the harbour area <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>better nav aids, defined rule 9 channel and enforced, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>better anchorage area for cruise ships <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Bi law to keep leisure crafts from impeding commercial vessels in the channel<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>better linkspans <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>better fenders on quay wall<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>bigger car marshaling areas<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>crew parking areas<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>finer for non compliance with speed limits and rule breaking,<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
11	Jul 31 2018 02:19 PM	Proper consultation with leisure yachting cruising
12	Jul 31 2018 02:11 PM	Speed restriction to be properly controlled
13	Jul 31 2018 02:09 PM	<p>Harbour legislation should accommodate all activities relating to navigation within the harbour limits, by whatever means - whether commercial (cargo, ferry, cruise, diving vessels, local passenger vessels etc) as well as leisure activities (leisure sailing, yacht racing, dinghy sailing, kayaking, sport diving etc).<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Also, it should include maintaining safety and freedom of navigation including the effective control of moorings within the harbour limits.</p>
14	Jul 31 2018 01:59 PM	The Yachts are a danger to navigation both in north and south entrances. Uneducated mariners with no regard to code of practice, seamanship or rule of the road. A clamp down on this behaviour must be clamped down on sooner rather than later
15	Jul 30 2018 09:33 PM	Should accommodate scuba diving
16	Jul 30 2018 07:16 PM	<p>A harbour authority must represent the local community and the main users, so a trust port is the best approach.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • until I see the basis of your costings, I can't see why a trust port should be much more expensive.<input type="checkbox"/> • the principal user should not also be the harbour authority (and CMAL and Calmac are effectively two parts of one operation)<input type="checkbox"/> • impact of charges on business can't be quantified at this stage until charges are known<input type="checkbox"/> • Q10 - how can one say what type of vessel causes risks? It's inconsiderate behaviour and want of seamanship that are the primary causes. Too high a speed in the north channel is a major factor - and ferries are frequent culprits.

17	Jul 30 2018 06:29 PM	<p>Access to Oban marina by leisure craft and the benefits this business has to Oban □</p> <p>The removal or reduction of the “Transit Berths” which increase traffic in the area of North Pier and across ferry and commercial routes in the bay. These were a politically motivated installation and the money spent on their construction and upkeep would be better spent on assiting the marina to provide an effective ferry service allowing it to prosper and increase employment and income locally.</p>
18	Jul 30 2018 05:06 PM	<p>Trustte Harbour ASuthority required to protect all owners and operators of Harbour facilities now and into future and to safe guard public interests</p>
19	Jul 30 2018 01:32 PM	<p>Any new harbour authority should promote Oban as a destination for all, be it commercial, leisure, or cruise liners etc. The role of the authority is the safe management of all interests, and not solely around the amount of income generated.</p>
20	Jul 30 2018 11:53 AM	<p>It should include representatives for all areas of users especially the smaller groups.</p>
21	Jul 30 2018 11:36 AM	<p>The survey should have been written to meet the Scottish Government's Community Engagement Standards. The small text box for comments actively discourages further dialogue.</p> <p>□</p> <p>The harbour should be an asset to the whole community and not be managed by a single large user or small group of users. No one user should have disproportionate influence over the harbour and the harbour authority should be able to charge commercial vessels to the benefit of all harbour users and the wider community. Any harbour management body should be representative of the wider community as well as the full range of harbour users. □</p> <p>A number of incidents have been recorded by CMAL though details have not been published and no records of reports to the MCA or MAIB have been released. Full details of the incidents and who has recorded them and from where should be published as part of this consultation. □</p> <p>Ferries and leisure vessels seem to be the largest source of conflict. Publishing any recorded incidents might confirm this and better adherence to colregs could solve this. Fault lies on both sides here and leisure users should not be unduly targeted. At a recent short survey of the north channel four out of five Calmac vessels entering the harbour were exceeding the speed limit. □</p> <p>The figures presented on the costs of various options have been widely disputed. More detail should be published on how these figures were derived. □</p>

		<p>Question 12 is a leading question. Small businesses will be less able to absorb extra costs. A positive response to this question could be used to help CMAL/Calmac avoid paying harbour dues. Their viability is not in question given the amount of taxpayers' money they receive.</p> <p>No details of how the harbour might be run under a CMAL HRO so it's very difficult to participate in any meaningful consultation.</p>
22	Jul 29 2018 10:21 PM	
23	Jul 29 2018 04:28 PM	
24	Jul 29 2018 11:40 AM	No details of how the harbour might be run under a CMAL HRO
25	Jul 29 2018 11:25 AM	<p>The new harbour should be representative of the community of Oban and the users. The priority should be safety followed by maximising the benefit of the Port for the locality including collection and reinvestment of harbour dues and conservancy fees. A new Port Authority should have control over the whole area with no 'nested' vested interests which detract from the value that the local community might gain from the use of their harbour. The major user should not be the controlling interest and the Board should have considerable representation from the relevant sectors active in the area. □</p> <p>The whole survey is leading. I sit on the Stakeholder Group and cannot say with any certainty who presents the greatest safety risk (Q10), at the moment I believe it is the ferries interacting with leisure users, but I do not have confidence in the presented data to allow me to make a clear judgement. I am not an expert in navigation aids (Q11) either so cannot, with certainty answer this closed question either. Q12 gives me no choice but to follow the precautionary approach and answer Yes, but as you have provided no idea about the charging structures or what would actually be done under an HRO to improve safety I cannot, again, make a clear judgement. Q13 it is clear to me that charges should be proportionate to use and should not discourage leisure and tourism so, for example, further fees should not be levied by the back door on leisure traffic to Oban Marina or the North Pier pontoons, nor should anchoring of leisure vessels be charged for. □</p>
		This survey would not meet any of the Standards for Community Engagement as spelled out by the Scottish Government.
26	Jul 27 2018 10:17 PM	<p>Provide traffic light system at North channel. □</p> <p>This survey does not ask the right questions. □</p> <p>I do not understand why a trust port would cost so much. Nor do I think there are any significant safety issues in current set up.</p>

27	Jul 27 2018 03:51 PM	<p>The legislation needs to enshrine the position of the local community along with communities of interest (such as recreational boating) as principle stakeholders along side those with commercial interest. It is entirely inappropriate for a body with a significant commercial interest to become the Harbour Authority in a manner that effectively excludes the local community, recreational users of the area and connected businesses.□</p> <p>A Trust Port is by far the most appropriate and representative option.□</p> <p>Question 10 is unreasonable as it is the geography and limitations of space that create the risks identified in the Bay and specifically the North Channel. Individual vessels of all kinds exacerbate this risk through poor or inconsiderate seamanship. It is inappropriate to try and label one type of craft as the major risk when each is as capable of the other of creating risk.□</p> <p>Question 12 is a ludicrous option. Respondents cannot possibly know the outcome of any impact of charges until the structure, methodology and scale of charges are indicated. □</p> <p>Question 13 - costs should be shared proportionally on the volume or scale of commercial interest and the capacity to facilitate payment.□</p> <p>The right to anchor, free of any charges, should be accommodated within the Harbour Authority area.</p>
28	Jul 27 2018 12:46 PM	The questionnaire has too many leading questions and others that cannot be answered competently without more information.
29	Jul 26 2018 04:36 PM	All without restriction.
30	Jul 26 2018 03:47 PM	Must accommodate leisure traffic which is helping to revitalise local retail businesses and food outlets.
31	Jul 26 2018 01:26 PM	<p>?10 My answer would be Vessels which navigate unsafely without due care, This does not apply to one type of vessel. This question encourages a prejudiced point of view. As I was unable to complete the survey without answering this question I have ticked them all. as all are capable of being navigated unsafely.□</p> <p>□</p> <p>Harbour legislation should accommodate safe harbour operation.</p>
32	Jul 26 2018 11:47 AM	Seems to work pretty well as it is
33	Jul 25 2018 04:24 PM	We are a yacht, which motors slowly. While approaching the north entrance from Oban Bay, we have asked on radio whether any large vessels were approaching (ie hidden by Kerrera). The large vessels approaching have not bothered to reply, meaning we have met them mid opening. Worrying if they either don't bother monitoring vhf, don't have sufficient staff on bridge or can't be bothered to reply.
34	Jul 23 2018 11:26 PM	N/a
35	Jul 23 2018 06:44 PM	Kayak users, commercial fish farms, natural animal habitats, water quality, free public access ramp facilities, better vhs or mobile reception

36	Jul 23 2018 05:36 PM	All activities and events should be covered, BUT the new harbour authority should NOT be CMAL, the main users. Instead, it should be independent, taking into account the interests of all water users, and the benefits to Oban and the surrounding area. I understand many other ports are run by trustees - so why not Oban? Why the huge difference in costs of the 3 alternatives listed - not explained in the documents I've seen.
37	Jul 23 2018 05:00 PM	CALMAC may be the dominant operator in Oban Bay but this is precisely why it should NOT extend their SHA to a wider area. The Council is a democratic organisation and can give weight to the needs of all interested parties when deciding how to regulate operations in Oban Bay. CMAL has it's role but it should not be granted powers beyond what it already has.
38	Jul 23 2018 10:46 AM	The questionnaire is misleading in parts, e.g. the source of risk. Obviously the major issue is the mix of users. With CMAL in control of the extended harbour it is inevitable that they will constrain users other than ferries for much of the bay. Government is good at regulating but bad at managing. Broader interests must prevail.
39	Jul 22 2018 01:10 PM	The main user should not be the Port Authority.
40	Jul 21 2018 10:47 PM	Fully consider the trust port option please
41	Jul 21 2018 05:09 PM	Review the Code of practice and make it available to all users
42	Jul 20 2018 09:51 PM	Wider consultation is required to produce a properly considered proposal. Harbour management should not be the responsibility of one user, eg CMAL which is state owned; representative local stakeholders must be involved. Evidence to support proposed management funding models required, especially as both CMAL and A&BC are taxpayer funded.
43	Jul 20 2018 05:48 PM	The only acceptable model is a Trust Port with true representation from all user groups. Calmac must not be allowed to set its own rules to benefit its own commercial operations. The current self-appointed 'management group' must widen its membership to include representation from all Oban Bay user groups, then start this process again to come up with a proposal that is acceptable to all, rather than imposed by a high commercial user.
44	Jul 20 2018 02:14 PM	Handing the running of Oban bay to CalMac or another commercial company is not desirable <input type="checkbox"/> Harbour management trust would see all users treated fairly <input type="checkbox"/> Tobermory and Tarbert Loch Fyne are good examples
45	Jul 20 2018 01:48 PM	Should have full and balanced regard for all users with safety paramount but without undue restrictions on any group of users. Extending CMAL role would put extended SHA under a governance structure set up for the interests of ferries alone.

46	Jul 20 2018 01:23 PM	<p>Avoid as much empire-building, bureaucracy, health and safety as possible.□</p> <p>Re Q11.□</p> <p>limprove the buoyage in the area of the Corren ledge/sewer outfall now that vessels are more likely to hug the coast on the way from the north entrance towards/from the new Transit pontoons. How about a westerly. (?) cardinal..□</p> <p>Bear in mind that the marina on Kerrera is a considerable asset and attraction to Oban and whilst it s a private commercial for profit enterprise it must have huge benefits to the town. Without it I would probably pass Oban by - at least until the new Transit pontoons are a bit more proven to be viable in strong southwesterly winds.□</p> <p>Re Q 14□</p> <p>Based on the widely held view that Oban is a town that has been dis-interested in its harbour and sea-based leisure activities I am at a loss to think which sort of body is likely to be best for the town - one with strong local input from local maritime users seems desirable but would it be funded□ on a continuing basis?</p>
47	Jul 20 2018 12:16 PM	<p>Any changes to the legislation covering the existing Oban General Harbour Authority area should cover all the statutory requirements for the infrastructure investment, maintenance and management of the port of Oban to ensure its safe operation, correct governance and economic viability.□</p> <p>CMAL has no legal authority as an SHA in its own right, therefore the option to "extend their SHA" is invalid.</p>
48	Jul 20 2018 09:30 AM	<p>An independent trust is more likely to consider the needs of all users in an impartial and transparent way. □</p> <p>It is difficult to see how the proposal for CMAL to run the harbour would not be biased towards their operational requirements.</p>
49	Jul 20 2018 08:53 AM	<p>Not apparent to myself that there is a major safety problem that the current code of practice doesn't cater for. Some leisure vessels don't adhere to the code of practice but I don't think any review will change this, because their skippers aren't aware of it as they are often only occasional visitors. Also it's clear that many vessels don't adhere to the speed limits in the harbour. A criticism is that perhaps this initiative is simply creating another level of bureaucracy when the major problem is poor adherence to the current code of practice.</p>
50	Jul 19 2018 04:19 PM	<p>Oban is an important destination for cruising yachts and motor boats. Any compromise to this which discourages these visiting boats will be detrimental to the local economy.</p>
51	Jul 19 2018 11:59 AM	<p>I feel that all users of the harbour should have equal representation and feel that if the overall authority is vested in a commercial interest this could be used to minimise the influence of all other users.</p>

52	Jul 18 2018 10:16 PM	All currently in place; plus powers to ban the dangerous jet-skis (water scooters) and any other particularly dangerous, noisy or otherwise polluting craft.
53	Jul 18 2018 07:34 PM	<p>New legislation should address navigation and navigation aids and activities in the bay. The area under the management of the new authority should be extended, possibly as far as the north entrance. □</p> <p>The risk management consultants have identified the greatest hazards to be groundings on the Corran Ledge, Sgeir Rathaid, and Ferry Rocks and so some improvement to the buoyage should be considered.□</p> <p>I object to CMAL being appointed in the proposed legislation as that authority cannot be expected to balance the interests of all users of the bay.</p>
54	Jul 17 2018 08:09 PM	Leisure users of Oban bay have been very poorly catered for in the past, handing control to a commercial operator, which CMAL in plain language would be a huge mistake.They will prioritise their business interest over all else.
55	Jul 17 2018 05:12 PM	<p>Considering the amount of tourists, hikers and especially cruising yachts at the height of the summer season I would like to find good onshore facilities eg. toilets, showers, laundry,water and an easy access for yachts / small craft fuelberth etc. Also substantial pontoons / marina with these facilities close at hand.□</p> <p>I also believe it would be in the best interests of all users to ban the expulsion of toilet waste from all boats. They would therefor require a holding tank or portaloo. In the Baltic this is a legal requirement and would look to the future of our water environment. Please be mindful that the area in question has sheltered waters which are needed for the safety of small craft.</p>

56	Jul 17 2018 03:04 PM	I am a recreational cruising sailor, in my own boat, based in the Firth of Forth. Oban is one of the best and most convenient towns on the West Coast from which to enjoy the natural beauty and navigational challenges of sailing. It has good landward connection and an excellent range of on-shore facilities but until recently has lacked good marine access for small craft, now provided by the transit marina (which I have not yet visited). The access and buoyage in the Sound of Kerrera and Oban Bay can be confusing and congested. Reliable marine management involving appropriate open radio authorisation and direction, particularly of larger vessels and aircraft and provision of recommended safe routes for small vessels would improve the safety of all concerned. Such management should protect the safe passage of all properly-skipped craft, and provide optimum protection for all the water users, while recognising the operational needs and commercial pressures on commercial vessels. Busy as the Bay is, I believe there is ample space to accommodate the needs of all water users and the preferences of most. The economic wellbeing of Oban and the adjacent areas will be enhanced by good development of the marine access, while the enjoyment of sailing visitors and tourists alike will directly feed into the town's good reputation.
57	Jul 17 2018 01:23 PM	No extra regulation is required, the col regs are sufficient in all cases.
58	Jul 17 2018 09:43 AM	The harbour should not be placed under the control of a single company. A Company would make use of the bay for its own benefit without much consideration to other users. Previous experience of the way Calmac behaves should be taken as a warning
59	Jul 17 2018 09:34 AM	I cannot answer Q 9 as it depends on how it was run.
60	Jul 16 2018 10:10 PM	Ensure private leisure craft are properly considered and protected along with other users.
61	Jul 16 2018 12:23 PM	Not just marine movements, but berths, access roads and parking areas
62	Jul 16 2018 08:14 AM	Small leisure craft-less than 5 meters
63	Jul 15 2018 09:41 PM	To establish a system of safe navigation for the north entrance to Oban Bay for all users.

64	Jul 15 2018 07:12 PM	<p>The costs of a municipal or state harbour are not justified by the safety considerations. The safety issues are best decided by a local port board, with wider representation of all classes of uses, which can best prevent the otherwise inevitable slide into ever more bureaucratic procedures and the associated costs, particularly in salaries of officials whose main justification may easily degenerate into an undemocratic police force. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The serious issue at stake is the need to share local use with an increasing schedule of ferry sailings. In my view the ferry users, already heavily subsidised by the government are the only suitable users to pay for the costs. In particular, the harbour should not be used as an unofficial source of government taxation. The best approach is therefore to insist that the government pays for the additional costs, through its ferry service revenue and subsidies, while the management is kept local. Only in this manner, will all sides be united in preventing this initiative from getting out of control and degenerating into additional revenue for local and national government, instead of concentrating on safety issues raised by local users. The most important constitutional point is that no class of user, not directly represented on the board of management, should ever be asked to pay for the decisions made by the board.</p>
65	Jul 15 2018 05:45 PM	<p>1.VHF advisories re safety. 2. vessel passage hannel management. 3. Guidelines for manoevering in Oban Bay. 4. Enforcement of speed restrictions.</p>
66	Jul 15 2018 12:50 PM	<p>Firstly, I do not like the questions presented in this survey .<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The future management of Oban bay needs to enhance the experience of all bay users equally, not putting the interests of the Ferries and other large commercial vessels ahead of everyone else .Cal Mac should be kept in check . Maybe a new location for the ferry terminal should be considered close to the town but not in the middle of town , with all the traffic congestion that ensues at present .</p>

67

Jul 14 2018 12:39 PM

FOR REASONS GIVEN BELOW PLEASE DISREGARD MY ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS 9, 10 AND 13.

The questions in this survey are clearly leading the user towards certain responses, mainly by not allowing immediate follow-up comment (e.g. question 9 should include a "why?", questions 10 and 13 should include "other"). For this reason I would have preferred to have left certain questions blank, as I do not feel the survey allows me to answer them.

From reading the minutes of the OHMG meeting notes, it would appear that information on incidents is partial and biased - e.g. there is no information on the speed of vessels involved in incidents, and incident reporting often depends on the Harbour Manager having witnessed the incident; as the Harbour Manager is also an employee of CalMac this would seem to be an unacceptable bias in information.

Furthermore, of the incidents reported, over 60% seem to arise from vessels not respecting IRPCS, or not minimising their wash. There seems to be no indication in any of these proposals as to how a Harbour Revision Order would change that - if the rules exist but are not being followed, why does a different manager make people follow them?

With regards to my specific area of interest, my partner and I are intending to move to Oban and take over an existing business which makes use of the harbour area. The business currently operates out of central Oban, but it doesn't have to. Any proposal would need to genuinely take into account the interests of all stakeholders, not just one company with a clear and biased commercial interest in the outcome.

68	Jul 14 2018 09:19 AM	<p>Oban bay has a thriving and diverse maritime community the developments in the bay such as the new transit berths have added significantly to the facilities and attraction of the bay to both commercial and leisure Marine tourism. Any new harbour legislation should be designed to ensure that any operating has the scope to enable the management of the diversity interest and activity within the bay. I do not believe that an operator with its own significant commercial interest within the bay will best serve the diversity of interest and activity commercial or leisure. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In passing on costs to users it is vital that this does not create the unintended consequence of either threatening the viability of commercial users or threatening the numbers of resident leisure user or transient leisure users. As investment into marine tourism increases and infrastructure continues to develop it would be wrong to see Oban bay becoming less attractive as a hub for commercial or leisure users.</p>
69	Jul 13 2018 10:09 PM	<p>1) Protect the right of all users to peaceful enjoyment of their property while in Oban Bay.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Consider feasibility of safe small boat channel running parallel with main channel.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Recognise that the growth of ferry operations is not sustainable and develop an alternative port facility away from Oban bay.<input type="checkbox"/></p>
70	Jul 13 2018 08:48 PM	<p>Any harbour legislation must allow for the development of leisure use of Oban Bay and approaches, especially for visiting yachts.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The area considered to be included in a harbour legislation plan is excessive and should be restricted to within a fixed distance from the notional centre of the bay in all directions.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Why are the Oban Bay Management Group not implementing the recommendations of the Fisher Associates Report ?</p>
71	Jul 13 2018 05:12 PM	<p>All existing activities, events and facilities must be accommodated. Nothing should be excluded without full consultation and discussion. Oban Bay has always been a freely available marine area and must remain as such.</p>
72	Jul 13 2018 03:44 PM	<p>compared with busy ports no need for over regulation present system perfectly adequate with its mix voluntary, private; commercial this exercise waste of time and money</p>
73	Jul 13 2018 01:16 PM	<p>Need to accommodate West Highland Week fleet</p>
74	Jul 13 2018 10:55 AM	<p>More small vessel launch and storage facilities.</p>
75	Jul 12 2018 11:08 PM	<p>All maritime movements and activities<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This questionnaire seems very biased</p>

76	Jul 12 2018 09:15 PM	<p>It seems wrong for CMAL to take over the management of the bay, inevitably it will show a bias favourable to CALMAC. □ Is the north channel a narrow channel within the meaning of the colregs? If not then can small vessels ignore the code of practice and stand on, expecting ferries to give way? Is something akin to a traffic separation scheme possible with separate channels for large and small vessels?</p>
77	Jul 12 2018 04:53 PM	<p>All stakeholders both commercial and leisure need to be accommodated. I understand that some sail racing is held within the area and must not be excluded. Does the "harbour" own onshore facilities and what revenue is available from these to offset any costs? Some of these questions are closed, so are manipulative. It is important that local strategies e.g. council, management group etc. don't dominate the agenda. RYA should be included as a consulting stakeholder as a national body representing water users.</p>
78	Jul 12 2018 04:15 PM	<p>Q16 is a far to broad a question to get a simple answer in a questionnaire. In short All activities within the harbour area need to be considered</p>
79	Jul 12 2018 11:04 AM	<p>Oban Bay is used by a huge range of people, not just the ferries and large ships, and imposing a huge burden of unnecessary regulations on the area will reduce the ability of people to use the bay as it has been for hundreds of years. Having discussed the near misses and incidents that the Management Group have recorded I strongly believe that most are nothing of the sort, and that this is a case of organisations and people justifying their existence. If an unnecessary port authority must be created then it absolutely must be a trust port run for the benefit of all. CMAL do not have a right to impose their will and rules to suit them on the many other users of Oban Bay, which should be a resource for all. To do so would trample on generations of use by all, with very minimal issues. Having moved to Oban from Peterhead, and having worked in both harbours, it has been fantastic to see how much gets done in Oban and the numbers of boats that are able to use it without excessive and offputting control, and I don't believe at greater risk because of it. The levels of traffic in the bay are massively less than in large ports that have harbour control, such as Peterhead. □ Secondly I must raise issues with the leading questions contained in this survey, which seriously reduces the results' usefulness.</p>

80	Jul 12 2018 10:09 AM	<p>Exclude kayacking, dinghy sailing etc from the main bay where commercial traffic operates.□</p> <p>Better control ie navigation marks, small ship channels etc for small craft, both leisure and commercial, both in the bay and at the north entrance.□</p> <p>Handing control to one commercial operator, no matter what stated intentions, will inevitably lead to self interest over riding needs of all users.□</p>
81	Jul 11 2018 11:35 PM	Economic impact of all leisure and marine tourism business on the whole town and the area generally.
82	Jul 11 2018 10:36 PM	To facilitate intensive use by all users so as not to exclude or penalise minority interests.
83	Jul 11 2018 10:35 PM	To facilitate more intensive use by all parties and types of vessel without excluding any interests.
84	Jul 11 2018 09:44 PM	Wider representation of all users
85	Jul 11 2018 05:12 PM	<p>Its not clear from Oban Bay Management Group website what level of consultation there has been with leisure users of Oban Bay. □</p> <p>I do appreciate that restricted manoeuvrability is the main issue for large vessels but hope that any safety guidelines are proportionate.□</p> <p>Although I have stated a preference for a Trust Port, I would struggle to be convinced that additional costs of £700,000 can be justified. Is there some middle ground where leisure interests can be represented (related to my first comment above).□</p> <p>From personal experience I think the voluntary code of practice works well - but it does rely on skippers being aware of the rules. I suspect any incidents are due to ignorance/laziness and I'm not sure whether extending the SHA and revising regulations would address these failings.</p>
86	Jul 11 2018 04:28 PM	All boat users whether commercial or leisure
87	Jul 11 2018 09:43 AM	<p>Regulate movement of vessels within the harbour area.□</p> <p>Comparative costings supplied by OBMG are not credible unless details are provided.</p>
88	Jul 11 2018 08:07 AM	sailing yachts should not pay or suffer exclusions□
89	Jul 10 2018 11:32 PM	Oban needs a manned VTS service. This will hopefully prevent a serious incident or accident which is more than likely to happen if it remains as a free for all.
90	Jul 10 2018 06:21 PM	<p>New legislation should not disadvantage any of the current categories of user.□</p> <p>Personally, I have not experienced any safety issues when sailing in the Oban area.</p>
91	Jul 10 2018 01:56 PM	I believe the current level of engagement and the intentions of the Oban Bay Management Group are not adequately transparent and that the interests of the local community and the recreational boating community are being ignored.□

92	Jul 10 2018 12:03 AM	Both leisure and commercial users of Oban Bay need to co-exist and can easily do with mutual understanding and goodwill.
93	Jul 09 2018 08:55 PM	No change to existing usage by traditional users.
94	Jul 09 2018 08:19 PM	I am very concerned about any/over legislation being used in the alleged interests of 'safety'. We are a Maritime Nation and our civil right are being subsummed by self serving created bodies with (despite contrary assurances), absolutley no accountability to the independant user.
95	Jul 09 2018 03:22 PM	The focus of harbour legislation should be on safety both on and off the water. I feel that the greatest risk to safety is with vehicle traffic departing ferries and being forced to navigate Argyll Square roundabout in large volumes. The new Premier Inn will add to this risk with added volume of tourists using this road. The legislation should incorporate roads within the harbour vicinity as traffic incidents are far more of a threat to safety. The second threat to user safety is the competence of vessel skippers, both within leisure and commercial. If the rules of the road are obeyed and Oban Bay speed limits observed, there is very little risk. However, a leaflet clearly explaining the guidelines covering Oban Bay and approaches should be provided to every vessel which visits the north pier and pontoons, fishing vessels, Kerrera marina users, Oban sailing club members, mooring holders in the Bay and dunstaffnage marina. The legislation should ensure that whichever organisation runs the harbour must make every effort to make sure that all visitors and users are aware of the guidelines. The legislation must not attempt to exclude one group in favour of another. Regardless of size or influence, every user should be at all times encouraged to make use of Oban Bay in a safe manner. No user should be advised to avoid certain areas, rather they may be encouraged to use certain areas within the area.
96	Jul 09 2018 11:19 AM	Ferry movements involve large vessels. Small vessels are not always clearly visible, may move erratically and may fail to observe colregs. In my view this is the principal risk area hat needs to be managed, especially in the vicinity of the North Channel. I would suggest a traffic light system similar to other UK harbours.
97	Jul 09 2018 10:01 AM	Activities that involve small craft should be given certain abilities and priorities !

98	Jul 09 2018 09:51 AM	<p>Leisure boats seem to be on the increase but for those not familiar with the Oban Harbour would find it difficult to understand the VHF message as it is spoken so rapidly that it can be incoherent particularly for visitors whose first language is not English. □</p> <p>I have witnessed local large sailing yachts racing at great speed within Oban Harbour this surely can be controlled.□</p> <p>I have witnessed regular shuttles of tenders from vast cruise liners passing in and out of the North Channel entrance that seem to ignore current rules of passage. □</p> <p>A few yachts have been seen entering Oban Harbour under sail which is not advisable, one even choosing the channel as a location to take sails down!□</p> <p>I would be very concerned if the changes had an adverse impact on the newly taken over Oban Marina who are doing everything to improve the facilities for leisure sailing. □</p> <p>The Transit marina is a bonus but has this in itself created more of an issue between leisure craft and ferries. This may require some bouyage.□</p>
99	Jul 09 2018 12:19 AM	Safe use of channels into and out of bay, but not to impair normal passage of yachts in surrounding area
100	Jul 08 2018 11:36 PM	Safety, facilities for tourism
101	Jul 08 2018 11:35 PM	Any excessive speed by vessels in OBAN Bay should be penalised.
102	Jul 08 2018 09:07 PM	Marina facilities for 20,000 leisure boats which use the harbour annually with reasonable fees for their use, A without profits organisation would bring considerable trade to the town.

103	Jul 08 2018 08:35 PM	<p>This seems a poorly constructed questionnaire because it makes some presumptions that there needs to be a SHA with the boundaries given. Small craft do not need the extra beurocracy and restrictions. The large operators will inevitably say that safety is being compromised when they are not in total control. Q9 ask about if an SHA is beneficial to safety. The answer of course is yes, just as if it asked if banning all large craft would be beneficial to safety the answer would be yes. It is such a meaningless closed question and nowhere in the questionnaire does it ask about disadvantages of a SHA, how rules and regulation might affect the operations and economics of other activities. Why does the area need to be so extensive? Q10 What type of vessels pose most risk to safety? Evidence please. Statistical. What does leisure sector cover? Kayaks, pedaloos, small fishing craft, jet skis, sailing dinghies, yachts, private fishing boats, windsurfers, the list goes on and on, yet somehow the commercial boats are divided into ferries, fishing boat, cruise boats etc. Will you publish every written response is the decision already made. It certainly sounds as if the HRO will happen and a SHA will enforce it. This is not consultation but a feeble attempt to gather meaningless evidence to support what the bully boys intend to do anyway. Shame on them.</p>
104	Jul 08 2018 08:00 PM	<p>I would be very concerned that Oban as a destination will suffer in terms of Leisure sailors if costs are passed to them. This would affect the viability of Kerrera marina, and perhaps even the transit marina, though as this is Council owned this could be subsidised. I have used Oban as a destination many times. I have unfortunately witnessed some thoughtless behaviour, mostly, though not exclusively caused by leisure sailors obstructing large commercial boats. (The latest being a yacht sailing into the bay via the north entrance as MV Clansman tried to exit). I suspect that many of these instances occur due to ignorance of the voluntary code, rather than deliberate flouting of any rules. I have never seen anything dangerous occur however. I have also seen commercial boats eg tenders from liners create issues, and also witnessed on occasion Caledonian McBrayne ferries break the recommended speed limit within the bay, though to be fair this is not usual and I have not witnessed it recently. Finally it is fair to point out that due the number of ferry movements it can require a great deal of patience waiting for a chance to enter or exit, particularly with two ferries now operating the Mull run together with the Barra, Lismore and Coll/Tiree ferries.</p>

105	Jul 08 2018 07:34 PM	<p>The board must give careful consideration to the growing importance that Marine leisure has with local businesses in Oban and must encourage and grow this area of business. The investment in the new pontoon facility and the private investment in Oban Marina must be encouraged. It would not be Health for CMAC to dominate the harbour board as this would impact recent and future investment in the Marine leisure facilities in the bay. While I realise the importance of safety in the bay and do not wish to see this compromise the involvement of all users must be carefully considered by way of representation on the harbour board.</p>
106	Jul 08 2018 02:43 PM	<p>The Oban waterfront is currently a hotchpotch of minor developments as now somewhat disjointed. □</p> <p>Considering the waterside we are looking at a major commercial facility with a large number of movements co-existing with an expanding leisure sector with substantial recent investment, both public and private. Elsewhere in UK there are a number of similar situations, which have been resolved effectively and amicably. Of note the Queen's Harbour, and Dover Harbour have similar narrow entrances with very frequent ferry and ship movements which work very satisfactorily using VHF. The busiest port, Felixtowe works effectively with large numbers of small boats and large ships, using a well publicised code of practice, without ever having to resort to the VHF for controlling small craft. In Oban the use of a port control, rather than messages from individual ships, usually ferries, would considerably reduce the amount of VHF traffic, which now seems to be transmitted on high power, to the annoyance of craft from Jura to Fort William. The chartered small craft route through the North Channel seems to me to fly in the face of good seamanship when strong winds are running. □</p> <p>There is also a need for the authority to consider the well being of the town as a whole and its business. As an example, to function as a Yachting hub crews will come to Oban by car, which is currently the only practical option, only to find that the provision of long term parking (a week or more) is severely limited and likely to get worse.</p>
		<p>If the council wants visitors to stop in Oban, then they have to make it easy for them.</p> <p>Yachtsmen have the option of going to other marine centres where parking is unlimited, and the costs hidden in the mooring fees. In the future with adequate parking in Oban, tourists to the Islands would prefer, or even be obliged to use non polluting hire vehicles at their destination.</p>

107	Jul 08 2018 02:11 PM	The present Code of Practice is clear and works well. Given that the main hazard appears to be larger vessels colliding while berthing, improvements to the present buoyage - for example by marking a small craft channel - would seem to be unnecessary. Many small craft skippers will already have 'virtual buoyage' on their iPads. Compared with somewhere like Cowes, Oban always seems quite a relaxed place to approach.
108	Jul 08 2018 12:49 PM	Much more needs to be done to accommodate visiting small vessels. What has been done is inadequate and way too expensive. Oban has missed out on a small fortune over the many years I have been sailing the west coast.
109	Jul 08 2018 12:28 PM	Accommodate all current activities. CMAL would like to use the extended harbour as a "cash cow" with anchoring charges, pilotage charges, passenger landing charges etc. The option to apply any, all, or none of these charges should only lie with the council wherein lies the discretion to manage such charges for the benefit of Oban and the surrounding area. It must NOT go to CMAL.
110	Jul 08 2018 11:55 AM	N/A
111	Jul 08 2018 11:43 AM	Any new harbour legislation should be run on a Trust basis, not either by CML or the Council. I object to the wording of Q13, to which assumes that there will be additional costs to be borne by users, in extending the area covered by the harbour authority. If CMAL and the Council are pushing for the whole of the bay to be covered, it should be for these 2 parties to fund an independent harbour trust which will safeguard the interest of all users, not just those of larger vessels.
112	Jul 08 2018 10:53 AM	All current
113	Jul 07 2018 11:33 PM	The Ferry / Commercial traffic route could be marked by smaller buoys. Also the current 10kts speed limit allowed is far too high for such a narrow entrance and fairway. It should be limited to 6kts. That limit should apply to all of Oban Bay from the Ferry Rocks Buoy to Maiden Island.
114	Jul 07 2018 06:47 PM	Didn't know anything about obmg. If cmal became the operator then I feel as though that would be a negative move. They would be biased towards their own wants and needs. A private commercial company could push for everyone's gains.
115	Jul 07 2018 01:08 AM	N/a
116	Jul 06 2018 11:58 PM	These questions are very leading & do not ask the main question, asking is it necessary to put restrictive laws in place. Question 13 is extremely leading & assumes that you agree that this organisations running costs should be passed on.
117	Jul 06 2018 08:22 PM	Oban is still a small place with a relatively small number of vessel movements per day. I don't believe it needs any additional regulation or administration.

118	Jul 06 2018 07:51 PM	Oban should be better promoted as a regional centre for leisure yachting on the W coast. The harbour itself operates well but there appears to be no strategic position on the above and Oban as a town seems to be suffering. The new transit marina is good but lacks fuel. The chandlery has gone. Yachts are choosing other destinations such as Tobermory. I think investment in this would give good returns for the community
119	Jul 06 2018 03:02 PM	There seems to be a strong focus on "commercial" activities in the questionnaire, with limited attempt to seek leisure users input. Considering the volume of leisure traffic and recent attempts to develop this through pontton provision, alongside the ongoing propotion of Oban marina under new management,I have serious reservations about the quality of output from this poll.
120	Jul 06 2018 01:09 PM	The 5 knot speed limit to be applied to ferries which are frequently seen to be exceeding this if the whole of Oban bay is now within port limits. To continue to allow the ferries to proceed at a greater speed I consider dangerous and would remove the problem of the ferries in the Orth and South channels.
121	Jul 06 2018 12:30 PM	Oban harbour needs a fully independent organisation to run the harbour in the interest of all users. All users should be equally represented. The cost should be paid by government bodies the same as all other navigational aids. I do not believe it is in the wider interest to allow CalMac to have preferential treatment.
122	Jul 06 2018 10:44 AM	Future restrictions with the bay designed to prioritise ferry operations must not be restrictive of access by small craft, particularly with respect to the two marinas Any harbour authority subsequently formed will require to have the interests of small craft operators strongly represented at board level with protection for small craft users written into the constitution..
123	Jul 06 2018 10:41 AM	Everything that's water bound
124	Jul 06 2018 10:18 AM	Remove lobster traps from the bay area
125	Jul 06 2018 09:55 AM	A proper commercial quay for use by all commercial vessel operators, not just the bigger operators. Build a dedicated quay and perhaps a "service centre" where commercial vessels can berth and get repair work carried out. Currently berthing in Oban is at the Hbrmastr's discretion and commercial vessels regularly get moved on which is very inconvenient.
126	Jul 06 2018 09:23 AM	The trust port approach gives the fairest representation for all harbour users, giving a strong voice to commercial operators, but without completely ignoring the concerns of the leisure industry.
127	Jul 06 2018 08:19 AM	Cmal would destroy tourism, the new marina needs time to grow, it would be curbed by high operating costs by a company that only knows how to survive by subsidies, it is obsessed with health and safety and yet historically there are no accidents

128	Jul 05 2018 11:45 PM	This is a very limiting and poorly designed questionnaire which has leading questions and no decernable useful information. I hoe the tax payer isn't funding this consultation.
129	Jul 05 2018 10:14 PM	<p>We have encountered large ferries in both the north and south entrances on occasion while entering or leaving in our cruising sailing boat. It's clear that yachts and other small craft need to keep clear of and not impede the ferries. I'd suggest that, if there is a perception that added supervision is needed in the Bay, then an authority with good CCTV cameras should enforce the collision rules by identifying craft in breach of the rules and using ch16 or even a rib to catch up with them subsequently. Out of interest, Larne Port Control recently called us on ch16 to enquire of us what our intentions were as we approached the port (we were still well clear of the entrance channel and preparing to call LPC ourselves). They have good cameras there.□</p> <p>□</p> <p>An occasional fine for anyone in clear breach of the rules would concentrate everyone's mind.□</p> <p>□</p> <p>My email is below, but only in the interests of openness, not to invite contact.</p>
130	Jul 05 2018 10:04 PM	<p>Code of practice difficult to read due to colours of text.□</p> <p>I said I don't know which type of vessels present the most risk because it is not the vessel but the competence of the crew that matters. Also the clarity of the navigation marks. These require a lot of concentration due to the distribution of hazards, the tidal streams, and the manouvering of ferries etc.□</p> <p>One measure that might reduce risk would be to exclude vessels under sail from particularly hazardous areas, such as the north channel,</p>
131	Jul 05 2018 09:47 PM	I don't personally see any need for this at all.
132	Jul 05 2018 07:42 PM	I do not propose to add to what I have said at the Stakeholders meetings This questionnaire is not objective and is widely seen as quite inadequate for purpose. The bottom line is that Oban Bay is Oban's Bay not CMALS or anybody elses. The electorate have been ignored.
133	Jul 05 2018 07:08 PM	<p>The last thing that Oban Bay needs is for it to be run by CMAL as they are only interested in the benefits it would bring to them ie total control of Oban Bay.□</p> <p>This is not about safety this is about control. □</p> <p>It's the aggressive attitude of the large ferry skippers coming into and out of the bay that are he biggest threat to safety.</p>
134	Jul 05 2018 06:56 PM	The interests of all users
135	Jul 05 2018 06:45 PM	Any new SHA should take in to account all stakeholders requirements and views, although it may not be able to accommodate everyone;s wishes.
136	Jul 05 2018 06:32 PM	This should exclude restrictions or extra costs to sea kayaks.

137	Jul 05 2018 05:33 PM	<p>Improve marking of the channels to be used by smaller leisure boats in the North Channel. The new visitor berths are excellent. The radio communication from ferries when they are moving is helpful, and they are respectful of other vessels. I see many leisure boats ignoring the requirement to stay on one side of the channel.</p>
138	Jul 05 2018 04:10 PM	<p>1) I think that fishing vessels and charter/day vessel in general don't obey the rules, they are frequent users of the harbour and appear to think that the rules don't apply to them. □ 2) The ferries, large commercial vessels and cruise ship seems to be on top of the situation and, in general keep to the rules. □ 3) Most leasure users, in yachts, simple want to keep out of the way of large ships and anything traveling quickly, there's a small minority who simply don't know the rules and can cause confusion. Education is the best approach (as recommended by the RYA), simple applying more rules and penalties won't work. What makes anyone think, that if they don't read the current rules, they will read any new ones? □ 4) Small high speed power boats are often the most problematic, it's possible to get into a small power boat, without any previous marine experience, and just drive it like a car. I've seen some appalling behaviour from this class of user. □ 5) I've been sailing teh West Coast of Scotland since the early 1970's and I've a regular user of Oban Bay. □ 6) I sail a 14m yacht with a draft of 3.3m, so although whilst at first sight, my boat isn't a large vessel, it is a large vessel according to your definition. I can't keep as close to the shore might be expected. □</p>
		<p>7) I can't see any good reason to apply more bureaucracy to the Oban Bay area on the grounds of safety. it just seems like an excuse. If more money is to be spent, it should be focused on education and reminding frequent users of the rules, and having a presence on the water to help and advise all users of the area.</p> <p>8) I'd advise the board to look at the Cullen Report on Piper Alpha, the take homes message is; rules don't work, you have to change the culture, and you can only do that by educating the users of Oban Bay.</p>
139	Jul 05 2018 03:10 PM	<p>I trust Calmac about as far as I can throw one of their ferries. Near my home base on the Clyde they show little consideration for other marine users. Or their passengers.</p>
140	Jul 05 2018 01:20 PM	<p>Oban is a gateway to the area and should support all users of the harbour area. Designated areas for leisure craft/exclusion zones would be advantageous</p>

141	Jul 05 2018 12:56 PM	Consider the tourism industry here and be wary of posing restrictions that may quickly see people avoiding an area that is becoming restrictive in how it can be accessed and enjoyed
142	Jul 05 2018 12:44 PM	leisure excluded
143	Jul 05 2018 12:28 PM	I don't see any need to change the current set up. All that's required from a safety point of view is better enforcement and the cal mac masters adhering to the same rules as the rest of us and not thinking themselves above them!
144	Jul 05 2018 11:51 AM	Well it needs to include all, it cannot successfully exclude anyone, anything or any group. For me, it's all about the management and whatever structure is decided upon must be effective enough to manage all stakeholders.
145	Jul 05 2018 10:35 AM	<p>Any new legislation should be fully compliant with the requirements of the Port Marine Safety Code and so manage the safety of navigation of all vessel using the waters in Oban Bay. The PMSC is not selective about which vessels should have the safety of their navigation managed. A study of the PMSC will quickly reveal that the Harbour Authority should embrace all activities within, on, one or under its statutory limits. The statement from CalMac gives no information about how they will run the Port, immediate questions are: □</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What powers will they need to acquire? □ 2. What aids to navigation do they think the prt requires? □ 3. Will they introduce a vessel traffic management system which would normally be required by a Port managing over 18,000 movements per year? Any who doubt this statement can easily check with any number of ports in the UK and worldwide. □ 4. In a navigational incident involving a ferry and for example a yacht how will these ensure that there processes are impartial and transparent. □ 5. Will they also seek to become a competent harbour authority and issue Pilotage directions - noting the nature of the waters in Oban Bay will they introduce a formal Pilotage Exemption Scheme in common with other ports in the UK. □ 6. How will they meet the requirements of the Open Port Dutyrequired by the Harbours Piers etc Act and the PMSC. □

		<p>7. Will there be any provision for local representatives be on the Board and so have some of the duty holde responsibilities</p> <p>8. Exactly who or what will be the Duty Holder?</p> <p>9. What legislation do they intend to introduce in the shape of Byelaws, general directions etc?</p> <p>10. How do they intend to enforce any regulations they do bring in?</p> <p>These are just some of the questions that a responsible harbour authority should be able to answer immediately, it is of great concern to me that none are addressed in the preamble to this survey.</p>
146	Jul 05 2018 10:28 AM	It is important that the stakeholder's group is listened to carefully so that Oban remains an attractive destination for all boat users.
147	Jul 05 2018 10:26 AM	<p>There are 50+ Trust Ports in the UK and this should be the model used in Oban and recommended in the Fisher Associates report, as the most inclusive option and will best represent the widest range of stakeholder interests. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>As the report 14UK1002_NRA_OBA states in the Conclusions and Recommendations section the risk level is already ALARP with the highest risk hazard being the collision between a major CalMac ferry / cruise ship and another major CalMac ferry / cruise ship. The imposition of any future controls affecting Leisure boating activities is therefore not required and shouldn't be put in the hands of an authority where transparency of decisions is questionable and where Leisure boating is not adequately represented.</p>
148	Jul 05 2018 09:52 AM	It is essential that the Board (and management) of new harbour legislation should include local and knowledgeable members. It is not acceptable to have a majority of its members representing a single commercial vested interest.
149	Jul 05 2018 09:35 AM	1.No details provided to explain differing costs of setting up alternative forms of harbour authorities.2.No details provided as to harbour charges for different types of users.
150	Jul 05 2018 03:37 AM	NA
151	Jul 05 2018 01:12 AM	<p>I feel that the Code of Practice for Oban Bay is welcome along with the priority given to safety but feel that Trust Port status offers the best chance of all users having their interests taken into account on a long term basis.<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The developments that have already taken place in Oban will very likely lead to significantly increased leisure visitor numbers which will exacerbate the existing parking problem in the town. Any port authority would do well to consider affordable long term parking provision.</p>

152	Jul 04 2018 10:32 PM	<p>It seems that there are an awful lot of organisations all with their own agendas. Never a recipe for success.□</p> <p>I don't think there would be any benefit in extending the regulated area, simply more costs □</p> <p>I do think however that buoyed 'Small vessel' channels in both the North and South Bay entrances would be of benefit to all users.</p>
153	Jul 04 2018 10:18 PM	<p>I personally do not think that the harbour requires the level of management envisaged. The voluntary code works well and knowing how other managed harbours operate does not provide a magic pill to sort out problems.</p>
154	Jul 04 2018 10:17 PM	<p>It is important that as Oban Bay is used by many sectors CMAL should not as a government ferry operator by the harbour authority due to their obvious Ferry interests. Caledonian MacBrayne/CMAL should always be requested to make a case for any alterations and developments within Oban Bay Harbour. By appointing CMAL as the harbour authority the remaining sectors will never be convinced of the impartiality required to ensure the requirements all sectors who use and enjoy Oban Bay can when appropriate be met.</p>
155	Jul 04 2018 09:49 PM	N/a
156	Jul 04 2018 07:57 PM	<p>It has taken a ridiculous number of years for Oban to wake up to the potential of providing even adequate facilities for the leisure market. The new transit marina has addressed the long term need for resupply, crew changes et al for visiting yachts, it will bring much needed revenue into the town and wider area. For goodness sake do not stifle and suffocate this facility before it has even reached adolescents with restrictive practices of a new unelected quango setting it self up as a statutory authority over the whole of Oban Bay to only best serve the interests of the commercial user and CalMac.</p>
157	Jul 04 2018 07:25 PM	It sounds like big boy bully tactics
158	Jul 04 2018 06:55 PM	Always have full consultation and discussions with all harbour users before making changes.
159	Jul 04 2018 05:38 PM	Leisure yachts, both berthed locally and visiting, are essential for the economy of Oban and this region. Cruise liners add little to this apart from berthing fees.
160	Jul 04 2018 05:34 PM	Scotland has to look abroad to find good practice as Ports are NOT up to International standards. 'Authorities are poor at running (leisure)marinas although The Port Authority should have overall control over all vessels.
161	Jul 04 2018 03:25 PM	<p>16. To all marine activities.□</p> <p>The harbour authority should overview all marine activities in the north Channel and Sound of Kerrera as marine activities increase.□</p> <p>I am surprised that cruise ships anchor within Oban Bay when the centre of the bay is constrained by the rocks indicated by the cardinal buoys.□</p> <p>Leisure vessels entering the North Channel close to Kerrera will have to cross the path of the ferries when accessing the pontoon at the North Pier. Perhaps some rules should be created.</p>

162	Jul 04 2018 02:54 PM	All nautical activity
163	Jul 04 2018 02:36 PM	For many years Oban had a reputation for doing very little to welcome yachts. Generally not interested. I hoped that the North Pier pontoons would be the first step in making Oban the premier port on the west coast for folks having yachting holidays. With the beds and roads in Oban operating at capacity for much of the summer it is worth remembering that these guys and gals supply their own beds, don't clog the roads yet use the shops and restaurants. It is just an extra bonus for Oban traders. I feel it is largely untapped and when comparing to many ports (UK and Med) it saddens me to see this missed opportunity for my birth town. So in all that you do in future please increase the facilities and welcome to the yachtspeople. The ferries are there to serve not dictate. Please keep that perspective.
164	Jul 04 2018 02:28 PM	I am concerned that CMAL taking over the port will make it increasing difficult for all vessels other than the ferries. The small boat channel is already cramped between the main channel and the shallows/rocks & is not properly marked. There are far busier ports in the south of the UK which manage to deal with heavy leisure traffic better. Definitely CMAL must not be allowed to ignore the needs of leisure traffic particularly as Kerrera Sound is a vital sheltered water area for small craft.
165	Jul 04 2018 02:22 PM	They should include provision for sailing charities and yacht racing facilities
166	Jul 04 2018 02:18 PM	CMAL have tried this in many different locations, most have been stopped. □ CMAL can not be trusted to put the needs of the community ahead of their commercial gain. Their attitude to small businesses on the Pier has shown this. □
167	Jul 04 2018 02:13 PM	The port authorities must be more proactive in keeping members of the public informed. I read little in the local newspapers or hear anything on local radio that would inform me or my friends. The bay has multiple users all with an Equal (note emphasis!) interest and this must be respected. The costs noted are unclear in whether they are individual options or collective. That is to say CMAL cheapest option Trust dearest. Or are the the contribution each would make to a successful Port operation. Please explain.

168	Jul 04 2018 02:10 PM	Continued reasonable access via North channel is essential. Yachts grounding in Corran ledge suggest revised buoyage is needed for Transit pontoons. Poor practice by yachts should be challenged but not via legal enforcement, rather by continued engagement and education. North pier pontoons need dedicated vhf channel not ch12, and permanent staff to remind callers to keep to dunollie side of channel, out of the way of ferries. I would be wary of calmac enhanced powers being heavy handed or restricting reasonable access to yachts. I am very sceptical of proposed costs of trust body - why is it a multiple of the other options?
169	Jul 04 2018 02:05 PM	None should be excluded on principle, the harbour should be available for all, but all must use the harbour in a manner that does not impede others. That's why we have the Code of Practice. Individual events might need consideration in the light of harbour use at the proposed time, etc., but this consideration needs to be undertaken by a truly independent body representing all uses. CMAL should be represented on this body, but not be the body - they have a clear conflict of interest.
170	Jul 04 2018 02:02 PM	Unhappy about a CMAL monopoly being used to favour CALMAC ferries at the expense of other vessels and don't believe the costing.
171	Jul 04 2018 01:42 PM	They need more family activities at reasonable prices, people who live in Oban should get reductions as we are not tourists. The beach at Oban bay needs looking after properly.
172	Jul 04 2018 01:20 PM	Must be considerate to dinghy and private leisure sailing vessels
173	Jul 04 2018 12:52 PM	Marina facilities would be most prevalent to me preferably run by the local council (as they have a less biased approach) and policing of the whole harbour by the local constabulary.
174	Jul 04 2018 11:35 AM	Cannot believe the figures presented by the OBMG for the three options. If Ullapool can manage to operate as a Trust port surely Oban can.
175	Jul 04 2018 11:17 AM	Parking at or closer to Port facilities at a "Reasonable cost", Clearer Rules or byelaws around the use of the North Channel with regards to Ferry Traffic. Fair use of the North pier for all not just Calmac.
176	Jul 04 2018 11:17 AM	No

177	Jul 04 2018 11:02 AM	<p>Im in Oban regularly throughout the year. Business and pleasure on and off the water. Just two weeks ago w/c 18th June one of the ferries entered the bay at speed and maintained his speed while a sail training vessel was crossing the bay. Ferry just kept sounding its horn and did not adjust its speed to a safe speed. Other slower vessels have the right to safe passage across the bay. This type of action will turn visitors and there money away from Oban. Also □</p> <p>The parking in Oban is ridiculous. You have built the new transit marina and excellent shower block but joining crew now have no where to park long term other than outside someones house or be charged a fortune for parking. Again this will turn visiting boats away. Free long term parking is a must for vessels using the marina.</p>
178	Jul 04 2018 10:59 AM	<p>Leisure craft should be considered and the impact this can have on tourism. The majority of movement within the harbour is by yachts, dinghies and other leisure craft. To allow CMAL to extend their reach to the whole bay is risky and could negatively effect all other users. Question : Could this be classed as conflict of interest?</p>
179	Jul 04 2018 10:29 AM	<p>Fairness, access and safety on behalf of all, with timetables secondary.</p>
180	Jul 04 2018 10:27 AM	<p>It is my belief that a Trust Port is the best option to address the safety and other issues of the boating community identified in the Fisher associates report.</p>
181	Jul 04 2018 10:21 AM	<p>Putting Cmal or Calmac in charge of Oban bay would detrimental to all other users of the bay. If there is to be a unified harbour authority then it should be locally led and independent with representation from all user groups on an equal footing. No more than one commercial boat should move or loiter within the confines of Oban bay at any time. The Calmac vessels should either be tied up or arriving/departing the bay free of other moving commercial vessels in the bay including other Calmac boats. Timetables would need to be adjusted. A port control lookout office at the eastern side of the entrance with views across the harbour and out to the open water controlling all commercial traffic and leisure boating. This would be run by the local organisation.</p>
182	Jul 04 2018 10:12 AM	<p>I think the inclusion of a large commercial marina with full user facilities, including showers, toilets, office and perhaps restaurant facilities, would significantly benefit the town. In the year that the temporary facility has been in place this has attracted hundred's of visitors to the town who would otherwise not have visited Oban but instead would have bypassed it to go to Dunstaffnage, perhaps Kerrera and up to Tobermory.</p>
183	Jul 04 2018 10:04 AM	<p>Well the fact that fishing boats are being turned away from the pontoons is rediculous!!! Fishing employs a large number of people in Oban as well as buisness's!!</p>

184	Jul 04 2018 09:47 AM	It should be as inclusive as possible. It should also be free of commercial interests. ie CMAL should not be responsible for overseeing their own ferries. These ferries already flout the code of practice in terms of speed. Any new board must be independent of CMAL and other commercial interests.
185	Jul 04 2018 09:36 AM	Unable to complete until further consultation information is available
186	Jul 04 2018 09:21 AM	This is a biased questionnaire with leading questions.
187	Jul 04 2018 09:09 AM	I believe there is room in the north channel for large vessels and small vessels to navigate safely in accord with IRPCS.
188	Jul 04 2018 08:58 AM	All users of Oban Bay are important to the prosperity of Oban and it's not about which users cause the greatest safety risk but continuing to balance the needs of all by education and negotiation. Allowing one harbour user to manage everyone else would be a poor option
189	Jul 04 2018 08:54 AM	The rules should include provision for access for all activities in a sensible and inclusive way. This is the major access port for the west coast and it attracts massive numbers of movements on the water at all levels. It would be incredibly short sighted to risk this changing both financially and socially.
190	Jul 04 2018 08:38 AM	Canoeing kayaking sea kayaks sups...all of which are used... <input type="checkbox"/> jet skis can cause bigger problems generally because u don't need a license to buy one or drive one...but then the same could be applied to all leisure craft.. <input type="checkbox"/>
191	Jul 04 2018 08:23 AM	I feel that Oban is loosing control of its most important assets indeed Oban is here because of the harbour and the shelter it offered when the town started! Argyll and Bute have been forward thinking lately with the creation of the new transit marina which is proving to be a major success. To give away the controls for the harbour and running of a great asset would be very disappointing and I feel concerned
192	Jul 04 2018 08:20 AM	Nothing to add
193	Jul 04 2018 07:59 AM	I have nothing new to add
194	Jul 04 2018 07:43 AM	There is a large input into the local economy from all types of vessels whether commercial or leisure. There is no reason for present activities to be stopped or discouraged unless one particular group takes control of discussion making to the exclusion of other users.
195	Jul 04 2018 07:24 AM	Question too widely phrased
196	Jul 04 2018 06:27 AM	It is vital that the use by leisure craft is protected especially the use of north channel
197	Jul 04 2018 01:13 AM	Fuel to be available at Transit Marina. <input type="checkbox"/>

198	Jul 04 2018 12:48 AM	Consultation document is too vague on the extent of the area in question. The word "probably" has no place in a formal consultation. The current code of practice is sufficient . It seems to me the proposed SHA would only benefit the large commercial vessels and would disadvantage leisure and small commercial users. I am NOT in favour of this proposal. Your consultation pre-supposes that this will go ahead. IT SHOULD NOT.
199	Jul 04 2018 12:03 AM	The RYA have claimed that their preferred model/suggestion for port management has not been seriously considered as an option, it would be interesting to know why. The harbour legislation should be aimed at ensuring that the harbour is operated for the benefit of the maximum number of users from all sectors, but within the bounds of current national and international safety standards, with the associated costs and benefits shared fairly by all sectors to ensure sustainability.
200	Jul 03 2018 11:47 PM	It ain't broke...don't fix it. □ This nothing more than a exercise in trying to scam more money out of marine visitors to Oban who already bolster the local economy. This year I'll have spent £4,000 + in the Oban area and hundreds (if not thousands) of leisure boaters will have done the same. If your plan is to drive us out then I'm sure our cash will be appreciated elsewhere.
201	Jul 03 2018 11:46 PM	Ive seen ferries bullying their way in and out of the harbours by sheer size and speed which a lot of it i assume is the wee man big boat syndrome.. I fear that if cmal extend the harbour limits it wil give the ferries total reign over the harbour, itl will end up no vessels allowed to move while the ferries are around the harbour.. I understand that theve got timetables to meet but so does a variety of smaller vessels. An example would be to catch the tides. Why should the ferries get priority? Thats my opinion anyway
202	Jul 03 2018 11:33 PM	Separate channel for ferries and other small crafts going through the north channel heading to maiden island. □
203	Jul 03 2018 11:21 PM	Restrictions should not be made to ordinary people accessing the harbour areas.
204	Jul 03 2018 11:14 PM	CMAL's interests will be biased to ferry operations to the detriment of other users/stakeholders. in effect, this will create a private harbour for CMAL. The interests of all current and potential users need to be protected and harbour operations run in an unbiased, objective manner, not possible if CMAL are granted this responsibility
205	Jul 03 2018 10:57 PM	I feel fishing, leisure and charter use at Oban is important to Oban and the wider area. Reinforcing the existing code of practice should be sufficient

206	Jul 03 2018 10:51 PM	I have worked professionally in survey design. I am sympathetic to the current goals. I would have failed any student who designed such a incompetent survey. Its preamble and leading questions invite annoyance and opposition. I started off on your side, but am now worried that the crassness of the survey will be reflected in the management style of the favoured administration. Get a grip please. The harbour needs sensitive management. P.s. You have just disallowed me from exiting because I didn't tick anything in the "Pass on charges question". That was because the question is rubbish. It should have "none of the above", "all of the above" and "don't know options". One of the reasons why I failed the student who designed the survey. My answer to that question is meaningless.
207	Jul 03 2018 10:44 PM	A harbour revision order gives CMAL too much control of what is a significant leisure area. With the CMAL/Calmac tie up this leads to a significant monopoly in the oban bay area which cannot act with impartially to navigational safety conflicts.
208	Jul 03 2018 10:36 PM	Other maritime users - kayaking.
209	Jul 03 2018 10:34 PM	On entering Oban on several occasions I have had to avoid day trip boats refusing to comply with Colregs.
210	Jul 03 2018 10:27 PM	Na
211	Jul 03 2018 10:21 PM	Control of small vessels is appropriate within the town bay but is not necessary south of Kilbowie
212	Jul 03 2018 10:15 PM	All visiting vessels
213	Jul 03 2018 10:01 PM	This entire questionnaire lacks structure and form that would meet any rigorous scrutiny. It seems predicated on justifying the outcome being sought. A thinly veiled power grab. □ Basically observing present regulations and guidelines by all parties would produce the desired results. The "policing " of the harbour area to ensue compliance and good seamanship would be most effective. □ Fishing boats without lights, boats creating wake, aggressive maneuvering by larger vessels and an apparent conviction that CalMac vessels have a higher right that justifies their behaviour.
214	Jul 03 2018 09:58 PM	Slow down the ferries, only allow one ferry to move in the bay at once
215	Jul 03 2018 09:55 PM	Yacht racing
216	Jul 03 2018 09:47 PM	Accomodation of all water users is what I campaign for.

217	Jul 03 2018 09:35 PM	<p>There is no need for further controls, the colregs and current local rules are sufficient and cost effective.□</p> <p>□</p> <p>The qu in the survey are superficial and also leading in their wording. They suggest that the solution has already been identified and agreed and that the survey is worded in such a manner as to solicit responses that back up the desired solution. The costs are crazy and cannot be justified. If these costs are passed onto comercial vessels then they would be approx £75 per vessel. If you include leisure then £37. Add these costs to fishing and diving and leisure then you'll cripple these areas.□</p> <p>□</p> <p>At the end of the day no change is required so any cost cannot be justified. The proposal has self interest written all over it, I'm guessing the people driving these proposals see some highly paid jobs for themselves within the new organisations being created.□</p>
218	Jul 03 2018 09:34 PM	Traffic light system
219	Jul 03 2018 09:27 PM	There needs to be wide ranging stakeholder involvement in the process to involve the local boating community as well as leisure groups. This appears to have been relatively lacking in the process so far
220	Jul 03 2018 09:19 PM	<p>This all sounds like an expensive job creation scheme. Oban Bay is a relatively simple harbour to manage.□</p> <p>Without any background information about how unsafe Oban Bay is deemed to be, and how the proposals will make it safer, make this questionnaire rather meaningless.</p>
221	Jul 03 2018 09:13 PM	Whilst safety must be a priority, it must not inflict rules, regulations ad costs that will discourage leisure craft from visiting Oban.

222	Jul 03 2018 08:59 PM	<p>I believe the option in the fisher report for a single trust port is the best option. As stated “Option 5 involves the creation of a trust port as a new single SHA. Trust ports specifically serve regional and local interests, representing a broad cross section of undertakings. Trust ports are independent statutory bodies, each governed by its own, unique statutes. There are no shareholders or owners. Any surplus is reinvested in the port for the benefit of the stakeholders of the trust port. Trust ports are governed by a Ziti purpose Board, appointed according to best practice.□</p> <p>The trust port would take over responsibility for all marine aspects of Oban Bay Harbour, and operate as any normal Statutory Harbour Authority.□</p> <p>Its harbour limits would cover the whole bay and also subsume those areas currently controlled by CMAL and A&BC. CMAL and A&BC would rescind their harbour limits and statutory powers.□</p> <p>CMAL and A&BC (and NLB) would continue to own their quayside infrastructure, but would have no SHA powers. They would become similar in character to “terminal operators” operating under the marine regulatory framework set by the overall new SHA</p>
223	Jul 03 2018 08:43 PM	Leisure marine should be included as that constitutes the biggest group and the most vulnerable to large ship movements
224	Jul 03 2018 08:42 PM	<p>Toilets, showers, laundry and a reception room with a pay phone a Wi-Fi. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>What is meant by a safety risk-Q10? Risk to people, vessels or the hardstanding piers/pontoons or who is likely to call out RNLI most often? □</p> <p>□</p> <p>With regard to who should pay, this should depend on who uses what area of the harbour? I assume small craft will be prohibited from using the ferry ports/south pier?□</p> <p>□</p> <p>No additional navigational aids are required. Navigational aids are more than sufficient but as with the rest of the UK there are no minimum requirements as to the level of knowledge for leisure craft users.□</p> <p>□</p> <p>Use of Kerrera marina should not be subsidised by the local authority/locals of Oban. This means the Council/ locals are supporting one or two businesses rather than Oban as a whole.</p> <p>□</p> <p>□</p> <p>Not specific to the project but free parking for the first hour like many other towns!</p>
225	Jul 03 2018 08:42 PM	Leisure users should not be sidelined to suit commercial interests.
226	Jul 03 2018 08:39 PM	<p>The existing voluntary code of practice is adequate. □</p> <p>Q11: buoys to mark the edge of the large vessel channel may be helpful (at least 5 would be required)</p>

227	Jul 03 2018 08:12 PM	<p>There is a serious risk that CMAL will adopt a heavy-handed and bureaucratic approach to the detriment of Oban as nucleus for West Coast sailing. There is already some evidence of this at Ardrossan. The risk is that minor incidents are blown out of proportion by an institutionally risk-averse culture. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This is not to deny the need for control, but do things need to be changed significantly from the status quo?</p>
228	Jul 03 2018 07:59 PM	All users should have an equal voice. Consideration should be given to Scotland, Nationisation, Brexit and the service industry that will grow around tourism.
229	Jul 03 2018 07:55 PM	Many of the questions in this questionnaire are poorly constructed and downright leading - i.e. phrased in such a way as to push the correspondent into the desired response - lack of competence or deliberate?
230	Jul 03 2018 07:53 PM	Yacht races that start/finish in Oban bay
231	Jul 03 2018 07:47 PM	Charity's that operate at sea should be free of charge.
232	Jul 03 2018 07:44 PM	This survey is littered with <input type="checkbox"/> Leading questions.
233	Jul 03 2018 07:41 PM	The Harbour Authority must be independent of the primary user, Caledonian MacBrayne ferries, though they should of course be represented. It is imperative that a single user does not dominate the shared use harbour
234	Jul 03 2018 07:05 PM	<p>It is important to balance the needs of all users and not focus on the needs of CalMac. There are several things that could be done now to improve safety. I sailed in to Oban at the weekend and was surprised to see that there is no new buoyage in the north channel. I observed two jet skis operating at 30+ knots between the north and south pier yet there was no enforcement. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Leisure boats are important to the economy of Oban, and the mooring holders, Kerrera berth holders and transit marina users should not be managed out of the equation by an over-zealous operator that seems to be trying to force its will on the wider Oban Bay.</p>
235	Jul 03 2018 06:37 PM	Q10 the larger the vessel the less manouverable they become so the great number of passages of large vessels is the biggest threat to safety
236	Jul 03 2018 06:35 PM	It would appear that the commercial interests in the port are not consulting widely especially with the large number of leisure users who visit and pump money into the local community. Some of the support business' such as Oban Marina are marginal at best and may not be severed well by an organisation that is wholly focussed in commercial interests
237	Jul 03 2018 06:35 PM	CMAL have a proven history of successful management of ports, I believe this being awarded to them would assist drive safety concerns & improvements therefore reducing risks.

238	Jul 03 2018 06:00 PM	All activities in the bay should be given consideration. <input type="checkbox"/> Visiting leisure vessels should not be burdened with additional cost for short stay. This would unfairly increase their costs compared with any other west coast Marina facility. Oban bay Marinas and mooring residents could contribute within their annual fees.
239	Jul 03 2018 05:55 PM	I expect leisure traffic to be the greatest hazard to safe navigation, primarily due to a lack of knowledge of regulations and the unregulated manner of leisure craft ownership and use. <input type="checkbox"/> I would therefore doubt that an extension of statutory powers will achieve any safety benefits. Education through groups such as sailing and boating clubs, the RYA, marinas and boat retailers would probably be more successful. <input type="checkbox"/> The other fear of creating a "greater" overall authority is that prices would increase which could deter traffic that ultimately benefits the local economy.
240	Jul 03 2018 05:50 PM	Whilst ferries, fishing boats and commercial shipping needs to be accommodated in any harbour rules so do the craft which make up most of the traffic movements in the harbour area i.e. leisure traffic. The vast majority of these leisure vessels obey the current harbour rules and do not cause problems for commercial vessels their access to the marinas, moorings etc in the area should not be restricted especially in poor weather where shelter is very important. The harbour authority should supply clear concise information for all users as to the harbour rules and the responsibilities of each group with respect to the other vessel groups. Any vessels not operating within these rules should be Reminded of their obligations unless their actions can be deemed to be dangerous navigation.
241	Jul 03 2018 05:46 PM	Up until now there has not been the transparent engagements of all the stakeholders. The needs of the recreational user needs to be given a greater voice. The CMAL proposal represents a management model that is not equitable with all users.
242	Jul 03 2018 05:44 PM	What has prompted the change? has there been an increase in safety related incidents that justify the changes. Seems to me it works fine at the moment, just apply common sense and the rule of the road. maybe publish the guidelines in Reeds almanac & websites for the benefit of people who visit for the first time
243	Jul 03 2018 05:36 PM	should introduce traffic control zone with radar as well as ais input
244	Jul 03 2018 05:32 PM	safe navigation, safety messaging for boat owners and visitors - assist with passage planning and weather

245	Jul 03 2018 05:25 PM	<p>This survey starts with a single solution and leads the survey. It would be much better to have the pros and cons of different solutions explained based on examples elsewhere. Some of the questions - e.g. 13 force you to choose from an incomplete list of options as to where costs could be passed onto and therefore the answers are unlikely to represent people's views. Oban harbour should be run by an independent board that represents ALL stakeholders and not by a private company.</p>
246	Jul 03 2018 05:17 PM	None
247	Jul 03 2018 05:14 PM	<p>Whilst there are marked channels for large vessels there should be consideration paid to the safety of smaller vessels entering and leaving Oban Bay.</p>
248	Jul 03 2018 05:06 PM	<p>Waterways should offer a free and open passage to all vessels, governed as they are globally by IRPCS. Specific issues relating to the narrow northern harbour entrance could be dealt with by a traffic light system (red = do not enter for incoming traffic when a large vessel is exiting) and or designated lanes for large and small vessels (don't know if there is enough room for both side by side) or a simple keep north on entrance, south on exit. The loss of yacht traffic would also have an impact on local business (eg Kererra marina). A long tradition of dinghy racing and sailing from Oban sailing club must also be respected. □</p> <p>I feel your proposal represents a very authoritarian way of addressing the issue of safe navigation in the harbour area and one that would entail excessive costs in order to administer and enforce. □</p> <p>I would suggest that you could instead take advantage of the network of sailing and cruising clubs and other communication mediums available to Scotland's marine sector to highlight the navigational safety issues and educate water users on the correct course of action in a variety of given situations. □</p> <p>I personally have transited Oban Bay many times over the last ~15 years of yacht and dinghy racing and cruising and never caused or witnessed any incidence of undue navigational risk. My experience as a deckhand on a commercial vessel operating across Europe, in addition to my accumulated experience aboard a variety of yachts, in my opinion qualifies this evaluation of risk. □</p>
		<p>I feel strongly that the solution lies in engagement with ALL stakeholders, not in "the big stick" approach (enforcement). If an environment can be fostered where leisure craft owners are self-policing and bad practices are pointed out as part of a larger drive towards good navigational practice in the area, this will result in an enduring, positive change.</p> <p>Also, the ferries need to slow down a little!</p>
249	Jul 03 2018 04:59 PM	None

250	Jul 03 2018 04:59 PM	If CMAL are given control of the harbour area, then its interests will be paramount in the minbds when setting the rules and regulations. A local Trust Port would take all the interests of the commercial/leisure and ferry operators into account. A good idea would be a dedicated small boat channel specifically marked to keep clear of the ferries, and maybe like Portsmouth have a QHM equivalent to ask permission to enter the harbour so that any incoming vessel is aware of hazards in the bay that may not be visible on approach.
251	Jul 03 2018 04:55 PM	It should be fully inclusive and balance the requirements of commercial operators with those of the leisure industry. Both are important to Oban and the wider area.
252	Jul 03 2018 04:48 PM	Same as at present!
253	Jul 03 2018 04:47 PM	As many as reasonable
254	Jul 03 2018 04:47 PM	consideration to berthing off visiting vessels to attract custom to the port area and beyond
255	Jul 03 2018 04:46 PM	Not sure how any fee would be levied. <input type="checkbox"/> You would have to understand how the fees and controls would affect local businesses with low margins. <input type="checkbox"/> No single group should be singled out as causing a greater risk, each has a contribution
256	Jul 03 2018 04:41 PM	This questionnaire is limited and the questions are leading. There is little nuance (other than that desired!). <input type="checkbox"/> The level of engagement and the intentions of OBMG are not transparent and key stakeholders and users' interests and concerns are being ignored. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Why has the Fisher Associates Report been dismissed without consultation? It appears to be inclusive and represents the wider interest of ALL stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
257	Jul 03 2018 04:39 PM	While I agree the safety of the harbour and it's users is paramount, I believe visiting leisure vessels will be the first to be discriminated against when new rules are introduced - which will be to the ultimate detriment of the area in general.
258	Jul 03 2018 04:36 PM	The code of practice generally works well although regularly ignored in respect to speed by calmac Navigational marks in the north entrance have provided confusion to some although clear to myself. Any implementation that passes on costs to smaller users and businesses in the area will be detrimental in an already difficult climate Council involvement should be avoided due to likelihood of poor management abuse and corruption
259	Jul 03 2018 04:35 PM	Due consideration to tourism generated by leisure craft
260	Jul 03 2018 04:31 PM	all events and groups should be accommodated and given suitable arrangements
261	Jul 03 2018 04:28 PM	thxft

262	Jul 03 2018 04:25 PM	Port VTS with a single point control facility independent of A&B Council and CMAL. <input type="checkbox"/> NLB are commercially independent and have the expertise to supply this service for all port users without commercial pressures or any unfair bias.
263	Jul 03 2018 04:22 PM	If the ferries weren't there, there wouldn't be a problem.
264	Jul 03 2018 03:42 PM	accomodate leisure, ferry, fishing and commercial craft
265	Jul 03 2018 01:37 PM	Dredging <input type="checkbox"/> Harbour infrastructure <input type="checkbox"/> Port control
266	Jul 03 2018 12:57 PM	I have a concern that CML would inevitably have a primary interest in ferry operations and, despite the proposal for OBMG to "feed into" CML, would tend to prioritise these over the needs of other users.
267	Jul 03 2018 11:45 AM	Where is the data on safety related incidents? If you can't supply this data how is anyone meant to answer Q10 other than idiot's (incl. on occasion Calmac and NLB) who don't follow the existing IRPCS rules? <input type="checkbox"/> What has happened to CMAL's plan to move their ferry terminal? <input type="checkbox"/> The costs quoted do not make clear whether these are nett after income or with CMAL include their internal transfers. This needs to be clearer. <input type="checkbox"/>
268	Jul 03 2018 11:31 AM	Sorry but find this question unclear as to what is meant. <input type="checkbox"/> As an annual visitor by sailing boat I have not found any great issues so far sonot sure that any further control is needed. If dues are levied in future I will go elsewhere. I do spend quite a lot locally when there.
269	Jul 03 2018 09:10 AM	It should promote all marine activity beneficial to Oban and exclude only those not capable of complying with the " Rule of the Road". It is the mix of vessel types that causes the risk. The Harbour should not be managed by a Government Quango or Local Authority
270	Jul 02 2018 02:16 PM	legislation should cover the appropriate use of piers and moorings to allow safe passage for vessels and transit of human and vehicle traffic. The use of piers in the harbour has been poorly thought out so far with the current facilities now over extended. CMAL should consider other long term options for the ferry berths which should be outwith Oban bay as the town infrastructure cannot cope with the ferry traffic both on land and in the water. Giving CMAL greater and extended control does not give solutions to the problems rather it gives CMAL carte blanche to put their company priorities in front of all harbour users and the town citizens.
271	Jul 02 2018 12:49 PM	Na
272	Jul 02 2018 12:33 PM	Calmac would be better off focusing on the quality, fare pricing, reliability and efficiency of their ships rather than this. This is just a smokescreen to hide their failings.
273	Jul 02 2018 11:22 AM	Nanny state thinking by Cal MAC, totally unnecessary interference in free right to navigate. IRCS rules are enough <input type="checkbox"/>

274	Jul 02 2018 08:05 AM	If a new port authority does go ahead, then it has to be ensured the views of all users are considered with a commensurate application of all views. Whilst we all appreciate the safety angle, there is danger that bureaucracy in the name of safety will create an administrative nightmare. Any changes have to be seen as reasonable, respect all users and moderate. □ Do not kill the goose that lays the golden!
275	Jul 01 2018 09:10 PM	Enlarged marina
276	Jul 01 2018 04:07 PM	The new harbour authority should be enabled and encouraged to promote the long-term development of the harbour with the object of improving the economic and social benefit of the harbour to the people of Oban. This could include (but not be limited to) improving and extending the existing infrastructure, (piers, marina and mooring facilities, breakwaters, land for commercial and industrial development, etc. The Authority should have a proactive ethos written into its governance. Its governing board should include proportionate representatives from all the user groups including leisure and small business, and the wider local community.
277	Jul 01 2018 02:33 PM	Need to consider the benefits/risks for all users not just commercial
278	Jun 30 2018 05:41 PM	This questionnaire is appallingly written. It reads as though it is a very dangerous area to be with accidents common place. This is NOT the case.
279	Jun 30 2018 11:32 AM	This time bound consultation has come to me as a surprise. There has been no prior public discussion that I am aware of to raise awareness of why it should be necessary or desirable to make changes to the existing harbour governance. It looks like change for the sake of change and the addition of additional bureaucratic cost without a clear statement of why it may be required. The survey question regarding what type of vessel causes the greatest safety risk needs to be much better defined before it can be meaningfully answered. If you insist on a vague answer to a vague question it would be "the biggest, heaviest, most fuel and passenger burdened, I.e. a ferry or cruise liner".

280	Jun 29 2018 11:43 PM	I do private flying and we are constantly beset by this type of airspace grab by the local airport. Of course more regulation can be presented as more safety but just how much safety do we need? In aviation the CAA has been very good at restraining airspace grabs by Inverness Airport. The resulting situation is untidy but works. To my mind the only bit of safety kit that might be helpful at Oban might be a very powerful loud hailer with which to pass instructions to boats that do not have a radio or whose batteries are flat (eg mine). Perhaps more code of practice information could be put on the Admiralty chart (more useful than 'submarines exercise in this area' - which they don't). I saw an advert for Oban Harbour in a magazine in the toilet block in Linnhe Marine which contained a statement that Oban had 300,000 large ship movements a year. This would seem to be an overstatement by at least 2 orders of magnitude - so are we sure that the powers that be are feeding us accurate information? □
281	Jun 29 2018 09:39 PM	It's clear that one of the Trust Port models referred to in the Fisher Associates report would be the most advantageous for ALL the stakeholders in the Oban Bay area and not just A&B C and CMAL, who may not have the best interests of all the stakeholders in mind in their decision making.
282	Jun 29 2018 07:59 PM	Acquisition of assets, building of new assets, eg breakwater,
283	Jun 29 2018 07:05 PM	You must be open minded and assume new activities will continue to emerge as IT and leisure expands.
284	Jun 29 2018 05:49 PM	Harbour operator needs to provide 24 hour VTS to ensure traffic management is controlled in safe and efficient manner
285	Jun 29 2018 05:45 PM	I cannot see any need to create further harbour legislation
286	Jun 29 2018 04:43 PM	Visiting yachtsmen who would be unaware of new rules.
287	Jun 29 2018 04:34 PM	Racing Yachts through the channels to enter Oban bay should not be permissible.
288	Jun 29 2018 03:16 PM	Yachting must be considered for the benefits it brings to the town, and is growing
289	Jun 29 2018 10:03 AM	This extension to the harbour authority seems unnecessary on the grounds of maintaining safety. The current operators guide does a good job and I am not aware of many accidents or near misses in Oban Bay (perhaps the reporting is amiss here)
290	Jun 29 2018 09:00 AM	The management should be sectioned off to oversee their own given space/area of expertise with fair representation for all maritime users within an overall board. No single vessel or user type should hold greater influence over another since all bring value to the community commercially. □ □ Also your questions are not balanced and are, in some cases, leading – Particularly Q9 when it is not certain or uncertain if the creation of an SHA would benefit safety. There is no reason to assume it would.

291	Jun 29 2018 12:31 AM	About time this got sorted- too many users simply ignore IRPCS or assume it doesn't apply to them
292	Jun 28 2018 11:49 PM	The port should be run by locals with the aims and objectives to be for the good of all who live in the area and any profits should be channelled back in to the area
293	Jun 28 2018 08:33 PM	Na
294	Jun 28 2018 08:24 PM	The ferries that run in and it of Oban bay should make all their VHF announcements clearly, stating not just the vessel name but also that it is a CALMAC ferry.
295	Jun 28 2018 07:20 PM	<p>Poor questionnaire. If yachts are passing through or are part of a race, they should be subject to no charges whatsoever. If yachts are staying then perhaps a tourist tax payment should be levied. Boats under 24ft should be exempt and only pay marina fees. Signals should be installed in the north channel to give periods of safe approach to large ferries. The Lismore ferry should not be given such clear periods as it is too small. The sailing club and visitors should be given all assistance and incur no charge for use of facilities in support of their activities. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Whatever the arrangements, a sensible approach to management of all craft should be applied and issuing of penalties should be avoided at all costs. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The beauty and emotion of Oban Bay including its ferries and all other boats must be retained and cannot be subjugated to the needs of commerce.</p>
296	Jun 28 2018 06:27 PM	, when the info could easily have been given on Ch16. Not everyone has a remote control to change channels , and a move to the cabin is not the best thing to do when single or short handed . This affects visitors more than those familiar with the area , and so is doubly undesirable.
297	Jun 28 2018 05:23 PM	Why is RYA Scotland not a stakeholder in this exercise?
298	Jun 28 2018 04:52 PM	Na
299	Jun 28 2018 04:05 PM	Having worked hard to improve step ashore facilities for commercial and leisure users of the port of Oban its invaluable that the port remains OPEN and welcoming to all without added costs which could deter growth and development of the cruise market.
300	Jun 28 2018 04:02 PM	It should not infringe the access or add cost to private vessels used for leisure.
301	Jun 28 2018 03:53 PM	focus on safety and insure all users of the port are treated equally
302	Jun 28 2018 02:50 PM	X
303	Jun 28 2018 02:40 PM	I am opposed to a private commercial enterprise having any statutory powers within the harbour. This is best done by a body accountable to the public.
304	Jun 28 2018 02:34 PM	Define a "Narrow Channel "for the Bay in which users shall always be aware of when large vessels are entering or leaving, then all other vessels shall abide by the col regs under rule 9.

305	Jun 28 2018 01:54 PM	The present system is working well. There have been no serious accidents that I am aware off. Leave well alone please
306	Jun 28 2018 11:41 AM	Evidence needs to be provided for the necessity of this change. Increasing cost and compliance levels needs to be justified. If it's not broken then don't fix it.
307	Jun 28 2018 10:23 AM	In many other parts of the country boat movements of commercial and leaisure, move responsibly around the harbours together. If the ferry operator were to take over the management, then leisure craft users would be greatly reduced. We need a better consideration of safety management, knowledge/theory and understanding of other users requirements.
308	Jun 28 2018 10:07 AM	Access to Oban for all vessels through both North and South entrances - respecting the various requirements of each class of vessel.
309	Jun 28 2018 09:49 AM	The focus on cost should be on those with a commercial interest, making money from their use
310	Jun 28 2018 09:07 AM	It is essential that the principle of freedom of navigation be maintained. It is objectionable in principle that the harbour should be essentially owned by one user, albeit the most important one. If the current Code of Practice were to be given statutory force, and then policed, it would certainly resolve much of the problem. Many other busy ports including Dublin and Belfast have just such a system.
311	Jun 28 2018 08:55 AM	If a new body covers all of Oban Bay, then all users of Oban Bay and the residents of Oban should be involved.
312	Jun 28 2018 07:53 AM	This is not rocket science, can you please come up with a practical solution rather than creating a new body that will be self serving, and bureaucratic there are many examples of how this type of thing are managed in the Sweden and Denmark in area that have far higher density of combined users.
313	Jun 28 2018 07:42 AM	Insufficient information is being provided to allow a balanced assessment of the proposals, particularly with respect to what problems exist at the moment that require such a change, the ramification of concentration of powers, a potential future lack of accountability, a potential increase in regulation and a resulting increase in "costs". It is not clear why the existing "lack of clarity" cannot be resolved by other means. Continued involvement and real involvemnt decision taking of the widest possible variety of stakeholders is strongly preferred over any trend to concentrate powers of oversight and regulation within a single organisation.
314	Jun 28 2018 07:39 AM	Oban is a major base for yacht sailing. It is vital that the commercial interests of Calmac don't unnecessarily restrict the use of Oban Bay for yachts cruising and racing. In addition as previous member of Oban sailing club it is vital that dinghy racing can continue in the bay. □ Allowing an organisation that is potentially biased to take control of a large part of Oban Bay would be potentially devastating to the sailing community and the toutist industry connected to it.

315	Jun 28 2018 03:35 AM	None
316	Jun 27 2018 10:52 PM	<p>It should include Leisure Vessels, Events (Regattas etc), Superyacht, Cruise, and clearly all commercial activities currently running in the bay. □</p> <p>The definition of large vessel, would affect many leisure craft, which are in fact highly manoeuvrable. Many yachts under 20m have a draft of more than 3m, but could not be considered large craft. Likewise Superyachts up to 30m can easily manoeuvre in quite restricted places. I believe the definition of a large craft should be reconsidered, especially if "large" craft are going to be subject to pilotage charges. The Superyacht market is growing in Scotland and should not be discouraged by unnecessary restrictions or charges.</p>
317	Jun 27 2018 09:40 PM	There should be enforced speed limits for jet skis and speed boats north of Brandystone rock
318	Jun 27 2018 08:14 PM	Having used Oban Bay as a visiting cruising yachtsman for many years, I see no reason to change the status quo. Minor incidents will occur regardless of the bureaucratic regime. I am not aware of any major accident, or even a near miss, that would have been avoided by more bureaucracy.
319	Jun 27 2018 06:48 PM	It looks like CalMac will walk all over other users.
320	Jun 27 2018 06:44 PM	Oban bay is enjoyed by all because it manages to steer a fine line between regulation and respect for the individual/small boat user. Giving all the statutory power to one user will certainly undermine this happy state of affairs.
321	Jun 27 2018 06:39 PM	<p>A significant driver to the increase in Marine traffic has been the growth of tourism - an economic aim of the Scottish Government. As ever tourism infrastructure in Scotland lags behind the growth. SG has to invest. Safety is of course paramount but other than conjecture I have not seen evidence of problems. The ferries are a major user and will continue to be so - but their increased activity compromises the space for all others who in turn contribute to the local economy. A management plan for consultation would be good taking account of all users flexible needs. The very and increasing success of area must not result in the area failing through any increased and awkward bureaucracy particularly if controlled by the state. A trust port operating by definition for the benefit of all user might be the way forward.</p>
322	Jun 27 2018 06:24 PM	More clearly marked channels for ferries and commercial craft and if necessary a system for restricting access to these areas by a light/ sound or VHF announcement
323	Jun 27 2018 06:22 PM	Interests of all users.
324	Jun 27 2018 06:07 PM	It must accommodate all existing activities, events, facilities and must not exclude any current categories of users
325	Jun 27 2018 06:03 PM	The existing Marina facilities should be expanded and further developed.
326	Jun 27 2018 05:46 PM	There should continue to be a balanced use of the passages around Oban.

327	Jun 27 2018 11:43 AM	The legislation should be designed to reflect the interests of the local community and those who live in the area. Management processes should not favour any one interest over another consequently it is impossible for CMAL to be impartial if they take on the role. OBMG is not an appropriate representation of the local community so a different structure of representation is needed
328	Jun 27 2018 12:32 AM	Really just not convinced that an issue exists here. Leave it as is.
329	Jun 26 2018 11:30 AM	Leisure users (sailors, pleasure boats, local small craft) should not be financially burdened or restricted in their use of waters in and around Oban Bay by any new governing body.
330	Jun 26 2018 10:28 AM	From Oban Lifeboat's perspective, the need to exceed a speed limit would need to be accommodated, on occasion, for immediate lifesaving only.
331	Jun 26 2018 08:02 AM	I have nothing to add apart from this is a terrible survey
332	Jun 25 2018 10:06 PM	This consultation is unclear as to its purpose and largely hidden from public view. As such it is either meaningless or a device to achieve a pre-determined outcome. Shame on you!
333	Jun 25 2018 09:16 PM	-
334	Jun 25 2018 06:38 PM	.
335	Jun 25 2018 05:36 PM	I think a council run SHA would be better, as CMAL currently have a vested interest in CalMac, the council would run the harbour for the benefit and safety of all. Leave CMAL to be SHA for their current area around the Railway Pier.
336	Jun 25 2018 03:47 PM	Better access for car passengers
337	Jun 25 2018 03:05 PM	Safe harbour operations under all foreseeable conditions. Develop marine tourism access dredging buoyage lighting harbour facilities.
338	Jun 25 2018 02:41 PM	It has to include everyone, all are equally important. ☐ I'm not impressed at the figures, these have been seriously misrepresented there is no way we have so many. Your putting us on a level with vessel movements in the Solent and Aberdeen. That's not the case and you all well know it! Conning the people...again!☐ Also the buoyage introduced this year has caused multiple vessels to ground at the harbour entrance, why had this not been rectified?? It's seriously too close inshore and almost impossible for a small vessel to navigate around... if this is the start of things to come?? The harbour needs to stay in public hands!!
339	Jun 25 2018 02:37 PM	If oban harbour was extended this will create more land (parking spaces) a berth for cruise liners etc bringing much more tourists/money to oban.
340	Jun 25 2018 02:16 PM	If there is any desire to maintain (never mind boost) tourism and leisure in the area then leisure, trips and tourism should be protected from negative impact including costs.

341	Jun 25 2018 01:57 PM	Accommodate leisure use of Port Beag slip.□ Enforce speed limit for large vessels.□ Designate inner and outer harbour areas to permit planing boats to transit the outer area at an efficient speed.
342	Jun 25 2018 01:42 PM	Access to fishing vessel for repair, loading/unloading is near impossible with current restrictions to vehicles on railway pier.
343	Jun 24 2018 01:32 PM	The cost estimates are puzzling. □ The cost per boat owner would be excessive for all involved especially leisure craft.
344	Jun 23 2018 07:21 PM	Should be run by local people for benefit of Oban
345	Jun 23 2018 06:53 PM	HA should have the authority implement (with user consultation) and enforce local harbour rules. There are a considerable number of leisure users whose interests should not be ignored in favour of large commercial ferry companies.
346	Jun 23 2018 05:58 PM	A harbour,any harbour,is for the use of one and all,from the largest ship down to the smallest rowing boat,and should always remain so.We all have to live and work alongside each other....there is no "might is right",so get on with life afloat and enjoy it.Provided harbour users on all sizes of vessels abide by the rule of the road,exercise caution and generally use common sense when navigating within the confines of Oban bay,especially in the main shipping channel,then there shouldn't be a problem for anyone.In a perfect world this should be the case,but as we all know this isn't a perfect world and there's always the odd one here and there who gives the rest a bad name! I see no need for further laws,by laws,harbour regulations and more layers of bureaucracy for what is a perfectly good,well functioning harbour at present.It may not be perfect but it works well enough for me and has done so for the last 50 years.I therefore see no reason for drastic change.
347	Jun 23 2018 12:42 PM	Long term parking for boat owners urgently required now that parking charges have been extended. Park and ride.
348	Jun 23 2018 12:32 PM	"The OBMG has concluded that a statutory harbour for the wider Oban Bay area is required to be able to significantly reduce the current risks that have been identified" - what are the current risks. Apart from a few fast jet skis and large cruise ships making it difficult for Cal Mac to get into the harbour easily, Oban bay seem pretty safe to me - or are there safety issues I don't know about?
349	Jun 22 2018 07:40 PM	Policing of the North channel and approaches□ A single harbour mooring trust which encompasses all non private mooring areas□ All berths except NLB to be brought under CMAL control as they have the expertise to run them under port state control legislation and ensure red tape is kept to a minimum for all users.□

350	Jun 21 2018 10:37 AM	Allowing all vessels equal access to the Bay, not for the ferries to have exclusive rights of way and enforcement over other users.
351	Jun 20 2018 09:46 AM	Priority is safety and navigation aids.□ Not to impact on current users financially.
352	Jun 19 2018 06:24 PM	Marking of the North Channel needs improvement maybe thought should be given to having direction of Buoyage into port from South and North changing in th bay then lateral marks can be used in the North Channel lessening confusion. ATONS in Sound of Kerrera remain unchanged. Also mark end of sewage pipe at Corran Buoy with a fixed spar. Corran buoy would change to a red lateral mark
353	Jun 19 2018 04:58 PM	I am not convinced this is necessary. Is it just going to create more admin jobs and bureaucracy and so increase costs to businesses. All the same people will be driving all the boats and surely that is what affects safety rather than rules and regulations. I dont see why there should be a need to increase any costs and certainly not to the extent that appears to be being suggested.□ Some of the questions I didnt want to answer but it wouldnt let me complete without answering such as who should foot the bill. If I dont think there should be a bill then how can I allot the costs to someone.
354	Jun 15 2018 01:59 PM	A single point of contact (LPS)□ Deconflicting large vessel movements around the bay and north entrance.□ Deconflicting large vessel berthing movements□ Control of Yachts in the north entrance