

---

## **BRIA Business Interview- COOKE AQUACULTURE**

Q1. Briefly describe your business objectives

*Cooke Aquaculture- primarily farming and processing Atlantic Salmon, have proposals in the pipeline for expansion in Shetland. Looking to grow 10-20%. Currently have sites in Yell, Unst, Hoga Ness, processing factory in Yell, freshwater hatchery in Unst, processing plant in Orkney, sites in Hoy, Rousay, Westray, and new sites Stronsay.*

*Tonnage in Shetland larger than Orkney ~22 000 tonne in Shetland, 17 000 tonne in Orkney.*

Q2. Do you agree with the objectives of the SIRMP?

*Broadly in agreement. Economic growth balanced vs community and environmental objectives.*

### **Benefits of Implementing the Different Options**

Q3. Do you agree/disagree with the suggested benefits as an outcome of implementing each of the three options?

*Broadly in agreement.*

Q4. Are there any further potential benefits of each option to your business/sector?

*No- you have broadly identified the areas relevant to the sector.*

### **Costs of Implementing Options 1 & 2**

Q5. Do you agree/disagree with the costs associated with implementing option 1?

*Broadly correct.*

Q6. Do you agree/disagree with the costs associated with implementing option 2?

*Broadly correct.*

### **Costs of Implementing Option 3**

Q7. Do you agree/disagree with the cost assessment of the new/amended policies within the SIRMP as detailed in **Table 1**?

*Most appropriate to go with three. No significant cost implications.*

Q8. Are you in favour of implementing the SIRMP and the policies within it?

*Yes*

Q9. Can you foresee any specific positive/negative impacts to your business resulting from the implementation of the SIRMP?

Port Arthur, Scalloway, Shetland,  
ZE1 0UN, Scotland. UK

Email: [nainfo@uhi.ac.uk](mailto:nainfo@uhi.ac.uk)  
Web: [www.nafc.uhi.ac.uk](http://www.nafc.uhi.ac.uk)



---

*Streamlining the regulatory framework could save us money when preparing applications.*

---

## Amended Policy-Waste Minimisation (Pg 28 SIRMP)

### See Table 2: Amended and new policies

Q10. Do you currently consider waste minimisation as part of the EIA process?

Yes

Q11. Do you create waste minimisation plans in-house? What does it entail? How many man hours does it take?

*EIAs are written in-house. Not an arduous task, standardised plans which are modified for each site. May be longer in the future as we move towards a reduce, re-use and recycle hierarchy.*

*There are plans for a coming together of all aquaculture companies in Scotland to create a sustainability forum, collaboration on waste and recycling. Knowledge sharing to create a circular economy. Whisky industry used as an example of best practice.*

Q12. Do you currently have written waste management procedures?

Yes

Q13. Can you foresee any other costs that could be associated with the amended policy?

*No significant cost- could better promote the fact that finfish already does these things*

## Amended Policy- Safeguarding Navigation Channels and Port Areas (Pg 32 SIRMP)

### See Table 2: Amended and new policies

Q14. Are you likely to submit an application for a development adjacent to a port/harbour area?

*Concern over harbour master power. We look to consolidate sites rather than create new sites where possible. Consolidating sites reduces impacts on navigation and for recreational users in harbour area. Consult Northern Lighthouse Board (NLB) even before scoping and screening. Scoping in rather than out.*

Q15. Do you envisage that this policy would cause any economic impact on your business?

*Not in the short term. Block on future development in Yell Sound area is limiting growth as this is one of the few areas left in Shetland where there is the potential for growth.*

Q16. Do you think this policy would have a greater impact on the development potential around smaller ports/harbours?

No

## **Amended Policy- Safeguarding Marine Recreation (Pg 94 SIRMP)**

### **See Table 2: Amended and new policies**

Q17. Do you think your business/development type could be impacted by the amendment to the wording of this policy?

*Don't think so, we try to enhance recreational use, e.g. in Uyea Sound we have put in a pontoon and break water which we use for our smaller boats and the local community use it as their marina.*

## **New Policy- Harbour Plans (Pg 32 SIRMP)**

### **See Table 2: Amended and new policies**

It has always been a requirement that developers comply with specific harbour plans, policies, directions and by-laws, this policy has been included to add clarity and consistency.

Q18. Can you foresee any additional impacts associated with the inclusion of this new policy into the SIRMP?

If 'Yes', please give details of any potential impacts and associated costs.

*Don't think so- as long as it's clear, it is not always easy to find all the relevant by-laws etc for an area.*

## **New Policy- Habitat Protected Areas (Pg 49 SIRMP)**

### **See Table 2: Amended and new policies**

This policy gives protection to areas closed to fishing by the SSMO (which have been closed to protect PMFs). There is overlap between this policy and policy MP SPCON4 which protects Priority Marine Features.

Q19. Can you foresee any additional impacts associated with the inclusion of this new policy into the SIRMP?

If 'Yes', please give details of any potential impacts and associated costs.

*We have some concerns that a private, non-statutory group such as the SSMO are enshrined in policy. We are nervous due to the uncertainty that the areas could be changed/ expanded from year-to-year.*

---

*Different sectors will have different impacts on an area i.e. dredge fishing would have a catastrophic impact whereas aquaculture would be much smaller, each should be given appropriate weight.*

*[Rachel- "policy states the potential development must have a significant level of impact to be refused. If developers can show the level of impact would be low/impacts are mitigated development could still be permitted. Potentially the wording around this policy could be changed to state that it only covers the existing SSMO closed area.]*

### **New Policy- Decommissioning of Assets (Pg 100 SIRMP)**

#### **See Table 2: Amended and new policies**

Q20. Do you agree/disagree with the inclusion of this policy?

*Broadly agree, would not be a significant impact.*

*Would be useful for our sector to clarify when the decommissioning clause would come into effect as we are constantly changing and upgrading equipment.*

*[Rachel- "the policy is intended for when the site is shut. Will look at the potential to change the wording of this policy for clarity.]*

Q21. Have you ever had to create a decommissioning plan?

*Currently a small section on decommissioning within our EIA. Not a significant concern.*

Q22. If you were directed to create a decommissioning plan, how easy would it be for you to compile the necessary information?

*Not a significant problem.*

Q23. Please give an estimate of the man hours it takes to create a decommissioning plan

### **New Policy- Development Restricted Areas (Pg 101 SIRMP)**

#### **See Table 2: Amended and new policies**

Q24. Would you be likely to submit an application within a development restricted area?

*Not in those areas.*

Q25. Aquaculture isn't currently allowed within these areas; do you agree with this policy or does it restrict your business development (for example expansion into seaweed farming)?

*It is fair that it applies to all sectors.*

## Competition Assessment

Q26. Do you think that the SIRMP could directly or indirectly limit the number or range of suppliers?

*No*

Q27. Do you think that the SIRMP would limit the ability of suppliers to compete?

*No*

Q28. Do you think that the SIRMP would limit the suppliers' incentives to compete vigorously?

*No*

Q29. Do you think that the SIRMP policies could limit the choices and information available to consumers?

*No*

## Consumer Assessment

Q30. Do you think the policies within the SIRMP will have an effect on the quality, availability or price of any goods or services in a market?

*No*

Q31. Do you think the policies within the SIRMP will have an effect on the essential services market, such as energy and water?

*Slight chance on supply of utilities, but big utility companies will have presumably factored this in.*

Q32. Do you foresee that the SIRMP would involve storage or increased use of consumer data?

*No idea!*

Q33. Do you think that the SIRMP would increase opportunities for unscrupulous suppliers to target consumers?

*No*

Q34. Do you think the SIRMP would impact the information available to consumers on either goods or services, or their rights in relation to these?

*No*

Q35. Do you think the SIRMP would affect routes for consumers to seek advice or raise complaints on consumer issues?

---

Port Arthur, Scalloway, Shetland,  
ZE1 0UN, Scotland. UK

Email: [nainfo@uhi.ac.uk](mailto:nainfo@uhi.ac.uk)  
Web: [www.nafc.uhi.ac.uk](http://www.nafc.uhi.ac.uk)



---

*No*