



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

Meeting Location: Dakota Hotel, South Queensferry

Meeting Date / Time: 23 August 2011

Subject: Community Forum South

Participants

Community Representatives

Evelyn Woollen (Newton CC)
Doug Tait (BRIGS)
Doug Ross (QDCC)
Keith Giblett (QDCC)
Martin Gallagher (QDCC)
Les Chapman (BRIGS)
Bert Scott (Cramond and Barnton CC)
Murray McLaren (BRIGS)
Jim Taylor (Linn Mill Residents Association)

Transport Scotland - Employers Delivery Team (EDT)

Lawrence Shackman
Ross Hornsey
John Watt
Keavy O'Neill
Allan Buchan (c/o Big Partnership)

Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (FCBC)

Carlo Germani
Ewen Macdonell
Derek Chambers
David Watt

John Graham (Dromore) Ltd

Richard Docherty

John Sisk and Roadbridge

Seamus O'Brien

City of Edinburgh Council

Audrey Primrose
Darren Wraight

Observers

Diane Brown (Queensferry Ambition)
Cllr Tom Kerr (West Lothian Council)
Mike Crockart MP (Edinburgh West)

Date of Distribution 18 November 2011



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

Notes	Action
Meeting chaired by Lawrence Shackman	
1 Review of minutes and outstanding actions	
1.1 South Community Forum 16 June	
<p>EW noted grammatical changes were required. KON to update and re-circulate for approval prior to publishing on the Transport Scotland (TS) website.</p> <p>Further outstanding actions were discussed:</p> <p>(1.1) Contract award updates LS confirmed page had been created on FRC website and all information from liaison groups was up to date.</p> <p>(4.2) Reporting mechanism for public commitments LS confirmed TS will review on a regular basis. A reporting / status column will be added to the commitments and undertakings register on the TS website.</p> <p>(7.1) Ground Water Report EM confirmed report will be produced by end of August and will be circulated to Forum members. Item to remain on agenda.</p> <p>(7.2) AOB – Relaxation of Listed Building Conditions LS to provide written answer regarding compensation for people in listed buildings who cannot fit double glazing. (See Associated Papers)</p> <p>Written responses EW asked that any written responses be added by TS to the minute.</p> <p>(7.3) AOB – CPO LS confirmed that the District Valuer has received some applications from directly affected landowners and is currently assessing these.</p> <p>If requested TS would arrange for an expert to speak to land owners.</p> <p>LC/DT highlighted concern that no documentation regarding titles has been provided since CPOs were introduced on 16th May and, as a result, residents may be unable to sell their properties. LC/DT understood this to be the 89th day in a 90 day process and highlighted that the issue had also been raised by Kirkliston</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>TS</p> <p>FCBC</p> <p>TS</p> <p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<p>Community Council.</p> <p>LS confirmed that TS would provide a written response regarding these issues. (See Associated Papers)</p> <p>(7.4) AOB – Port Edgar Marina EM to issue minutes from FCBC meeting with Edinburgh Leisure on 20th July.</p> <p>EM confirmed that at the meeting FCBC confirmed the impact on the marina would be minimal and provided reassurance that they would maintain contact.</p> <p>DR highlighted potential impact on racing events.</p> <p>RH confirmed commitment to continue to maintain contact with the marina in order to minimise disruption.</p> <p>CG highlighted that there would be limited commercial opportunities for the marina from FCBC, apart from possible use to transport staff to marine works.</p> <p>Further outstanding actions were covered during relevant parts of the agenda.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
1.2	<p>Community Forum workshop 31 March (6.2 from Outstanding Actions)</p> <p>LS noted previous amendments had been made. Forum members approved. TS to publish on website.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
2	Introduction to John Graham (Dromore) Ltd – Fife ITS	
2.1	<p>Overview of contract Richard Docherty (RD), Fife ITS CLO, provided summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works on M90/A90 extend from Admiralty – Junction 3 Halbeath - Approximately 18 ITS gantries will be erected - Embankments next to each gantry will be designed to support future maintenance activities – e.g. providing paths and parking for maintenance vehicles - The M90 southbound hardshoulder will be upgraded to incorporate a bus lane to complement the Forth Road Bridge public transport facility. - Works will commence in September, subject to approvals and consents, and will be completed in summer 2012 - A priority will be to ensure safe traffic flow with a phased approach to traffic management 	<p>Noted</p>



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuous Flight Auger (CFA) piling methods will be used to minimise environmental impact - Mining consolidation works will be required 	
2.2	<p>3 month look-ahead programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works programme scheduled to start in September 2011, with completion in Summer 2012 - The Design and construction programme are currently under review by Transport Scotland - Consultation is taking place and consents are being sought from relevant bodies e.g Local Authority, SEPA - Sampling is taking place to inform the design process - The site compound is being established at Belleknowes industrial estate - The baseline study for noise and vibration is underway – a specialist noise consultant has been appointed <p>As CLO, RD is based at the temporary Contact & Education Centre at FETA offices with the other CLOs.</p> <p>A Draft Environment Management Plan (EMP) has been prepared. RD emphasised that environmental impact should be minimal as the project was mainly contained within the existing road corridor</p> <p>Copies of the EMP were made available by RD who requested comments by 5pm Tuesday 30th August.</p> <p>Q: DT requested clarification re scope of ITS works. A: LS confirmed that each of the three contracts contained an ITS element and that the number of gantries were fairly evenly spread within the three contracts.</p> <p>Q: Queries regarding planning and impact of Fife ITS traffic management, including south of the Forth Road Bridge. A: LS confirmed that all Contractors are part of the Traffic Management Group along with appropriate representatives of the relevant local authorities, FETA, road operating companies and the emergency services, thus representation was on a local and national level. When planning traffic management, the Group will take into account national and local events. A dedicated Police Liaison Officer from Fife Police has been appointed as a member of the Employers team to assist with this Group and related activities. RD explained that a phased approach to traffic management is proposed for Fife ITS which is likely to include, subject to approval, long continuous lanes rather than chicanes. He added that a controlled 40mph speed limit would be in operation.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Community Reps</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
	Q: EW asked if the minutes from the Traffic Management Group	Noted



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<p>had been published on the web? A: LS stated that the minutes had been published and apologised for their late publication. TS undertook to ensure that future minutes be published on time on the relevant sections of the FRC website.</p> <p>LS emphasised that traffic management plans would be included in the 3 month look ahead programme so that Forum members could comment. TS agreed to publish on a regular basis the 3 month look ahead programme on the FRC website.</p> <p>Q: KG asked if contact names would be provided? A: RH emphasised that all enquiries should, in the first instance, be directed to the appropriate CLO.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p>
3	Introduction to John Sisk and Roadbridge (M9 Junction 1a)	
3.1	<p>Overview of contract</p> <p>Seamus O'Brien outlined that the M9 Junction 1a works will include: upgrade of existing junction, widening of the motorway to facilitate extra lanes, construction of a new bridge, new slip roads, culverts and 19 ITS gantries. Traffic management will include 40mph speed limits and is likely to involve, subject to approval, linear traffic management (similar to that used recently on the M80) designed to minimise disruption.</p>	Noted
3.2	<p>3 month look ahead programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Statutory consultation, including with land owners, is underway - Noise and vibration monitoring plans will be implemented soon - Compound construction will start in September, subject to approval - Site clearance will begin mid to late September. <p>Q: EW requested three month look ahead programme be published online A: TS to include in FRC website.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>
4	Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contract)	
4.1	<p>3 month look ahead programme</p> <p>CG outlined current activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Temporary site office has been set up at Arrol House, Rosyth. Approx 100 members of staff are based there and Transport Scotland's Employers Delivery Team is co-located. 	Noted



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site clearance has begun for the main site offices to be located off Ferrytoll Road – likely to move in Dec/Jan (NB location highlighted on map supplied) - Current work is still focusing on design - Consultation is taking place with the local authorities re road works and traffic management - Site investigation related to road and marine works is progressing. <p>Subject to approvals being obtained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The main construction compound will be based within the Forth Ports site (contains concrete batching plant, materials storage etc) - A smaller site compound than originally envisaged will be established on the south side. This is likely to be for less than 50 people with up to 70 car parking spaces. - Site clearance for the first road works will begin in August, but no traffic management is required as this will take place well away from main roads - A trial blast is due to take place during first week of September as the basis for the main blasting which is likely to commence in October/November - Noise and vibration plans/method statements are being developed for each activity and approvals being progressed. 	
<p>4.2</p>	<p>Q&As</p> <p>Q: (DT) Which areas are being monitored for air pollution? A: (LS) These are detailed in the Code of Construction Practice. Specific statements will be provided for each area of work.</p> <p>Q: (DT/EW) Requested further details on air quality monitoring – what was to be measured? A: TS to check and confirm. (See Associated Papers)</p> <p>Q: (DT) Will all pre-cast works be located north of the Forth? A: (CG) This is under review and FCBC should be able to confirm by the November Forum or by the end of the year.</p> <p>Q: (MG) Is there still a need for a haul road if the south compound was to be reduced in size? A: (CG/LS) Yes. Access is still required as there will be a requirement to launch precast materials for the approach viaduct and to construct the piers near the barracks. However, FCBC are looking at the possibility of a new haul road alignment and are consulting widely on this. CG added that he believed screening and noise mitigation measures would meet or better the requirements of the Environmental Statement for residents of Linn Mill.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>FCBC</p>



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<p>Q: Will the haul road be maintained after construction? A: It will be maintained (where it forms part of the permanent works) and will be available to cyclists.</p> <p>Q: How will this haul road junction be controlled? A:(EM) The haul road could be reconfigured to cross Society Road at one location and traffic control would only be required for site traffic, with local residents able to use the road as normal. (EM) At the junction with the A904, a gate will be provided which will be closed at the end of the day's shift and the compound security team will patrol. A sentry will not be posted during the day.</p> <p><u>Post Meeting Note:</u></p> <p>A gate would also be provided at the Society Road end with this haul road option).</p> <p>Q; (EW) Which of the two lay-bys on the A904 is closest to the access point? A: (CG) Planning is still taking place and a number of issues have still to be resolved before approvals can be obtained. FCBC could then explain the proposals. (EW) Newton Community Council (NCC) is keen to be part of and comment before final approval. EM to discuss direct with EW/NCC.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC/NCC</p>
<p>4.3</p>	<p>Action points from previous minute were discussed:</p> <p>(2.4) Overview of Programme of Works</p> <p>LS confirmed that the separate Community Forum for M9 Junction 1a will take place on 1st September.</p> <p>(4.2 – Outstanding action 16 June 2011)</p> <p>SO confirmed the J1a works will be complete by summer 2013, before the Dalmeny Chord rail project begins. Therefore, Network Rail would not be required to attend the Forum.</p> <p>CG explained that the construction programme had been submitted and feedback from TS was being addressed in order to progress approval. CG hoped to arrange for planners to attend the November Community Forum meetings to provide overview of the approved programme.</p> <p>(6.5) Structural surveys</p> <p>(EM) Initial contact has been made with everyone on the supplied</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>FCBC</p> <p>FCBC</p>



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<p>list of contacts. A number of surveys have been completed to date and the first reports will be completed and issued from this week onwards. FCBC would attempt to make contact with those that had not responded to their requests to undertake the surveys and to update the Forum members re progress.</p> <p>Q; (MMcL) Can houses on Society Road be included in the surveys? A: (CG) FCBC might undertake additional surveys. EM to discuss with Murray McLaren following meeting.</p> <p>Q: (KG) Concerned that proposed B800 bridge works would prevent land being released until June 2016, impacting on progress of proposed social housing development. Asked if works could be completed earlier? A: (CG) CG was unaware of this. EM to discuss with KG following meeting.</p>	<p>FCBC</p> <p>FCBC</p>
5	Approval of Terms of Reference	
	<p>EW highlighted that comments from NCC had not been included in the revised version and that a section should be added on how members leave the group. RH suggested this be covered by reversal of process for joining the group. Forum members agreed. TS to update. EW to confirm requested changes.</p> <p>DT expressed concern that a reference to Community Council Code of Conduct implied that non-community council members had to adhere to this Code. RH explained this was not the case. The reworded version stated that members can comply with their relevant code and, should they not have one, the community council code is provided as an example.</p> <p>DT to re-examine draft and provide comments on 25th August.</p> <p>Forum members agreed that the terms of reference do not need to be re-tabled at the next forum. Agreement will be sought via correspondence.</p>	<p>NCC/TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Completed</p> <p>TS</p>
6	Engaging with Communities - Construction	
	<p>TS issued updated draft of Engaging with Communities (EWC) and LS expressed hope that these could be published by 2nd September before construction works begin.</p> <p>EW highlighted that from an initial view of the draft, some substantive comments had not been incorporated. RH emphasised that the report was still a draft and that TS can</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<p>incorporate various comments where deemed necessary..</p> <p>Forum members to feedback comments by phone or email by Wednesday 31 August. TS to re-circulate to Kirkliston Community Council members advising of deadline for comments.</p> <p>Forum members debated the purpose of the report and ordering of information, and need for simplified information for local residents. RH explained that the report was designed to provide a simplified version of the Code of Construction Practice and the commitments given. While designed to be more accessible, it could not be over simplified if the original meaning was to be clearly communicated. RH explained that the EWC had still to be laid out in a proper report format and that this would support readability. RH also confirmed the EWC is part of a suite of materials required to meet different communication requirements – this will include easy to follow explanations in newsletters, eZines, flyers etc.</p> <p>RH agreed to consider bringing contact details to the beginning of the document and adding a contents section.</p> <p>LS then suggested that a separate one page contact document could be produced to summarise contact details.</p> <p>EM confirmed that FCBC were producing a flyer summarising contact details which it intends to distribute to local residents. EM to circulate electronic version to Forum members.</p>	<p>Community reps Completed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>FCBC</p>
	<p>Q: (EW) Is the complaints procedure detailed in EWC a summary of a detailed version? A: RH confirmed the EWC version was the main explanation of the complaints procedure. RH to consider production of flow diagram to support explanation of complaints procedure.</p> <p>LS confirmed the telephone hotline is live and the number will be issued through the FRC website, latest newsletter and FCBC flyer etc.</p> <p>The draft of current update newsletter was issued for information. TS informed that this will be published in early September.</p> <p>RH confirmed new email address for enquiries is enquiries@forthreplacementcrossing.info RH clarified that the previous email address would continue to be monitored by TS, but the three contractors have direct access to the new email address.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

7	Meet the Contractor	
7.1	<p>13 September 2011; Orocco Pier, South Queensferry 14 September 2011; Queensferry Hotel, North Queensferry</p> <p>LS outlined the format for these public events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1pm to 6pm – people can drop in to speak one-to-one with representatives of the contractors and TS - from 7pm – a presentation by TS and the contractors with Q&A session. <p>RH advised that publicity would include local press advertising, information on the FRC website and distribution of the latest FRC newsletter.</p> <p>RH requested the help of Forum members in publicising the event locally.</p> <p>Q: (MG) Would TS consider an evening follow up session providing opportunities for one-to-one discussion? A: RH suggested the evening presentation would provide opportunities for local people to ask questions both during the presentation and one-to-one afterwards. RH emphasised that if these events were oversubscribed, a follow up event would be considered.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Community reps</p> <p>Noted</p>
7.2	<p>Q&A</p> <p>RH requested that any questions (issues and themes) be forwarded by forum members in advance to allow the presentation content to be tailored. However, questions that relate to a specific local resident should be addressed in one-to-one discussions or by correspondence.</p>	Community reps
7.3	<p>LS highlighted that outstanding actions from the previous minutes (Section 5.1) were covered in the discussion.</p> <p>LS confirmed that the Meet the Buyer event (Outstanding Action 5.2) had taken place successfully and attracted over 100 businesses.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
8	Community Issues	
	<p>LS noted that outstanding actions detailed in previous minutes 6.1 Specific Community Issues – General had been covered as part of discussions.</p>	
8.1	Timeline for availability of draft Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and subordinate plans (section 1.5 of CoCP)	



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<p>FCBC confirmed draft EMP had been issued for comment on Friday, 19th August. Noise and Vibration Management Plans were issued on 23rd August.</p>	Noted
8.2	<p>Procedure for community review and feedback on plans.</p> <p>Discussion took place on opportunities for forum members to comment on these plans.</p> <p>CG highlighted requirement for FCBC to consult with Transport Scotland, statutory consultees and local communities. There is a need for plans to be in place in order to meet contractual/legislative requirements and to enable works to progress.</p> <p>CG suggested that there was a requirement to approve plans that were “substantially there” for construction to commence, but that FCBC would, if required, continue discussions and issue revisions as agreed.</p> <p>LS confirmed that it is the contractor who is consulting and, as Employers Representative, Transport Scotland gives final approval.</p> <p>DC highlighted that initial comments, where appropriate, would be incorporated and if further updates were agreed, revisions would be issued. Discussions with local communities would be on-going. It was agreed that Community Liaison Officer’s (CLO’s) would respond to Community Councils regarding comments provided on the Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) and provide copies of EMPs that went forward for approval.</p> <p>Forum members to feedback by 31 August 2011.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>CLO’s</p> <p>Community reps</p>
8.3	<p>Status of proposed move of main site compound to Rosyth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What goes from and what stays at Echline? - What is the timeline for a final decision? <p>Covered during previous discussion – ref 4.1 FCBC 3 monthly look ahead programme.</p>	
8.4	<p>Proposed new cycle path link under the FRC (accessing Springfield Estate via SUDS pond)</p> <p>Q: (DT) Has a commitment been given to progress this link? (MG) This was raised at the independent assessors hearing.</p> <p>A: LS explained that the Principal Contract included for the cycle link from the A904 under the main crossing at its south abutment and back up to the A904, forming a bypass of the proposed A904 Junction. An additional link from Springfield westwards to join this link near to the abutment had been discussed following the</p>	Noted



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<p>assessors hearings and, although TS could not locate any correspondence on this issue prior to this Forum, LS recalled that an agreement may have been given that if the community could agree on the links routing through the gap in the houses at Springfield and agree this with City of Edinburgh Council (CEC), TS would undertake to construct the additional link.</p> <p>FRC EDT roads team to liaise with CEC to clarify position re this and report back to forum members. (See Associated Papers)</p> <p>DW of CEC confirmed that he was not aware of this issue prior to the meeting and would check previous correspondence.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Noted</p>
8.5	<p>Status of Bo'ness Road pedestrian crossing?</p> <p>LS confirmed that the position/layout of the crossing had been agreed and that TS and City of Edinburgh Council would discuss the approach to procure its construction.</p> <p>LS confirmed that procurement would progress during the next 12 months.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p>
8.6	<p>FRC website Community Forums and Working Groups</p> <p>EW highlighted that it was difficult to fulfill community obligations if required information was not issued on the FRC website by deadline dates and the website should be updated to make such information easier to locate.</p> <p>RH confirmed that comments had been taken on board and a significant revision was underway, with initial changes being completed by 13th September.</p> <p>RH issued a new website structure. Forum members to provide comments.</p> <p>RH emphasised that following the mobilisation period, processes were now in place and that publication deadlines would be met.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Community reps</p> <p>Noted</p>
8.7	<p>Working Groups / non compliance with CoCP</p> <p>Further discussion took place on how forum members can review materials and comment prior to approval: CG suggested the same principal be applied as was discussed for approval of the Engaging with Communities - Construction report (ref section 6). Plans are consulted upon and versions are required to be signed off and published. This enables construction to progress on time and commitments to be met. This does not, however, preclude further discussion with local communities and for revisions to be issued.</p>	<p>Noted</p>



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	<p>TS will undertake to highlight to forum members any approved variations against plans/standards e.g. working outside agreed hours.</p> <p>LS suggested that the three month look ahead programme provided sufficient detail for the Community Forums to highlight issues / concerns for discussion and influence the planning process.</p> <p>RH explained that the CLOs should be liaising with the appropriate contacts and be able to answer the majority of enquiries. If they do not, they can be raised at these Community Forums. If they cannot be resolved at the Forums, they can be referred to the appropriate working group.</p> <p>EM highlighted that the majority of questions should be capable of being answered very quickly.</p> <p>EW stated that the Terms of Reference for the other working / liaison groups suggested that the community council's have a responsibility but that they are unsure how they can fulfill this.</p> <p>KG suggested if QDCC did not get a response from the initial contact they would raise it at this Forum and if still no answer was provided, they would raise it with the Employers Representative (David Climie).</p> <p>Discussion took place on need for communities to explain to local residents why feedback has or has not been adopted. CG gave a commitment that, as part of communications process, such explanations will be provided.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
8.8	<p>8.8 Noise, Vibration and Air Pollution monitoring procedures</p> <p>Those who will host monitoring equipment have been contacted. A monthly summary report will be published on the TS website.</p>	TS
8.9	<p>Update on Compulsory Purchase Orders settled</p> <p>Previously discussed during meeting – see section 1.1</p>	
8.10	<p>Introduction of 30mph speed limit on A904 / B800</p> <p>Q (DT) Given undertaking by Scottish Ministers to reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph and as work is starting soon, would this not be a good time to reduce the limit?</p> <p>A LS explained that an order would have to be processed with City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) and West Lothian Council and that this would not be required until the end of the project.</p>	Noted



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

	DW (CEC) highlighted that temporary speed limits may be required as part of safety issues regarding access from the A904 to the site compound. This review by The Traffic Management Working Group can only take place once the project plans are approved as these will influence factors such as vehicle movements.	Noted
9	Next Community Forums	
	<p>Dates were confirmed as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 01 November 2011; North Community Forum - 02 November 2011; South Community Forum - 08 November 2011; Junction 1a Community Forum <p>LS suggested that the subsequent meetings take place in late January.</p>	
10	AOB	
10.1	<p>Identification</p> <p>DT highlighted safety concerns following visits to properties by individuals claiming to be representing FCBC. They had no identification other than business cards.</p> <p>LS clarified that vehicles will be clearly marked and FCBC personnel will have orange high vis jackets. J1a and Fife ITS will have traditional yellow high vis jackets.</p> <p>CG emphasised that all representatives will carry identification badges.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p>
10.2	LS thanked attendees.	



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

Associated Papers

1 Review of minutes and outstanding actions

1.1 South Community Forum 16 June

(7.2) AOB – Relaxation of Listed Building Conditions

LS to provide written answer regarding compensation for people in listed buildings who cannot fit double glazing.

Transport Scotland Written Response:

Further to your query regarding replacement windows at the listed Echline Cottages we have sought advice from the relevant authority, the City of Edinburgh Council Planning Department, on this matter.

If required, secondary glazing is likely to be the best option and may not require any listed building consent provided that there is no impact on any decorative joinery surrounding the windows or any impact on working shutters. For double-glazed replacement windows an application to the council for Listed Building Consent would be required. We are advised by the council that each case must be determined on its own merits. However, we do not anticipate that these buildings will qualify for any noise insulation either for construction works or for the completed scheme and therefore we will not pursue this matter further at this time.

For information, the City of Edinburgh Council's guidance on replacement windows and doors can be viewed at:

http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/1040/replacement_windows_and_doors

Replacement windows will not be provided as mitigation for dust nuisance. Scottish Ministers will consider temporary rehousing in special circumstances as outlined in section 6.2.6 of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).

This issue is still under discussion.

(7.3) AOB – CPO

LS confirmed that the District Valuer has received some applications from directly affected landowners and is currently assessing these.

If requested TS would arrange for an expert to speak to land owners.

LC/DT highlighted concern that no documentation regarding titles has been provided since CPOs were introduced on 16th May and, as a result, residents may be unable to sell their properties. LC/DT understood this to be the 89th day in a 90 day process and highlighted that the issue had also been raised by Kirkliston Community Council.

LS confirmed that TS would provide a written response regarding these issues.

Transport Scotland Written Response:

No further documentation has been issued since the General Vesting Declaration (GVD) Notice pack was issued on the 15th of April 2011. As outlined in the notice sent to affected



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

Associated Papers

parties, The Scottish Ministers have now vested in their land. The GVD will be registered by the Registers of Scotland (ROS). This process can take a considerable amount of time however it has no material affect on the vested land being under the ownership of The Scottish Ministers. Residents are not prevented from selling their properties due to the GVD as searches carried out by solicitors during the buying and selling of properties would highlight the vested land which would be excluded from the sale.

A claim form was included in the pack issued to the affected parties along with a notice advising of the vesting date. The claimant was asked to complete the claim form and send it to Transport Scotland at Buchanan House. The Scottish Ministers are only able to make a payment once a claim has been received. The claim is passed to the District Valuer for them to process whereupon they will contact the claimant to discuss the compensation due. We would encourage affected parties to submit their claim forms if they haven't done so yet.

The claimant must request an advanced payment from the Scottish Ministers for the payment to be made within 90 days. If no request for advanced payment is made then the normal negotiations between the claimant and the District Valuer will take place. If the claimant requests an advanced payment then, in line with the Land Compensation Act 1973, The Scottish Ministers will make a 90% payment within 90 days for either the agreed negotiated compensation or if no agreement is reached, 90% of the District Valuer's estimate of compensation.

This issue is still under discussion.

4 Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contract)

4.2 Q&A's

Q: (DT/EW) Requested further details on air quality monitoring – what was to be measured?

A: TS to check and confirm.

Transport Scotland Written Response:

The air quality assessment undertaken for the Forth Replacement Crossing Environmental Statement indicated that no mitigation measures were required with respect to operational traffic.

Mitigation measures required for air quality impacts during construction are given in the Code of Construction Practice. The contractors for the project are required to consult with the relevant local authorities regarding monitoring procedures. This consultation has confirmed the requirement to monitor dust and PM₁₀ (dust particles smaller than 10 microns) levels only, as appropriate for construction works. The purpose of the monitoring will be to identify whether excess dust is arising from any particular activity and to take appropriate action.

This issue is still under discussion.



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

Associated Papers

8 Community Issues

8.4 Proposed new cycle path link under the FRC (accessing Springfield Estate via SUDS pond)

FRC EDT roads team to liaise with CEC to clarify position re this and report back to forum members.

Transport Scotland Written Response:

Transport Scotland advised in September 2010, whilst there is no significant issue in providing a linking path across Echline field, which is land owned by the Scottish Ministers, there is a potential issue for the local community and particularly the landowner at Springfield in respect of the connection from Echline field boundary to the local path network within the Springfield estate. Resolution of this issue could be best managed by the local community via the community council and/or City of Edinburgh Council. Once that issue is resolved in terms of enabling removal of the fence and the creation of a linking path, an approach should be made to the Scottish Ministers. Scottish Ministers would be prepared to construct and fund the proposed path to the fenceline at Springfield under the proposed scheme.