



A737 Trunk Road – The Den, Dalry Environmental Statement

April 2013







CONTENTS PAGE		Page No
ABBREV	/IATIONS	A – 1
GLOSSA	ARY	G – 1
NON-TE	CHNICAL SUMMARY	NTS - 1
1.0	INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSED SCHEME	1 – 1
2.0	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODS	2 – 1
3.0	CONSULTATION	3 – 1
4.0	AIR QUALITY	4 – 1
5.0	CULTURAL HERITAGE	5 – 1
6.0	ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION	6 – 1
7.0	LANDSCAPE EFFECTS	7 – 1
8.0	LAND USE	8 – 1
9.0	NOISE AND VIBRATION	9 – 1
10.0	PEDESTRIANS, CYCLISTS, EQUESTRIANS AND COMMUNITY EFFECTS	10 – 1
11.0	VEHICLE TRAVELLERS	11 – 1
12.0	ROAD DRAINAGE AND THE WATER ENVIRONMENT	12 – 1
13.0	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	13 – 1
14.0	POLICIES AND PLANS	14 – 1
15.0	CONCLUSION RELATING TO IMPACTS	15 – 1
TABLES		
	Determination of Receptor Sensitivity	2 – 2
2.2	Determination of Impact Magnitude	2 – 2
2.3	Impact Significance Categories	2 – 3
2.4	Determination of Impact Significance	2 – 4
3.1	Summary of Key Scoping Responses	3 – 1
3.2	Summary of Consultees and Comments	3 – 7
4.1	Objective Concentrations of Air Pollutants.	4 – 3
4.2	Determination of Receptor Sensitivity	4 – 4
4.3	Determination of Impact Magnitude (EPUK)	4 – 5
4.4	Determination of Impact Magnitude (DMRB)	4 – 5
4.5	Background Concentrations in 2011	4 – 6





CONTENTS PAG	GE	Page No
4.6	Properties within 200m of the Existing Alignment	4 – 7
4.7	Properties within 100m of the Proposed Alignment	4 – 8
4.8	Representative Properties	4 – 9
4.9	Traffic Information	4 – 9
4.10	Air Quality Assessment	4 – 10
4.11	Air Quality Assessment Summary (Do-Something 2012)	4 – 10
4.12	Assessment of Impact Magnitude	4 – 11
4.13	Air Quality – Impact Significance	4 – 11
5.1	Criteria for Assessing Historic Landscape Sensitivity	5 – 2
5.2	Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Impact on Historic Landscape	5 – 3
5.3	Criteria for Assessing Sensitivity of Historic Buildings	5 – 4
5.4	Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Impact on Historic Buildings	5 – 4
5.5	Criteria for Assessing Archaeological Remains Sensitivity	5 – 5
5.6	Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Impact on Archaeological Remains	5 – 5
5.7	Cultural Heritage Features within 300m	5 – 7
5.8	Cultural Heritage Sites: Distance to Scheme	5 – 8
5.9	Summary of Impacts on Cultural Heritage Features	5 – 10
5.10	Summary of Residual Impacts on Cultural Heritage Features	5 – 12
6.1	Determination of Receptor Sensitivity	6 – 2
6.2	Determination of Impact Magnitude	6 – 2
6.3	Summary of Impact Assessment	6 – 8
6.4	Summary of Residual Impact Assessment	6 – 12
7.1	Criteria for Assessing the Sensitivity of Visual Receptors	7 – 8
7.2	Magnitude of Impact on Visual Receptors	7 – 8
7.3	Summary of Impacts on Landscape	7 – 24
7.4	Summary of Visual Impacts	7 – 30
7.5	Summary of Residual Landscape Impact Assessment	7 – 37
7.6	Summary of Residual Visual Impact Assessment	7 – 38
8.1	Determination of Sensitivity of Land	8 – 3
8.2	Determination of Impact Magnitude on Land	8 – 4
8.3	Private and Commercial Property Land Take	8 – 7
8.4	Development Land Take	8 – 7





CONTENTS PAGE	<u>:</u>	Page No
8.5	Agricultural Land Take	8 – 8
8.6	Agricultural Land Impact Significance	8 – 9
8.7	Land Take Required	8 – 9
8.8	Earthwork Quantities	8 – 10
8.9	Agricultural Land Take Required	8 – 13
8.10	Summary of Impact Assessment	8 – 14
8.11	Residual Impact Assessment	8 – 15
9.1	Sound Levels of Common Sources	9 – 1
9.2	Night time Hourly Traffic Flows	9 – 7
9.3	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Noise Levels	9 – 8
9.4	Determination of Receptor Sensitivity	9 – 9
9.5	Criteria for Classification of Magnitude of Noise Impact in the Long Term	9 – 9
9.6	Criteria for Classification of Magnitude of Noise Impact in the Short Term	9 – 9
9.7	Noise Sensitive Receptors	9 – 10
9.8	Sound Levels Experienced by Receptors - Do-Minimum (DM) scenario in baseline year (BY) compared against Do-Minimum scenario in the future assessment year (FY)	9 – 14
9.9	Long-term traffic noise reporting table for simple and detailed assessment (DMRB Assessment Table A1.2) Sound Levels Experienced by Receptors - Do-Minimum	9 – 15
9.10	scenario in baseline year compared against Do-Something scenario in the baseline year	9 – 16
9.11	Short-term traffic noise reporting table for simple and detailed assessment (DMRB Assessment Table A1.1) Sound Levels Experienced by Receptors - Do-Minimum	9 – 17
9.12	scenario in baseline year compared against Do-Something scenario in the future assessment year	9 – 18
9.13	Long-term traffic noise reporting table for simple and detailed assessment (DMRB Assessment Table A1.2)	9 – 19
9.14	Traffic Noise Nuisance Reporting Table for Detailed Assessments (DMRB Assessment Table A1.3)	9 – 20
9.15	Impacts of the Proposed Scheme in the Short Term	9 – 21
9.16	Noise – Impacts of Proposed Scheme in the Long Term	9 – 22
9.17	Dwellings within 40m	9 – 23
9.18	Traffic Airborne Vibration Nuisance Reporting Table for Detailed Assessments (DMRB Table A1.4)	9 – 23
10.1	Sensitivity of Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects	10 – 3
10.2	Magnitude of Impact on Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects	10 – 4
10.3	Non-Motorised User Movements	10 – 5
10.4	Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects Impact significance(Construction)	10 – 7





CONTENTS PA	AGE	Page No
10.5	Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects Impact significance(Post Construction)	10 – 8
11.1	Driver Stress	11 – 2
11.2	Criteria for Assessing Sensitivity of Views from the Road	11 – 3
11.3	Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Impact on Vehicle Travellers	11 – 3
11.4	Vehicle Travellers Impact Significance During Construction	11 – 8
11.5	Traffic Information	11 – 9
11.6	Vehicle Travellers Post Construction Impact Significance	11 – 9
12.1	Determination of Receptor Sensitivity	12 – 4
12.2	Determination of Impact Magnitude on Surface Water	12 – 5
12.3	Determination of Impact Magnitude on Groundwater	12 – 6
12.4	Determination of Impact Significance	12 – 7
12.5	Summary of Impacts During Construction without Mitigation	12 – 12
12.6	Groundwater Assessment	12 – 15
12.7	Summary of Impacts Post Construction without Mitigation	12 – 16
12.8	Impacts During Construction with Mitigation	12 – 18
12.9	Summary of Residual Impacts	12 – 19
13.1	Determination of Receptor Sensitivity	13 – 2
13.2	Determination of Impact Magnitude	13 – 2
13.3	Geological Deposits	13 – 3
13.4	BGS Recorded Mineral Sites	13 – 4
13.5	Contemporary Trade Directory Entries	13 – 5
13.6	Peat Management Plan	13 – 8
13.7	Summary of Geology and Soils Impacts	13 – 10
13.8	Summary of Geology and Soils Impacts with Mitigation	13 – 12
14.1	Impacts and Compatibility with A737 Proposed Re-alignment with Plans and Policies	14 – 10
15.1	Cumulative Effects Significance Categories	15 – 5
15.2	Summary of Cumulative Effects	15 – 6
FIGURES		
7.1	Landscape Character Areas of Ayrshire	7 – 11
7.2	Landscape Study Areas	7 – 11





CONTENTS PAGE		Page No	
PHOTOGRAPHS			
7.1	View to North west of Village	7 – 14	
7.2	View to North from 1 The Den	7 – 14	
7.3	View of Cottage Opposite 27 The Den	7 – 14	
7.4	View into Village from the West	7 – 14	
7.5	View 5 looking from N0.22 The Den in a north easterly direction	7 – 16	
7.6	View 6 looking from No.29 The Den in a north easterly direction	7 – 17	
7.7	View 7 looking from No.27, The Den in a south westerly direction	7 – 17	
7.8	View 8 looking from Meadowhead farm in a southerly direction, 25a can be seen to the right	7 – 17	
7.9	View 9 looking from 25a The Den in a southerly direction	7 – 18	
7.10	View 10 looking from 18-20 The Den north over the A737 to No. 27 and No. 29 The Den	7 – 18	
7.11	View 12 looking from No. 1 The Den in a north westerly direction	7 – 19	
7.12	View 14 looking in a north easterly direction from Fernside	7 – 19	
7.13	View 15 looking in an easterly direction from The Graze Restaurant	7 – 20	
11.1	Views looking north from the scheme toward the Renfrewshire Hills	11 – 4	
11.2	Showing right bend in the distance at the start of the scheme	11 – 5	
11.3	View of the left hand bend (looking south toward the start point of the scheme)	11 – 5	
11.4	View through the settlement of The Den	11 – 6	
11.5	View looking toward the northern most point of the existing road blind right bend in the distance	11 – 7	
12.1	Surface Water drainage ditch adjacent to Auchengree Road	12 – 8	
APPENDICES			
A	Alternatives Previously Considered	A 1	
В	Consultation Responses	B1	
С	Air Quality Assessments	C 1	
D1	Ecological Surveys	D1	
D2	Bird Survey	D2	
D3	Amphibian Survey	D3	
D4	Phase 1 Habitat Survey	D4	
D5	SNH Consultation	D5	
D6	Assessment of the Implications on European Sites	D6	





CONTENTS PAGE		Page No
Е	Visual Impact Schedule	E1
F1	Noise Survey Report	F1
F2	Predicted Noise Levels	F2
G	Non-Motorised User Survey Analysis	G 1
Н	Coal Mining Report (The Coal Authority, 2007)	H1

DRAWINGS

DRAWINGS	
10/SW/0901/037/013 Rev H	General Layout
10/SW/0901/037/026 Rev B	Landscape Layout
10/SW/0901/037/101 Rev A	Location Plan
10/SW/0901/037/102 Rev A	Extent of Scheme
10/SW/0901/037/112 Rev A	Utility Drawing
10/SW/0901/037/201 Rev A	Environmental – Air Quality Bands and Cultural Heritage Features
10/SW/0901/037/202 Rev A	Environmental – Ecology and Nature Conservation
10/SW/0901/037/203 Rev A	Environmental – Noise Measurement Locations
10/SW/0901/037/204 Rev A	Environmental – Noise and Vibration Study Areas
10/SW/0901/037/205 Rev A	Environmental – Non-Motorised Users Movements
10/SW/0901/037/207 Rev B	Environmental – Planning Applications
10/SW/0901/037/212 Rev A	Visual Impact Drawing
10/SW/0901/037/213 Rev A	Environmental Noise Receptors Existing Alignment
10/SW/0901/037/214 Rev A	Environmental Noise Receptors Proposed Alignment
10/SW/0901/037/215	Environmental Watercourses
10/SW/0901/037/216	Environmental Land Use
10/SW/0901/037/217	Environmental Drainage Layout – 1 of 2
10/SW/0901/037/218	Environmental Drainage Layout – 2 of 2
10/SW/0901/037/219	Noise Level Difference with Do-minimum 2012 and Do-something 2027
10/SW/0901/037/220	Noise Level Difference with Do-minimum 2012 and Do-something 2027 Overview
10/SW/0901/037/221	Noise Level Difference with Do-minimum 2012 and Do-something 2012
10/SW/0901/037/222	Noise Level Difference with Do-minimum 2012 and Do-something 2012 Overview