

A6.3 Summary of Key Issues

1.1.1 A summary of the key environmental input provided by consultees through the consultation process described in Chapter 6 (Consultation and Scoping) is presented below. A full list of consultees is provided in Appendix A6.1 with a summary of the information provided.

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response
BAA	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighted the risks associated with landscape planting and bird hazards in the vicinity of Edinburgh Airport. 	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions were held with BAA in order to develop landscape mitigation so as not to compromise safety at Edinburgh Airport by increasing bird hazards. The landscape assessment is presented in Chapter 12 (Landscape).
Dalgety Bay Sailing Club	<p><u>Disruption Due to Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that although the sailing activities of the club are unlikely to be significantly affected, access to and from the club may be affected during construction. 	<p><u>Disruption Due to Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues relating to the construction phase are presented in Chapter 19 (Disruption Due to Construction) and the Code of Construction Practice (Appendix A19.1). With regards to access during construction, the Contractor will consult further with local communities and businesses to inform a Traffic Management Plan.
Fife Coast and Countryside Trust	<p><u>Ecology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that red squirrel surveys should be undertaken. 	<p><u>Ecology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Red squirrel surveys were undertaken as part of the ecology assessment. Visual and hair-tube surveys provided no evidence of red squirrel presence. (Chapter 10: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology s10.3 Baseline Conditions).
Fife Council	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed noise monitoring locations were representative and no additional locations were required. Highlighted the need to mitigate construction noise effectively and expected a similar approach in terms of restrictions to that adopted by City of Edinburgh Council. 	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the noise assessment are presented in Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration). Taken into consideration as part of Disruption Due to Construction assessment (Chapter 19).
	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>General agreement on the approach to the air quality assessment.</p>	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Results of the air quality assessment are presented in Chapter 15 (Air Quality).</p>
	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern regarding the possibility of losing the off-road segregated path and NCR1 along the east side of the A90 connecting to the Forth Road Bridge. Recommended that a path of 2m minimum width should be maintained. Noted that disabled groups actively use the Forth Road Bridge and access should be maintained. Forth and Tay Ramblers should be contacted to confirm access points. Informed of the existence of paths gained through core paths plan consultation and provided advice relating the approach to assessment. 	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 2.5m path for use by NCR1 has been incorporated into the design and is assessed in Chapter 17 (Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects) and shown on Figure 17.3a (Potential Impacts on Paths and Proposed Mitigation). Forth and Tay Ramblers were included in consultation process. All points noted and taken into consideration as part of the Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects assessment (Chapter 17).

Forth Replacement Crossing
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A6.3: Summary of Key Issues

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response
	<u>Policies and Plans</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that the likely increase in residential land allocations in the southern Fife region may lead to increases in the volume of commuters using the existing and proposed bridges. 	<u>Policies and Plans</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forecast planning allocations provided by the local authorities are taken into account in the traffic model (refer to DMRB Stage 3 Report Part C: Traffic and Economic Assessment).
Fisheries Research Services (now Marine Scotland)	<u>Water Environment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed that a licence would be required for disposal of dredged material (and also potentially for dredging activities due to changes in legislation). General agreement from SEPA, FRS (now Marine Scotland) and SNH on the coastal modelling proposals. 	<u>Water Environment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A method statement for the dredging will be included in the FEPA Licence application for submission to Marine Scotland by the Contractor, for prior approval before commencement of the dredging. This will include details of any monitoring (such as turbidity monitoring) considered necessary (Chapter 9 Water Environment).
Friends of the Earth	<u>Air Quality</u> Concern regarding increase in traffic and greenhouse gas emissions.	<u>Air Quality</u> Impacts on air quality are assessed in Chapter 15 (Air Quality).
Historic Scotland	<u>Cultural Heritage (additional sites)</u> In addition to the sites identified as part of the EIA, Historic Scotland requested the following additional sites be included in the assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aberdour Castle (Site 1285) Dunfermline Abbey (Site 1289) Blackness Castle (Site 1286) Hopetoun House Viewing Platform (Site 1290) House of Binns Tower (Site 1287) Inchcolm Abbey (Site 1288) Hound Point (Site 1291) Dundas Castle Keep (Site 849) 	<u>Cultural Heritage (additional sites)</u> These additional sites were included in the assessment, the results of which are presented in Chapter 14 (Cultural Heritage).
	<u>Cultural Heritage (Designed Landscapes)</u> Historic Scotland expect the ES to deal with issues relating to direct impacts on the Designed Landscape and impacts on the setting of the various listed buildings discussed during the site visit to Dundas Castle Designed Landscape.	<u>Cultural Heritage (Designed Landscapes)</u> The impact of the proposed scheme on the settings of listed buildings at Dundas Castle Designed Landscape and other sites in the study area are assessed in Chapter 14 (Cultural Heritage).
	<u>Cultural Heritage (General)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that a marine archaeological review should be undertaken. Historic Scotland is satisfied that the route and its design and mitigation features do not significantly impact on the historic environment and therefore they do not have significant concerns regarding the proposed scheme. 	<u>Cultural Heritage (General)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A study of the marine geophysics has been undertaken by marine archaeologists and the results of this study are provided in Appendix A14.1 (Marine Geophysics Assessment). Comments taken into consideration as part of the Cultural Heritage assessment (Chapter 14).
North Queensferry Heritage Trust (NQHT)	<u>Cultural Heritage</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested the lighthouse on Beamer Rock should be dismantled and rebuilt at an alternative location. Requested that the Impact of local stone extraction be considered. Suggested construction compound in the north is located to the west of the sewage 	<u>Cultural Heritage</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a result of consultation with NQHT, it is proposed that the lighthouse (beacon) is subject to topographic survey, recording, and dismantling. It will then be stored in a suitable location, leaving open the possibility to re-erect the beacon at a suitable site later if appropriate. The impact on Beamer Rock Beacon is assessed in Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage (Site 426).

Forth Replacement Crossing
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A6.3: Summary of Key Issues

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response
	<p>works, avoiding St Margaret's Marsh..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concerns regarding air quality impacts in North Queensferry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Contractor will be responsible for sourcing material for the proposed scheme. It is the intention that the cut and fill balance will reduce the amount of additional material required where possible. • A 'satellite' construction compound will be located in the north, adjacent to the Rosyth Strategic Link Road, avoiding St Margaret's Marsh. Impacts as a result of construction compounds are assessed in Chapter 19 (Disruption Due to Construction). • Air quality impacts are assessed in Chapter 15 (Air Quality).
National Museums Scotland	<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concern regarding the impact of the proposed temporary construction access route at Society Road on the collections held at Port Edgar Barracks. 	<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions with the National Museums Scotland with regards to Port Edgar Barracks are ongoing. Transport Scotland hope to agree an acceptable solution through further consultation.
National Trust for Scotland (NTS)	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concern that the proposed scheme will have serious environmental, heritage and landscape impacts and it is therefore essential to keep these to a minimum and mitigated through the design and construction process and a robust environmental impact assessment. • NTS are encouraged by the commitment of the project team to gather baseline information and undertake stakeholder consultation. 	<p><u>General</u></p> <p>Comments noted and taken into consideration as part of the environmental impact assessment.</p>
Queensferry and District Community Council (QDCC)	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested that human environmental impacts such as visual amenity, noise, changes in land use, land take and socio-economic impacts should be considered. 	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impacts listed by QDCC are addressed in the following ES chapters: Chapter 7 (Land Use), Chapter 13 (Visual), Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 17 (Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects).
People Friendly Design	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlighted the need for the proposed scheme to be Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant. 	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed scheme is DDA compliant and discussions are ongoing regarding specific provisions. General compliance is included in the assessment of Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects (Chapter 17).
Ramblers Association	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concern that the proposed scheme is not going to have provision for walkers and cyclists. • Raised concern regarding the lack of provision for walkers and cyclists in windy weather. • Highlighted the need to consider impacts of traffic on walkers and cyclists in a much wider area. 	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing Forth Road Bridge will be for the use of public transport (including buses and taxis), pedestrians and cyclists only. • As part of the proposed scheme, the current situation in the event of high winds and closure of the bridge is not expected to change for pedestrians and cyclists. • The assessment for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians extends to 2km either side of the proposed connecting roads and related works. The results of the assessment are presented in Chapter 17 (Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects).
Scottish Badgers	<p><u>Ecology</u></p> <p>Advised that a full badger survey is carried out.</p>	<p><u>Ecology</u></p> <p>Extensive badger surveys have been undertaken as part of the ecology assessment. which is reported in Chapter 10 (Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology). Field surveys did not record any</p>

Forth Replacement Crossing
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A6.3: Summary of Key Issues

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response
		evidence of badger activity within the study area to the north of the Firth of Forth. Badger activity south of the Firth of Forth comprised a total of five social groups and one badger population recorded throughout the study area. A summary of baseline badger data is provided in Chapter 10 (Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology), with detailed baseline information including badger sett and activity location provided in the confidential Appendix A10.5 (Confidential Badger and Otter Information).
Scottish Government - Climate Change & Water Industry Directorate	<u>Water Environment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised of the need to ensure that there is no significant impact on the water environment (both surface and groundwater). All potential pollution risks associated with the proposals and mitigation should be identified. Highlighted the importance of involving SEPA in discussions. 	<u>Water Environment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive discussions have taken place with SEPA throughout the EIA process in order to agree assessment methodology and mitigation measures. The results of the water environment assessment are presented in Chapter 9 (Water Environment).
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)	<u>Ecology (Firth of Forth Ramsar Site, Firth of Forth SPA, Forth Islands SPA, River Teith SAC)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided advice on the scope of the Reports to Inform an Appropriate Assessment (RIAA). 	<u>Ecology (Firth of Forth Ramsar Site, Firth of Forth SPA, Forth Islands SPA, River Teith SAC)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations from SNH were taken into consideration during preparation of the RIAAs.
	<u>Ecology (scope of assessment)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided advice relating to the scope of the ecology assessment, including the approach to assessing the impact on great crested newts. Advised on the need to provide detailed mitigation for European protected species. Generally satisfied with the scope of the ecology assessment. 	<u>Ecology (scope of assessment)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ecology assessment is presented in Chapter 10 (Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology) and Chapter 11 (Estuarine Ecology). Chapter 10 outlines detailed mitigation to reduce the impacts of the proposed scheme on European protected species. The scope of the ecology assessment, which included field survey methods, was agreed through consultation with SNH throughout 2008.
	<u>Ecology (construction)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted the impact of noise and water quality on species such as salmon and lamprey to be of most concern. Informed that the impact of bridge construction on grey and common seals is unlikely to be of major concern but still requires to be assessed and in particular grey seals which are an SAC qualifying species on the Isle of May SAC. Raised concern regarding the potential impacts on roseate terns on Longcraig Island, great crested newts and birds as a result of lighting. Suggested that piling and blasting time constraints are incorporated into the bridge construction programme during sensitive periods. Advised that there should be marine mammal observers on board vessels when construction work such as piling is being carried out. 	<u>Ecology (construction)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact of noise on all fish species is discussed and assessed in Chapter 11 (Estuarine Ecology), the impact of noise specifically on salmon and lamprey is discussed in the River Teith RIAA as both salmon and lamprey are interest features of the SAC. All identified impacts on seals arising from the proposed scheme are discussed in detail and assessed within Chapter 11 (Estuarine Ecology). Lighting levels will be monitored by an Ecological Clerk of Works during construction and lighting will be sensitively designed to reduce light spill. Time constraints for piling are not considered necessary for marine ecology as low noise levels are predicted and this noise will not be spreading across the entire width of the estuary. The Contractor will have to demonstrate that the chosen method will not compromise the integrity of the receptors. Mitigation during construction is provided in Chapter 11 (Estuarine Ecology) and Chapter 19 (Disruption Due to Construction). An Ecological Clerk of Works will be present on site to ensure no marine mammals are in the immediate vicinity when piling begins following periods of inactivity. A marine mammal observer will ensure no mammals are within an exclusion zone surrounding the excavation of

Forth Replacement Crossing
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A6.3: Summary of Key Issues

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response
		Beamer Rock. Mitigation during construction is dealt with in Chapter 11 (Estuarine Ecology) and Chapter 19 (Disruption Due to Construction).
	<u>Ecology (St. Margaret's Marsh SSSI)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed that the central/western area of the site is of higher value than the area south of the sewage treatment works which is of lower value and therefore of less concern. Advised that the treatment of run-off will be a key consideration relative to impacts on St. Margaret's Marsh. • Advised that improved management of the existing habitat is preferable to habitat creation. 	<u>Ecology (St. Margaret's Marsh SSSI)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive consultation with SNH has been undertaken, including discussions on St. Margaret's Marsh SSSI. Impacts on St. Margaret's Marsh SSSI are addressed in Chapter 10 (Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology). • Mitigation proposals were amended to reflect SNH's advice. Further consultation will be undertaken to develop and agree the long term management of St. Margaret's Marsh SSSI between the landowner, Transport Scotland and SNH.
	<u>Ecology and Geology (Ferry Hills SSSI)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advised that any widening will impact on Ferry Hills SSSI. Informed that it was the exposed cutting faces that were notified. • Noted that there are areas where SNH prefer not to have the rock faces covered in wire mesh and would prefer a gentler slope. 	<u>Ecology and Geology (Ferry Hills SSSI)</u> Feedback taken into account in detailing mitigation. Results of the landscape assessment are presented in Chapter 12 (Landscape).
	<u>Landscape and Visual</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed acceptance of the proposed approach and methodology for the landscape and visual assessments. • Agreement was reached on viewpoints for the visual assessment. • Agreed with the approach to mitigation, highlighted the need to avoid minimal roadside planting, embrace the wider landscape context and promote off-site mitigation/sufficient land take. • Stressed the need for reinforcing the local landscape character through appropriate planting/tree alignment. • Advised consulting with BAA regarding landscape mitigation. 	<u>Landscape and Visual</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments taken into consideration as part of the landscape and visual assessments (Chapter 12: Landscape, and Chapter 13: Visual). • Landscape mitigation was agreed with SNH and BAA.
	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> Highlighted the need to take into consideration the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 SPP1, and section 22 of SPP11.	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> Comments taken into consideration as part of the assessment (Chapter 17: Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects Chapter).
SEPA	<u>Water Environment (Hydrology and Flood Risk)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided advice on the design of culverts and the need to avoid increasing the risk of flooding. • Flood risk assessment methodologies were agreed with SEPA. 	<u>Water Environment (Hydrology and Flood Risk)</u> Comments taken into consideration during assessment on hydrology and flood risk (Chapter 9: Water Environment).
	<u>Water Environment (Water Quality and Drainage)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested that an assessment of the drainage options and spillage risk assessment for the Main Crossing is undertaken. • Advised that new highways are to have two to three treatment levels (Sustainable Drainage Systems - SUDS) where possible, taking into consideration land availability and topography, before discharging to a watercourse. 	<u>Water Environment (Water Quality and Drainage)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage principles paper and spillage risk assessment for the Main Crossing was provided to SEPA during the consultation process and their comments taken into consideration during assessment on water environment (Chapter 9 Water Environment). • Comments taken into consideration during drainage design and assessment on water environment (Chapter 9 Water Environment).

Forth Replacement Crossing
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A6.3: Summary of Key Issues

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry SUDS systems such as basins or swales preferable to permanently wet ponds. • Outfall and potential SUDS systems, including detention basin locations, were discussed during meetings with SEPA. 	
	<u>Geomorphology</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of fluvial geomorphology assessment for the proposed scheme was discussed and agreed with SEPA. 	<u>Geomorphology</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments taken into consideration during assessment on fluvial geomorphology (Chapter 9: Water Environment).
	<u>Air Quality</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach to the air quality assessment was agreed with SEPA. 	<u>Air Quality</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of the air quality assessment are presented in Chapter 15 (Air Quality).
	<u>General</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEPA has no objection in principle with realignments, but advised that they would need to be appropriately designed, taking into account watercourse sensitivity including flood risk and geomorphological conditions. • SEPA advised that bridge structures are to be considered first for all new river crossings as they have the least environmental impact. Watercourse crossings should be selected and designed in accordance with best practice available from SEPA's website. • SEPA advised on application requirements for SUDS discharges and engineering works requiring authorisation under the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2005 (CAR). 	<u>General</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taken into consideration during design and assessment of the proposed realignment of Swine Burn (Chapter 9: Water Environment). • Taken into consideration during design of the proposed scheme. The new crossing of Swine Burn has been selected taking account of engineering, environmental and cost considerations in accordance with SEPA guidance. • Activities requiring CAR authorisation and content of CAR applications agreed with SEPA.
SCURL (Scottish Confederation of University & Research Libraries) Special Needs Group	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested that car parks should be provided nearby with adequate space, accessible toilets and ramps onto footpaths across the proposed scheme. Any viewing area should also provide appropriate space and viewing facilities. • Requested that the design should abide with the appropriate guidelines for pavement width/paving and provide decent crossings and appropriate signage. • If public transport is in use it needs to be accessible and provide good online/offline information as to the access features. 	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parks and viewing areas are not considered relevant to the proposed scheme. • There will be no access for pedestrians and cyclists across the proposed scheme. They will continue to use the existing Forth Road Bridge. This is assessed in Chapter 17 (Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects). • The existing Forth Road Bridge will be a dedicated public transport corridor and therefore facilitate public transport movement across the existing bridge.
Scottish Government Rural Directorate	<u>Land Use</u> Advised that the impact on agriculture is considered minimal and therefore they have no objections to the proposed scheme.	<u>Land Use</u> Noted. Impacts on agricultural land are assessed in Chapter 7 (Land Use).
Spokes	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advised that cyclists prefer not to use off-road routes and severance or interruption to routes by new at grade roundabouts or intersections may cause them problems. 	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taken into consideration during design of the proposed scheme. Impacts on cyclists are assessed in Chapter 17 (Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects).
Sustrans	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concern regarding the possibility of losing the off-road segregated path and NCR1 along the east side of the A90 connecting to the Forth Road Bridge. 	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 2.5m path has been incorporated into the design. Impacts on cyclists are assessed in Chapter 17 (Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects).

Forth Replacement Crossing
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A6.3: Summary of Key Issues

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response
	<p>Recommended that a path of 2m minimum width should be maintained, although 3m is preferable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that the diversion of Builyeon Road would be an unacceptable diversion for cyclists, joggers and walkers who use this route from South Queensferry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access for cyclists will be maintained along the realigned Builyeon Road. The impact on cyclists is assessed in Chapter 17.
The City of Edinburgh Council	<p><u>Disruption Due to Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested that all movements of construction traffic be limited to major roads and if possible temporary haul roads. No objection to the proposed construction compound located west of South Queensferry. 	<p><u>Disruption Due to Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further consultation will be undertaken by the Contractor who will be responsible for preparing a Traffic Management Plan. The locations of the construction sites are presented in Figure 19.1 (Disruption Due to Construction).
	<p><u>Water Environment (Hydrology and Flood Risk)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that runoff rates from developed areas should be restricted to pre-development Greenfield runoff rates. Requested consideration of peak flows from new hardstanding areas and when these flows exceed the capacity of the drainage attenuation system (if the flows cannot be treated via a SUDS pond). 	<p><u>Water Environment (Hydrology and Flood Risk)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road drainage discharge to inland watercourses has been restricted to pre-development flow rates as part of the proposed scheme. The capacity of the system was checked against the different design events in the post-development situation. In the majority of cases, the system copes well in locations that issues were identified. Mitigation is proposed in the ES and further analysis of mitigating any potential issues will be provided during the detailed design stage. Further information can be found in Appendix A9.2 (Surface Water Hydrology).
	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approach to the air quality assessment was agreed with The City of Edinburgh Council. 	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results of the air quality assessment are presented in Chapter 15 (Air Quality).
	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stressed the importance of good public liaison in order to avoid noise complaints during construction and the need to follow the Council's guidance leaflet. 	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Contractor will undertake further consultation with local communities. The requirement for public liaison is written into the Code of Construction Practice.
	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended that provision, and preferably 2-way movements, is provided for cyclists to link from Ferrytoll to the Forth Road Bridge. 	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision for maintaining the cycle route (NCR1) from Ferrytoll to the Forth Road Bridge is incorporated into the proposed scheme design, and is reported in Chapter 17 (Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects). Figure 17.3a shows the proposed movements for cyclists with the proposed scheme in place. Cyclists would be able to utilise two routes from Ferrytoll to the Forth Road Bridge: one on a 2.5m path on the eastern side of the A90; and one using the realigned B981 and new ramp to the western slip road. Additionally, a crossing point will be provided to the north of the Forth Road Bridge which will link these two routes.
Visit Scotland	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested that all routes, in particular walking and cycleways, be incorporated into the Main Crossing. Advised that consultation should also be carried out with the Scottish Rights of Way Society (Scotways) and The City of Edinburgh Council access officers. 	<p><u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be no access for pedestrians and cyclists across the proposed scheme as they will be able to continue to use the existing Forth Road Bridge. Chapter 17 presents the assessment for Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects. Scotways and The City of Edinburgh Council access officers have been consulted with as part of the consultation process.

Forth Replacement Crossing
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A6.3: Summary of Key Issues

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response
West Lothian Bridleways Association	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informed that they do not have any major concerns as no equestrian routes appear to be affected. However, should any routes be altered, there is a need to consider the impact on equestrians. 	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No equestrian routes would be affected as a result of the proposed scheme (Chapter 17: Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects).
West Lothian Council	<u>Noise</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stressed that it is very important to keep local authorities involved with the construction process. 	<u>Noise</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Comment taken into consideration as part of assessment in Chapter 19 (Disruption Due to Construction assessment).
	<u>Disruption Due to Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested that the Contractor keeps the local authorities informed of what roads will be closed. 	<u>Disruption Due to Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further consultation will be undertaken by the Contractor who will be responsible for preparing a Traffic Management Plan.
	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested that the proposed footpath on the A904 between Echline Junction and the B924 Bo'ness Road be extended over the new mainline overbridge to allow to tie-in Newton to South Queensferry footpath in the future if required. 	<u>Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The path referred to will be maintained with a minor diversion at the A904 Junction (Chapter 17: Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects).
WOSAS	<u>Cultural Heritage</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that the proposed scheme would have impacts on the setting of Hopetoun Estate. Indicated that impacts on West Lothian Council area would be minimal. 	<u>Cultural Heritage</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The residual impact on the setting of Hopetoun House Designed Landscape is assessed to be of Slight significance. Further information on setting impacts is presented in Chapter 14 (Cultural Heritage).