



# Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

**Meeting Location:** Kirkliston Community Centre

**Meeting Date / Time:** 1<sup>st</sup> September 2011, 7pm

**Subject:** Community Forum (Junction 1a)

**Participants**

**Community Representatives**

Henryk Zukowski (Kirkliston CC)

**Transport Scotland - Employers**

**Delivery Team (EDT)**

Lawrence Shackman

Keavy O'Neill

John Watt

David Burt

Allan Buchan (c/o Big Partnership)

**John Sisk and Roadbridge (SRB)**

Seamus O'Brien

Val Fox

Paraic McCarthy

**Forth Crossing Bridge**

**Constructors (FCBC)**

Carlo Germani

Ewen Macdonell

Derek Chambers

**John Graham (Dromore) Ltd**

Richard Docherty

**Observers**

Evelyn Woollen (Newton CC)

Martin Gallagher (QDCC)

Bert Scott (BRIGS/Crammond

Residents Association)

**Date of Distribution** 25 October 2011



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

Notes	Action
<b>Meeting chaired by Lawrence Shackman</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>Overview of the Forth Replacement Crossing project and Community Forum objectives.</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction to John Graham (Dromore) Ltd (Fife ITS)</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Overview of Contract</b>
	<p>Richard Docherty (RD), Fife ITS CLO, provided summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Works on M90/A90 extend from Admiralty – Junction 3 Halbeath</li> <li>- Approximately 18 ITS gantries will be erected</li> <li>- Embankments next to each gantry will be designed to support future maintenance activities – e.g. providing paths and parking for maintenance vehicles</li> <li>- The M90 southbound hardshoulder will be upgraded to incorporate a bus lane to complement the Forth Road Bridge public transport facility</li> <li>- A priority will be to ensure safe traffic flow with a phased approach to traffic management</li> </ul>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>3 month look-ahead programme</b>
	<p>RD apologised that no hard copy of the 3 month <b>look-ahead programme</b> was available for the meeting as the design and construction programme was being reviewed by Transport Scotland (TS), but a copy will be published on the FRC website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Works programme is scheduled to start in September 2011, subject to approvals and consent, with completion in Summer 2012</li> <li>- Consultation is taking place and consents are being sought from relevant bodies</li> <li>- Sampling and investigation works are taking place to inform the design process. This includes some investigatory works between Halbeath and Admiralty from 5<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> September which will require traffic management. RD emphasised that this is preliminary work and does not mean the full contract construction works has begun.</li> <li>- The baseline study for noise and vibration is underway – a specialist noise consultant has been appointed</li> </ul> <p>As CLO, RD is based at the temporary Contact &amp; 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. Copies of the EMP were previously made available by RD who</p>



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	requested comments by 5pm Tuesday 9th September. Comments to be emailed direct to RD and copied to FRC email enquiries.	
<b>2.3</b>	<p><b>Q&amp;A</b></p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ asked for clarification if new gantries would be located close to old gantries?  <b>A:</b> LS confirmed that all existing gantries within the contract site will be removed.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ requested details regarding programme timings.  <b>A:</b> RD explained that timings were being adjusted to accommodate requests from Park Lea residents to begin works near their location at an earlier date. Work will begin in September, subject to approvals. Traffic management, site establishment and mine consolidation works will take place prior to gantry foundation works. Work could be taking place anywhere in the corridor at any one time. Gantries will be erected in the Spring of 2012.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ asked for location of site compound.  <b>A:</b> RD confirmed that the site compound is being established at Belleknowes Industrial Estate, near Admiralty Junction.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contract)</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<p><b>3 month look ahead programme</b></p> <p>CG outlined current activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A 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.</li> <li>- 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)</li> <li>- Current work is still focusing on design and there has been some work on procurement – e.g. steel for the deck and foundation materials for the caissons.</li> <li>- Site investigation related to road and marine works is progressing, i.e. geotechnical and geophysical studies</li> <li>- A trial blast is due to take place on 2nd September as the basis for the main blasting which is likely to commence in October/ November.</li> </ul> <p>Subject to approvals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The main construction compound to be based within the Forth Ports site (contains workshops, concrete batching plant, materials storage etc)</li> <li>- 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. This will possibly include a</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	<p>small area for pre-cast works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Approvals are being sought for the haul road to be constructed to access the south viaduct</li> <li>- The first significant signs of work is likely to be removal of the beamer rock lighthouse at the end of October or early November, followed by excavations on the site</li> <li>- Major works will begin in the first quarter of 2012.</li> </ul> <p>LS highlighted that extended discussions took place at the South Community Forum the previous week and that copy of the minutes would be issued to HS for background and to circulate to Kirkliston CC members.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ asked for clarification if temporary bunds would be used to mitigate construction works?  <b>A:</b> CG confirmed most would be permanent. EM confirmed some temporary barriers based on a 3 metre high fence would be erected prior to site clearance.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Completed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noted</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Introduction to John Sisk and Roadbridge (Junction 1a)</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	<p><b>Overview of contract</b></p> <p>Seamus O'Brien and Val Fox provided a presentation of the contract and immediate works.</p> <p>TS to publish presentation on the FRC website</p> <p>The M9 Junction 1a works will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upgrade of existing junction</li> <li>- Widening of the M9 motorway to facilitate extra lanes</li> <li>- Construction of a new bridge, new slip roads, culverts and ITS gantries.</li> <li>- Realignment of the Swine Burn</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">Noted</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TS</p>
<b>4.2</b>	<p><b>3 month look ahead programme</b></p> <p>Current activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed design is progressing on all aspects</li> <li>- Statutory consultation, including with land owners, is underway</li> <li>- Noise and vibration monitoring plans will be implemented soon</li> <li>- Structural surveys have taken place at Kirkland Park Grove – only house No 13 remains to be surveyed.</li> </ul> <p>September activities will include:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Noted</p>



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site compound will be established</li> <li>- Fence erection, site clearance and earthworks will begin.</li> </ul>	
4.3	<p><b>Q&amp;A</b></p> <p><b>Q:</b> MG asked if overnight closures were required when gantries are installed. <b>A:</b> SO advised that plans are currently being reviewed, but it is hoped that on the M9 Spur for example, installation will take place during weekend nights using rolling road blocks.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ highlighted difficulties in reviewing the draft Environmental Management Plan as it made references to contents in the Environmental Report. <b>A:</b> SO agreed to supply copy of the Environmental Report volumes 1 and 5.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ queried location of noise receptors as there were concerns that appropriate numbers would not be positioned sufficiently far enough away from the site. HZ asked for clarification that noise receptors would be positioned in a 300m perimeter zone as this had been the basis for previous studies. <b>A:</b> LS confirmed original noise monitoring was undertaken for the Environmental Statement to support calibration of models.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ asked for comparison of ES noise receptor locations compared to contract receptor locations. <b>A:</b> TS/SRB to supply details. <b>(See Associated Papers)</b></p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ queried if the ratings used to specify the 68-75 decibel level limits were set at high, medium or low (frequency) levels as this did not seem to be specified in the Environmental Report? <b>A:</b> TS to confirm frequency levels. <b>(See Associated Papers)</b></p> <p>LS explained that the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) sets the noise limits to which the contractor has to adhere. The Noise Liaison Working Group will ensure best practical means are employed to operate below these limits.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ confirmed traffic management 'flyers' had not been received. <b>A:</b> SO apologised and confirmed copy had been left in post offices.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ query requirement for temporary traffic lights <b>A:</b> SO confirmed approval was being sought from City of Edinburgh Council along with application to reduce speed limit on Overton / Newmains Road to 30mph as compound access will be taken from this road.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Questions regarding how far in advance such a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) is applied for and how much</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>SRB</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS/SRB</p> <p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	<p>advance notice is provided to the general public. Forum members understood this to be 21 days. Request that contractor makes Forum members aware of applications as previously City of Edinburgh Council officials have not alerted Kirkliston CC in sufficient time to advise local people. Again highlighted concerns that if road closures were planned, traffic would have to divert through Kirkliston.</p> <p><b>A:</b> SO re-emphasised that rolling road blocks were being considered and no closures of the M9 or diversions through Kirkliston were planned. Plans will be considered in detail by the Traffic Management Working Group and SO committed to provide significant advance notice if this were to change,</p> <p><b><u>Post Meeting Note:</u></b> The Contractor must provide 14 days notice of works starting.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ highlighted a need to know about the outcomes of working group meetings as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>A:</b> LS emphasised that details would be fed into the 3 month look ahead programmes published on the project website so that Community representatives could view upcoming events and feedback any concerns as soon as possible. Traffic management information would be broadcast 2 weeks in advance using a range of media.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ highlighted the need for advanced information to pre-empt local people approaching the community council.</p> <p><b>A:</b> VF emphasised commitment to provide advance notification in sufficient time. This would include ensuring letter drops are done and that they can be approached direct.</p> <p>LS said that any direct approach should first be through the CLOs and Contact &amp; Education Centre.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ asked if a haul road from the M9 Spur southbound to the B9080 would be constructed?</p> <p><b>A:</b> SO confirmed haul access roads to/from the M9 Spur will be constructed on both sides (ref: SA8-SA7 / SA4 – SA3)</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ highlighted concerns regarding dust/noise created during construction of the original M9 Spur – in particular that caused by shale transported from bings.</p> <p><b>A:</b> SO confirmed there would be very small quantities of shale required on this project compared to original construction of the M9 Spur. LS confirmed that widening of the spur would generally be on the west side, furthest away from homes, and work would not be as intrusive as the original spur construction works - dust, noise and vibration monitoring will also be in place.</p>	
		Noted
		Noted
		Noted
		Noted





## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	<p><b>Q:</b> HZ queried the route of which any shale would be delivered. <b>A:</b> SO highlighted blue line on map.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ queried the levels of construction traffic through Kirkliston. <b>A:</b> SO confirmed construction traffic was not permitted through Kirkliston other than to deliver plant and equipment for the site compound. Once established the restrictions in the CoCP must be adhered to. SO to consult with Kirkliston CC regarding delivery of site compound materials.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ suggested JS/R team consult with the head teacher, at the local primary school at King Edwards Way re relevant works that might affect the school. <b>A:</b> SO agreed.</p> <p>SO requested Forum members feedback direct on the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). LS asked that members also cc the FRC email address.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Questions re Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) at Kirklands Park Grove. Residents have been advised by TS that they are due compensation, but there are two conflicting titles, one which gives residents ownership and one which does not. Separate legal advice sought by some residents suggests they are not due compensation. A formal complaint has been sent to the Registers of Scotland <b>A:</b> DB confirmed that the GVD was implemented on the 9<sup>th</sup> of June and access rights obtained from mid July. A number of residents have submitted compensation claims. Compensation will be assessed by the District Valuer. All expert advice provided to TS state residents are joint owners and entitled to compensation.</p> <p>DB advised that in this particular situation the compensation would be divided equally amongst all 77 owners as they jointly own Plot 606 and therefore the compensation sums are likely to be very small. It is hoped that a solution could be sought without resorting to significant legal fees for residents.</p> <p>Due to complexity of the conflicting titles, DB will consider whether it is possible to provide a formal letter agreeing that there would be no reclaiming of compensation by the Scottish Ministers if it came to light that only Kirklands Park Grove residents owned plot 606. <b>See Associated Papers</b></p> <p>HZ to forward legal information obtained for DB to re-check status of ownership with specialists.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ asked if trees would be felled behind Kirkland Park Grove as there were concerns re impact on drainage.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>SRB</p> <p>Community reps</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>HZ</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	--



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	A: PM confirmed that if plans indicate these are protected they will not be felled.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Terms of Reference</b>	
	<p>LS confirmed minor amendments had been requested at the previous south Community Forum and asked that any future changes be conducted by correspondence. KON to update and reissue w/c 5th September.</p> <p>HZ highlighted feedback from local people who may want to form their own groups and be represented at the committee.</p> <p>LS requested that HZ highlight to them that ideally representation should come from Kirkliston CC and that these forums were designed to cover strategic issues rather than individual issues/complaints which should be, in the first instance, directed to the relevant CLO. Information would be provided to local people on a regular basis.</p> <p>EW stressed the importance of Community Councils receiving timely information in order to reassure local residents and help avoid such request for representation.</p> <p>MG highlighted discussions with Ross Hornsey regarding potential use of social media channels to provide information.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>6</b>	<b>Engaging with Communities: Construction</b>	
	LS confirmed deadline for comments was the 31st August and Version 1.0 would be published on the FRC web on 2nd September. This did not preclude future revisions based on discussions.	TS
<b>7</b>	<b>Meet the Contractor event</b>	
<b>7.1</b>	<b>3 month look ahead programme</b>	
	<p>LS outlined the format for these public events - 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&amp;A session.</p> <p>LS advised that publicity would include local press advertising, information on the FRC website and distribution of the latest FRC newsletter.</p> <p>MG confirmed QDCC would publicise through social media.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>14 September 2011; Queensferry Hotel, North Queensferry</b>	





## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	As 7.1	Noted
<b>7.3</b>	<p><b>Q&amp;A</b></p> <p>KON 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
<b>7.4</b>	<p><b>Meet the buyer</b></p> <p>LS confirmed successful meet the buyer event had taken place with 100+ companies attending.</p>	Noted
<b>8</b>	<b>Community issues</b>	
<b>8.1</b>	<p><b>Report and copies of sound tests carried out in Kirkliston area.</b></p> <p>SO confirmed 30 locations are being used to establish the baseline levels for day, evening and night-time.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> EW asked if baseline will be published on the FRC website. <b>A:</b> Yes, once collated.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> EW expressed concerns that working group information would be published 2 months in arrears to enable validation – would this also include baseline information? <b>A:</b> LS confirmed the intention was to publish such information a month in arrears or faster.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> EW asked if baseline information be provided as soon as available. <b>A:</b> LS highlighted requirement to process data.</p> <p>Also covered as part of Q&amp;A – see section 4.3</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>8.2</b>	<p><b>Land and Compensation</b></p> <p>Covered as part of Q&amp;A – see section 4.3</p>	Noted
<b>8.3</b>	<p><b>Compliance with Best Practice</b></p> <p>Covered as part of Q&amp;A – see section 4.3</p>	Noted
<b>8.4</b>	<b>Protection and use of the proposed haul road from Stirling Road (B9080) to construction sites</b>	



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	Covered as part of Q&A – see section 4.3	Noted
<b>8.5</b>	<b>Road haulage / site compound and the use of existing roads through Kirkliston</b>  Covered as part of Q&A – see section 4.3	Noted
<b>8.6</b>	<b>Use of hunters bing</b>  Covered as part of Q&A – see section 4.3	Noted
<b>8.7</b>	<b>Security and times of operation of the construction compound</b>  PM confirmed 24/7 security presence will be provided when the compound is not in operation. The hours of operation are detailed in the CoCP.  <b>Q:</b> HZ asked if there would be Sunday working? <b>A:</b> PM said no. There may be Saturday works, any works undertaken would be in line with the CocP.  HZ highlighted problems with local thefts. PM thanked HM for drawing attention to this and confirmed there would be security on site.	Noted  Noted  Noted
<b>8.8</b>	<b>Noise / dust levels in relation to construction works</b>  LS emphasised dust would be monitored during construction and that there would be some benefits from significant works being in cutting.  HZ highlighted existing poor air quality levels faced by Kirkliston area – one of worst in Edinburgh area and emphasised the need to avoid making this worse by exceeding agreed levels.  SO emphasised SRB was aware of the commitments and the monitoring would establish a baseline  HZ highlighted existing noise problems from M9 and suggested this may be due to increased traffic levels. LS suggested traffic levels could be assessed through the Scottish Roads traffic database.  HZ highlighted problem with 7 local construction sites including 700 houses and, next year, the Dalmeny Cord rail project. LS clarified that the Dalmeny project will not begin until 2014, after the M9 Junction 1a upgrade completes. MG highlighted presentation on the project had been provided to	Noted  Noted  Noted  Noted



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

	<p>QDCC and Kirkliston could request a similar update.</p> <p>Also covered as part of Q&amp;A – see section 4.3</p>	Noted
<b>9</b>	<b>Next community forums</b>	
	<p>Dates were confirmed as            01 November 2011; North Community Forum            02 November 2011; South Community Forum            08 November 2011; Junction 1a Community Forum</p> <p>LS suggested that the subsequent meetings take place in late January.</p>	Noted
<b>10</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
<b>10.1</b>	<b>Identification</b>	
	<p>EW highlighted discussion at South Community Forum re identification of contractors            TS to forward minute.</p> <p>EW suggested community police officers be advised.            HZ confirmed local police officer contact was Tony Palin.            LS highlighted that a Police Liaison Officer, Jeff Balshaw, had been seconded to TS and would be able to help identify policing issues.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Completed</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>10.2</b>	<b>Newsletter</b>	
	<p>LS confirmed that a FRC newsletter would be issued in the near future and presented a latest draft.</p>	Noted
<b>10.3</b>	<b>Additional questions</b>	
	<p><b>Q:</b> When will the permanent Contact &amp; Education Centre be opened?  <b>A:</b> August 2012. (temporary facility is already operational within FETA's offices at the Forth Road Bridge)</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is approval required from council planning for the site compound and will it comply with building standards.  <b>A:</b> No approval is required as this is procured within the Forth Crossing Act and it will have to comply with building standards.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> HZ asked if building warrant had been sought.  <b>A:</b> SB believed this was also covered by the Act but would check and confirm.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>SRB</p>
<b>10.4</b>	LS thanked attendees.	Noted



## **Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Associated Papers**

### **Item 4 - Introduction to John Sisk and Roadbridge (Junction 1a)**

#### **4.3 Q&A**

**Q:** HZ asked for comparison of ES noise receptor locations compared to contract receptor locations.

**A:** TS/SRB to supply details.

#### **Transport Scotland Written Response:**

The baseline noise monitoring undertaken for the Environmental Statement is described in Appendix A16.3 of the Environmental Statement. The monitoring was undertaken in 2009. The monitoring locations are listed in Table 1.1 of Appendix A16.3 and shown in Figure 16.2 of the Environmental Statement. At Kirkliston, one receptor was used, namely No. 8 Kirklands Park Grove. The purpose of the monitoring, as stated in Appendix A16.3 was to allow for verification of the noise levels predicted using the noise model and to inform the operational and construction noise assessments.

The Contractor has established 3 fixed noise monitors, at King Edwards Way, Buie Rigg and Kirklands Park Grove. In addition, the Contractor is supplementing monitoring with short term mobile monitoring at other key receptors. The receptors are those listed (number 17 in total) in Appendix A19.2 of the Environmental Statement for the M9 Junction 1a area for which assessments were undertaken for the Environmental Statement plus an additional 3 receptors which the Contractor has identified as being relevant to allow them to demonstrate compliance with the Environmental Statement and Code of Construction Practice. Overall, the Contractor has identified 20 receptors, of which fixed monitors are at three and 17 for which short term mobile monitoring applies.

As far as predictions are concerned, the Environmental Statement reports the construction noise assessments in Section 19.6 and Chapter A19.2. As indicated above, the Environmental Statement considers 17 receptors in the M9 Junction 1a area and the Contractor has identified an additional 3 receptors. The Contractor in its noise assessments undertakes assessments at the relevant receptors from this list of 20 depending on the location and nature of the construction activities.

It is important to note that the Contractor has consulted with the Noise Liaison Group in developing its Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) which includes its monitoring proposals and then also on each Plans for Control of Noise and Vibration (PCNV) where the Contractor sets out its assessments of construction noise and has to demonstrate that it will comply with the Environmental Statement and Code of Construction Practice and also sets out specific monitoring to be undertaken during the construction activities.



## Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Associated Papers

### Item 4 - Introduction to John Sisk and Roadbridge (Junction 1a)

#### 4.3 Q&A

**Q:** HZ queried if the ratings used to specify the 68-75 decibel level limits were set at high, medium or low (frequency) levels as this did not seem to be specified in the Environmental Report?

**A:** TS to confirm frequency levels.

#### Transport Scotland Written Response:

All of the noise predictions are undertaken using the 'A' weighted scale rather than at different frequencies for different types of sound. This is wholly consistent with the process set out in BS 5228: Parts 1 and 2: Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites. There is an explanation of what this means as far as noise is concerned in the glossary in the Environmental Statement and Code of Construction Practice which I provide below.

*Decibel (dB) - The range of audible sound pressures is approximately 0.00002Pa to 200Pa. Using decibel notation presents this range in a more manageable form.*

*A decibel is not an absolute unit of measurement but is a logarithmic ratio of the variation in pressure. It should be noted that because the decibel scale is a logarithmic ratio, the arithmetic sum of more than one decibel does not equate to the corresponding noise level. For example, the combined noise level generated by adding two equal noise levels together is approximately 3dB higher than the individual noise levels ie  $50\text{dB} + 50\text{dB} = 53\text{dB}$ .*

*'A' Weighting - The human ear does not respond uniformly to different frequencies. The 'A' weighting is commonly used to simulate the frequency responses of the human ear.*

The Contractor makes assessments of construction noise using the methods set out in BS 5228 and predicts noise in terms of dB(A), that is decibels using the A weighting for frequency which is that which is relevant when predicting how the human ear responds to noise. This is the long term accepted and recognised method of predicting construction noise levels in terms of how they relate to human perception and impact.

Section 5.2 of the Code of Construction Practice outlines mitigation of noise and vibration impacts and in particular section 5.2.15 explains when noise insulation will be considered in terms of the Noise Insulation (Scotland) Regulations 1975.

The Contractor will determine through its assessments submitted in its PCNVs whether noise levels are likely to comply with the Environmental Statement and Code of Construction Practice and also whether there properties will qualify for noise insulation. Noise insulation will be provided based on these predictions. Monitoring is used to help demonstrate compliance and if monitoring indicates non-compliance it will be possible to use the monitored levels in a comparison with the assessments to determine if there is a need to provide noise insulation.



## **Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Associated Papers**

### **Item 4 - Introduction to John Sisk and Roadbridge (Junction 1a)**

#### **4.3 Q&A**

**Q:** Questions re Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) at Kirklands Park Grove. Residents have been advised by TS that they are due compensation, but there are two conflicting titles, one which gives residents ownership and one which does not. Separate legal advice sought by some residents suggests they are not due compensation. A formal complaint has been sent to the Registers of Scotland.

**A:** DB confirmed that the GVD was implemented on the 9th of June and access rights obtained from mid July. A number of residents have submitted compensation claims. Compensation will be assessed by the District Valuer. All expert advice provided to TS state residents are joint owners and entitled to compensation.

DB advised that in this particular situation the compensation would be divided equally amongst all 77 owners as they jointly own Plot 606 and therefore the compensation sums are likely to be very small. It is hoped that a solution could be sought without resorting to significant legal fees for residents.

Due to complexity of the conflicting titles, DB will consider whether it is possible to provide a formal letter agreeing that there would be no reclaiming of compensation by the Scottish Ministers if it came to light that only Kirklands Park Grove residents owned plot 606.

HZ to forward legal information obtained for DB to re-check status of ownership with specialists.

#### **Transport Scotland Written Response:**

When paying compensation the Scottish Ministers send out a receipt and discharge which is signed by the claimant. This signed document is binding on both the Scottish Ministers and the claimant and as a result there would be no reclaiming of compensation by the Scottish Ministers if it came to light that the payment was made incorrectly.

No legal information has been received by Transport Scotland.