

Appendices

Appendix 1

Consultation Responses Summary Table

Consultation Responses Summary Table.

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|---|---|--|
| British Horse Society (BHS) Helene Mauchlen | 08 April 2004 E-mail | Does not feel widening for horse riders necessary as A68 is a busy major road. |
| | 07 October 2004 E-mail | A68 Considered too fast a road for horses. BHS content if every opportunity to create safe off road multi use routes is pursued. Very pleased with the proposals which seem to address these concerns. |
| Cyclist Touring Club C/o Mike Harrison | 29 March 2004 | Main concerns are cyclists crossing the existing road and any sight line improvements would be welcomed. Important that improvements do not encourage drivers to exceed speed limits. Highlighted that it would be unusual for cyclists to use the A68 for any distance, though individuals and club rides may feel obliged to use short sections. Main concern is crossing the A68 safely at four points. |
| | 17 September 2004 | Wanted to clarify that; WS2+1 sections are 13m wide, 3 lanes of 3.5m with 1m hard strip on each side and will include cat's eyes. Voiced concern over cat's eyes and kerbs and that the hard strips need to be well maintained. Was pleased with discussion on possible pedestrian / cyclist underpass. |
| | No Response - letter sent 01 August 2005 | |
| Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) Ian Laidlaw | 12 October 2004 Telephone | Only concerns are the mature trees to the north and east of the road and an area of new planting between the road and the burn. Would prefer the option that minimises impact upon woodland and river / burn habitat. |
| Forest Enterprise (FE) Steve Penny | 07 October 2004 Telephone | Advised that they would have no comments or concerns unless there is Forestry Commission land in the vicinity of the scheme and are content that FC will raise any potential issues. |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|--|--|---|
| National Trust for Scotland (NTS) – Arthur Martin | 04 October 2004 Telephone | Advised that they have no comments to make. |
| Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historic Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) – Peter McKaigae | 22 March 2004 27 September 2004 | Advised that a data search would cost £50 per hour (approx. 2hrs work). All archaeological and historical info within a 1km corridor would be provided in a text report. Scheduled monument info would come from HS, Designated Landscape info from SNH. Confirm nothing further to add. Roman Fort near Oxton the only item they are aware of. |
| Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Peter Gordon | 13 September 2004 | Option 1 involves an area of land used by wintering oystercatcher – may be a site for social interaction & pair bonding. Option 2 therefore would be preferred, however, it is appreciated that road safety is of more importance than what is a relatively minor bird site. On a personal note, expressed concern that there is no new turn off proposed for the dangerous C84 to Oxton turn off. Advised that the regional office could carry out a data search on the area for a fee. |
| Scottish Badgers Ian Hutchinson | 19 March 2004 21 September 2004 No response – email sent 08 August 2005 | Provided grid references on road casualties. .Strong recommendation that badger setts should be identified within the area. Confirmed that the A68 is among the worst roads in Scotland for badger fatalities – listed those which have occurred within the scheme area. Advised contacting SBBRC at Harestanes for sett data. Considered this an ideal opportunity to identify crossing points and appropriate mitigation. Pointed out that data is usually from members of the public, so care should be taken with grid references. |
| Scottish Borders Biological Records Centre | 18 March 2004 E-mail | Advised that information search could be carried out at cost of £40 per hour and would include production of relevant report. Advised on data held and other organisations that hold similar data. |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Dr Jon Mercer | 05 April 2004 E-mail | Reminder re-info search and re-iterating the useful information that SBBRC hold. |
| | 09 September 2004 E-mail | Confirm that they are still able to supply records, which could be returned within 5 working days. |
| | 16 September 2004 E-mail | To confirm that SBBRC do hold electrofishing and road kill data. |
| | 17 September 2004 E-mail | Provided information and report |
| | 21 September 2004 | Voiced concerns on access problems from minor roads out of Oxton and potential disturbance to burns, where dipper are known to nest and otter spraint regularly found. Suggested taking the exit of the C83 further north to a point opposite the revised carrae entrance on junction 1. |
| Scottish Executive Development Department (SEDD) | 19 March 2004 | No comments. |
| | 10 September 2004 | No comments to make on the proposals |
| Scottish Executive Air, Climate & Engineering Unit Guy Winter | 23 September 2004 Letter | No specific comments, other than the impact on the water environment, particularly at river crossings, should be taken into account. |
| | 16 August 2005 | No specific comments. Stressed the importance of general precautionary approach and mitigation, where necessary, to maintain water quality, waste disposal, mineral extraction and drainage standards. |
| Scottish Executive, Wildlife & | 30 March 2004 | Need to categorically establish species present on the site and where, before the |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|---|---|--|
| Habitats Division Fiona Leslie | Letter | application is considered for planning consent. Schedule 1 birds and European Protected Species must be included as part of detailed survey work. Advised that consultants and developers must be aware of legislation, and whether licences are required if disturbance is a possibility. |
| Scottish Executive Enterprise & Rural Affairs Department (SEERAD) | 10 September 2004 Letter | No comments to make on the proposals. |
| Scottish Wildlife Trust Julian Warman | 31 March 2004 13 September 2004 | Advised SWT could provide information regarding SWT wildlife sites in the vicinity, which is also available from SBBRC. No other comments apart from avoiding pollution etc by following standard good practice. Requested that any tree planting uses only native species of local provenance, to aid local biodiversity enhancement, as would the enhancement of hedgerows within the vicinity which are in a poor condition with low ecological value at present, though are a priority habitat within the Scottish Borders LBAP. |
| Sustrans Tony Grant | 25 March 2004 21 September 2004 09 August 2005 Email | Advised that unaware of any specific cycling proposals in the area. Recommended that any improvement works incorporate 1m strips to assist cyclists. In addition, advised that appropriate measures to assist pedestrians / cyclists / equestrians in crossing the A68 between the C3(should that be C83?) and D47/5 (Oxton to Carfrae) Earlier response still valid, though concerned that neither of the proposed options seems to allow safe crossing of the A68 between the C83 & D47/5. No specific additional comments. Supported provision of pedestrian/cycle underpass. |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|---|---|---|
| The Coal Authority Stuart Clarke | 22 April 2004 Telephone | Advised that a mining report could be prepared for each site for a fee, highlighting past present and future underground mining and open cast mining together with details of any subsidence and shafts. |
| River Tweed Commissioners Dr. Ronald Campbell / Tony Coleman | <p>01 April 2004</p> <p>14 September 2004</p> <p>08 August 2005 Email</p> <p>08 December 2005 Email</p> <p>No response to letter 31 July 2007 – revised design.</p> | <p>Advised that much of the Tweed is an SAC and SSSI due to the presence of salmon, and that the Leader Water in the Oxton area also contains salmon. The particular concern is the road re-alignment and access for salmon and other migratory fish under any crossings or through any culverting of watercourses.</p> <p>Unsure as to how much of the Headshaw Burn would be diverted under each option – requested figures. Welcomed the assurance that RTC would be involved in the design of a new channel, if this is necessary. Advised that a charge will be made for fish ‘rescue’ work should diversion / drainage be necessary. Advised that salmonid monitoring data is available from the 3 years of monitoring since 1988 at a cost of £50 (each year). Indicated that it would be useful to know whether the existing stream crossing would be replaced under option 1 and if so, would it be a culvert or clearspan?</p> <p>Advised that if a section of Headshaw Burn was to be dried, a fish rescue would have to be arranged.</p> <p>Having visited the site, the River Tweed Commission would not object to the planned bridge extension subject to appropriate methodology and timing. Advised to contact them when the project needs to progress.</p> |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|---|--|---|
| Scottish Ornithologists Club David Kelly | No Response | |
| Borders Bat Group William Huckerby | 05 October 2004 Telephone | No comments on the proposed scheme |
| Health & Safety Executive Dr. G. Cook | 07 April 2004 | The Transco 2227 pipeline, which has a consultation distance of 36m passes close to the A68 near Oxton. YA should contact Transco to ascertain what measures need to be taken. |
| Historic Scotland Mrs Lily Linge | 05 May 2004 No response to letter 08 September 2004 01 September 2005 Letter 12 September 2007 Letter – revised design | No comments if the widening scheme is within the existing verges, with the likelihood of adverse impact negligible. Any areas of new land take could potentially disturb archaeological remains. Advised that an archaeological evaluation should take place prior to construction, especially on the short bypass of Hillhouse Farm due to the presence of a nearby hillfort. Also commented that in light of this, the entire A68 section to be widened be surveyed, including the drainage. Suggested that the work would be fairly small depending on what was found. No further relevant historic environment information. Most significant element of revised scheme is the new link road, which requires a sizeable strip of 'greenfield' land take. Due to possibility of unrecorded archaeological remains being uncovered, a sufficient mitigation response would be archaeological topsoil strip monitoring. This requirement would normally be secured through inclusion within the Historic Scotland 'Special Requirements'. |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|---|--|--|
| Scottish Borders Council Planning Department Charles Johnston | 12 October 2004 Telephone | If scheme is within the existing verges, then there are no planning issues. Planning permission will be required for any new section of road or turn off. |
| Scottish Borders Council Economic Development & Environmental Planning Dr. Andy Tharme | 07 April 2004 | Advised that there are no SSSIs or SPAs within the immediate vicinity of and likely to be affected by the development. There are no ancient woodlands or semi-natural woodlands likely to be affected. There is an area of mixed semi-natural woodland at the confluence of Mounthill Burn and the Leader Water which is in close proximity to the A68. This may be of local biodiversity value & local biological records should indicate the local significance of this habitat. There are no tree preservation orders (TPO's) within the area. Advised that SBBRC and Tweed Foundation can supply additional information. |
| | 05 October 2004 – Telephone | Original comments still stand. The primary concern is the river and would require mitigation to ensure there is no significant adverse impact. |
| | No response – Letter sent 01 August 2005 | |
| Alistair Lorimer | 18 September 2007 Letter - revised design | No comments to make on the revisions. |
| Scottish Borders Council Economic Development & Environmental Planning Rory McDonald | 15 September 2004 Letter | Advised that this part of the Scottish Borders is archaeologically sensitive as the Leader Valley has been a natural route for thousands of years. Three identified sites may be affected and are protected under SBC's Structure Plan Policies N14 & N15. Archaeological monitoring should be carried out |
| Scottish Borders Council Environmental Health | 28 September 2004 | No objections to the proposals and no baseline information that would be useful. |
| Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) Will Dryburgh | 31 March 2004 | Advised that water quality of Mountmill Burn is A1 and the Leader Water below the confluence with the Mountmill Burn is A2. It can be assumed that other sections of the Leader Water is A1 / A2. Under the terms of the WFD, no deterioration in ecological |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>23 September 2004 Letter</p> <p>13 September 2005 Letter</p> <p>No response to letter 27 July 2007 – revised design.</p> | <p>status can be allowed and the design of the scheme will need to protect this status. SEPA will require SUDS as an integral part of the design specification and this must be discussed at an early stage.</p> <p>Confirmed that original comments still stand. Option 2 would be preferred as it appears to have the least impact upon Headshaw Burn / Leader Water, whereas Option 1 would seem to require a diversion, which may result in the loss of natural riverine habitat. Also points out the need for the careful design of bridges / culverts so there is no hindrance to passage of migratory fish.</p> <p>Confirmed that SEPA had no comment to make on the overall option of the scheme. Advised that consultation with SEPA, SNH and the River Tweed Commission would be required prior to work commencing on the Annfield Bridge. Suggested an on site meeting as best option. Confirmed SEPA's approval of road drainage proposals.</p> |
| <p>Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) Richard Kehoe/Carol Jones</p> | <p>28 September 2004</p> <p>12 October 2004 Telephone</p> <p>18 October 2004 Letter</p> <p>14 June 2005 Letter</p> | <p>Advised that is dealing with both A68 schemes along with Davie Gray. Main concerns are Headshaw Burn mainly due to salmon spawning and River Tweed SAC.</p> <p>Concerns are any potential impact upon the River Tweed cSAC, impact on watercourses during construction and the need for appropriate assessment.</p> <p>Impossible to comment on preferred option at this stage. Points raised in original letter of 21 April are still valid. SNH opinion is that an appropriate assessment is required, as both options will require diversion of the Headshaw Burn.</p> <p>Responded to GI proposals. Concerns covered below.</p> |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | <p>22 September 2005 Letter</p> | <p>Expressed concern at potential for ecological degradation as a result of Annfield Bridge Extension. Specified impacts on the River Tweed SAC arising from: contamination from silt; encroachment by piers and subsequent changes in flow dynamics, habitat loss and erosion; cumulative effects of many small-scale proposals.</p> <p>Provided the following mitigation guidance: bridge built high enough to not affect the flow during flood conditions; bridge spanning the entire river so as to avoid encroachment onto the water course; no intervention work on the river; any works resulting in silting or vehicle movements should occur outside salmon and lamprey breeding/spawning season; no work should take place between October and June as out with the months, the water level should be lower thus reducing the risk of floodwater washing sediment into the Headshaw Burn; care against contamination/pollution; any species mix used to reseed banks should be chosen to maximise wildlife potential of the site, native species only.</p> <p>SNH expressed concern at the potential for drainage and waste surface water run-off impacts, both during and after construction and advised that SuDS be utilised. Also pointed out that no machinery should be stored on the Headshaw Burn flood plain.</p> <p>Advised on the scheme's potential to impact on protected species, in particular otter, badger and water vole and suggested surveying to ascertain those species present. This to be followed with appropriate mitigation. Suggested contacting Biological Records centre for information on any rare species known to occur in the locale. Advised that any work should be occur out with critical mammal and bird breeding time.</p> <p>SNH noted that the proposed works would result in the potential loss of areas of woodland and hedgerows and as a result, sympathetic reseedling should occur.</p> |

| Organisation and Contact | Date of Response | Response |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>14 August 2007 Letter – revised design</p> | <p>Provided Annex of River Tweed SAC regulations.</p> <p>The new link road will cross the Headshaw Burn and passes close to Mountmill Burn, which are part of the River Tweed SAC. SNH's advice is that the revisions to this proposal could have a significant effect on the qualifying interests of the SAC. Direct and indirect impacts on the SAC are considered to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encroachment into the SAC of the bridge piers; Intervention work carried out in the SAC (e.g. hard engineering); Contamination of the watercourse with silt, building material or debris during construction or after completion; Changes in floodplain dynamics through loss of floodplain; and Small scale cumulative indirect impacts. <p>Therefore, this new link road needs to be subjected to appropriate assessment. SNH are pleased to see inclusion of SUDS within the scheme and would like best possible practice to be continued.</p> <p>SEPA must also be content that any discharges will not have an adverse effect on the SAC.</p> <p>Protected species survey require to be updated one month prior to work starting on site, using a suitably qualified surveyor and mitigation updated as necessary.</p> <p>SNH is pleased that an ecologist will be on site during ground investigation works.</p> <p>Planting and seeding should be extended to cover new link road.</p> |