Statement in relation to consultation carried out by Transport Scotland on the Forth Replacement Crossing

There have been very significant shortcomings in the consultation with the Council on the Forth Replacement Crossing from the inception of the Forth Replacement Crossing Study through to the laying of the current Bill before the Scottish Parliament. The Council, despite being prepared from the outset to work on the proposed crossing in partnership with Transport Scotland, has been kept at arms’ length. Until 2009 the Council was largely engaged on a similar basis to a member of the public, for example through invitations to respond to information exhibitions. Only after the Bill was introduced to Parliament has Transport Scotland started some exploratory work on a supporting public transport package of the scope needed to address the concerns of this and other Councils and of SEStran. The Council has a number of outstanding concerns.

Accordingly, for its interests as a mandatory consultee, the Council submits that Transport Scotland has failed fully to meet its obligations in terms of Rule 9C.1.8 of the Standing Orders of the Scottish Parliament.

The Council therefore requests the opportunity to present written and/or oral evidence to the Hybrid Bill Committee.

1. Inadequacy of the consultation process
1.1 It is the Council’s view that the consultation process has fallen far short of the “proactive approach to engagement and consultation” set out as an aspiration in Paragraph 1.3 of the Forth Replacement Crossing Consultation and Engagement Report (CER) published in November 2009. The points below summarise concerns on a chronological basis. They cross-refer to the CER in a number of places. They also cross-refer to pertinent correspondence and reports on the Forth Replacement Crossing, where these documents are referred to by title they are included in Appendix 3.

2006-2007

1.2 Section 2.2 of the CER notes that ‘Consultation was undertaken with local authorities on the issues informing the Forth Replacement Crossing Study (FRCS). Regrettably, this consultation did not include any meaningful engagement with the City of Edinburgh Council, this despite more than one direct request for such engagement on behalf of the Council by SEStran (See Appendix 3). Instead, as the CER acknowledges, the consultation was through ‘a reference group comprising all seven Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs) and CoSLA. This general representation of Scottish Councils through CoSLA, as opposed to specific representation of the City of Edinburgh and other immediately neighbouring Councils, was unhelpful.

1.3 Section 2.2 of the CER also claims that ‘Specific discussions were held with local authorities and the Regional Transport Partnership (SEStran) to consider the emerging options from the FRCS.’ These discussions consisted of a single combined briefing session for the SEStran local authorities which considered the entire Strategic Transport Projects Review.

1.4 Section 2.4 of the CER notes that in August 2007 Transport Scotland held a series of public information exhibitions on the outcomes of the FRCS. A report to this Council’s Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee on 25 September 2007 noted this process but commented that “These options have been developed for Transport Scotland by consultants, but with no consultation with relevant local Councils, SEStran, or the Forth Estuary Transport Authority.” It noted that the lack of consultation was “a matter for regret and concern”.

1.5 In relation to the August 2007 exhibitions, the Council was essentially treated in the same way as a member of the public, being invited to attend the exhibitions and submit comments on a feedback form. A more helpful approach would have been to actively involve the Council in the development of options and for the Council to potentially have been a joint sponsor of the exhibitions.

2008
1.6 During 2008 Transport Scotland afforded officials of the Council briefings/meetings covering the development of the new crossing and its approach roads at roughly 3 month intervals. However the meetings were much more presentations of progress than a meaningful attempt to engage the Council in helping with the development process for the new crossing. In early 2008 Transport Scotland apparently acknowledged that combined meetings with the City of Edinburgh Council, Fife and West Lothian Councils and SEStran would be helpful (See Appendix 3). However no meaningful combined meetings on the key strategic issue of the supporting public transport strategy were held until mid 2009.

2009

January to March 2009

1.7 In early 2009 a series of local public information exhibitions and stakeholder briefings were once again held on the emerging proposals. Once again Transport Scotland afforded the Council a status similar to that of an ordinary member of the public and did not, for example, involve it in considering options to be presented at the exhibitions or to participate in any way in preparation for or running of associated meetings.

1.8 On 10 February 2009 this Council’s Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee considered a report on the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) that gave comments on the Forth Replacement Crossing in the STPR context. The report again expressed concern over consultation; ‘lack of consultation during its preparation’ being the first key concern mentioned. The report went on to note that ‘The review has been conducted almost entirely ‘behind closed doors’, with no formal opportunities for engagement by Local Authorities or many other key partners (The Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce has noted the ‘invisible’ consultation on the STPR).’

1.9 In February and March 2009 Transport Scotland started to increase the level of briefing of the Council on roads and transport issues. However the process still appeared to be intended mainly as a one-way flow of information rather than an attempt to engage the Council actively in development of the project. On 5 February 2009 Transport Scotland presented the ‘Managed Crossing Strategy’ to officials of this Council. From February onwards a series of meetings were arranged that jointly briefed officials of the City of Edinburgh Council and other Councils and also of SEStran on transport modelling issues. These meetings did invite feedback but there was no attempt to model or evaluate the Park and Ride and public transport priority package that the Councils and SEStran were advocating.

1.10 Section 4.4 of the CER notes that ‘Significant design changes, such as those made in spring 2009 regarding the relocation of the South Queensferry Junction and alterations to the Ferrytoll Junction, were also
discussed with the local authorities prior to finalising those plans.’ The Consultation with the Council on this issue is summarised below.

1.11 On 10 March 2009, at roughly one day’s notice, Transport Scotland presented an alternative option for the main junction for Queensferry at a meeting with officials of the Council. This was a significant change to the project as it affects Queensferry. The way that Transport Scotland dealt with the Council on this matter was a particularly poor example of engagement and consultation:

- Officials were given 7 days to respond to this major proposal. The option must have taken a considerable time to develop and it is considered likely that Transport Scotland could have shared it with the Council some weeks or possibly months earlier.
- In arranging the meeting Transport Scotland’s project director suggested that he would prefer to meet separately with the Council’s Transport and Planning officials, rather than with both together as suggested by the Council (this was what actually occurred)
- A meeting was held the same evening by Transport Scotland with Queensferry and District Community Council. Council officials were only informed of the meeting during the afternoon it was taking place. When they requested to be sent a note of the meeting the initial Transport Scotland response was a refusal, on the grounds that they did not wish the Council officials response to be influenced by views expressed by the Community Council.

1.12 The Council sent a letter to Transport Scotland on 19 March 2009 setting out its response to the suggested junction relocation. It is a reflection of Council officials’ ongoing concern at the level and meaningfulness of consultation and engagement being undertaken by Transport Scotland that this letter closed with the following paragraph:

“...We note that you have consulted Queensferry Community Council on the junction options and that they have indicated a preference for option 3. Given the very significant impact of the approach roads on the town of Queensferry we would urge a major effort to engage with the local community and address their concerns. We would counsel that this should include substantial effort to mitigate the negative environmental impacts of the approach road and junctions and provision of suitable bridged crossings to avoid severing Queensferry from non-motorised access to its surrounding countryside.”

1.13 A detailed letter was sent to Transport Scotland on 25 March 2009 setting out a variety of concerns and asking a number of questions in relation to the ‘Managed Crossing Strategy’. A further letter was sent on 7 May 2009. Despite the Council’s status as a mandatory consultee and the substantive nature of a number of the comments, no reply was received until 25 June 2009.

May to December 2009
1.14 One of the matters raised in the letter from the Council to Transport Scotland on 7 May 2009 was the promised joint meeting with SEStran and Fife and West Lothian Councils. No such joint meeting had taken place during 2008 or 2009 despite earlier requests. The first joint meeting was eventually held on 11 June 2009 at Transport Scotland’s offices in Glasgow. At the meeting Transport Scotland undertook to develop a Public Transport Strategy for the crossing, working jointly with the respective Councils.

1.15 Having received no contact from Transport Scotland in the intervening period, officials wrote to Transport Scotland on 28 August 2009, noting that “The City of Edinburgh Council is most willing to engage with Transport Scotland to assist in developing a Public Transport Strategy and welcomes your commitment to developing the strategy.” But also that “Since your commitment at the [meeting on 11 June], that development of a Public Transport Strategy to dovetail with ongoing development of the Forth Replacement Crossing Project was a fundamental component of the overall project, and that it was Transport Scotland’s responsibility, our Council have not received any further updates on progress on this Strategy from Transport Scotland.”

1.16 A joint briefing for Councils and SEStran officials was arranged for 1 October 2009. Disappointingly, at this meeting it emerged that Transport Scotland had, in the meantime, made no substantive progress on developing a Public Transport Strategy. The Council sent a letter to Transport Scotland on 3 November 2009 expressing concern at the lack of progress.

1.17 On 29 October 2009 Councillors and officials from Edinburgh, Fife and West Lothian Councils and from SEStran met with the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Climate Change to discuss matters covered in the appended Joint Position Statement. At this meeting it was agreed that Transport Scotland would develop a Public Transport Strategy to complement the new bridge in close consultation with the relevant Councils and SEStran.

1.18 On 11 November 2009 Transport Scotland replied to the letters of 28 August and 3 November 2009. This letter disagreed with the complaint of lack of progress, claiming that “Transport Scotland is developing a strategy, building upon measures including those recommended within the STPR and those which have and are being promoted/ developed by adjacent local authorities and SEStran.”

1.19 Following the meeting with the Minister referred to above and the placing of the Bill before Parliament, Transport Scotland has held two meetings with relevant Councils and SEStran, on 22 December 2009 and 18 January 2010. A follow up meeting between relevant Councillors, Officials and the Minister has also been held. Progress is now being made on the development of an agreed package of measures to
complement the new bridge. However at present the Bill does not provide for any of the package to be implemented and there is no indication of funding being available.

2. **Substantive points made during the consultation process and Transport Scotland’s response**

2.1 During the consultation process the Council and others made a number of substantive points. Regrettably most of these were not answered to the Council’s satisfaction prior to the placing of the Bill before the Scottish Parliament on 16 November 2009. The main strategic points outstanding as of that date are summarised in the attached “Joint Position Statement on New Forth Crossing” (See Section 4 and Appendix 1). The Joint Position Statement remains valid at the time at which this Statement of Representation is being prepared. Further points of concern to the Council are summarised in the attached copy of Appendix 4 of a report to the Council’s Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee on 24 November 2009 (See Appendix 2). The attached reports to the Council’s TIE Committee on 22 September and 24 November 2009 (See Appendix 3) give further supporting information on the Council’s concerns.

2.2 There follows a brief chronological summary of points made to Transport Scotland during the development process of the Forth Replacement Crossing.

**September 2007**

2.3 A report to the City of Edinburgh Council Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee responding to public information exhibitions in August 2007 asks for “a demand management and investment package that will ensure that traffic in Edinburgh will remain at or below the levels that would have been forecast without an additional crossing”.

**Briefing meetings during 2008**

2.4 The main theme of comments by the City of Edinburgh Council Transport officials was that if a new crossing is built it should have a package of measures prioritising public transport and High Occupancy Vehicles as an integrated part of the project.

**2009**

**January/February 2009**

2.5 The January 2009 proposals did not contain public transport slip roads to enable buses to enter and leave the A90 in the vicinity of the current Echline junction. In a briefing meeting Council Transport officials expressed the view that this was not consistent with a strategy of promoting public transport use as bus journeys across the old bridge would have been significantly slower than car journeys over the new
bridge and potentially subject to congestion. Slip roads were subsequently included, though the route for northbound buses remains relatively slow.

10 February 2009

2.6 A report to Council’s Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee on the STPR commented that “If the new crossing proceeds, it is critical that package 25, bus-based light rapid transit between Edinburgh and Fife, is implemented at the same time. Furthermore, opportunities should be taken to prioritise High Occupancy Vehicles on the approaches to the bridge, for example by giving them priority in any ramp-metering (traffic control at key junctions on the approaches).” This report was followed by a letter from the Council’s Transport Convenor to The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Climate Change re-iterating the point.

19 March 2009

2.7 A letter from the Council to Transport Scotland supported the relocation of the Queensferry Junction.

Other points made in letter were:

a. Bus priority at B924/A904 junction - This was rejected in a reply to the letter received on 25 June 2009.

b. Bridge on current line of U221 Builyeon Rd to south west of Queensferry, especially to safeguard recreational walking and cycling. – this was rejected in the same letter of 25 June referred to above.

c. Environmental mitigation and heritage matters - detailed reply (in June) referring to residents meetings and consultation with bodies, including SEPA.

25 March 2009

2.8 A letter from the Council to Transport Scotland made the following main points in relation to the new crossing and a supporting transport package:

a. The Council is fully committed to the Managed Crossing Strategy and notes that this can make best use of the two bridges through encouraging public transport and higher occupancy vehicle use.

b. Concern that Transport Scotland modelling and proposals appeared to solely focus on “attempting to smooth and maximise general traffic flow across the new bridge” rather than seeking to take forward a genuine Managed Crossing Strategy that acknowledges the need to promote public transport and high occupancy vehicle use.

c. Advocating high quality bus priority both on the immediate Forth Road Bridge approaches and on the whole cross-Forth corridor, noting that the STPR material suggests that STPR project 25 (light rapid transit between Edinburgh and Fife) “could include provision of a bus-based rapid transit service as part of the Forth Replacement Crossing”.
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d. Advocating improved bus stops and interchange at Echline.

e. Requesting more work on a possible Park and Ride at Echline.

f. Requesting the proposals make provision for High Occupancy vehicles on the Forth Replacement Crossing approaches (not the crossing itself) as long as this doesn’t compromise bus priority.

g. Asking that the project exploits the opportunity to improve pedestrian and cycle links within Queensferry and protects links from Queensferry to the surrounding countryside.

h. Seeking compatibility of approaches to the Forth Road Bridge with future tram use as far as possible.

i. Seeking the making permanent of a ‘haul road’ link to Society Rd in Queensferry to facilitate access to Port Edgar (and Hopetoun House).

2.9 The response from Transport Scotland gave a reassurance in relation to Paragraph 2.8 point h - future tram use. However it did not offer meaningful amendment to the project on any matter and subsequent discussions also did not result in any amendments.

Meetings between April and November 2009

2.10 Points continued to be made around the need for a supporting investment package encouraging public transport and High Occupancy Vehicle use. There were some detailed discussions covering the bus slip roads. Council officials also attended several briefing sessions around traffic modelling. Concerns were expressed that these demonstrated a lack of attention to prioritising public transport.

Meetings following submission of the Bill to Parliament

2.11 As noted in Paragraph 1.19 above two meetings were held to discuss development of the public transport strategy following submission of the Bill to Parliament. These meetings have been constructive in relation to the development of the package of measures. Issues remain on the content of the package of measures (relating for example to the need to develop proposals in more detail, to the lack of proposals for public transport priority on the A90 in the latest draft, the lack of proposals for High Occupancy Vehicle priority and the lack of mention of matters such as rail services). However the largest outstanding concern is the lack of commitment to a funded implementation programme.

3. Other concerns

3.1 Since the publication of the Bill concerns relating to the consultation process and points made in it have been raised with Council Officials by local residents through the Bridge Replacement Interests Group South (BRIGS) grouping. Two concerns which it is felt the Bill Committee may wish to consider are suggested below.

Location of Queensferry Junction
3.2 Residents have raised concerns about the proximity of this junction to houses. The residents requested that Transport Scotland consider relocating this junction south-westwards. The Council was not informed of this request and so has not been able to consider its implications and the merits or otherwise of such a move. The Echline Corner Consultative Alliance (ECCA) residents group has informed the Council that Transport Scotland rejected the suggested relocation when the suggestion was first made. However it would appear likely that there would be some significant benefits for some residents. On these grounds it is suggested that Transport Scotland could be asked to present the Bill Committee with an alternative junction location, along with an assessment of relevant costs and benefits, for consideration.

Location of Haul Road for main construction compound

3.3 Residents have also raised concerns about the location of this road, seeking relocation significantly westwards. The Council has been involved in detailed discussions with Transport Scotland seeking potential permanent status for the road to facilitate access to Port Edgar and Hopetoun House. As with the location of the Queensferry Junction the Council has not had time to consider the merits or otherwise of a westwards move of the haul road. It is, however, suggested that the impacts and costs of a westward relocation of this road merit investigation.

4. Joint Position Statement

4.1 The Joint Position Statement (included as Appendix 1) was agreed by officials and politicians of The City of Edinburgh, Fife and West Lothian Councils and SEStran prior to a meeting with the Minister for Transport Infrastructure and Climate Change that took place on 29 October 2009. The Statement was subsequently formally approved by the City of Edinburgh Council’s Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee and West Lothian Council’s Executive, and was noted by the Environment, Enterprise and Transportation Committee of Fife Council and the SEStran Board.
APPENDIX 1

Joint Position Statement on New Forth Crossing

SEStran, Fife Council, City of Edinburgh Council and West Lothian Council

Introduction

All four bodies welcome the Scottish Government’s decision to proceed with the procurement process for the delivery of the New Forth Crossing.

We also welcome Transport Scotland’s announcement in December 2008 that they had developed a “Managed Crossing Strategy” for the New Forth Crossing, which takes into account the existing bridge. As part of that announcement they stated that “the more positive prognosis for the Forth Road Bridge allows it to become a dedicated public transport corridor carrying public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. In the future it could be adapted to carry a Light Rapid Transit (LRT) system, such as a tram.”

Shortcomings of the Managed Crossing Strategy

We are disappointed that, despite forecasts that the amount of cross Forth travel will increase, the project being developed by Transport Scotland does not include any significant measures to encourage greater use of public transport or high occupancy vehicles (HOV’s), e.g. Park and Ride improvements, priority lanes or priority at junctions.

To date the transport modelling being carried out for the project has only considered the situation just one year after the new bridge is expected to be open (i.e. 2017). With a total of 2 lanes in each direction across the Forth for general traffic, all additional cross Forth travel demand (e.g. including future development in key strategic areas to the North of the Forth, and West Edinburgh, etc) beyond 2017 must be accommodated by measures to encourage greater use of more sustainable travel choices.

Good access for freight to Rosyth and Grangemouth is important for the Scottish economy. Delays to freight are costly, and if this involves delaying or missing a ship, these costs can be disproportionately high. Freight therefore needs uncongested conditions to operate effectively, but this has not been demonstrated in the transport modelling for the existing proposal.

A further concern is the apparent lack of flexibility of use of the 2 crossings. For example, if the new crossing was to be closed for any reason, all vehicles would require to be diverted through the Ferrytoll and Echline junctions at either ends of the Public Transport Corridor,
causing significant congestion and disruption on the adjoining local road network.

We are also disappointed that the proposals for the New Forth Crossing do not include any footway provision, to cater for occasions when the Existing Bridge is closed for maintenance, which could potentially be for considerably lengthy periods.

**Supporting the Purpose of Government**

The inclusion in the Parliamentary Bill of all measures necessary to encourage greater use of more sustainable travel choices, and a commitment to fund them, would ensure that an effective “Managed Crossing Strategy” could be achieved, and hence the overall project could actively support the National Transport Strategy (NTS).

The three key strategic outcomes of the NTS, which support the Purpose of Government, are

- **Improve journey times and connections** between our cities and towns and our global markets to tackle congestion and provide access to key markets
- **Reduce emissions** to tackle climate change
- **Improve quality, accessibility and affordability** of transport, to give people the choice of public transport and real alternatives to the car

The lack of incentives within the project to increase the modal share of more sustainable forms of transport means that as currently proposed, the New Crossing will fall far short of delivering any of the NTS strategic objectives, and hence fail to adequately support the Purpose of Government.

**Delivering an Effective Managed Crossing Strategy**

In 2005 SEStran and its constituent Councils carried out the SEStran Integrated Transport Corridors Study (SITCoS) which recommended that a “Balanced Strategy” should be pursued. The key short term measures recommended by this study for immediate delivery included the Halbeath and Rosyth Park & Choose facilities and associated A90 / M90 Priority Measures for Buses / HOV’s.

SEStran’s Regional Transport Strategy, which was approved by Scottish Ministers in 2008, includes several key principles for the future of Cross Forth travel, which are listed in the annex.

To date Transport Scotland has not accepted that key strategic complementary measures such as the Halbeath and Rosyth Park & Choose facilities and associated Bus / HOV Priority Measures on the M90 / A90 require to be implemented as part of the main bridge project. However, without such schemes, this iconic infrastructure project will fail
to contribute anything meaningful to Scotland’s challenging and world leading carbon emission targets, and the unacceptable levels of congestion experienced to date are likely to continue to increase on this key strategic corridor.

With the above in mind, the four bodies jointly ask that a package of measures to encourage cross-Forth Public Transport / HOV movement, and support movement on cycle and foot, is progressed as an integral part of the proposals for the New Forth Crossing. The package should include:

- Construction of new bus / rail based Park and Ride / Park and Choose sites (i.e. Halbeath and Rosyth, etc)

- High quality, high speed, access to and from the existing bridge for buses, including extensive priority measures from both the north and south (e.g. M90, A90, M8, M9, and M9 Spur to the A8000).

- Similarly, priority for HOV (i.e. cars / vans / minibuses with two or more occupants) on the bridge approaches, though this should not be at the expense of bus priority.

- Active use of Intelligent Transport Systems to assist in bus and HOV priority

- A high quality bus interchange for Queensferry at Echline, with good pedestrian and cycle access and car / cycle parking – potentially a full scale Park and Ride

- Improvements to bus and rail services

- Measures to ensure that walking and cycling networks on both sides of the Forth are fully integrated into the new Public Transport Corridor

- Ferry / Hovercraft services, subject to positive further work

- Measures to improve safety and accessibility for vulnerable communities north and south of the new crossing, including Queensferry, Inverkeithing and Newton

These measures are necessary in the short term and should be set in the context of the longer term LRT proposals included in the MVA study south of the Forth and the Scott Wilson study on the north, which should be part of the integrated public transport strategy in support of the Bill.

It would also be beneficial to upgrade Junction 1a of the M9 as advanced works or at the first stage of construction, and improve the A801 at Avon Gorge.

Such complementary measures would maximise the potential for more sustainable travel across the Forth, not only after the new Bridge is
open, but also during the period of traffic management that will be necessary during the complex works required to tie the New Crossing into the existing road network, particularly on the A90 at Ferrytoll.

Conclusions

The absence of a robust package of complementary measures from the current proposal is a missed opportunity. Their inclusion would transform the project into one that is, and will be seen to be, truly integrated and supporting the Purpose of Government and the recent carbon emissions targets from the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, which the First Minister announced on 25 June 2009 was “an historic, groundbreaking bill that sets an international example that we hope others will follow”.

A relatively modest investment by Scottish Government in relation to the overall cost of the project would secure significant benefits in terms of sustainable economic development and environmental leadership.

Recommendation

The inclusion in the Parliamentary Bill of the complementary measures outlined above, and a commitment to fund them, would ensure that this project provides the platform for Scotland to set a truly sustainable economic and environmental example of a transport project, for other countries throughout the world to follow.

SEStran
Fife Council

West Lothian Council
City of Edinburgh Council
Annex to Joint Position Statement

Key principles for the future of Cross Forth travel from the SEStran Regional Transport Strategy (2008)

• the combination of old and new crossings should provide no more than the current two lanes in each direction available to single occupant cars;

• the net increase in traffic lanes across the Forth all need to be dedicated to buses and HOV’s. Consideration should be given to the possibility of allowing HGV’s to access these lanes;

• HOV priority measures should also be introduced on the A90/M90 in the short term to encourage more sustainable travel and provide a means of managing the southbound traffic flow during periods of maintenance on the existing crossing;

• physically separate running lanes for the mixed use of buses, HOV’s and possibly HGV’s should be considered, but as far as possible, flexibility should be maintained to enable full vehicle carrying capacity for traffic during periods of bridge maintenance; and

• the promoter should be required to put in place a package of measures that will seek to ensure that traffic in Edinburgh will remain at or below the levels that would have been forecast without an additional crossing.
The following sub-paragraphs supplement the joint statement on issues that the statement does not address or addresses in less detail. Where necessary there is brief supporting text.

1. To welcome the currently proposed combination of new bridge for general traffic and existing bridge for public transport only.

   This approach will act to contain growth in Cross-Forth traffic and the associated adverse impacts on West Edinburgh. Use of the existing bridge for public transport, if backed up by a suite of priority measures, bus services and Park and Ride, would offer a useful congestion-free corridor which should assist in strengthening cross-Forth public transport.

   The proposals envisage the existing bridge as the most likely future tram route. Transport Scotland has assured the Council that relevant approach roads and structures are being designed, where appropriate, to accommodate trams.

2. To support the decision to build the new bridge so as to be capable of carrying trams.

   Design of the new bridge for capability to carry light rail is a welcome ‘future proofing’ element of the current proposals.

3. The joint statement supports high quality, high speed, access to and from the existing bridge for buses. Speeds on the approach from the A90 will be restrained, especially at the exit on to the former A8000. An objection is likely to seek change on this issue.

4. The joint statement refers to measures to protect safety and accessibility for vulnerable communities. In Queensferry there are 2 specific issues relating to this:

   a) There is an opportunity for the proposals to include better connection between the eastern and western parts of the town that are currently severed by the Echline junction

   Improving local pedestrian and cycle links from east of the current crossing approaches to west (i.e. from the Echline area to the Viewforth/ Inchcolm area) would connect areas of Queensferry currently completely severed by the Echline
junction. Links could be dual purpose as they would also access the proposed bus interchange. Links should be robust and capable of operating or being effectively managed during any emergency diversions.

b) The new bridge approach road will sever Builyeon Rd SW of the town. It is suggested that a dedicated cycle and pedestrian crossing should be provided to retain the continuity of this route.

The new proposed FRC/A904 junction will substantially degrade access by foot and cycle from Queensferry to Builyeon Road. This road currently gives opportunities for recreational cycling and walking SW of Queensferry accessed directly from the town with only the need to cross the A904. Under the current proposal people will need to access this road via a large and grade separated junction including crossing 2 slip roads. In Transport Scotland consultation earlier this year 13 local comments referred to this issue (this was based on an option for the approach road which had a lesser impact on Builyeon Rd.) It is therefore considered that there is a case for a bridge on or near the where the line of the minor road will cross the approach road.

Consideration should also be given to providing a link or links westward from the Echline/Springfield area to allow continued informal countryside access.

5. The Forth Crossing project potentially offers an opportunity to improve access to Hopetoun House and Port Edgar (the Council owned marina and sailing school) by creating a new access road to the west of South Queensferry. Such a road will be built to facilitate construction of the new crossing. But it is proposed to build it to a low standard and to grub up the northern end of it following completion of the new bridge.

Subject to legal advice, the Council could advocate that the Bill includes powers for such a road to be made permanent and that the project includes the construction of the road to an appropriate standard for permanent use.
APPENDIX 3
Pertinent Correspondence and Reports on the Forth Replacement Crossing Project

The following supporting correspondence and reports are appended to this Statement of Representation document:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Letter: SEStran to Transport Scotland</td>
<td>12/9/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Report to CEC TIE Committee: ‘New Forth Crossing - Proposed Council Response’</td>
<td>25/9/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Letter: CEC to Transport Scotland</td>
<td>17/3/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Report to CEC TIE Committee: ‘Strategic Transport Projects Review’</td>
<td>10/2/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Letter: Councillor Phil Wheeler to Stewart Stevenson, Minister for Transport,</td>
<td>13/2/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure and Climate Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Letter: CEC Transport to Transport Scotland</td>
<td>19/3/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Letter: CEC Transport to Transport Scotland</td>
<td>25/3/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Letter: CEC Transport to Transport Scotland</td>
<td>5/5/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Letter: Transport Scotland to CEC Transport</td>
<td>25/6/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Letter: CEC Transport to Transport Scotland</td>
<td>28/8/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Report to CEC TIE Committee: ‘New Forth Crossing - Proposed Council Position’</td>
<td>22/9/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Letter: CEC Transport to Transport Scotland</td>
<td>3/11/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Letter: Transport Scotland to CEC</td>
<td>11/11/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Report to CEC TIE Committee: ‘New Forth Crossing - Update and Parliamentary</td>
<td>24/11/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:
SEStran = South East Scotland Transport Partnership
CEC = City of Edinburgh Council
TIE Committee = Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee
Dave Anderson
Director of City Development
City of Edinburgh Council
26 January 2010