

North Queensferry Community Council

Minutes of Community Council Meeting on Thursday 11 September 2014

Members Present: Lin Collis (LC), Christina McKenzie (CM), Mary Finlayson (MF), Barbara McKechnie (BM), Jim George (JG)		
3 Village Residents		
Agenda Reference	Description	Action
1. Apologies for Absence:	James Lawson (JL), Iain G Mitchell (IGM) Simon Tate will be contacted to verify if he still wishes to be a member of the Community Council	CM
2. Minutes of previous meeting.	Minutes for July were approved. It was also agreed that in future Draft Minutes, once approved in principal by email from the Council Members, will be posted on the Web site – on the Home Page_ News Items_ Current Draft Minutes	BM
3. Matters Arising	No matters arising	
4. Police Report	MF and JL had a meeting with the Police prior to the Forth Bridge Festival period. Police advised cones would be placed appropriately in the village and if necessary, access to the village would be restricted to residents and business access. Ian Jones from Fife Council also attended the meeting and may be contacted re similar traffic restrictions to be applied for on future occasions.	
5. Issues Arising from Community Stakeholders' Meeting	<p>Re Community Centre Community Engagement meeting on 100914 with Forth Forum representatives: LC expressed disappointment that no new information was made available at the meeting. The Speakers did indicate that there will be further meetings with the village residents with opportunities for feedback once the Traffic Assessments and analysis have been completed.</p> <p>Traffic: CM noted issues highlighted at the meeting re current traffic issues in North Queensferry, especially in the Primary School area and around the Railway Station. LC will draft letter to Ian Jones, Fife Council re traffic issues requiring immediate attention. In view of possible misinformation/rumours, clarification will be sought from Sandra Montagu Stewart re traffic management options mentioned at the meeting in respect of planning for the increase in visitors. The Community Council would appreciate assurance that the options being considered DO NOT include any further parking for visitors within the Village. LC will draft second letter to seek reassurance on this point.</p> <p>Community Benefits: MF drew attention to the Network Rail statement at the meeting that 'Community Benefits' funding will be offered 'from the profits' of the proposed Forth Bridge Experience. MF stressed however that at meetings which she had attended it was clear that there was current funding available for projects brought forward by the Community in the light of a general increase in visitors due to the attraction of the Three Forth Bridges. CM will ask Lucy Macaulay to prepare a letter on behalf of the Community Centre to request identified task support from this funding source.</p>	<p>LC</p> <p>LC</p>

	<p>respect of options for Christmas lighting within the village. Possible locations: railings adjacent to the War Memorial; planted area outside north bound railway station entrance. LC would email grant form to MF.</p> <p>In respect of Environmental Plan queries raised by Jim West (JW) at July NQCC meeting and on behalf of JW, JG gave JW's apologies for being unable to attend this meeting (11 September). At the Community Meeting on 100914, JW had delivered a document with 8 questions related to environmental issues for follow up from members of the Forth Forum attending the meeting. A copy of this document is attached as an Addendum to the Minutes of NQCC September monthly meeting.</p>	
--	---	--

Next Meeting: Thursday 09 October 2014, North Queensferry Community Centre 7.30pm

~~

Addendum 1

North Queensferry Community Council Meeting Minutes 110914

Source: Jim West

As an Environmental Plan is not required for the special project of the Forth Replacement Crossing (see reference in July Minutes), Jim West delivered the following questions to the presenters at the Community Engagement Meeting held on 10 September 2014:

NB: Jim West supplied the copy below.

Dear Councillor Shirkie

Sorry for the delay in forwarding my environmental concerns as raised at the North Queensferry Community Council Meeting on July 10th.

Individually each of these concerns may appear trivial but it is the cumulative effect which potential could bring a detrimental impact on to the village.

The items of concern are as listed below.

(a) Following the removal of long established trees for the approach road to the new bridge crossing no replacement

measures appear to have been thought about to restore the wind protection lost to the village from these trees. Whilst trees have been, planted these are young trees and for a box ticking exercise for carbon offset.

I raised the this question at a bridge progress briefing and again at the June 27th environmental aspects briefing the first presenter referred me to the second Briefing and the second presenter referred me to Transport Scotland and Fife Council, as they felt that it was not within the contractors brief.

(b) The effect on the village especially the upper level from the woodland referred to in item (b) having been removed, we will not receive any benefit from the foliage.

The baffle structure intended to reduce cross winds on the new bridge and may generate additional wind noise on their own, this combines with the thermal uplift to the prevailing wind from the West generated, as air over the cold water encounters the thermal from the landfall, rises it will push the noise upwards.

(c) The planning application notes intimated that the expected noise increase in North Queensferry would be minimal around 3 dB(A) to 6dB(A) since the measurement of sound is shown on a Logarithmic scale even 3dB(A) would mean a doubling of the sound level and 6dB(A) would see levels 4 times experienced now, with this in mind all proactive measures should be utilized to minimize the increased Noise Nuisance.

The Contractor again does not see this as being covered by their responsibility as they are working to a brief and again referred me to Transport Scotland and Fife Council, I would therefore ask if the following measures are being considered to reduce noise

1/ Additional Foliage (on the upper cutting steps of the existing bridge. 2/ Noise reducing road surface. Large Bunds with trees either side slope.

(d) Increased traffic entering the village not only from the attraction of the 3 bridges all situated at one location but also existing and proposed tourist attractions with in the village, listening to discussions at the last 2 Community Council meetings I fear that Projects are being promoted and approved without the formulation of an Environmental Management Plan or

possibly ant consideration given to Parking and Traffic Management with the Heritage trust representative appearing to take the view that they have no responsibility with their developments, I would question why Fife Councils Planning , Environmental and Transport divisions are allowing the instigator of these projects not escape their responsibilities?

(e) World Heritage status has been applied for the Forth Rail Bridge without an Environmental Management Plan having been prepared; this now leaves the Village with no preparation or even out line of restrictions which may be imposed on the villagers.

(f) The redevelopment of the Ferry Boat Pier and Sailing Club is one of the developments for which no Environmental Management Plan has been produced along with the Railway Station, Lighthouse and the Beamer Rock Memorial, all of which generate increased traffic (it would be naive to think that only rail travelers will visit the Station) and we already have a problem with cars being left on the streets and around the school by rail users displaced from Inverkeithing.

(g) The overspill car park lost during the Bridge approach work replacement does not appear on drawings or the model of the North side is this to be replaced and if so where?

(h) The proposed Rail Museum and Visitors Center will only exasperate the village access problem, it does however

highlight the reason why Environmental Management Plans are a requirement and should not be overlooked when a small village like North Queensferry is looking to have its use exploited?

Finally one of the questions the Bridge Contractors appear to have no knowledge of is the Drainage Problem below

the Existing Fly Over has not been rectified, despite new stanchions and tunnel cover being already built, potentially, this will either be more difficult to rectify or it may be left for any tourists to enjoy the aroma.

Best Regards

Jim West