



EARL – Action Notes from Ratho Community Council Meeting

23rd October, 2006

Ratho Church Hall

Present:

Kevin Murray
Gail Jeffrey
Ameet Juttla
Paul Maddock
Judy Wightman
Scott Kennedy
Robert Campbell

tie
Scott Wilson
Scott Wilson
ERM
Ratho CC
Roddinglaw
SASA

Catherine Jackson
Gary Coutts
Malcolm Bissett
Margaret Smith
Rod Graves
Tom McCall

tie
Scott Wilson
Halcrow
MSP
Ratho CC
Roddinglaw

	Issues / Questions	Response
1	RG asked for clarification on the object of the meeting.	KM explained that the meeting object was to work through the objection, and that the agenda had been structured around this.
2	JW stated that she was happy that the RCC knew the details of scheme and did not require further explanation.	KM provided brief detail on the Consideration Stage and what is expected to take place; he also provided details regarding the Assessor hearings due to take place on week commencing 27 November.
3	RG stated that he felt it was clear from the rebuttals and for some time, that tie have not changed their position at all. RG believed that this therefore rendered the meeting a waste of time.	KM commented that there have been a number of studies undertaken recently that can provide a basis for useful discussion.
4	RG commented that tie 's "professional opinion" had been used frequently throughout the written evidence, and that it was questionable.	KM stated that a number of opportunities have been presented to RG to demonstrate the development of the design with experts in the field. These offers have not been accepted by RG.
5	TM, a resident at Roddinglaw asked if the Grade Separated Junction could not be moved back slightly. RG proposed that the grade level junction be moved north.	KM explained that the possibility of moving the junction had been reviewed but it had been found to be too expensive. GC explained that this would affect the journey time on the existing Edinburgh - Glasgow line.
6	TM commented that he felt it had been "cheeky" of tie to have written to the residents claiming that the scheme will increase the value of their properties.	KM said he would review this letter and revert back to TM. (Action 1) Post meeting note: The letter quotes that the species listed for the screening will add value to the amenity, not value.
7	RG asked for further clarification on the noise impact at Roddinglaw.	PM explained that the noise impact on Roddinglaw would be 2db, which is low. KM further explained

		that the methodology has been peer reviewed by an independent party, ARUP during the Preliminary Stage.
8	<p>RG commented that the criterion regarding noise has not yet been set.</p> <p>RG asked for clarification on who would police this? RG felt that it would be unlikely that the Local Authority would do this in practice.</p>	<p>KM explained that criteria regarding noise have been detailed in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) for both construction and operation. He made clear that the CoCP commits tie to set levels.</p> <p>KM explained that this would be the Local Authority and would be monitored by them.</p>
9	MS commented that she was aware that there is no detailed design at this time; however the residents require details to better understand the proposals and impact.	The current detail is at the level currently expected by the Parliament. KM referred to the ES policy on Noise and Vibration and Code of Construction Practice and reiterated that these commitments are enforceable through the Bill.
10	TM stated that the alternative road diversion proposed by Ratho CC would cost a bit extra but would be worth it for the sake of not having the current proposal.	KM explained that EARL is funded through the public purse and that a balance therefore needs to be found.
11	TM commented on the 6 residents who do not drive and asked for clarification on how they would get around once the road was split? SK also expressed concern over access.	KM noted that the proposals in the Bill have been approved by the City of Edinburgh Planning Committee.
12	RG stated that words and reality were different, and that families would be hurt as a result of this. He commented further that part of the RSA was cherry picking from the report.	KM commented that this had been discussed at the Planning Committee, at which RG had been present.
13	RG commented that the RSA was not compliant with the DMRB.	MB clarified that this was not the case, to which RG asked for an opportunity to discuss this in person with MB. (Action 2)
14	MS requested clarification on the degree of comfort given to the residents in terms of compliancy, and asked who this was reviewed by.	MB explained that the design is audited by peer review.
15	KM explained that surveys and the RSA have informed the decision to keep the alternative road option, and that this has been supported by a view from the emergency services.	SK stated that all surveys and investigations have been undertaken by tie , and therefore how can they be sure that they are compliant.
16	GC explained that any issues will be identified in the second RSA.	
17	TM requested a site visit to discuss the compliancy of the road diversion to DMRB standards.	MB and GC agreed to this and scheduled at date for the 31 st October. (Action 3)
18	KM commented that the Assessor site visit information should have been sent already to the lead objector.	MS to check with the Private Bills Unit that this has been done. (Action 4)
19	TM asked for clarification on who will maintain the land (Plot 456, Environmental Mitigation)	KM explained that tie do not wish to own the land, that the owner will retain ownership and will maintain it. He further clarified that the cost for maintenance would be compensated.
20	TM mentioned that he will still walk to his local pub regardless of whether or not the SASA bridge is compliant to DDA standards.	GC explained that the SASA bridge cannot be public access as it is not compliant with DDA requirements. He commented that SASA may be willing to provide access to residents. MS questioned this on the principle of the right to roam, and land reform legislation. tie to check this. (Action 5)

21	RG commented on the 6m access for the neighbouring farmer along the boundary of his property as excessive, and asked that tie consider lowering this to 3m. This would allow mature trees to be saved.	KM agreed that tie would establish what the 6m requirement is for the farmer, but commented that new trees would be planted, and that if required a site visit could be arranged to discuss planting requirements.
22	SK commented that he was concerned that in the need to make the road compliant, the residents parking would be lost. He asked if alternative parking would be provided.	KM confirmed that alternative parking would not be provided.
23	MS asked that she be copied into all papers that have been issued regarding the road.	KM agreed. (Action 6)
24	SK asked that tie also pass the supplementary paper on the Grade Separated Junction to MS.	KM agreed. (Action 7)
25	RC asked to be issued a copy of the Compensation Paper.	KM agreed. (Action 8)
26	KM informed the attendants about the Ratho Open Day on the 15 th November.	

	Action	Responsibility	Deadline
1	Issue 6 KM to review the letter issued to Tom McCall claiming that their properties would increase in value as a result of the EARL scheme.	KM	03/11/06
2	Issue 13 MB to schedule meeting with RG to discuss the RSA and to illustrate its compliance with the DMRB	MB	03/11/06
3	Issue 17 TM requested a site visit to discuss the compliancy of the road diversion to DMRB standards.	GC/MB	31/10/06
4	Issue 18 MS to check that details regarding the Assessor site visit have been issued to the lead objector.	MS	03/11/06
5	Issue 20 tie to check on the public access issue on the SASA bridge.	tie	03/11/06
6	Issue 23 KM to issue MS all papers issued regarding the road.	KM	03/11/06
7	Issue 24 KM to issue the Supplementary Paper on the GSJ to MS.	KM	03/11/06
8	Issue 25 KM to issue Compensation Guide to RC.	KM	03/11/06