

Public Displays were held on 17th April 2013 at Kinmylies Church of Scotland, Kinmylies, 18th April 2013 at Culduthel Christian Centre, Culduthel Avenue and on Saturday 4th May at the Inverness Eastgate Centre. The public were invited to comment on the scheme proposals and a comments sheet was attached to a handout made available to the public attending the displays and was available on line at the Council's project website. The Consultation period for the Inverness West Link extended from 15th April 2013 until 31st May 2013.

Seven categories of comment were invited to be completed, the landscape proposals as displayed, the proposed footpaths, cycleways etc, recreation and sporting areas, the proposed bridges layouts, suggestions for the name of the bridge crossing the River Ness, suggestions for the name of any of the roundabouts and any further comments. The display advised the Public as follows: *The Detailed Design proposals are in draft form at present. This is to allow you to contribute to the Detailed Design process and the next step is to finalise the detailed design read for the planning application.*

All public comments including comments from the Councillors at the meeting of the Inverness City Committee held before the Public Displays, have been recorded in a spreadsheet by the Council TECS services project team. Those comments relating to the Detailed Design and the Detailed Design process are listed in the following pages together with the Project Team's response to the comment. The Project Team comprised of officers from the Councils TECs services and personnel from the Councils Consultant Capita Symonds who have been commissioned to undertake the Detailed Design.

Several comments were received that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display and a summary of these comments are included at the end of the report. Some of these comments related to the Council's choice of Route 6 ahead of other options. These issues were recorded, responded to and decided upon in previous consultations and reported to The Highland Council. Therefore they are not covered in any detail within this report.

Summary:-

- 152 submissions were received from the public.
- 86 of the submissions provided constructive comments on the detailed design proposals.
- 66 of the submissions offered comments not relevant to the detailed design proposals.
- Note – 59 of those submitting a comment had previously responded to Consultations No's. 1 and 2.

No.	Ref.	Comment 1: Any comments on the landscaping proposals.	Response
3	Con1/E010	I like the idea of a linear park, with footpaths alongside the River Ness in the Holm area. The SUDS ponds have great potential for wildlife enhancement if the appropriate shrubs and trees are used.	Comment welcomed. The Council's Development Brief incorporates these ideas. Where surface water drainage arrangements allow, the SUDS ponds will be permanent water features to support wildlife habitats.
3	Con1/E010	The New bridge over the Ness fits neatly into the riverside landscape and is an attractive design. There is minimal visual disturbance to the landscape of the canal-side pitches No impact on Whin Park. The views toward (and from) the new Ness Bridge will be spectacularly good.	Positive Comments. No design change requested.
10	Con2/ E031	I am concerned that no consideration has been given to creating baffles along Holm Road as there are a number of existing houses within ten metres of the road who are likely to be affected by additional noise from the increase in traffic.	Noise assessments have been carried out and mitigation incorporated in the scheme where necessary.
21	Con3/ H006	The proposed bridge sits very well in the River landscape. The river side parks are very welcome.	Positive Comments. No design change requested.
50	Con1/H340	All the extra roads and roundabouts in plan 6 are bound to cause high carbon emissions. Traffic will be held up when the computerised opening bridges fail.	Air quality assessments have been carried out and no significant impacts have been identified. The design of the tandem swing bridge arrangement reduces the congestion due to a permanent traffic link over the canal and means that if one of the bridges fails there is an alternative route. There will always be a fixed link for traffic.
51	Con2/H029	The blue areas (The Inverness West Link Environmental Constraints) look good on a map. They are to collect road drainage water. The potential of them being dirty unkempt rubbish tips is enormous. How will they be properly maintained and managed?	The drainage basins will be part of the maintained highway network with appropriate maintenance and cleaning schedules.
53	Con2/E043	The council's preferred scheme is too complicated, and that the landscaping has not been thought through in terms of the areas topography.	The Inverness West Link is substantially at grade and the design has been carried out reflecting the topography whilst designing the link road to current standards.
54	Con3/E020	What size are the trees? What type of trees? Where are they being brought from?	There is a range of planting mixes used throughout the scheme to best suit specific areas. There will be a requirement for the contractor to use predominantly native species. The exact mix and size has not yet been determined.
75	Con1/E031	The primary concern with this route is that it is a route with a projected flow by 2020 of 10,000 vehicles per day (according to the Capita	Noise assessments have been carried out and mitigation incorporated in the scheme where necessary.

No.	Ref.	Comment 1: Any comments on the landscaping proposals.	Response
		<p>Symonds consultant) with vehicles travelling at speeds comparable to the Southern Distributor (40 mph). For comparison Kenneth Street has this flow of vehicles but travelling at a speed of approximately half of the proposed speed. Significant noise will be generated by the proposal. The route is being threaded through a very important and peaceful recreational area.</p> <p>It strikes me therefore that the current landscaping proposals are inadequate at reducing noise pollution. Physical barriers between the road and what remains of Canal Park are necessary, or alternatively physical barriers between Canal Park and Whin Park are necessary.</p>	<p>Noise mitigation measures have been added to the scheme at the length at the Canal Parks. Alternative pedestrian/cycle routes are being provided to the tow path and Whin Park.</p>
78	Con3/E029	<p>Given the proposed landscaping I would actively question whether any discussion has actually been had with those who use the recreational areas this proposition intends to cut a road through. If this is in fact the case, has any heed been taken of the replies?</p>	<p>We have had regular discussions with Highland Rugby Club, Inverness Leisure and Inverness Rowing Club. The landscaping has not been a significant issue at these discussions, with minimising the land take as the primary issue. Additional planting has been incorporated wherever practical. The Pre Application Process has also enabled the wider public to comment on the proposals for this area.</p>
84	Con2/E025	<p>The project as it now stands will go a long way to irreparably destroying the calm and scenic landscape to the immediate west of the city. Once this is damaged in this way it will be exceedingly difficult if not impossible to restore it.</p>	<p>Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate these impacts as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.</p>
97	Con3/E044	<p>The introduction of a major road through this area of outstanding beauty would be a disfigurement to the landscape, both aesthetically and environmentally. This proposal would render the inherently calm and wild vernacular of Inverness city (a difficult balance to achieve in any city, yet currently attained in Inverness!) and transform it into most other generic cities that place value on the rough, loud and transient nature of road travel above that of a places natural charm.</p>	<p>Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate these impacts as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.</p>
104	Con3/E049	<p>It is good to see the trees and pathways will be maintained. Does road is lined by trees that contribute to a village feeling and I hope when houses are built that these will stay.</p>	<p>The Does Road frontage trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and are unaffected by the Inverness West Link.</p>
105	Con3/E050	<p>Keeping the mature trees is a welcome sight, though provision for maintaining this when some of them die off is also important. The landscaping as shown in the video is somewhat misleading as the</p>	<p>The visualisation showed the opening year for the Inverness West Link and assumed no housing yet constructed at Ness Side. It also did not show any</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 1: Any comments on the landscaping proposals.	Response
		<p>majority of the time that the road is in place will be when the area is built up.</p> <p>As the city faces new challenges considering increased flood risk, altering the landscape of the area further west to replace the Carse as a flood plain would provide an inexpensive way to protect the central areas of the city from floodwaters coming downstream in the spring spates. This would alleviate pressure for the need for costly new flood defences, and will add to the effectiveness of those already in place. As a short river with limited bank space, there is little opportunity left to use the natural areas of the River Ness to protect the city from this growing threat.</p>	<p>planting as it takes a number of years to establish. This was intended to show the worst case.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed to have no net effect on the flooding in the area. Additional flood management is outside the scope of this project.</p>
115	Con1/E158	<p>It is important to ensure that there is sufficient space between the river and the road to develop a path wide enough to allow walkers and cyclists; and to enable a green corridor that separates the path from the road to create a recreational space such as it happens with 'the Islands' and paths into town.</p> <p>The current pavement area along the southern distributor road is not a good path model to follow, it is noisy and unpleasant for walkers/families and runners. While cyclists are faced with having to dismount their bikes from their pavement at every roundabout or venture cycling beside the fast traffic.</p> <p>Native open woodland and more natural looking trees/shrubs will blend better with the river, providing conservation benefits and a better visitor experience, than a more formal garden landscape style - as it is the case with 'the Islands' as an example.</p>	<p>The Project Team have allowed space for future access/landscape improvements adjacent to the river for a green corridor as suggested. A linear park is proposed for this location but is not part of the Inverness West Link project.</p> <p>The scheme has the same details as the Southern Distributor Road but additional links and underpasses have been added into the scheme to provide alternative links to Whin Park and the canal towpath. The Development Brief for Ness-Side also includes additional cycleways, footpath connections and green space.</p> <p>There is a range of planting mixes used throughout the scheme to best suit specific areas. There will be a requirement in the Contract for the road construction, for the contractor to use predominantly native species.</p>
CC3		<p>Winter Vegetation (No leaf loss on trees). There was a requirement to ensure that effective screening between the road and the rest of the area was in place from the outset in order to minimise disruption, particularly in terms of noise.</p>	<p>It has been agreed that a higher proportion of evergreen trees will be used, although deciduous trees will still be used as they are more in keeping with certain areas of the scheme. Trees do not technically offer reduction in noise and alternative noise mitigation has been used where necessary.</p>
121	Con1/E025	<p>The 'land take' for the road etc. as shown on the diagrams seems far too small.</p>	<p>The land footprint for the new road has been carefully assessed relative to that required to construct and</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 1: Any comments on the landscaping proposals.	Response
		<p>It is not clear from the pictures and diagrams what is to happen to the existing road network. What is to happen to the road that runs around the new archive centre past Whin park, up beside the sports centre car park to the main road?</p>	<p>maintain the new road. At the public display a drawing was tabled showing the existing roads and footways that will require to be 'stopped up'. This information will be published along with the other statutory consent applications in September. The road referred to will remain in place but become a cul-de-sac with Bught Road to be stopped up at the rugby car parking area, and the junction at Bught Drive and Glenurquhart Road is to be improved as the principal access road to the Sports Centre.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
1	Con1/E085	It all looks very pretty but, in reality, what is currently a pleasant, safe walk along the canal, well used by tourists, dog walkers and families will become a walk alongside a busy road with no barrier to prevent accidents. Would like to see separate cycle ways - bikes are an absolute menace on canal path	There are no proposals to include improvements to the canal towpath. The new road is segregated from the canal towpath by the existing canal embankment (apart from the bridge crossing) and the canal embankment vegetation will remain generally untouched apart from wherever there are links from the new road footway/ cycleway to the towpath and the new swing bridge.
2	Con3/E001	A one way connection to the floral hall/Bught lane/Whin park should be added to the first roundabout at Queens Park after you cross the river. Otherwise motorists in particular will have to travel a long way for a shortcut! This will reduce the amount of traffic on Bught Drive.	<p>The benefits of this proposal are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improved flexibility and access to the Sports Centre <p>The disadvantages are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impact on Sports Centre Car Park ● Impact on Canal Rugby pitches ● Impact on mature trees ● Increased risk of rat-running <p>On balance the disadvantage of the proposal outweigh the advantages and in mitigation it is proposed to improve access to the Sports Centre and the junction at Glenurquhart Rd/Bught Drive is now incorporated into the scheme and will be enhanced.</p>
3	Con1/E010	<p>I welcome the improvements and extensions to the cycling and walking opportunities in the area - particularly along the Riverside. Improved access to the Torvean esker is also a good prospect. I trust that the New Ness Bridge will have segregated cyclists and walkers from traffic?</p> <p>Is there an opportunity to provide a direct connection between the Sports Centre/Aqua Dome car parks with the new road system by creating a spur from the Queen's Park Roundabout? This would save a convoluted circuit for traffic via the ice rink road system.</p>	<p>The new Ness bridge has a shared use cycleway and footway on either side of the road with a raised kerb.</p> <p>The benefits of this proposal are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improved flexibility and access to the Sports Centre <p>The disadvantages are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impact on Sports Centre Car Park ● Impact on Canal Rugby pitches ● Impact on mature trees ● Increased risk of rat-running

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
		<p>Improved accessibility to river banks in Ness Side is very welcome. Assuming that the new Ness Bridge will segregate cyclists/pedestrians from traffic this will give much needed additional opportunities for accessing both sides of the city (South) - excellent. Improved access to Torvean Esker is also v. welcome.</p>	<p>On balance the disadvantage of the proposal outweigh the advantages and in mitigation it is proposed to improve access to the Sports Centre and the junction at Glenurquhart Rd/Bught Drive is now incorporated into the scheme and will be enhanced. Positive Comments. No design change requested.</p>
10	Con2/E031	<p>I would recommend an additional pedestrian crossing be added to the new access (currently leading to Dick Precast) as this area is likely to have high traffic value. It is likely that the additional housing will require a new school and the improved traffic management that goes with it.</p>	<p>The design for the project includes provision for additional pedestrian crossings that are anticipated when the Ness-Side area is developed. Ducts under the carriageway and side roads will be installed to allow signalised pedestrian crossings to be introduced on defined desire lines and when there is an increased pedestrian movement in the area.</p>
11	Con3/H003	<p>The scheme obviously priorities car traffic: not enough thought for cyclists and pedestrians. Roundabouts are difficult for cyclists to negotiate and mean pedestrians have longer to walk. Therefore provision of underpasses for pedestrians would be useful. Pavement beside a fast moving road provides an unpleasant walking environment - therefore set the pavement back from the road with planting between. Must provide a push button crossing for Glenurquhart Road.</p>	<p>Two underpasses now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. A Toucan push button pedestrian/cyclist crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness Side Development plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p>
12	Con1/H251	<p>So many busy roads for pedestrians to cross at different gradients not conducive to easy access.</p>	<p>Two underpasses now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and Cyclists desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. A Toucan push button pedestrian/cyclist crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. An additional footpath link to the towpath incorporated into the scheme to provide</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
			alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness Side Development plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.
14	Con3/H004	<p>Need better access to canal path from Aqua dome for pedestrians and cyclists E.g. underpass (wide, bright and safe) or pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>Make sure footpaths stay fit for cyclists (>3.3m wide).</p>	<p>Two underpasses and new ramps now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82.</p> <p>The Design Team have given careful consideration of the comment. With four sections of the Southern Distributor Road constructed with this standard detail it has been decided to complete the fifth and final section including the detail, to provide a consistent approach that the public recognise and are familiar with. Consideration has been given to including off line footway/cycleway length and the design now has added a link from the north side of the bridge over the River Ness to the canal towpath.</p>
15	Con1/H002	Will there be a light controlled pedestrian crossing where the Great Glen Way crosses Glenurquhart Road East of the bridge and proceeds towards the riverside?	A Toucan traffic light controlled pedestrian/cyclist crossing on the A82 located to the west of the Tomnahurich swing bridge has been added to the design. The crossing will be part of the rerouting of the Great Glen Way required as part of the scheme.
19	Con3/E005	More ramps from new road to Queens park area. The proposed ramp requires a detour and dismounting for the steps look an easier option.	Two underpasses and new ramps now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82.
21	Con3/H006	The new bridge will increase opportunities for cycling and walking all the river side's and canal.	Positive Comments. No design change required.
45	Con1/H143	<p>There will be a complete loss of continuity along the towpath, whereby pedestrians and cyclists would have to wait to cross the road at pedestrian lights. This is asking for trouble on what would be a fast and busy road.</p> <p>How often do you try to cross the Distributor Road at pedestrian-</p>	Two underpasses and new ramps now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82.

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
		<p>controlled lights as it is? It can be an alarming experience. Likewise a footpath alongside such a busy road is not a recreational experience - the whole of the canal pitches area would be in the "footprint" of the road - even if, as claimed, the Whin Park play area is "untouched" - who would want to take their children to play in such close proximity to something like the Distributor Road?</p> <p>It is a nonsense to say that a major (and presumably you hope, busy) road will not affect the areas immediately beside it.</p> <p>Any roundabout effectively "sterilises" a large area of land around it, and its effect is not as neat as shown on plans.</p>	<p>Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate these impacts as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.</p>
50	Con1/H340	<p>Footpaths and cycle ways will be unavoidably noisy and unpleasant in spite of attempts to provide undergrowth. People will not choose to take walks in this area. Underpasses are unpleasant in times of darkness so joggers will avoid them.</p>	<p>Two underpasses now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness-Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops. Underpasses will be lit and will include CCTV cameras to reduce likelihood for anti-social behaviour.</p>
53	Con2/E043	<p>The greatest drawback of this scheme as a whole is the effect on the river and canal corridor. This area currently provides uninterrupted green space from the centre of the city to recreational facilities at Bught and beyond to Dochgarroch. The proposed road will slice this area up into disconnected green spaces blighted by traffic noise and air pollution.</p>	<p>Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate these impacts as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.</p>
65	Con1/H184	<p>I would hope that proposed footpaths and cycleways are separate from one another. This is based on my experience as a pedestrian who has narrowly missed being knocked down on several occasions by cyclists on the existing pavements.</p>	<p>The proposals do not separate cyclists and pedestrians due to requirement to minimise the footprint of the scheme. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness-Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
75	Con1/E031	<p>As mentioned above the proposed West Link is expected to carry a substantial volume of traffic (10,000 vpd in 2020) similar to that travelling on Kenneth Street but at what is likely to be double the traffic speeds. Traffic flows on the A82 in the vicinity of the proposal are also expected to increase. These traffic flows will represent a huge barrier to pedestrians and cyclists, who need to 'interact' with the traffic (e.g. cross the road).</p> <p>At the moment no consideration has been given in the design as to how such users of the road network will interact with the traffic. The proposed design is reminiscent of car centric designs from the 1980s rather than a modern holistic design that caters for all road users.</p> <p>The current design standards for categorising pedestrian severance on new roads are contained in DMRB Volume 11. With the traffic flows as suggested by the consultant (10,000 vpd) the route will have a Moderate severance impact on users at one at-grade crossing. At a Moderate level of severance impact "some users particularly children and elderly people will be dissuaded from making trips" (source DMRB Vol 11). As traffic flows increase through the lifetime of this scheme the severance impact will increase to that of Severe. At a Severe severance impact "People are likely to be deterred from making trips to an extent sufficient to induce a re-organisation of their habits. This would lead to a change in the location of centres of activity or in some cases to a permanent loss to a particular community" (Source DMRB Vol 11).</p> <p>The guidance also states that if two or more 'Moderate' barriers to pedestrian/cyclists exist then the severance should be categorised as Severe. For pedestrian and cyclist movements between Kinmylies/Dalneigh routeing along the canal towards the Aqua dome and Whin Park this is the case as either they have to cross two highly trafficked roads or they will need to make significant detours to a safe crossing point. The proposal as currently designed therefore is viewed as having a negative impact on pedestrian and cyclist movements at a Moderate to Severe level. This is of particular concern when it is</p>	<p>demand develops.</p> <p>Two underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. A Toucan push button pedestrian/cyclist crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness-Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement covers this topic and will be submitted as part of the Planning Application.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
		<p>considered that 30% of households in Inverness do not have access to a car (Census 2001) and houses in Kinmylies and Dalneigh score badly on all the indices of deprivation (SIMD indices). Clearly this has to be unacceptable in a proposal which has as one of its objectives the promotion of Active Travel. There is therefore a need to provide safe pedestrian crossing facilities on all the side arms to each of the roundabouts and across the main carriageways. These facilities need to protect pedestrians and cyclists and minimise distance travelled. Ideally however the junctions should be re-designed to cater for all road users rather than being car dominated. Multilane roundabouts for example represent a formidable barrier to cyclists, reducing cycle use of such facilities to just the 'hardcore'. Modern designs slow traffic down physically (though design) or use traffic signals to control the traffic. I would urge you to consider such modern designs in this proposal so as to truly cater for all road users and to meet the Active Travel objective of the proposal.</p>	
76	Con2/E054	<p>The footpaths and cycleways contiguous with carriageways should be delineated with road markings and symbols so that everyone will know exactly where they should be, as the current practice of having shared surfaces for pedestrians and cyclists results in cyclists choosing either to go on the carriageway endangering themselves and annoying drivers or on the footpath annoying pedestrians. This may not cost any more as the expensive margins of paving blocks which require costly regular applications of environmentally unfriendly weedkiller could be omitted. To encourage cyclists to use the cycleways, kerb up stands at junctions etc should be zero at points where they have to cross kerb lines.</p>	<p>The Design Team have given careful consideration of the comment. With four sections of the Southern Distributor Road constructed with this standard detail it has been decided to complete the fifth and final section including the detail, to provide a consistent approach that the public recognise and are familiar with. Consideration has been given to including off line footway/cycleway length and the design now has added a link from the north side of the bridge over the River Ness to the canal towpath.</p>
84	Con2/E025	<p>Cycleways are good, especially if they are not built adjacent to major roads.</p>	<p>Two underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and Cyclists desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide alternative route north of the river away from the road. Ness Side Development plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
		<p>A cycle bridge / foot bridge across the Ness to the west of the islands would be a good thing. Pedestrians have very good access to the Islands (too many dogs), Whin Park and the path along the canal to Loch Ness. Building a road will only make it worse for the walker.</p>	<p>develops. These features will help remove cycleways away from the road. A separate cycle/footbridge across the Ness is not part of the proposals but the road bridge does include wide shared use footways/cycleways on each side of the road.</p>
96	Con2/E085	<p>I think what is there just now (before you build all these roundabouts) works fine - I can cycle from Drummond/East Inverness through Bught park to the sports centre or canal area Tomnahurich or over to Craig Dunain without having to negotiate a busy road and lots and lots of roundabouts. It looks like I'll no longer have the pleasure. If I did decide to cycle the long way around on the bypass -(as opposed to via what's left of the park) - I'd have to either - ignore the cycle path and ride on the road - get off my bike at every roundabout and push my bike over the road which defeats the object - I might as well ask for a lift in the car.</p> <p>Is there a foot bridge of stair way so that pedestrians on the riverbanks (yes some of us do still wish to walk there - even after it has been spoilt) can get across the river.</p>	<p>Two underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and Cyclists desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide alternative route north of the river away from the road. Ness Side Development plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p> <p>Ramps and steps are being provided at the River Ness bridge to provide access to the river side paths from the bridge.</p>
104	Con3/E049	<p>It is great that from Holm we can still access all the footpaths to the river. Also it is good to see that the Bught park will be unaffected by the road.</p>	<p>Positive Comments. No design change required.</p>
105	Con3/E050	<p>Access to the riverside being maintained, particularly in several areas is important to me as a local resident. These have been maintained in enough areas which are good to see.</p>	<p>Positive Comments. No design change required.</p>
109	Con3/E054	<p>I write as a regular "guest worker" to this city who greatly appreciates the ease with which I am able to do business by bike (meetings, consultations etc.) around Inverness. The high proportion of (Victorian?) river crossings in Inverness that are only available to pedestrians (some of whom push a bike) has helped give Inverness and unenviable advantage (over my home town Perth for example) in making the city more foot and bike friendly and so an attractive place to visitors, residents, workers. Overall this western link will reduce the advantage that travel by foot and bike has in crossing the river and hence will dilute this "unenviable advantage". The hope is that any</p>	<p>The new footway/cycleway link along the south side of the Canal Parks will expand the network in this area and it is anticipated that a dedicated footway/cycleway link into Inverness will be provided in the future.</p> <p>Two underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
		<p>initial temporary decrease in city centre traffic will be captured synchronously by infrastructural changes to the city centre to make it more convenient for foot and bike movements. Increasing road capacity (e.g. through the west link) always encourages traffic growth. Therefore significant effort needs to be made to encourage walking and cycling and public transport in line with the council's (and government's) desires on transport. It is therefore in the city's (and the region's) long-term interest to listen carefully to advice (especially technical) from expert user groups for the transport modes that are at the top of the transport hierarchy. For example: Living Streets Scotland, Cycling Scotland, Highland Cycle Campaign, CTC, Spokes, and Transform Scotland. If their advice isn't forthcoming via consultation (as they are overly-stretched organisations) then their opinions should be solicited directly.</p>	<p>route north of the river away from the road. The Ness-Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p>
115	Con1/E158	<p>It is important to maximise the opportunity to create a network of cycling and walking paths, in particular a route along the river Ness in town. There is a good connection under the road in the west side. But at present on the east side it looks like the path along the river is just following the road line rather than maximising the opportunities to connect areas by foot/cycle. The path needs to continue towards the city centre and towards Dores. A network of path needs to be planned out for example using the sustran/spokes model in Edinburgh (produced by the Lothian Cycle Campaign):</p> <p>http://www.sustransshop.co.uk/products/5304-spokes-edinburgh-map</p>	<p>The new footway/cycleway link along the south side of the Canal Parks will expand the network in this area and it is anticipated that a dedicated footway/cycleway link into Inverness will be provided in the future.</p>
CC1		<p>Canal Park – Footways. If possible, it might be best to locate footpaths on the river side (and not on the roadside) as this would create a more pleasant environment for pedestrians.</p>	<p>An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road.</p> <p>Ramps and steps are being provided at the River Ness to provide access to the river side paths from the bridge.</p> <p>This will allow pedestrians/cyclists the opportunity to travel remote from the roadside. Consideration is to be given to a suitable replacement to the existing gate</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
			<p>arrangement on the towpath to deter motorcycle use.</p> <p>Currently walkers using the canal pitches do so without any formal path. The road proposals show a formalised path to be constructed along the edge of the pitches adjacent to the Mill Lade (Electric Burn), therefore the option to provide a remote path between the revised rugby pitches and the new road is not to be progressed, other than to provide the opportunity for walkers on the canal pitches to gain access back up to the roadside footway by the means of access points through the sports netting.</p> <p>If in the future there is evidence that this area is subject to high usage, a more formal path could be provided. The footway along the south side of the Canal parks is not to have a bituminous surface.</p>
CC6		Disabled Driver Usage of the Green Route. The needs of disabled drivers and pedestrians had to be considered as a priority from the outset.	The normal regulations for disabled drivers will apply. A Non motorised Users audit will be undertaken as part of the project, this looks at how the project caters for Pedestrians, Cyclists and Equestrians.
CC15		Concerns re noise and adequate access to riverside area	Additional noise mitigation measures have been added to the design following the completion of the noise assessment work that will be reported in the Environmental Statement. The south side riverside area will have three pedestrian access points provided.
CC16		Existing SDR is boring road to walk along with no interest	<p>An additional footpath link to the towpath incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p> <p>The location is also different as the new road will be near the River Ness and Canal with differing views.</p>
121	Con1/E025	Overall, there will be more road crossings to negotiate if you are a	The path along the side of pitches adjacent to Whin

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
		<p>pedestrian. I am also very concerned regarding possible 'user conflict' alongside Whin Park. In more detail, the path along the side of pitches adjacent to Whin Park is now described as a '3m wide walking and cycling...' Plus it seems to be shown as a route for cross country. It will not encourage many people to walk if those with push chairs, wheel chairs, walkers of all ages, some with dogs, runners and joggers, and all have to compete with cyclists for space on this path. What about people who need peace and quiet, freedom and space? Do they now have to travel further to find it? There are limitations to the existing available facilities - Whin park is not available to dog walkers and the 'Ness Islands' area is too small to accommodate the legion of regular walkers, commuters and tourists who use this area already when seeking out peace and green space away from road traffic. The paths alongside the roads will not be used by walkers who wish to take an enjoyable stroll.</p> <p>I cannot recall seeing any mention of public transport.</p>	<p>Park, to which you refer, has been recognised as a route frequently used by pedestrians and has been included in the scheme to enhance pedestrian and cyclist connections with the new road. It is anticipated that pedestrians and cyclists will be able to travel into the City Centre on a dedicated route on the north side of the river.</p> <p>Discussions have been held with Stagecoach to ensure the scheme makes adequate provision for public transport including access to new developments.</p>
125	Con1/E090	<p>Footpaths and cycleways around so many roundabouts are going to be very difficult. The "Torvean triangle", in between the two swing bridges, will also pretty much rule out of popular use an area nearly the size of the city centre, because few will want to negotiate those roads to spend time in a green space surrounded by busy traffic.</p>	<p>The Design Team will ensure that the final detailed design includes appropriate provision by way of drop kerbs etc at pedestrian/cyclist crossing points as well as a number of underpasses.</p>
126	Con2/E109	<p>The current cycle/walk route along the canal banks is free from traffic noise and pollution and it is difficult to see how the new road plan can create anything to match the green recreational space that is currently there. Road noise, pollution and multiple roundabouts may suit the car user but certainly won't benefit the cyclist or walker. It is important to ensure that whatever is built for non car users does not follow the example of the southern distributor road - a wide pavement beside the road is not a quality experience for cyclist/walkers or runners. Surely we should be encouraging people out of their cars rather than into them?</p>	<p>Careful consideration was given to altering the standard detail for pedestrians and cyclists incorporated along the Southern Distributor Road. Moving the location for pedestrians and cyclists from adjacent to the carriageway to divorced paths running parallel to the road was considered. Considerations relative to safety at a divorced location, the additional cost for separate lighting all contributed to a decision to retain the standard detail. However an additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
127	Con1/E210	<p>1) The canal side area will be ruined from a cycling and walking perspective for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more traffic in the immediate locality - awkward roundabouts to negotiate - poorer environment (the avenue of beech trees by the sports centre will have been removed). <p>2) The bridge over the river could be used as a river crossing on foot or bike. However it looks like there are no steps/ramps up to in from either of the river banks - so it's only a vehicular bridge.</p> <p>3) Cyclists like to cycle without having to get off and push their bikes over kerbs and roundabout slip roads. There are too many roundabouts on this new route that involve jumping awkward kerbs and road crossings. What was once an easy cycle from the sports centre west over the Tomnahurich bridge now involves a series on non cycle/pedestrian friendly roundabouts.</p> <p>I recently managed to get my young cyclist daughters over to the west side of the canal - it will not be possible to do this safely with the new road layouts.</p>	<p>the road.</p> <p>1) Underpasses now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness-Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p> <p>2) Full connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists from the bridge location to the river banks will be provided by ramps and steps.</p> <p>3) The design team will ensure that the final detailed design includes appropriate provision by way of drop kerbs etc at pedestrian/cyclist crossing points.</p>
136	Con2/E192	<p>In the current plans there do not seem to be safe crossing points for cycle traffic - at Tomnahurich roundabout for example. For cyclists travelling from Tomnahurich and wishing to travel to Kinmylies for example a roundabout will have to be negotiated or crossing a busy road required. Regular zebra crossing points with traffic speed calming features should be installed to ensure traffic flow is at a safe speed and crossing places are easily accessible for all cycling and pedestrian users.</p>	<p>Two Underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness-Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.	Response
			constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.
137	Con1/E027	In the current plans there do not seem to be safe crossing points for cycle traffic - at Tomnahurich roundabout for example. For cyclists travelling from Tomnahurich and wishing to travel to Kinmylies for example a roundabout will have to be negotiated or crossing a busy road required. Regular zebra crossing points with traffic speed calming features should be installed to ensure traffic flow is at a safe speed and crossing places are easily accessible for all cycling and pedestrian users.	Two Underpasses now incorporated into the scheme at Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness-Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops. The roundabouts will have splitter islands where pedestrians can also cross.
38	Con1/H061	<p>(1) I think it is important to have new planting of trees running on both sides of the river and elsewhere arranged so to be as contiguous as possible.</p> <p>(2) I'd like you to ensure that residents of Holm Mills have joined-up pedestrian access to use the river crossing AS SOON AS IT IS OPEN FOR TRAFFIC in order to get over/back to the Bught, and not have to wait for walkways/paths until the "future development" happens.</p>	<p>(1) Comment noted and the design will be completed making every effort to ensure the tree planting where required reflects the comment.</p> <p>(2) A short term footway/cycleway link is being added to the design for a 2.5m wide unsurfaced footway/cycleway link from Dores Road to the stub end of the side road from the Mill-Lade roundabout. The temporary link to have bollards at each end to prevent misuse and have fencing on both sides. The temporary link will be removed as and when any housing development proceeds at that location.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 3: Any comments on recreation and sporting areas	Response
3	Con1/E010	<p>The concept of a Sports Hub for the city is welcome. Minimal loss of rugby club pitch will be more than compensated by development of other pitches in the Torvean area. Replacement facilities for other sports interests appear to improve all the recreation provision in the area. New holes in the Torvean area for the Golf Club will greatly improve its attractiveness and competitiveness as a city course and the new club house facilities are much needed. Cycling and walking in the area will link all the sports interests together.</p> <p>The prospect of a new canal-side marina is also very exciting. Plus: Sports Hub - great idea. Rugby Club only losing one pitch - (what is all the fuss about!). Replacement/new pitches in the Torvean area will more than compensate. Better access to rowing club and an expanded Torvean Golf Club with improved/new club house is good news for city.</p> <p>Is there an opportunity to provide more immediate access to existing sports centre car park by providing direct link from Queens Park Roundabout? Retaining the convoluted route to the car park via the ice-risk seems a lost opportunity.</p>	<p>Comments Welcomed. No design changes required.</p> <p>The benefits of this proposal are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improved flexibility and access to the Sports Centre <p>The disadvantages are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impact on Sports Centre Car Park ● Impact on Canal Rugby pitches ● Impact on mature trees ● Increased risk of rat-running <p>On balance the disadvantages of the proposal outweigh the advantages and in mitigation it is proposed to improve access to the Sports Centre and the junction at Glenurquhart Rd/Bught Drive is now incorporated into the scheme and will be enhanced.</p>
9	Con1/H366	<p>Road Proximity to Queens Park is a concern.</p>	<p>The Project Team have held several meetings with the operators of the Queens Park Stadium given the proximity of the road proposals to the stadium. Mitigation measures have been included to minimise any impact on the location.</p>
12	Con1/H251	<p>Criminal desecration of rugby and golf land with no clear alternative costings included. How the proposed replacement facilities to be funded? Will the new pitches/course be in place before works take</p>	<p>The cost estimates prepared for the Inverness West Link project at Consultation II stage (Options Appraisal) included, for Option 6, costs for relocating 4 holes of</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 3: Any comments on recreation and sporting areas	Response
		away existing provision?	Torvean Golf Club, Inverness Blitz American Football training facilities and adjustments to the Highland Rugby Club pitches. The project cost estimates have been updated to reflect the final design. The works required to relocate Inverness Blitz American Football training facilities and adjustments to the Highland Rugby Club pitches will be completed before Stage 1 of the road scheme commences and Torvean Golf Club works will be in use ahead of the Section 2 works start.
19	Con3/ E005	The relocation of the sports facilities should begin during the Phase 1	The works required to relocate Inverness Blitz American Football training facilities and adjustments to the Highland Rugby Club pitches will be completed before Stage 1 of the road scheme commences and Torvean Golf Club works will be in use ahead of the Section 2 works start.
21	Con3/H006	I like the idea of the sports hub. I am surprised and pleased to see that the new bridge does not disturb Whin Park and there is only the one rugby pitch lost. All the press coverage suggested that there would be major destruction of recreation areas but this is not the case. The replacement of golf course and rowing club is essential.	Positive Comments. No design change required.
22	Con3/H007	I don't see any details of the Golf Course and Club House etc. Is this cost included in the average cost?	The cost estimates for the changes to the Golf Club arising from the impact of the project and its operations are included in the scheme cost estimates. However the enhancements to the Golf Club are part of the Golf Course and Sports Hub project which is separately identified in the Council's Capital plan.
43	Con3/H008	<p>The A82 roundabout enlargement will be very detrimental to the sporting facilities at Queen's park with increased pollution and noise at unacceptable levels. These facilities are not just used by the general public, but are the training ground for a number of young athletes well on their way to performing well at an international level. Constraints imposed by this proposal will prevent future development of the stand at the running track.</p> <p>The route is also unacceptably close to the rugby pitches for the same reasons, particularly at the south end. There is a total loss of recreational use of the land currently outwith the pitches area with</p>	<p>Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate the impact as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.</p> <p>Noise mitigation in the form of a 900mm high wall has been added to the design at this location to accommodate the requirements of the Environmental</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 3: Any comments on recreation and sporting areas	Response
		route overlying areas currently used by walkers and others. Inverness Harriers currently make use of this "lost" area for a number of events during the winter. Sheet 3 shows a 25m development exclusion zone. This is conveniently not bothered with in relation to the sporting areas.	Statement. The 25m exclusion zone is to restrict housing development in the future being constructed right up to the edge of the new road. To the south of the river the land is zoned for development, the north is not the same and the 25m exclusion is not necessary.
50	Con1/H340	Recreation areas will be surrounded by traffic and the air quality will be poor. Wildlife will leave the area or be in danger of being run over by traffic.	Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate the impact as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme. Extensive wildlife surveys have been completed and impacts assessed. The impact is assessed as low and where appropriate, mitigation is included into the scheme.
54	Con3/E020	There will be a HUGE impact on Whin Park with the road going along the route the Council has decided on the noise and pollution. There will be a loss of facilities at the rugby club. They will lose pitches. The noise and air pollution? The road/roundabout near to the running track?	An Environmental Assessment has been completed and the proposals will not have a significant negative impact on Whin Park. Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate these impacts as identified in the Environmental Statement and provide benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme. There will be no loss of facilities at the Highland Rugby Club. The Club operate under a lease from the Council which includes for three pitches and three pitches will be provided for the Club remaining at the Canal Parks. Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate the impact as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.

No.	Ref.	Comment 3: Any comments on recreation and sporting areas	Response
		<p>The American football club where are they going?</p> <p>The Torvean Golf club will be disrupted?</p>	<p>Inverness Blitz American Football Club training area operates under a temporary lease from the Council. The Club training area is relocating to a location adjacent to the main pitch at the Bught Park.</p> <p>The project team are preparing design drawings for a relocation of Torvean Golf course that will be an enhancement of the existing course.</p>
58	Con3/H013	As much of this as possible to keep people healthy in body and mind thereby a saving to NHS.	Positive Comments. No design change required.
65	Con1/H184	<p>I am very disappointed with the proposals re. Torvean Golf Course. It seems to me that one of the most attractive parts of the course will be removed if this project goes ahead.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how such destruction of existing excellent facilities can be justified. Surely we should be looking to preserving all the sporting facilities for which the people of Inverness have fought so hard in the past.</p>	The project team are preparing design drawings for a relocation of Torvean Golf course that will be an enhancement of the existing course.
73	Con1/E146	It seems from one report you have no idea of costs involved.	Costs associated with all 8 options were included in the STAG assessment and Public Consultation II. Details of updated costs are included in the Planning Application (Scheme Economic Report).
75	Con1/E031	The recreation and sporting areas are very negatively impacted by the proposal. The noise pollution will be most unpleasant for users of the rugby ground, the canal and Whin Park. Noise reduction barriers should be included in the design.	There will be an impact at this location and Noise mitigation in the form of a 900mm high wall at the back of road verge on the Canal Parks side, has been added to the design at this location to accommodate the requirements of the Environmental Statement.
78	Con3/E029	Destroying the canal parks in favour of this road is the absolute wrong way to go about this. I myself am very fond of walking my dog along the canal park and I cannot think of anything worse to happen than to cut a road through it. The pollution and noise that would result is absolutely unwelcome.	Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate the impact as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.
84	Con2/E025	Cutting a chunk out of the rugby ground does seem a shame. I really don't like the high fence running along the major road much too close to the field. It's not the same participating in sport next to a busy road!	Comments noted, arrangements have been made to accommodate the Rugby Club at the Canal Parks but it may relocate to the Sports Hub at a future date. If the relocation proceeds the sports netting will not be needed.
85	Con3/E035	I am anxious to ensure that recreational provision in Inverness will not	Throughout the period after the Council selected Option

No.	Ref.	Comment 3: Any comments on recreation and sporting areas	Response
		<p>be undermined by the development. It's not clear how the rugby and golf clubs will adequately compensated for loss of land, what the public sector cost of providing like with like facilities would be, how it would be funded and what implications there will be for the running costs of clubs affected.</p>	<p>6 as the preferred option regular meetings have been held with the various sports clubs affected by the proposals. The arrangement at the Canal Parks for Highland Rugby Club during the Stage 1 period has been discussed in detail and the associated costs included as Accommodation Works in the project cost estimate. Similarly discussions are on-going with the Golf Club.</p>
96	Con2/E085	<p>Those that have to drive to the sports centre and park areas are going to have to look for parking spaces further afield because you have built over some of the current ones.</p> <p>The current sports facilities are all together - in a great great green space. These plans will have current and new facilities in different localities divided with a few roundabouts and roads - it's dreadful.</p>	<p>The scheme proposals do not reduce the number of parking spaces available at the Inverness Sports Centre nor at the Rugby Club location. Replacement parking at the Rugby Club will provide the same number of spaces with a nominal increase.</p> <p>Underpasses now incorporated into the scheme at Queens Park area where pedestrian and Cyclists volume is anticipated to be high and on the A82. A Toucan push button pedestrian/cyclist crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. This will improve the connectivity between sports facilities.</p>
97	Con3/E044	<p>The road will create small islands of green and recreation space which I fear will ultimately become underused and then redundant. I would not want to walk, cycle or picnic in areas so close to a major road which houses large volumes of traffic, pollution and noise. Again, it is so sad to see these beautifully simple spaces which allow people the time and space to reflect upon life, spend time with their family, and enjoy the splendour of Inverness so harshly undervalued. The cost of this, I fear, will have far longer lasting impacts on social interaction, mental well being and uptake of sport (via early years natural play) than can be 'simulated' at present.</p>	<p>Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate the impact as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.</p>
104	Con3/E049	<p>The extra parking due to go in by the rugby pitches should help with the always busy leisure centre car park. With further housing though I think there is a clear case for sports facilities on the other side of the river. The leisure centre is already very busy with waiting lists for many of its key services. Similarly a park in keeping with the style of Bellfield park in Holm would benefit the community.</p>	<p>There will be no extra parking, 'like for like' replacement however the Sports Hub proposal includes additional parking facilities.</p> <p>The Council's Development Brief allocates for an additional sports pitch at Ness-side.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 3: Any comments on recreation and sporting areas	Response
121	Con1/E025	The pitches appear to be uncomfortably close to the new road. Overall there is a lack of amenity in Inverness and the Council appears determined to prefer to prioritise road based solutions to encourage people to travel to a limited range of indoor facilities; instead of ensuring that residents on both sides of the river have a range of amenities to choose from which would encourage them not to have to travel distances.	Arrangements have been made to accommodate the Rugby Club at the Canal Parks but it may relocate to the Sports Hub at a future date.
126	Con2/E109	Any new facilities should be set back from the road so that impact of noise and pollution is minimised (e.g. can rowing on the canal or rugby on the canal pitches ever be the same with a busy road running alongside?) Even Whin park will be affected by traffic noise with the proposed route.	Careful consideration was given to altering the standard detail for pedestrians and cyclists incorporated along the Southern Distributor Road. Moving the location for pedestrians and cyclists from adjacent to the carriageway to divorced paths running parallel to the road was considered. Considerations relative to safety at a divorced location, the additional cost for separate lighting all contributed to a decision to retain the standard detail. However an additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road.
127	Con1/E210	Roads will spoil the west side of the Bught. Roads/fences/roundabouts will divide it into separate areas (walking/cycling/running from East/West i.e. by crossing canal/new road will be now be less pleasant and diminish the experience.	The design has been undertaken to address as these issues and provide the optimum solution. Following the Public Consultation No. 3 two underpasses have been added together with an additional pedestrian/cyclist link from the road to the canal towpath.

No	Ref	Comment 4: Any comments on the proposed bridges layouts	Response
3	Con1/E010	<p>New Ness Bridge sits well in the riverside landscape. I like the design - simple, graceful and pleasing to the eye. Much to be preferred to the high-level bridge over the river/canal which is being proposed by a protest group. Such a high-level bridge will be very obtrusive in the landscape of the Great Glen and will serve no useful purpose as far as I can see.</p> <p>The twin canal swing bridges are an elegant solution to a difficult traffic problem and sit in the landscape and environs of the scheduled Ancient Monument very well.</p> <p>Dual canal swing bridges working in tandem is an elegant solution to a difficult problem - (could become a tourist attraction in their own right). The new Ness Bridge is beautiful and sits in the river landscape very well. (Much to be preferred to the very obtrusive high level bridge/canal crossing favoured by some opponents of option 6)</p>	Positive Comments. No design change required.
8	Con1/H019	The existing swing bridge over the canal at Tomnahurich should be replaced by a matching modern bridge and not rely on the old existing bridge which will be the weak link on the whole route	As part of the development work for this project Highland Council have held regular meetings with representatives from Transport Scotland and Scottish Canals. Tomnahurich Bridge is owned by Scottish Canals and maintained by them with the bridge carrying Transport Scotland's trunk road traffic. The responsibility for maintenance rests clearly with these organisations and they have been advised on the Inverness West Link phasing timetable. The West Link project will require adjustments to the bridge's electrical and mechanical arrangements to allow it to be operated from the new central control building.
10	Con2/E031	I believe that the proposed layouts are the most logical routes available and will help to greatly reduce traffic congestion in the town centre.	Positive Comments. No design change required.
15	Con1/H002	As boat owners and canal users we find the idea of two swing bridges in such close proximity totally impractical as there are times when there would not be enough space for boats waiting while one bridge closes and the other opens.	Regular meetings have been held during the design development with Scottish Canals, Jacobite Cruises and Caley Cruisers. The details that are included in the scheme for temporary and permanent berthing at the bridge locations have been developed in consultation with these organisations.
21	Con3/H006	The 2 swing bridges over the canal should work very well.	Positive Comments. No design change required.

No	Ref	Comment 4: Any comments on the proposed bridges layouts	Response
22	Con3/H007	<p>I am all in favour of the proposed Option 6 line but I wonder if the Council have costs produced for a tunnel under the River and Canal? Or a small tunnel under the Canal instead of a swing bridge which I think would not cost all that much.</p>	<p>A tunnel option was assessed and this was considered within Option 8 as an aqueduct option below the canal. This was included in the Options appraisal process as part of STAG stage 2. Economics was only one of the parameters where this option received a low score. However in addition, within the STAG pre-appraisal process, a generic tunnel was considered and subsequently ruled out along with a number of other options.</p>
43	Con3/H008	<p>Scottish Canals are already constrained in bridge openings. The current proposal with a very short distance between two swing bridges would increase disruption to canal traffic and hinder a desired increase in canal traffic. A swing bridge at a slightly higher level would allow a large percentage of boats to pass by without delay on the canal. Such a bridge would obviously need to be relocated to allow for an increased approach distance. A higher bridge would also have no impact on the rowing club.</p> <p>Justification for two swing bridges close together is to avoid traffic delay, however I note on the drive through video that the designers have acknowledged that there will be delays, with the inclusion of signs asking motorists to switch off their engines when held up.</p> <p>If there is a real commitment to build the second swing bridge, why is it delayed to Stage 2? This suggests a get out clause e.g. due to financial constraints</p>	<p>Regular meetings have been held during the design development with Scottish Canals, Jacobite Cruises and Caley Cruisers. The details that are included in the scheme for temporary and permanent berthing at the bridge locations have been developed in consultation with these organisations. A swing bridge at a higher level was considered, however the land required for this would be significantly greater and impact negatively on the Queens Park stadium area.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that motorists will be held up. The signing details, to which you refer, relate to a motorist who would have erroneously entered an approach leg to one of the bridges when it is in closing mode. The sign details are being developed further in consultation with Transport Scotland as this location is within the trunk road.</p> <p>The Highland Council are fully committed to taking forward and delivering the complete Inverness West Link project. The Planning Application will be progressed in September along with seeking approval for all statutory consents for the complete scheme and the detailed design for example the new canal swing bridge is currently being taken through the Design 'Approval in Principle' stage with the detailed design well advanced.</p>
45	Con1/H143	<p>"Proposed footpaths" section for pedestrian access/crossings. Not even a tunnel on each bank for pedestrians and cyclists?</p>	<p>Underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and</p>

No	Ref	Comment 4: Any comments on the proposed bridges layouts	Response
			cyclists' volume is anticipated to be high and on the A82. A Toucan push button pedestrian/cyclist crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge.
51	Con2/H029	The real concern is that this is a 2 phase scheme. Best time estimate is that the canal bridge (new) will not be in place until 2020/21. There is a real concern that the Phase 2 element may not take place. Those who oppose this scheme, as not the best option, need to be reassured. This will be best achieved by carrying out both phase simultaneously.	The Highland Council are fully committed to taking forward and delivering the complete Inverness West Link project. The Planning Application will be progressed in September along with seeking approval for all statutory consents for the complete scheme and the detailed design for example the new canal swing bridge is currently being taken through the Design 'Approval in Principle' stage with the detailed design well advanced.
53	Con2/E043	The proposed bridge layouts are too complicated, not cost-effective and will do nothing to address the perceived traffic problems.	Option 6 which included the tandem bridge arrangement was the most cost effective of the 8 options considered as part of the STAG assessment and will be of considerable benefit to traffic in and around Inverness.
58	Con3/H013	There would still be problems with opening and closing bridges over canal particularly if one ceased which has happened in the past.	The provision of two bridges will reduce the likelihood of problems caused by breakdowns as only one bridge will be open to canal boats at any one time. Providing a route for traffic even if breakdowns do occur. There will always be a fixed link for traffic.
75	Con1/E031	The current junction designs at the bridge heads (i.e. the roundabouts) do not cater for pedestrians and cyclists. As currently designed the current proposals will represent a severe barrier to pedestrians and cyclists and are likely to lead to a reduction in Active Travel (walking and cycling) that needs to pass through the area of the bridges. The functioning of the roundabouts is 100% dependent on the compliance of drivers to the proposed variable message signs (VMS) indicating when a bridge is closed. No signage scheme and no VMS scheme have ever achieved 100% compliance. Without 100% compliance vehicles will queue over the 'uncontrolled' roundabouts 'locking' them up - this is particularly the case for westbound traffic where there is only a short stacking capacity. There is a need to design in 100% compliance to the signage. Possibly this can be achieved by having barriers on the edge of the roundabout preventing anyone exiting the roundabout when a bridge is up. This however will increase circulating traffic on the roundabout, and may lead to	2 underpasses now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and Cyclists desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. A push button crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide alternative route north of the river away from the road. Good visibility at the approach to the bridge crossing will allow drivers to make appropriate choices. The proposals have been modelled using VISSIM micro simulation and demonstrated to operate with minimal congestion/queuing up until the design year 2031.

No	Ref	Comment 4: Any comments on the proposed bridges layouts	Response
		<p>confusion and therefore drivers slowing down and accidents. This is because for roundabouts such as those on the southern distributor it is not possible to see one's exit at the point of entry. I would argue that the best way to design in 100% compliance would be to replace the roundabouts with traffic signals. At the very minimum the junctions should be tested to less than 100% of drivers obeying the signage. If the junctions cannot operate at levels of compliance that can be anticipated during the tourist season then they need to be re-designed. I cannot overstate the importance of this. If the junctions cannot operate then the scheme is a huge white elephant. The modelling methods are available to test the proposed layouts to reasonable levels of compliance and then to re-design the junctions to accommodate such a level of compliance. This is utterly essential if the Council is not to look stupid for the next 20 years - through the construction of a road design that will not operate.</p>	
95	Con3/E043	<p>Your simulation shows the bridge opening in 7 seconds. This is technically not possible. For this system to work the bridges would need to be a lot further apart. As it is six pleasure craft can leave the marina on a Saturday morning all line astern this would mean both bridges being open at the same time.</p> <p>These are pleasure craft in most cases being manoeuvred by a crew with none or very little previous experience.</p> <p>What happens to the traffic caught in-between the two roundabouts? Do they turn back and try and catch the first bridge or form a queue to wait for the second one.</p>	<p>The simulation was at an accelerated speed and only showed the bridge opening, not the barriers or lights coming into operation. However the overall transit time for a boat through the bridge replicated the current situation as advised by Scottish Canals.</p> <p>Caley Cruisers have been engaged in the design discussions and additional mooring points incorporated into the scheme.</p> <p>If drivers ignore the advance signing they can choose to wait until the bridge opens.</p>
121	Con1/E025	<p>It is not clear what 'environmental impacts' the movement of the river bridge 'west' is reducing. Despite all the comments about mitigation in the environmental section I am not convinced that there will not be a severe detrimental effect on wildlife.</p>	<p>The design team are required to assess in detail any impact on wildlife and, where required, introduce mitigation measures. This information will be presented in the Environmental Statement document which will be published as part of the Planning Application.</p>
125	Con1/E090	<p>The second swing bridge at Tomnahurich is unnecessary if a route goes through Torvean in a more direct manner from Dores Road roundabout to the A82. Obviously the second swing bridge will mean that traffic heading up the A82 will never be disrupted, but this need</p>	<p>The provision of two bridges will reduce the likelihood of problems caused by breakdowns as only one bridge will be open to canal boats at any one time. Providing a route for traffic even if breakdowns do occur. This</p>

No	Ref	Comment 4: Any comments on the proposed bridges layouts	Response
		and cost will be minimised if traffic can move in an unbroken way via the Torvean route.	provides a fixed link. The comment regarding an alternative route is not relevant to the Public Consultation No 3.
136	Con2/E192	I do not believe an additional swing bridge will result in improved traffic flows. At no point has it been made clear in the various consultations what the actual traffic need is for a new bridge.	The tandem bridge arrangement will provide uninterrupted flow for traffic removing the interruptions caused at present when the Tomnahurich bridge is opened to allow canal traffic to transit past the bridge. The provision of two bridges will reduce the likelihood of problems caused by breakdowns as only one bridge will be open to canal boats at any one time. Providing a route for traffic even if breakdowns do occur. A fixed link will be provided.
137	Con1/E027	I do not believe an additional swing bridge will result in improved traffic flows. At no point has it been made clear in the various consultations what the actual traffic need is for a new bridge.	The tandem bridge arrangement will provide uninterrupted flow for traffic removing the interruptions caused at present when the Tomnahurich bridge is opened to allow canal traffic to transit past the bridge. The provision of two bridges will reduce the likelihood of problems caused by breakdowns as only one bridge will be open to canal boats at any one time. Providing a route for traffic even if breakdowns do occur. A fixed link will be provided.

No.	Ref.	Comment 5: Any suggestions for the name of the bridge crossing the River Ness	Response
2	Con3/E001	Holm Bridge	The limited number of suggestions will be advised to the Inverness City Committee meeting to be held on 12th August 2013.
3	Con1/E010	New Ness Bridge Holm Bridge Lade Bridge	
13	Con1/E175	The bridges proposed are not significant enough to require a name. But "Holm Bridge" would do.	
22	Con3/H007	Holm Bridge	
17	Con3/E003	Bridge Street Memorial Bridge Concrete Bridge	
45	Con1/H143	Drochaid Thorr Bheathain (Torvean Bridge)	
58	Con3/H013	Dores Bridge	
73	Con1/E146	The Ness Bridge	

No.	Ref.	Comment 6: Any suggestions for the name of any of the roundabouts	Response
2	Con3/E001	Tomnahurich Roundabout Whin Park Roundabout Torvean Roundabout	The limited number of suggestions will be advised to the Inverness City Committee meeting to be held on 12th August 2013.
22	Con3/H007	The names suggested for the Roundabout are very good.	Comments welcomed. No design changes required.
51	Con2/H029	They are apparently already named. See Inverness West Link Recreational Routes	Indicative names were included to help the public to understand the proposals and the drawings presented at the exhibition.
58	Con3/H013	Torvean	
93	Con1/H045	Queens Park Roundabout	

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
2	Con3/E001	If the road is to open up previously unavailable areas of the river (particularly Ness side) then there is a need for parking and picnic areas to be created. If parking is not provided, then people will park in the residential areas creating a potential problem for residents.	A Lay by has now been included at Ness-side for access to the proposed riverside linear park which it is anticipated will include picnic areas.
2	Con3/E001	The timescale/timeline for development of many of the new Sporting enhancements should and could be carried out in tandem with the Stage 1 development of the road. The Golf Course will take several years to become established as will football pitches and Fitness trails etc. These are required now for existing residents and existing communities and not just for future residents in future housing estates.	The timetable, published as part of the Consultation, advised that the works to relocate the Torvean Golf course would coincide with the Inverness West Link Section 1 works. The Sports Hub is proposed for 2019. The Inverness Blitz American Football training area and the Highland Rugby Club pitches will all be made ready in advance of construction for the Inverness West Link Section 1 works.
2	Con3/E001	I have reservations regarding an Underpass connecting the recreational areas on both sides of the A82. I understand the need to connect both areas but I believe there is an opportunity to create a feature bridge - Torvean version of the A9 Golden Bridge incorporating public art in its design perhaps- as there is plenty of land on either side of the road for this to be developed. This would link in with the vision of "Creating landmarks and vistas to help people navigate the area" as stated in the Torvean and Ness Side Development Brief. This would be an ideal opportunity to create an iconic Gateway welcome to the West side of the City. Perhaps a bridge could reflect the Loch Ness Monster or even the creation of a Kinmylies Kelpie along the lines of the Angel of the North scale could be considered.	The underpass is proposed to provide connectivity for the proposed Golf club and Sports Hub as well as providing for pedestrian access under the A82. A feature bridge would not be as feasible as the underpass at this location.
3	Con1/E010	I welcome the council's proposals for the completion of the Southern Distributor Road - Long overdue! The New River Crossing and twin canal bridges together with linking roads and roundabouts offer a comprehensive solution to alleviating congestion in Inverness City and are practical, achievable and value for money. The complementary plans for the development of lands in the Holm and Torvean Areas for housing, recreation and community facilities are well thought out and appropriate use of land in this area of the city. I trust that these proposals can be implemented with the minimum of delay for the well-being of the city and its environs and all its inhabitants - including me! The proposals for the completion of the southern distributor road are extremely well presented and provide a comprehensive solution which	Positive Comments. No design change required.

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>should alleviate the city's traffic problems for many years ahead. They are practical, achievable and value-for-money. I support them wholeheartedly.</p> <p>The complementary proposals for the Development of lands in Holm and Torvean have also been carefully thought through and will more than compensate for the minimum disruption caused by the road proposals.</p>	
11	Con3/H003	<p>No mention of public transport!</p> <p>Please put in bus lay-bys near the river and sports area.</p>	<p>As part of the development work for this project Highland Council have held meetings with representatives from Stagecoach to discuss existing bus routes and the potential for new routes. These new bus routes will be incorporated on secondary distributors within the new developments. Several comments have been made regarding lay-bys and a segregated type lay-by has been added at the Ness-side location adjacent to the river to allow northbound traffic to park. On account of lack of space and the proximity of the roundabouts it has not been possible to include a lay-by at the Queens Park sports ground location. Two lay-bys are included at General Booth Road.</p>
15	Con1/H002	<p>Concern about access to B&B business for passing trade. Motorists may be focused on signing and not notice B&B facilities.</p> <p>Possibility of main drainage (sewer) - currently septic tanks for all, four properties at Glenurquhart Road/Torvean.</p> <p>As adjacent landowners and business owners we have serious concerns about the proposed roundabout at Tomnahurich. This roundabout will be directly in front of our Guest House and we anticipate that it will be seriously detrimental to our business. About 75% of our business comes from passing trade from the West. During the construction phase the effect will be more pronounced causing us serious financial losses. We expect to be compensated not only for the disruption to our lives but also for the loss of income which will inevitably occur. It would be helpful and reassuring if we could arrange a meeting with relevant council officials to discuss our concerns and possible resolutions.</p> <p>Another point of concern to us is that it is not clear on the planning documents what measures will be taken to ensure safe access to and</p>	<p>Every effort will be made to mitigate the impact of the improved road at these properties.</p> <p>Connecting properties to the public sewerage system is outwith the scope of the project. A letter has been issued to Scottish water on this issue.</p> <p>The design retains the existing access to these properties.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>from the shared driveway for ourselves, our guests and our neighbours.</p> <p>It also states in point 6.6 of the Developer's Requirements that all development must connect to the public and waste water network. Does this mean that we will be connected to the waste water network which currently does not extend to the five houses at the canal side? We currently have septic tanks and it would be an ideal opportunity for this to be done when major road works are being carried out.</p>	
19	Con3/E005	<p>The current canal crossing will need maintenance work before Phase 2 work starts. Part of the plan should include a significant upgrade of this bridge.</p>	<p>As part of the development work for this project Highland Council have held regular meetings with representatives from Transport Scotland and Scottish Canals. Tomnahurich Bridge is owned by Scottish Canals and maintained by them with the bridge carrying Transport Scotland's trunk road traffic. The responsibility for maintenance rests clearly with these organisations and they have been advised on the Inverness West Link phasing timetable. The West Link project will require adjustments to the bridge's electrical and mechanical arrangements to allow it to be operated from the new central control building.</p>
20	Con3/H005	<p>Ourselves - 122 and our neighbours @ 120, 120A, 120B have septic tanks. With the introduction of Phase 6 Option, extensive earthworks and roadworks will take place on Glenurquhart Road. Could HRC consider connecting our properties to the mains sewer - which I believe ends at the main Glenurquhart Road entrance to the cemetery? This would bring us into the 21st Century.</p>	<p>Connecting properties to the public sewerage system is outwith the scope of the project. A letter has been issued by Highland Council to Scottish Water on this issue.</p>
32	Con1/H087	<p>I understand that Highland Council will not place any accuracy figures at all on the traffic flow model they have used to assess the routes. Despite this, it has been claimed that this road 'will remove traffic from the city centre and make it a much more attractive place for shoppers and tourists'. What percentage of the current 2013 traffic will be reduced in the city centre by this road? What percentage of the current 2013 traffic will be reduced in the city centre after the building of the proposed 1500 homes? How will the council measure this reduction? If the city centre becomes less congested, this will encourage more drivers to take a route through it. How does the model simulate this?</p>	<p>There are predictions in reductions in traffic flows through the City Centre as determined by the traffic model (The Moray Firth Transport VISUM Model) used for the project. The reduction in congestion in the City Centre is used by the model for assignment of traffic and the model simulates this in its figures.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
35	Con1/E097	<p>Regardless of the route, please try and improve the cycling facilities. It looks like at the moment the plan is similar to the shared use pavement as the rest of the distributor road. This is fine there on the clear pieces of road, but the problems come at the roundabouts. Either the cyclist has to wait to rejoin the traffic flow or stops at each 'arm' of the roundabout to cross, but at many there aren't even dropped kerbs! I usually just cycle on the road to avoid having to constantly stop, but this can annoy passing drivers and the relatively high driving speeds would put off many new or less confident cyclists (and makes it less pleasant for any cyclist). Given that the new houses being built could result in a fairly high density of pedestrians, it would make sense to build segregated infrastructure with cyclist priority at junctions / roundabouts, or at the very least a flat surface with good sight-lines! See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wEXD0guLQY0 for a Dutch example.</p> <p>There is no reason why we couldn't do the same - everyone benefits as car drivers are less likely to be held up by cyclists on the road, there is less motorised traffic, cyclists are faster and safer, pedestrians and cyclists won't have to worry about each other, cyclists will be healthier... (I could go on). Over time I have no doubt it would pay for itself in terms of health benefits and reduced traffic (and therefore infrastructure - perhaps we wouldn't need this road if our cycling infrastructure was better!).</p>	<p>Underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and Cyclists desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. A Toucan push button pedestrian and cyclist crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p>
38	Con1/H061	<p>I think it is important to have new planting of trees running on both sides of the river and elsewhere arranged so to be as contiguous as possible.</p> <p>I'd like you to ensure that residents of Holm Mills have joined-up pedestrian access to use the river crossing AS SOON AS IT IS OPEN FOR TRAFFIC in order to get over/back to the Bught, and not have to wait for walkways/paths until the "future development" happens.</p> <p>I support the idea of a net gain of playing pitches and having the golf course entirely on one side of the A82.</p>	<p>New planting is incorporated in the scheme as exhibited.</p> <p>The design will include a short term footpath/cycleway from Dores Road to the limit of the side road spur to be constructed at the Mill-Lade roundabout until such time as the development incorporating cycle tracks is in place.</p> <p>Comments welcomed. No design changes required.</p>
42	Con2/H012	<p>Is there any data on emissions created by 9000 vehicles using route plus 5 roundabouts</p>	<p>The Environmental Statement to be submitted as part of the Planning Application will include data on air quality.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
43	Con3/H008	<p>The Leisure areas at the canal i.e. rugby pitches and running track will see an increase in pollution, both noise and air, from traffic on the nearby roads. This will be detrimental to people's health.</p>	<p>Accepted that the proposals will have a noise and visual impact on the location. However the design has been carried out to mitigate the impact as identified in the Environmental Statement and provides benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.</p>
45	Con1/H143	<p>Signage - by creating this complex road network you will necessarily have major road signage at all roundabouts and bridges. How big will these need to be? Argue with the Scottish Govt when they will undoubtedly insist on bilingual signs, thus taking up even more space. No bilingual signs! Additional instructions for the swing bridges will add to the information overload. Towpath – Your plan envisages a break in this at the bridges - there is constant cycling/walking/running use – queuing up to cross at lights? That would be detrimental in the extreme to the recreational use (additionally, rowing competitions and training need their coaches to cycle immediately beside them on the towpath). It has not been clear that the traffic problems have been adequately professionally analysed, nor how beneficial any impact on traffic flow will be. The whole tone of this comments sheet begs the question - it assumes that respondents are in favour of the decision, and that it is merely a matter of "tweaking" and tidying-up the detail. This is very far from the case. It is not universally accepted that the "consultation" was adequate There has been no attempt to deal with the traffic problem at source - i.e. by analysing journeys, limiting the numbers of vehicles, e.g. by a Congestion Charge area in the town centre area - the presumption is passively and old-fashionably to accept ever-increasing car use. If Inverness thinks it is a "city" it should look at real cities, where there is a presumption against private motor vehicles for the benefit of the greater number.</p>	<p>Transport Scotland and Highland Council have an accepted policy on the provision of Bi Lingual signs. The signs will be designed and sized in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridgeworks (DMRB) standards and conform to national and local policy on signing.</p> <p>The signs will be a simple as possible and include red/green elements to give visual impression for route to follow.</p> <p>An underpass has now been included on the east side of the canal under the proposed road and a signal controlled crossing over the A82 and an underpass on the A82 west of General Booth Road thereby providing a continuous route without the need to cross the road.</p> <p>The scheme proposals have been discussed with Inverness Rowing Club and it is envisaged that rowing competitions and training is all carried out south of the proposed bridge crossing and on competition days the new swing bridge will be left in the open position for the races.</p> <p>Traffic management proposals for the City Centre will be developed following completion of the scheme with the primary objective of improving the environment for shoppers and pedestrians within the retail and business areas.</p>
45	Con1/H143	<p>Each roundabout will presumably have at least 3 entry points, each requiring a huge major-road-type sign for traffic going at more than 30 mph. Can the Government at least be persuaded to waive the rules</p>	<p>The Highland Council and Transport Scotland each have a policy regarding dual language signing which the project is obliged to address.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>about Gaelic signage - thus reducing the size of the signs to some extent?</p> <p>Can we at least have wild flowers seeded all along the road and on the roundabouts (as in previous years on the distributor road)</p>	<p>This will be included in the detailed design.</p>
51	Con2/H029	<p>There is no parking provision on the south side of the river at Mill Lade Roundabout see Inverness West Link Recreational Routes. This is a serious omission. Parking at the Aqua dome and Highland Rugby Club Car Park will be stretched to cope. A decent sized car park will relieve congestion.</p>	<p>A Lay by is now included at Ness-side to provide better access to the river side. It may be that the Rugby Club will move to the Sports Hub and will leave the additional 104 paces available for use by Inverness Leisure attendees and users of the Canal Parks.</p>
54	Con3/E020	<p>Please do not go ahead with the destruction to the Green Space of Inverness the peace and tranquillity of Whin Park and the future opportunities of holding championships at the Rugby Club.</p>	<p>Whin Park is not physically affected by the proposed route; adverse effects from noise will be mitigated where possible.</p> <p>Highland Rugby Club have confirmed that their current competitions can still be held at the proposed rearranged rugby pitches at the Canal Park and these details have been worked up in close association with the Club.</p>
60	Con3/H015	<p>Cycle path extension from Dores to town - excellent - New Road over Loch Ness - good. From Ness Roundabout we want the rurality to dominate - not a sense of intense suburbs as a tourism business rurality is our advantage and it starts from entering South Loch Ness at the Ness (Tesco Roundabout).</p>	<p>Comments welcomed. No design changes required.</p>
61	Con3/H016	<p>The Inverness West Development is sorely needed as a frequent traveller from the A96-A82. It is of extreme benefit to everybody travelling along the bypass.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed. No design changes required.</p>
68	Con1/E113	<p>While I can understand the desire to get traffic away from the town centre, I don't think the answer is to plough a major road through the recreational heart of the city. The plan is to lose the canal pitches, increase the volume of traffic past the pool, athletics area and Bught park and to devastate Torvean golf course. Combined this is far too great a price to pay for reduced city centre traffic.</p> <p>Our recreational areas are unique, and are something that make Inverness special and are priceless. Destroy these and we are some way to turning what is left of the green part of our city into a traffic filled conurbation.</p>	<p>The canal pitches are impacted but substantially remain. This scheme provides easier access from the east side of the city to the leisure area and is a desired outcome from the operators for Inverness Leisure.</p> <p>However the design has been carried out to minimise the impact and provide benefits elsewhere. As stated in the reasons for the scheme.</p> <p>Torvean Golf course is to be relocated as part of the Sports Hub project with improved pedestrian access by the incorporation of an underpass under the A82.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
71	Con3/H018	After seeing the plans for the new bypass at the West Link "Option 6" I wanted to express my approval. I am delighted to see the new sports facilities and new housing which is also included in the plan. As someone looking to buy my new house in the near future this is exactly the sort of area I would like to live in. I also look forward to the improved journey times due to the bypass.	Comments welcomed. No design changes required.
72	Con3/E026	Although I consider that a swing bridge rates a poor second to an aqueduct ; am disappointed that no effort appears to have been made to calculate a cost for this option. My original objective of free flowing traffic on the canal and road 'can be achieved with option six. An amendment to cross the river to the West, as suggested by Inverness Civic Trust, would retain all the recreational ground that is in use at present. I do not accept that traffic noise would have a major detrimental effect on the area. The proposed bypass, with the slight amendment can be a major improvement to the road network in Inverness and encourage further enhancement of the excellent Recreational and Tourism facilities in this area of the City. It is important to take advantage of the world wide publicity generated by Loch Ness and the Caledonian Canal and look beyond the construction of a road. The development of marinas will further act as a magnet to visitors and I would urge Highland Council to conclude consultations and progress the project without further delay.	Comments welcomed. No design changes required.
75	Con1/E031	<p>(1) The proposed design is weak at integrating the housing development at Ness Side with the recreational facilities at Whin Park and the Bught unless one travels by car. Similarly it is weak at integrating the existing housing schemes at Lochardil and Holm Dell with the same recreational facilities unless one travels by car. There is a need for clear pedestrian, cyclist routes through the proposed development and over the new bridge over the River Ness. Currently in the design the roundabout at the southern (Ness Side) end of the bridge presents a formidable barrier to anyone wanting to walk and cycle. Pedestrian crossing facilities are needed.</p> <p>(2) Wouldn't it be better to route the Oban-Fort William - Inverness cycle path over the proposed new bridge and through the lovely parkland on the Bught side of the river, rather than threading it past electricity sub-station and then down Dores Rd? The junction design along the route appears to have been poorly</p>	<p>(1) The Project Team have developed the proposals for footway/cycleway links for the project with additional links added. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness Side Development plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p> <p>(2) Sustrans intend reviewing the route for the Oban-Fort William-Inverness cycle path after the Inverness West Link is constructed.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>thought out.</p> <p>Provision for Active Travel. In the 5th April press release you claimed that this route will promote Active Travel and yet aside from wide pavements no facilities have been given over to aide pedestrians and cyclists to cross the roads. The proposed route will be busy — something similar to the eastern end of the Southern Distributor or Kenneth St (but with traffic travelling twice as fast). It will be very hard to cross the road, and the roundabouts will present formidable obstacles for cyclists aside from the 'hard core'. I have used current design standards (DMRB Volume 11) to estimate the level of 'severance' that the new road will cause. I estimate it to be Moderate to Severe. At Moderate levels of severance the elderly and children will be dissuaded from walking and cycling. At Severe levels of severance changes in travel patterns will occur. This is in the locality of the new road layouts not in the town centre. This is extremely poor design as one would hope that as many people s possible would access the leisure facilities in the Bught by foot or bike, rather than be forced for safety reasons to use the car. At the minimum 'protected' crossing facilities are needed on the arms of the roundabouts, however, good holistic junction design that caters for all road users would use a different junction form to a roundabout — due to the extra delays and distance required by those using the crossings. I am surprised that your officers and their consultants have not pointed this out to you. Including pedestrian and cyclist facilities is not a simple 'add-on' after the core design work has been completed. Such facilities reduce vehicle capacity and certain junction forms are better suited to their inclusion than others. I would have thought that a road proposal in such a fantastic recreational area would be using the most modern designs that cater for all road users, rather than outdated car-centric designs. I would urge you to encourage your officers and consultants to look at examples of junction designs in Active Travel friendly (and tourist orientated) cities such as York, and even London. As the design stands I would argue that you have been poorly advised that the current proposals will encourage active travel. Guidance would suggest that it will dissuade in the vicinity of the proposals.</p>	<p>ACTIVE TRAVEL In regard to the provision for active travel the Council has always said that it is not designing just for today, although that is important, but it is also designing for the future and it is looking at sustainable travel into the future. When the project was presented at public meetings previously, we advised that the road link will have twin footpaths/cycle tracks similar to the existing Southern Distributor and these will be incorporated in the city's active travel network. There were 2 major features that were outlined at these meetings that illustrated this integrated approach. Currently access for cyclists and walkers from Holm Mains/ Ness Castle areas into the centre of the city is via Dores Road and Island Bank road which is poorly served in terms of footpaths /cycle tracks and this presents a barrier to active travel movement. The project will incorporate a cycle track into the link road that will cross the river Ness via the new Ness Bridge then ramp down underneath the bridge abutments to join with a new cycle track to the south of the Canal parks to link onto Bught Road. Thereafter the cycle track will follow the north side of the River Ness all the way in to the city centre. This will provide a much more attractive route for cyclists and walkers all the way from Ness Castle and Holm Mains into the city centre.</p> <p>Also, on the south side of the river it is proposed to plan for a green link connecting the Mill Lade roundabout on the south side of the new River Ness bridge with the Dores Road. This link will have provision for cyclists and walkers as well as buses and service vehicles but designed to avoid a rat run being created for private cars. The middle section of this secondary distributor will be for service vehicles only. This restriction will be implemented via a future traffic order or other such similar measure. This link is part of the overall master plan for the area developed through the Charrette</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>The Bridge Layouts. In concept the proposed bridge layout is innovative. However, once again the devil is in the detail of the design. For it to be successful it is essential that 100% compliance is achieved regarding the routing of the vehicles once a bridge is closed. If vehicles do not re-route to the alternative bridge then they potentially can 'lock' up the junctions at the bridgeheads. At the moment this compliance is premised on signage. However no vehicle signage system has ever achieved 100% compliance. 100% compliance needs to be designed in. I would argue that roundabouts —with their limited visibility of the exit route are the worst form of junction that can be used to design in compliance for the proposed bridge layout. A set of traffic signals with an open view of the exit, a yellow box to prevent entry to</p>	<p>process and will be beneficial in encouraging active travel in this part of the city. A short term footway/cycleway link will be provided at this location as a temporary measure.</p> <p>The area which you have focused on at the roundabouts along with footpath and cycle track links is something that the consultants, Capita Symonds, have been looking closely at and this has also been raised by others as part of the consultation response. 2 Underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature. A Toucan push button pedestrian/cyclist crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. The Council does not want car-centric designs and needs to cater for sustainable transport as part of the overall layouts. In addition as well as cycling and walking we are also looking at public transport as part of the designs and within the Development Plan the Council is planning for Park and Ride in the vicinity of the Dores Road Roundabout and the Torvean Roundabout as interceptor car parks to encourage the public and tourists to use the bus service rather than take their car into the city centre.</p> <p>THE TANDEM BRIDGE LAYOUT</p> <p>The Council's Consultants along with Scottish Canals and Transport Scotland who manage the Trunk Road network are making a big effort to get this right. Current plans include drop down barriers, VMS signing as well as CCTV. The road arrangement has been modelled with traffic flows into the future with differing scenarios, and layouts have been tweaked to ensure gridlock does not happen. The travelling public need to be clear on their route path in the event of either of the bridges being closed to traffic. There is also the issue of coordinating the bridge openings with the VMS signing through a central control tower and the electrical mechanical</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>the junction unless an exit is clear and a set of very clearly marked 'drop-down' barriers with 'diversion' signs on them and big arrows would be necessary to ensure compliance. Again it is not simply a case of replacing one junction type with another, as the manner that different junctions cater for traffic differs. It is therefore essential that the proposed junctions are tested for operational performance with less than 100% compliance, and re-designed if it is shown that they cannot work, before the Council moves onto the next stage in the delivery programme. This is most pertinent for westbound flows, as there is very little stacking capacity on the exits to the bridges and it is therefore most likely that it will be the 'town-side' roundabouts that will gridlock up when one of the bridges is closed. As it stands the West Link proposals are interesting, but I would argue remain unproven in an operational sense. I am therefore surprised that you have gone to public consultation so soon and would urge you to get your council officers and their consultants to design in pedestrian and cyclist crossing facilities and to deliver a set of bridge head junction designs that either design in 100% compliance to the diversion signage or can be proven to work with less than 100% compliance to the signage. I would say that this is a matter of great urgency given your proposal to seek planning consent in August. I would be happy to elaborate on any of the above points.</p>	<p>operation for this will require sensitive and careful design and this is something being covered by the Consultants along with Scottish Canals who will be operating the new bridge system.</p>
76	Con2/E054	<p>Considering all the savings in the provision of essential services the Highland Council has already been obliged to make and with the prospect of even more drastic savings to be made in the future, it is really astonishing to find that traffic signs on the plans for this new road are to be bilingual. As the Council's Gaelic plan has to be reviewed regularly, it is hoped that before any more bilingual signs are erected there will be more widespread consultations involving all road users informing them of the Dept for Transport's regulations which call for words on signs to be kept to an absolute minimum so that they can be easily understood by strangers, thus ensuring that signs will be fit for purpose and will not be unnecessarily expensive.</p>	<p>Transport Scotland and Highland Council have an accepted policy on the provision of Bi Lingual signs. The proposal conforms to this policy.</p> <p>The signs will be a simple as possible and include red/green elements to give visual impression for route to follow.</p>
84	Con2/E025	<p>The overhead lighting will encourage speeding at night. The huge central lights on the roundabouts - especially the one on Glenurquhart Road - are not suitable next to residential areas.</p>	<p>Lighting design has been undertaken to current standards and the central columns are smaller than used elsewhere and reduced the overall number of columns needed to adequately illuminate the footpaths and road.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>And I would like to stress that I am very concerned about the proximity of the roundabout on Glenurquhart Road to the cemetery. It seems to come right up against the part where my family are buried and I can't see how it will be built without disruption to the graveyard especially to the Catholic plots right by the road. Maybe, given the way that council motor vehicles are driven over the unsuitable paths there, I should not be surprised.</p>	<p>New white light technology incorporating dimming within the overnight period will be used.</p> <p>The road will not physically impact on the Tomnahurich cemetery although the access adjacent to the Tomnahurich roundabout will have restricted vehicular access.</p>
85	Con3/E035	<p>The Caledonian Canal is an amenity of global importance yet Highland Council is apparently prepared to allow roads to be constructed alongside it.</p>	<p>Historic Scotland and Scottish Canals are part of the key stakeholder group formed at project commencement and are content with the project proposals. An application will be made to Historic Scotland for Scheduled Monument Consent for the works within the canal boundaries. The road is situated at the bottom of the canal embankment with minimal physical impact except at the bridge crossing.</p>
93	Con1?H045	<p>Spending £27 million in keeping 2 swing bridges over the canal, with 5 roundabouts in total will not deter traffic in moving into city centre. Everything in little diagrams looks good on paper but looks completely different when finished. If it does go ahead I would like to see underpass for pedestrians and cyclists. At the roundabouts near the canal as this would stop young people on bicycles in having accidents</p>	<p>Underpasses are now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists where desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. A Toucan push button pedestrian/cyclist crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p>
101	Con3/H019	<p>I support the West Link bypass Option 6. It will significantly shorten and make easier my commute from Culloden to Drumnadrochit.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed. No design changes required</p>
105	Con3/E050	<p>The number of roundabouts already existing on Sir Walter Scott drive is a real put off to actually using it. (I think off the top of my head is currently 9 on less than 2 miles of road,) Adding more roundabouts will only dissuade people from using this new road. I will often go straight through town rather than using Sir Walter Scott drive as the number of</p>	<p>The three roundabouts north of the river are necessary to allow the Tandem bridge arrange to operate efficiently.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>roundabouts means that the journey takes far longer than necessary. They are in place for even the most minor roads, a large number of which could be amply serviced by a simple junction or small slip-road. I am of course aware that there are developments pending for this area, but adding more roundabouts to the road will only dissuade people from using it and therefore reduce its effectiveness. I have no suggestions for names of roundabouts as I believe that the area could be well served with a few junctions like those which have always worked well on Island Bank Road.</p>	
112	Con1/E071	<p>We are pleased to note that the Council is seeking to make progress with the preferred Option 6. In doing so it appears that comments we made previously on behalf of these clients in respect of visual impact and disturbance to the River Ness environment, notably the fishing interests, have been taken on board.</p> <p>The completion of the West Link will improve connections for several modes of transport (vehicles, bicycles, buses and on foot) across Inverness, relieve traffic congestion in the centre of the city. It will also open up development opportunities for healthcare related uses by charitable organisations, low density housing and expansion of green space at Ness-side Fields. It will also result in improved sports facilities on the west side of the city.</p>	Comments welcomed. No design changes required.
113	Con3/H020	<p>Access slip-road to Inverness Leisure</p> <p>Following discussions, the Board echoed my view that the Inverness West Link Road project had missed an opportunity to create a 'direct access' route from the new road / roundabouts into Inverness Leisure. We are obviously delighted that the new road will undoubtedly increase our footfall and visitor numbers, but slightly concerned that access to and from the centre will remain through Bught Drive which is already extremely busy and congested during peak operational hours. The road traffic management issues are further exacerbated when there are multi-events taking place at Bught Park, the Ice Centre and the Florians Theatre at the same time.</p> <p>We are therefore appealing to the project team to further consider some level of access ideally to and from the new road or at least access into Inverness Leisure then creating a one way system out of the centre back o the Bught Drive area.</p>	<p>The benefits of this proposal are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improved flexibility and access to the Sports Centre <p>The disadvantages are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impact on Sports Centre Car Park ● Impact on Canal Rugby pitches ● Impact on mature trees ● Increased risk of rat-running <p>On balance the disadvantages of the proposal outweigh the advantages and in mitigation it is proposed to improve access to the Sports Centre and the junction at Glenurquhart Rd/Bught Drive is now incorporated into the scheme and will be enhanced.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>Improvements to car parking During our discussions at the board meeting there were some concerns expressed on how our already under-pressure car park at Inverness Leisure would be impacted due to the undoubted increase in visitor numbers.</p> <p>The Board of Management were keen that the car parking arrangements (for the complete project) were fully discussed and where possible consideration given to increasing the provisions at Inverness Leisure perhaps by a more structured amalgamation of our own and the parking at the rugby club. We are asking for the parking to be re-assessed and hopefully increased due to the fact that we feel our car park will now be used as a gateway for the canal / pathways for various walking, jogging, dog-walking etc. much more so than currently.</p> <p>We were also keen to have further discussions on pedestrian access to and from the new road and potentially from any extended car park, as the indications from some of the drawings lead pedestrians directly onto the car park with no clear walkways being created as the new joins and the old. Again, with what we believe will be increased in pedestrians accessing the car park and Inverness Leisure, that it is important the safety aspects of those utilising either Inverness Leisure or the car park to / from the Inverness West Link Road pathways should be a priority.</p> <p>Junction from A82 to Bught Drive - improvements requested I have enclosed a colour copy taken from Google Street View of the junction to which my next points reference. As previously outlined, I have always had concerns regarding the 'triangular' junction Leading from Bught Drive onto the main trunk A82. My concerns were further enhanced when the bus route to Inverness Leisure was removed resulting in our customers having to cross what is technically a three-lane carriageway to/from their bus drop off point. The access/egress to the junction is confusing due to its Layout and as a result we have witnessed a number of minor accidents at this junction over the years. Fortunately none have been serious nor have they involved pedestrians (to my knowledge). I raised this issue within my Board</p>	<p>The car parking arrangement at the Rugby Club location can be used for overspill use by the Sports Stadium.</p> <p>Underpasses are now incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature. Footway/cycleway links at this location have been amended accordingly.</p> <p>The junction at Glenurquhart Rd/ Bught Drive is now incorporated into the scheme and will be amended if necessary.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>report and my views were shared by a number of Trustees. Therefore while we understand this junction is not part of the Inverness West Link Road proposal we feel as the outline project works literally end a matter of metres away from this junction that as a Company we would appeal to the design team and to the Highland Council to look to incorporate a change to the junction in order that it becomes easier to use; less confusing for regulars and visitors but more importantly reduces the risk of any further accidents or incidents in the future.</p>	
115	Con1/E158	<p>Encourage traffic to use the new link road along the river to the Dores Holm Roundabout in preference to the shorter direct link to Dores Road. The design of the road and pavement is particularly narrow at the stretch Dores Road and Island Bank Road join, as well as along Island Bank Road. This road is not designed to cope with the high level of traffic it suffers and in particular with the frequent heavy vehicles and buses, the situation will get worse with more housing.</p> <p>There is a lack of recreational facilities planned on the East side of the river. This will increase traffic flow across the river and the level of congestion will increase again. The area between Inverness and Dores (Torbreck woods, and south Loch Ness) has a very distinct character, and is a well used area by cyclist, runners and walkers) and a prime tourist destination. It is extremely disappointing to see no plans are made to consider more strategically the future of this area. Again we see a lack of imagination where housing is driving the future use of this riverside area (opposite Ness- side). There is an opportunity to develop now a more strategic set of non vehicular route or routes that will connect Inverness to Dores, rather than limit plans to the road infrastructure.</p>	<p>An updated outline design for the Mill–Lade Roundabout to Dores Road Link (Green Route) has been developed and is illustrated in the Development Brief. The link is not part of the Inverness West Link and will be constructed by a developer. The developer's brief will be required to ensure the route will not be able to be used as a direct link road to and from Dores Road.</p> <p>This issue will be addressed in the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief.</p>
116	Con3/E057	<p>The Council has on numerous occasions sought to justify this road by claiming that the city centre will be a more attractive place due to less traffic.</p> <p>Please could you quantify exactly in percentage terms (NOT in vague qualitative terms), what the predicted / modelled decrease in traffic through the city centre (e.g. over Ness Bridge) will be as a direct consequence of this road AFTER the completion of the required developments at Charleston, Ness-side and the proposed Sports Hub, at peak, and non-peak hours.</p>	<p>This information is available as part of the Moray Firth Transport VISUM Model and can be determined for any street.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
CC2		Concerns about Mill –Lade Roundabout to Dores Road Link (Green Route). It was important that the green link at Ness-Side was not used as short cut to Dores Road by vehicles.	An updated outline design for the Mill –Lade Roundabout to Dores Road Link (Green Route) has been developed and is illustrated in the Development Brief. The link is not part of the Inverness West Link and will be constructed by a developer. The developer's brief will ensure the route will not be able to be used as a direct link road to and from Dores Road. The route will primarily be used by cyclists, walkers and public transport and service vehicles.
CC4		Signalised Crossing at 2 Roundabouts	A Toucan traffic light controlled pedestrian/cyclist crossing on the A82 located to the west of the Tomnahurich swing bridge has been added to the design. The crossing will be part of the rerouting of the Great Glen Way required as part of the scheme.
CC7		Single lane slip road into car park at Bught Road. The creation of a slip road into the Aqua dome Car Park would be advantageous if this could be achieved as part of the design.	<p>The benefits of this proposal are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improved flexibility and access to the Sports Centre <p>The disadvantages are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impact on Sports Centre Car Park ● Impact on Canal Rugby pitches ● Impact on mature trees ● Increased risk of rat-running <p>On balance the disadvantages of the proposal outweigh the advantages and in mitigation it is proposed to improve access to the Sports Centre and the junction at Glenurquhart Rd/Bught Drive is now incorporated into the scheme and will be enhanced.</p>
CC8		Inadequate provision for cyclists	<p>Cycle provision is a feature of this scheme. Not only are there cycle ways incorporated in the new road scheme but there are links from these cycleways to the local cycle network including the tow path and the north river bank to the city centre.</p> <p>2 Underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at the Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' desire lines are likely to feature. A Toucan push button pedestrian/cyclist crossing is now incorporated</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
			into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness Side Development plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.
CC9		Expansion of Torvean Cemetery. It would be helpful if further information could be provided on whether there were future plans to extend Kilvean Cemetery.	An assessment of the requirements for an expansion of Kilvean Cemetery has been undertaken and an expansion area has been identified. The proposals being developed for the relocation of Torvean Golf course, which are the subject of the Golf Course & Sports Hub Planning in Principle application, make an allowance for an expansion of Kilvean Cemetery.
CC11		Need for further underpass	2 Underpasses have now been incorporated into the scheme at Queens Park area where pedestrian and cyclists' volume desire lines are likely to feature, and on the A82. A push button pedestrian crossing is now incorporated into the scheme on the A82, west of the existing swing bridge.
CC12		No car parking/viewing points for pedestrian access	Several comments have been made regarding lay-bys and a segregated type lay-by has been added at the Ness-side location adjacent to the river to allow northbound traffic to park. On account of lack of space and the proximity of the roundabouts it has not been possible to include a lay-by at the Queens Park sports ground location. Two lay-bys are included at General Booth Road.
CC17		The Inverness West Link had to be completed in order to realise the potential of the surrounding areas in terms of development and leisure activities	Comments welcomed. No design changes required.
CC20		Moving the balance back to the west side of Inverness would open up a gateway to this part of the City and could attract niche businesses to the area	Comments welcomed. No design changes required.
CC21		Completion of this road was in the Capital Programme and as such required to be progressed as soon as possible in order to utilise the	Comments welcomed. No design changes required.

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		available funds	
CC25		Completion of this route should be undertaken as a priority as any further delays would impact on other development throughout the City.	Comments welcomed. No design changes required
119	Con1/H015	<p>According to the West Link page 16 there will be 2 main stages of construction stage 1 Holm Roundabout to Tomnahurich Roundabout and stage 2 Queens Park Roundabout to Torvean Roundabout. I believe that there are more stages to the whole process than this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creation of replacement sporting pitches 2. Build a new road and bridge across the River Ness resulting in loss of sporting pitches 3. Creation of replacement holes of the golf course 4. Move General Booth road which may affect existing holes on the golf course but may have to be completed before the replacement holes can be finished 5. Build a new road and swing bridge across the Caledonian Canal resulting in loss of some holes of the golf course 6. Creation of additional sporting facilities and marina etc <p>There is a great deal of information about the tree and shrub planting proposals, fences, walls and sports facilities but very little about the actual road itself and even less about the facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The A82 appears to follow a similar line to the existing road and I assume that it will remain the same width. There are to be 2 new large roundabouts on the road. On page 5 it states "Tomnahurich Roundabout has been enlarged to satisfy Transport Scotland design requirements." but this explanation is not on the "Scheme Proposals Sheet 1". I assume that the Torvean Roundabout also meets the same design requirements but the Queen Park Roundabout is much smaller and so must not be part of the trunk road because Transport Scotland would have demanded a similar standard.</p> <p>There has been no mention of Transport Scotland contributing to the cost of the second swing bridge and so I assume that Transport Scotland as the Trunk Road Authority do not think that a second swing</p>	<p>As detailed at the Public Displays, the Inverness West Link is to be constructed in two stages. While Stage 1 is being constructed the relocated Torvean Golf Course works will be progressed. This may have to be a staged construction to allow for the diversion works on General Booth Road which are to be undertaken at Stage 2. The proposed Sports Hub is planned to be progressed in association with the Stage 2 works.</p> <p>The project team consider that a great deal of information has been provided with respect to the details of the road and pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Most of the A82 will remain with the existing width; however the lengths approaching Torvean Roundabout will have an improved width. It is anticipated that the road arrangement incorporating the tandem swing bridge arrangement will become the trunk road.</p> <p>Transport Scotland are not contributing to the cost of the new swing bridge, however they are supportive with its provision. The tandem bridge arrangement will provide</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>bridge is needed. Why is a second swing bridge needed?</p> <p>It appears that to build the Tomnahurich Roundabout it will be necessary to take some ground from the Tomnahurich Cemetery but there is no mention of rebuilding the wall and replacing the straight iron fence by one with a curve in it nor any indication that trees will be lost in the cemetery and graves may have to be moved.</p> <p>There is no information about the width of the road and pavement along the line of the A82. An improved footpath/cycleway from Bught Drive to at least 500m west of the Torvean Roundabout should be provided. I appreciate that it will be difficult to widen the existing swing bridge but this should be considered when the bridge is due for update/renewal.</p> <p>Roundabouts may be desirable for easy of movement of traffic but they are not easy for pedestrians and cyclists to negotiate. The Driver's-eye view is the clearest video and does not show any dropped kerbs where crossings should be and some road signs and lamp-posts were in the combined footway/cycleway. It is possible to design large roundabouts which include special facilities for pedestrians and cyclists but these are large structures. The Torvean and Tomnahurich Roundabouts have been increased in size to meet the design requirements of Transport Scotland but the other 3 roundabouts are much smaller. If we must have roundabouts then they must be large enough for large vehicles to negotiate without the risk of creeping into other lanes —very dangerous for cyclists.</p> <p>The existing roundabouts on the Southern Distributor Road have a light controlled pedestrian crossing but none are planned for the</p>	<p>uninterrupted flow for traffic removing the interruptions caused at present when the Tomnahurich bridge is opened to allow canal traffic to transit past the bridge. The provision of two bridges will reduce the likelihood of problems caused by breakdowns as only one bridge will be open to canal boats at any one time. Providing a route for traffic even if breakdowns do occur. A fixed link will be provided.</p> <p>There is no requirement to intrude into Tomnahurich Cemetery.</p> <p>Widening Tomnahurich Bridge is not part of the scheme proposals. The footways on the south side of the A82 on each side of Tomnahurich Bridge will be widened slightly.</p> <p>All roundabouts have been designed to the standards set out in the 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges'. Detailing for drop kerbing will be included as the design is finalised.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to pedestrian crossings at roundabouts where there are defined desire lines from</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>roundabouts on the West Link. At least 2 crossings are needed at Torvean Roundabout and at least one at the other roundabouts. There are a number of designs of light controlled crossing in Inverness and a new standard design should be used on the West Link [with red/green lights visible on the other side of the road, red/green low level lights and a beeper or recorded message to accommodate different disabilities].</p> <p>I believe that all the proposed roundabouts should be replaced by traffic lights which include a pedestrian/cyclist phase when a button has been pushed. There should be a waiting area at the traffic lights for cyclists so that they can negotiate the junction safely on the road if they wish.</p> <p>I think the combined width should be at least 3.0 metres excluding the pink brick edging. There is little information about the specification of the road and footway/cycleway. Page 5 says: "Cross section similar to Inverness Southern Distributor" Page 9 says: "The proposals are designed to be the same cross section as the Southern Distributor Road" and above this there is a typical section with figures which indicates the roadway is 7.000 and the combined footway/cycleway is 2.000. What are the dimensions of the existing road?</p> <p>The proposal is for a standard footway/cycleway on both sides of the road. Non motorised users will be subjected to traffic noise and pollution and the surface will be collect grit and other rubbish thrown up from the road surface. In addition to these routes it would be desirable to have an additional route some distance away from the road and nearer to the river and canal with a screen of trees/shrubs between it and the road. Additional lighting will be needed and this should be of the same standard that is provided along the sides of the River Ness into Inverness.</p> <p>To make it easier for pedestrians [and cyclists] to cross the road it should be constructed with islands in the middle of the road and the</p>	<p>associated developments.</p> <p>The proposal was considered in discussions with Transport Scotland, however given the proximity of the canal swing bridges was ruled out.</p> <p>The Design Team have given careful consideration of the comment. With four sections of the Southern Distributor Road constructed with this standard detail it has been decided to complete the fifth and final section including the detail, to provide a consistent approach that the public recognise and are familiar with. The cross-section of the road will be a 7.3m carriageway with 2 footway/verge - 3.5m wide (comprising 0.525m Block Separator Strip, 2.425m shared footway/cycle path, 0.55m grass verge)</p> <p>The proposals do not separate cyclists and pedestrians due to requirement to minimise the footprint of the scheme. An additional footpath link to the towpath has been incorporated into the scheme to provide an alternative route north of the river away from the road. The Ness-Side Development Plan includes additional cycleways and footways further away from the road which will be constructed as the housing and increased demand develops.</p> <p>Following a full review after the public comments were received, the Project Team are content that adequate</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>refuge should be large enough for a bicycle, pushchair or disabled vehicle. It would be necessary to make the road wider to accommodate this but it would be easier to do this when the road is constructed and if would be easy to make them light controlled crossings at a later date.</p> <p>The new bridge over the river and the new swing bridge would not need to be widened. These islands in the middle of the road, about 100 metres apart, would be a traffic calming measure by preventing overtaking and would allow crossing the road at frequent intervals.</p> <p>There is no information in the documentation about the new swing bridge. The Driver’s-eye view video shows that the pink strip near the edge of the road is missing and that part of the metal bridge structure appears to reduce the width of the footway/cycleway. If the intention is to promote non motorised travel then adequate space must be allocated in new structures.</p> <p>On the map Scheme Proposals Sheet 1 there is a red box around the junction of the A82 and General Booth Road with the description “Location for proposed pedestrian underpass” but there is no indication of any path in this area. If this is intended as a route for pedestrians to cross the A82 near the Torvean Roundabout it is not acceptable to expect pedestrians to go so far and to climb down and then up after using the underpass.</p> <p>At present there is a core path from Glenurquhart Road along the edge of Bught Road but separated from it by a stone wall. This is being replaced by a standard footway/cycleway bordering the new road and the wall is to disappear.</p> <p>The proposed 3m wide Footway/Cycleway from the West Link towards the centre of Inverness between the rugby pitches and Whin Park should be extended under the new road to link up with the Canal towpath. The 3m wide route should be continued right into the centre of Inverness and should be a tarmac surface on a substantial base. Why are the grey, yellow and grey hatched routes not included in the key? I believe that the grey hatched routes are steps which are not appreciated by cyclists and disabled pedestrians. The proposal to put</p>	<p>provision for pedestrian and cyclists has been made. Road safety and Cycle Audits will be carried out at part of the project.</p> <p>The design for the new swing bridge is being carried out in full consultation with Transport Scotland. It is anticipated that the new bridge will become part of the trunk road network and accordingly it will be designed to meet the requirement of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p> <p>The final design will include links from the footway/cycleways on each side of the A82 to the new underpass.</p> <p>Replacement walling is included in the design.</p> <p>The proposed 3m wide Footway/Cycleway from the West Link towards the centre of Inverness between the rugby pitches and Whin Park extends under the new road to link up with the Canal towpath. The 3m wide route from the bridge to Bught Road at the Canal Parks will be formed in sub-base which is appropriate to the location.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>a dog leg in a core path with a ramp up to the West Link and not provide a means of crossing the road is not acceptable [Scheme Proposals Sheet 3]. It is essential that an island is provided in the road at this point and that it is large enough to be converted into 2 separate light controlled crossings if this proves necessary. It would be desirable to include an island half way between the Queens Park Roundabout and the bridge over the river so that it is easier to move from the Canal Towpath to the rugby pitches.</p>	<p>Following a full review after the public comments were received, the Project Team are content that adequate provision for pedestrian and cyclists has been made. Road safety and Cycle Audits will be carried out at part of the project.</p>
120	Con3/H021	<p>We commend the inclusion of shared use paths on either side of the road but note that these will not encourage cycling unless fully coherent. The current design fails in this respect.</p> <p>We draw your attention to National Cycling Strategy and the Highland Cycling Strategy which demand that all developments should be cyclable by a competent 12 year old.</p> <p>Shared use Paths — These should be a minimum of 3m width not including the paved road safety separation zone which should be a minimum of 0.5m.</p> <p>Roundabouts — These are the most dangerous junction design for cyclists and often impassable for pedestrians. The roundabouts should be replaced by signalled junctions with Toucan crossings along the main link giving priority to cyclists and pedestrians over vehicles joining and leaving the west link. Foresight in design here would advertise and promote a policy of encouraging cycling and walking and discouraging the wasteful and inequitable use of energy and materials brought about by applying a design whose priority is smooth motor traffic passage dominating other travel modes and detrimental to them.</p> <p>Core Paths & desire lines — Core paths, designated & aspirational, should be fully protected and improved where needed. We include informal paths such as that on the south side of the River Ness. Any paths severed by the road route should be provided with under or over passes, or at level controlled crossings.</p> <p>Land take — Loss of parkland, and semi natural country side should be</p>	<p>The Design Team have given careful consideration of the comment. With four sections of the Southern Distributor Road constructed with this standard detail it has been decided to complete the fifth and final section including the detail, to provide a consistent approach that the public recognise and are familiar with. Consideration has been given to including off line footway/cycleway length and the design now has added a link from the north side of the bridge over the River Ness to the canal towpath.</p> <p>The proposal was considered in discussions with Transport Scotland, however given the proximity of the canal swing bridges was ruled out.</p> <p>Careful consideration has been given to core paths being severed by the road and the relevant diversions. At Ness-Side the crossing point will be at grade however ducts will be incorporated to allow a signalised crossing to be installed at a later date if demand requires this.</p> <p>The allocations of land within the Council’s Development</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>compensated for by at least equivalent creation of similar space provided for within any new urban developments accruing as a result of this link and this space should be accessible to all citizens of and visitors to Inverness. The cost of this should be provided by the developers.</p>	<p>Brief more than compensate for the loss of sports and other public open space caused by the Inverness West Link. 6 holes of the existing golf course and one of the rugby pitches are “lost” as a result of the road scheme but these areas are more than compensated by the expected provision of an accessible riverside park and sports field at Ness-side, riverside picnic areas at Milton of Ness-side, a new sports hub incorporating 4 sports pitches and golf practice area at the Torvean canal-side, and a reconfigured 18 hole golf course.</p>
121	Con1/E081	<p>It is currently not apparent from the information provided by THC how much temporary land will be required for the WLR construction accommodation works.</p> <p>There is also no definitive information relating to land take for associated landscaping for the WLR; the width of the required landscaping corridor needs to be confirmed.</p> <p>The roundabout at Ness-side provides access to the east and west of the proposed developable areas; the spur to the west is currently designed to provide access to existing dwellings and a small holding. There does not appear to have been any consideration regarding accessing proposed development areas to the north and south of this spur. The area to the south of the spur is larger and will therefore have a significantly higher population and associated traffic movements; it is suggested that priority should be given to the access road to serve this portion of the site.</p> <p>THC is proposing a significant area of landscaping at the west side of the Ness-side roundabout. This landscaping would reduce the developable area and although it would screen the WLR from existing properties at the roundabout, this would occur by future new development in this location. Equally when mature this proposed landscaping would reduce the acoustic impact of the WLR to the existing dwellings, but this would also be achieved by development north and south of the spur road, making these landscape pockets redundant in future for the purposes for which they were identified.</p>	<p>All landowners have now been provided with information on Accommodation Works required for the Inverness West Link and an indication of the temporary land involved.</p> <p>Similarly all landowners have now been provided with an indication of land required for the Inverness West Link as essential environmental mitigation including landscaping.</p> <p>The Inverness West Link will afford developers the opportunity to develop land at Ness-Side with two roundabouts and legs from the roundabouts included to provide access. It is not part of the design remit to make specific provision for developers as suggested.</p> <p>The design for the Inverness West Link in landscape mitigation terms is based on the existing situation and is in compliance with the Environmental Statement which details mitigation arising from environmental impact for the project. It does not cater for future development.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>From existing information supplied by THC it is unclear how land which will be required to accommodate the new WLR will be acquired by the Council; in effect whether this land will be compulsorily purchased.</p>	<p>All land required for the Inverness West Link will be acquired using a Compulsory Purchase Order. However the Council hope to purchase land with the landowners' agreements.</p>
127	Con1/E210	<p>If it's designed as a bypass to the town - then it's a poor one - a complex series of roundabouts, a longer route than the short cut through town, and one that takes traffic back into town via one of the town's most scenic assets.</p> <p>I suspect however that it's not designed as a bypass - but a means of getting more cars back and forth across town by avoiding some current bottlenecks.</p>	<p>The Inverness West Link is not a bypass and has been designed as a distributor road and, when complete, will be the fifth phase of the Southern Distributor Road. It will provide additional capacity over the River Ness along with other benefits.</p>
128	Con3/E060	<p>The proposal will inevitably greatly increase the volume of traffic on Glenurquhart Road /Tomnahurich Street and no studies have been carried out to identify how or if this increased traffic can be managed. Long queues will form and inevitably drivers will use the side streets in the Bught and Dalneigh as rat runs to avoid the congestion.</p> <p>The realignment of the junction of the A82 and General Booth Road will severely impinge and affect a small pond in the corner of the golf course which is a significant habitat for Greater Crested Newts.</p> <p>The proposed new road severs easy and safe access from the car parking areas at the Sports Centre, Rugby Club and Whin Island to the heavily used Canal towpath for walkers, cyclists, runners, fishermen etc.</p>	<p>Traffic on Glenurquhart Road /Tomnahurich Street will decrease as a consequence of the Inverness West Link.</p> <p>The pond will be retained.</p> <p>The design for the Inverness West Link includes provision for walkers, cyclists, runners, fishermen etc. From the locations mentioned to the canal tow-path. Underpasses have now been included to take account of this.</p>
130	Con1/E107	<p>It's good to see that a significant area of green space will be retained in the SW of the area; however, there should be provision for public access along the whole affected length of the River Ness, including the river bank close to the larger houses at Milton of Ness-side. However, this path should not be lit as this is likely to restrict use of the riverbank at night by wildlife (otters, bats etc).</p> <p>Some of the fields in the development area are likely to be used by badgers and proper provision will be needed for them if this area</p>	<p>Footway provision is included along the full length of the scheme and a linear park is proposed between the new road and the river bank adjacent to Ness-Side. The new road will have street lighting however there are no proposals to light the linear park.</p> <p>A badger survey has been undertaken and any mitigation measures will be included after discussion</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>proves to be an important foraging resource for them. A thorough badger survey will be required to identify all setts and foraging areas. Appropriate mitigation will be required to ensure that badgers are able to continue to utilise the area and, if necessary, provision of safe access under the new link road will be required if badgers are likely to attempt to cross it. The badger survey should inform the detail of any mitigation that will be required.</p> <p>Given that the new link road runs through this site, the proposals for pedestrian crossings seem rather limited. It's clearly very important that residents have ample safe access across the new road.</p>	<p>with Scottish Natural Heritage.</p> <p>This point has been considered carefully by the Project Team and an additional short term link for pedestrians has been added from Dores Road to the Mill-Lade roundabout.</p>
131	Con1/E186	<p>Please would you leave a strip of land at Ness-side to permit future construction of a bridge over to Torvean SSSI and to the A82 for a future bypass road.</p> <p>This could be designed as an amenity/recreation strip for the future housing development planned on that land.</p> <p>It would need to be wide enough to cater for a rising embankment, preferably gradual but, I suppose, a more abrupt Skye Bridge style might be considered. We could certainly have an inspiring bridge design for this location.</p> <p>There would inevitably be some shadow effect from this embankment (if it were to be built) in the winter, but the important thing is to reserve the line for the future and make sure that new residents buying houses are made aware that the amenity/recreational strip might well, at some future date, become a road.</p> <p>What would be foolish would be to build houses there and have to knock them down again to provide a road line.</p> <p>Can the strip of land at Ness Side be safeguarded for a high level bridge to be part of a by-pass for Inverness in the future?</p>	<p>The Council consider that if a bypass road were to be constructed in the future it would be located at a location much further west. No safeguarding of land in the location, as suggested, has been included in the scheme details.</p>
132	Con1/H064	<p>Refer to document: The Inverness WLR final response to Public Consultation by Inverness Rowing Club dated 30th May 2013</p>	<p>Highland Council along with Scottish Canals have held regular meetings with Inverness Rowing Club and the</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
			<p>various issued raised by the Rowing Club relative to the Inverness West Link will be reviewed at the next meeting and subsequent meetings. The Rowing Club's comments have been considered in the development of the design.</p> <p>Transport Scotland have confirmed that they can see no issues for the new Canal Bridge remaining open for Inverness Rowing Club regattas on Saturdays/Sundays for 2 1.5 hour slots each day.</p> <p>Inverness Rowing Club are tenants of Scottish Canals.</p>
133	Con1/H081	Refer to document: Highland Rugby Football Club response to Torvean & Ness-Side Dev Brief 29.5.13	Highland Council have held regular meetings with Highland Rugby Club and the various issued raised by the Rugby Club relative to the Inverness West Link will be reviewed at the next meeting and subsequent meetings. The Rugby Club's comments have been considered in the development of the design.
134	Con1/H101	Refer to document: Torvean Golf Club West Link Response to draft development brief	Highland Council have held regular meetings with Torvean Golf Club and the various issued raised by the Golf Club relative to the Inverness West Link will be reviewed at the next meeting and subsequent meetings. The Golf Club's comments have been considered in the development of the design.
136	Con2/E192	<p>The traffic survey you have presented appears inaccurate in that traffic flow numbers do not seem to add up - e.g. the traffic increase along General Booth road is noted as 100 more vehicle per hour in the morning rush hour, but this suddenly drops to 50 further along the road- with no apparent reason or additional 50 elsewhere. I am very concerned at this level of increase along General Booth and King Brude- a route which has 3 schools along it (Charleston, Kinmylies Primary and Muirtown Primary), with high numbers of school children making their way to school along this route either on foot or by bike, morning and evening .</p> <p>I would like to know why Highland council believe this is an improvement to the current situation? During the last consultation round I requested evidence of the traffic issues and the required need for the new route (the reports available at the time stated categorically traffic modelling had not been undertaken and therefore the reasoning</p>	<p>The information shown at the displays represented the difference in flows between flows with the scheme in place and flows without the scheme in place.</p> <p>The road has not been designed as a bypass but as a distributor road. There are a number of benefits relating to the new road including a reduction in traffic levels in the City Centre.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		behind the need for the road seemed questionable). I did not receive a response to my request and the information available at this consultation does not provide enough detail to evidence any traffic need for this bypass.	
140	Con3/E062	So, another swing bridge? And very close to an existing one on the A82 which under these proposals is going to stay. Isn't that going to cause chaos with traffic around both of the two swing bridges being delayed when one of them is being swung or worse still both of them?	The provision of two bridges will reduce the likelihood of problems caused by breakdowns as only one bridge will be open to canal boats at any one time. Providing a route for traffic even if breakdowns do occur. There will always be a fixed link for traffic.
141	Con3/E063	<p>The proposed route of the West Link Road will negatively impact on the appeal of the canal and riverside paths which are most popular with my customers.</p> <p>My customers already comment on the poor quality of cycling infrastructure in Inverness. The damage this scheme will have on the popularity of these routes may be mitigated a little if first class cycle infrastructure is incorporated in the design. I stress "first class" as cyclists will generally ride on roads in preference to sub-standard cycling infrastructure.</p>	The project has included additional footway/cycleway links along the south side of the Canal Parks, additional links to the canal tow-path and additional opportunities to access the Southside of the River Ness.
142	Con3/E064	<p>1) Why are there so many lighting columns? Can there be fewer and of a better colour for example light green?</p> <p>2) The area alongside the River Ness could be a linear park. Is this something that is being considered in the design? If so will visibility be maintained from the road through the trees to the river? Please do not include a noise bund or wall which will prevent people seeing the view.</p> <p>3) Why is there a spur of the roundabout at the concrete yard leading to Dores Road?</p>	<p>1) Lighting design has been undertaken to current standards and the central columns are smaller than used elsewhere and reduced the overall number of columns needed to adequately illuminate the footpaths and road. The selection of colour for the columns has not been made yet.</p> <p>2) The Torvean & Ness-side Development Plan includes proposals for a linear park as suggested. Views from the road to the river will be afforded wherever possible but without removing any additional trees beyond those required to allow the road to be constructed.</p> <p>3) The spur off the Mill-Lade Roundabout is to cater for future development.</p>
143	Con3/E065	Representing the Highland Cycling Campaign, he requested more crossings for cyclists along the route.	Following a full review after the public comments were received, the Project Team are content that adequate provision for cyclists has been made. Cycle Audits will be carried out at part of the project.

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
144	Con3/H022	Any further crossing linking the Southern Distributor Road to the A82 would be of benefit to Police Scotland. Presently if the swing bridge on the A82 at the Caledonian Canal is open it can cause delays in Police attendance at incidents on the A82 to the South of Inverness, a second crossing would alleviate this problem. Although the current plan is just a proposal with details of the road design to be finalised there would not initially appear to be any issues in relation to our organisation, although consideration could be given to passing places/parking on the Southern Distributor Road, if traffic flow is expected to greatly increase on this route.	Comments welcomed. No design changes required.
145	Con3/H023	<p>Stagecoach would like to see an additional leg off the QP roundabout which leads directly into the Aqua dome area/Queens park area. Could be bus only? Stagecoach has considered in the past to taking buses into Queens Park from Glenurquhart Road, dropping off and looping round to return onto Glenurquhart Road but considered this to be economically unviable.</p> <p>Stagecoach commented that the additional swing bridge will be an improvement on existing situation and reduce congestion/waiting time.</p>	<p>This proposal as reported in a similar comment has been considered and has been discounted for a number of reasons. The bus only proposal was considered.</p> <p>Bus lay-bys on General Booth Road: lay-bys are retained but relocated as close to Torvean roundabout as possible to allow people using the Premier Inn to arrive/depart as close to the hotel as possible.</p> <p>Existing bus stop outside Tomnahurich Cemetery: to be moved to a location outside the caravan park (and be on the caravan park side of the road only). In the longer term, consider replacing with bus stops between Torvean and Queen Park roundabouts and Queen Park and Tomnahurich roundabouts. This would then become an alternative permanent route connecting travellers from Kinmylies to Queens park sports facilities and the town.</p> <p>Comment welcomed. No design changes required.</p>
146	Con1/H051	Having followed the process from the start, my opinion is that the current proposal is the best of all the options looked at. I cannot understand the current brouhaha in the press as it seems to me that the Council, given the constraints of the budget, landscape protection and heritage interests, has chosen wisely and democratically. I would also point out that those of us living west of the canal have a particular	Comment welcomed. No design changes required.

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>interest I an efficient and attractive scheme (unlike may protesters who live south of Inverness). It is also ideal if, in pursuit of this proposal, enhances sporting facilities are provided for the growing population of Inverness, especially the young. Well done everyone, and, since an improved canal crossing has been mooted for at least 50 years to my knowledge, please just get on with it!</p>	
147	Con3/E066	<p>As an Invernessian born and bred I have a long-time interest in the development and expansion of my town/city. This initial 'local-boy' interest developed considerably during my university studies when I eventually focussed in the late-glacial landscape systems in and around the town. Whilst appreciating the physical needs for development in the Ness-side/Torvean areas of the city and that there is no planned evidence of any significant physical damage to, or alteration of, our globally unique (in scale) set of landforms I do have some genuine concerns regarding the continued total preservation of Torvean and associated features. Briefly, the following are my concerns -</p> <p>(1) There is apparently no definitive statement in the Consultation Draft of an undertaking to preserve in its entirety for the future the 'culmination' feature of Torvean;</p> <p>(2) By increasing the housing/tourist/retail/commercial/recreational 'footprint' west of the Caledonian Canal we will maybe unintentionally yet inevitably increasing 'footfall' on or close to this already designated fragile site.</p> <p>Further information or confirmation of the fact that the published plans will not jeopardise Torvean or associated features would be appreciated.</p>	<p>The former Torvean Quarry and surrounding area is already well used for recreation; however it is acknowledged that through the provisions of the development brief it is likely that recreation will increase. To avoid a further impact mitigation will be negotiated with regard to the creation and implementation of an access recreational management plan.</p>
148	Con3/E067	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leisure/small craft transit (waiting) pontoons required to the West of the new bridge 2. Traffic signs to read 'ROAD CLOSED' 'ROAD OPEN 	<p>The detailed design includes provision of mooring points that have been designed in consultation with Scottish Canals.</p> <p>The road signing design for the tandem bridge road arrangement has been the subject of several meetings with Transport Scotland.</p>
149	Con3/E068	<p>Appraisal of the impacts of the proposal and advice River Moriston SAC</p> <p>This development brief straddles the River Ness, an important route for migrating Salmon is using the River Moriston Special Area of</p>	<p>The comments regarding the potential impact on the River Moriston SAC, Moray Firth SAC and Torvean Landforms SSSI are noted and modifications will be made to the development brief to reflect this wording</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>Conservation (SAC). There is potential for water quality in the River Ness to impact the designated features of the River Moriston therefore we suggest some alterations to the 'Developer Requirements' listed in the development brief. We welcome the production of a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) but suggest the bullet point which mentions this is amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce a revised strategic Drainage Impact Assessment to enable the development of a strategic approach to sustainable drainage across Ness-side and to safeguard the water quality of the River Ness. <p>This makes the point slightly focussed and clearly states why the DIA is required. Whilst this addresses the issue of drainage there is no mention of a requirement for developers to produce a construction method statement. We would advise that production of a construction method statement would further help safeguard the water quality of the River Ness. We recommend the inclusion of an additional bullet point worded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality of River Ness to be protected during construction works (particularly at Ness-side) by production and approval of a Construction Method Statement to avoid pollution and sediment run-off Moray Firth SAC <p>Additional boat movements in the Moray Firth SAC could potentially affect the bottlenose dolphins through underwater noise and disturbance due to the presence of vessels. The Inner Moray Firth is well used by the dolphins and the locality is already exposed to relatively high levels of boat traffic. Further information on the likely number of additional vessels to access the sensitive waters of the inner Moray Firth should be provided. We do not consider this is likely to be an issue, but if the new marina is likely to result in a significant additional amount of time that vessels spend in the presence of dolphins then we would recommend various mitigation measures to be put in place. These will be based on the arrangements currently in place for the Inverness Marina Ltd where vessels agree to adhere to best practice in terms of how to behave in the presence of dolphins.</p> <p>Torvean Landforms SSSI</p> <p>The development brief includes proposals for a number of activities and uses in and around the SSSI, such as mountain biking, running</p>	<p>which has been derived from working in partnership with SNH on the Habitats Regulations Appraisal of the development brief (not the case for the Torvean Landforms SSSI as this was not subject to Habitats Regulations Appraisal).</p> <p>The Inverness West Link Road Environmental Impact Assessment addresses several of these items.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>trails etc. Increased activity and construction of trails and other infrastructure may impact on the designated site. The inclusion of an extra bullet point would protect the interest feature of the SSSI raising awareness of this potential issue. This bullet point could be worded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoidance of any adverse effects on the adjacent Torvean Landforms Site of Special Scientific Interest. <p>Other Issues</p> <p>The existing green network within the development brief is important for both protected species and public access. It should be made clear that existing components of the green network within the area should be protected, with links made to them by new greenspace and walking elements within the development. The existing green network would allow for habitat corridors, results of the species survey (including badger and otter), and footpaths/cycleways. The bullet point which relates to this should be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safeguarding of existing green network features (people and wildlife), and linkage of greenspaces within the development to the green network both within the site and linking to the wider green network of adjacent sites, including the safeguard of land for the linear riverside greenspace to the west of the Link Road. 	
150	Con3/E069	<p>It is very important that access to the river is improved and enhanced with a path running the entire length of the development stretch of the river in the Ness-side plan. At present access rights do enable people to walk through the field at Milton of Ness-side and access the river (though not many people do); this proposal would prevent that which is unacceptable. The proposed large houses should not have gardens right down to the river - space must be left for public access (not just fishing access) as well as a way for the public to get there. The local authority access officer should be asked for advice about access to the river, and the benefits of enhancing and improving current access, as well as the need to ensure that access rights (such as exist over the Milton of Ness-side field to the river) are not negatively affected. It is very important that a cycle path be included particularly from the Holm roundabout down the Dores Road as far as the development area stretches, but ideally the whole length of the Ness-side development. There are many cyclists who use this stretch of road, and many who would like to but will only do so when a proper cycle lane is available.</p>	<p>Access to the River Ness will be protected and enhanced through this development brief which will identify a path network which will encourage better use of the existing and any future riverside paths.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>This would contribute to Scottish Government targets for increased cycle use for short journeys. Ideally the cycle lane will be separate from the road not just an added on bit at the side of the road - the latter type of cycle lane is not very good as people park in it, cars don't give cyclists enough room etc.</p>	
151	Con1/H063	<p>My comments relate to Map 9 – Indicative Masterplan Ness Side. This shows a road linking Dores Road to the roundabout at the south end of proposed bridge over the river.</p> <p>The link road shows “non priority junctions” but there does not appear to be any definition of these. However I understand that they are intended to give priority to buses and emergency vehicles but from information gleaned at the public meeting it appears that this will only “control” the traffic travelling towards the east of the river.</p> <p>I have always considered that any link road at this location will encourage traffic from both sides of the river to use Island Bank Road as a shortcut to cross the river. It may not be such a shortcut with traffic travelling east to Upper Drummond, Hilton and Drakies but certainly it will create a “rat run” going towards the west. The difference is that Merlewood Brae is one way down to the river whereas going up is via Stratherrick Brae which doubles back. Island Bank Road is not “fit for purpose” at present and cannot possibly cope with additional traffic unless it is to the detriment of road safety and amenity. The carriageway is too narrow for vehicles: it is impossible to pass safely if there are cyclists around; virtually all the accesses to the houses are "blind"; and there is only one very narrow pavement. Undoubtedly, even without this link road, there is bound to be a significant increase in traffic on Island Bank Road as a result of the Ness-side and Ness Castle developments and therefore to further exacerbate the problem by encouraging communities furth of the area is in my opinion contrary to sound planning and road traffic policy.</p> <p>I therefore suggest that this link road should be deleted from the plan but if it is essential for emergency vehicles then a proper “controlled” barrier should be installed for these vehicles only – it is not an excuse to say the barriers won't work in adverse weather conditions as they work elsewhere in the country. If buses need a link then I suggest they</p>	<p>It is proposed to plan for a green link connecting the Mill Lade roundabout on the south side of the new River Ness bridge with the Dores Road. This link will have provision for cyclists and walkers as well as buses and service vehicles but designed to avoid a rat run being created for private cars. The middle section of this secondary distributor will be for service vehicles only. This restriction will be implemented via a future traffic order or other such similar measure. This link is part of the overall master plan for the area developed through the Charrette process and will be beneficial in encouraging active travel in this part of the city.</p>

No.	Ref.	Comment 7: Any further comments / General Comments	Response
		<p>are re-routed such that it will not encourage the rat run referred to above.</p> <p>The other proposal in the Indicative Masterplan that I have concerns over is that of the triangular shaped area of residential zoning proposed next to the Ness-side buildings. Given the importance of the river frontage I feel that the area lying between the Link Road and the river frontage should be retained as public open space. Although there is public open space at Whin Park on the other side of the river together with Queen's Park and Bught Park there is virtually no public open space close to the east side of the river within the city boundaries. This is an opportunity to rectify that deficiency.</p>	<p>Following more recent flood risk studies, the area of residential development at Ness-side will be reduced. However, it is considered that there is scope of a limited amount of residential development in this area. The need for open space is acknowledged but it is considered that there is considerable opportunities to create and continue to deliver open space across the site. The Riverside Park, green corridor and playing field will play a significant role in meeting the needs of the new and existing communities in this area.</p>

Several of the Public Comments received did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display. The following tables give examples of these comments.

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 1: Any comments on the landscaping proposals as displayed
Con1/E047	I find the idea of a "linear park" pathetic. What it means is a slightly wide roadside ditch. It will soon be dotted with shopping trolleys and other roadside detritus.
Con3/H001	I am not in favour of these proposals- destruction of facilities/landscape where a simpler route would suffice.
Con3/E022	All irrelevant, the route is going to destroy greenbelt. This has been said over and over again and is only about the cheapest route. It is all about the council wanting to make money from the area being accessible to developers.

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 2: Any comments on the proposed footpaths, cycleways, etc.
Con1/E047	These are window dressing to a ridiculous route. The Option 6 route should be cancelled.
Con3/E047	This is a flawed connection - totally the wrong decision for Inverness & the communities to the west of it.
Con3/E048	Where is the provision for cyclists and pedestrians? What is happening to the quiet walk along canal?

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 3: Any comments on recreation and sporting areas
Con3/H001	It is a shame THC cannot put the 'enhancements' forward as part of the actual cost instead of trying to hide behind lies. I for one will ensure the escalating costs (as they will be) are exploited fully.
Con2/E062	A bridge and swing bridge layout which continued on from the distributor road in a straight line and continued through the quarry area would mean there is no disruption caused to sports in Canal Pitches, does not detract from the peace at Whin Park and retains more of the city's Fishing Association waters free from the noise of traffic.
Con3/E033	The recreation and sporting areas are at present excellent and the councils objective of providing a sporting hub will boost this further would be very welcome, however wasting money to move both the rugby club and also the golf course MUST be factored into the overall cost of option 6, only then will the true cost of option 6 become apparent
Con3/E036	The council fail to provide adequate sporting facilities for the area. The facilities you do provide are too expensive. You should build many more pitches, courts, halls and pools and make them free of charge to residents or heavily discounted.
Con3/E037	I very much doubt the funds are available to complete these and, if the common good monies are to be used, then that is a complete waste.
Con3/E040	The loss of the canal pitches and the traffic noise and pollution around Whin Park, the canal, the river and the golf course is unacceptable. These areas are well used and loved. They are a peaceful haven within our city and should not be destroyed by a road cutting through them. There are other options which are less destructive. PLEASE RECONSIDER.
Con3/E046	Loss of amenity ground and intrusion of traffic on verge of open space should not be allowed. The Torvean Golf Club will lose its best holes and no proper provision or funds have been identified for replacement.

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 4: Any comments on the proposed bridge layouts
Con1/E047	The bridges should not be built as they form part of a ridiculous route that will not benefit Inverness. The city needs to protect its green area at the Canal Park, not protect the value of development land for construction companies. A single bridge or tunnel linking the roundabout at Dores Road to the A82 via the Torvean Quarry would be worthwhile as it would attract through traffic away from city centre streets.
Con3/E004	Another swing bridge crossing the canal will hamstring the city for years. Nowhere else in the country would a major trunk road be built with such an arrangement. I believe a better arrangement would be a low level bridge over the River Ness, leading onto a short, motorway style tunnel under the canal.
Con3/E021	I am not involved in any protest group, but like many local people, born and bred in Inverness I do not feel that this is the best option. My choice would be a bridge crossing both river and canal at Ness-side and linking up with the A82 at the Kilvean junction, thus avoiding the need for a second swing-bridge.
Con3/E036	It would destroy a scenic area of parkland in the centre of the city. Most cities would envy such a space.
Con3/E041	We require a bridge design that will be suitable for increasing volumes of traffic in the years to come and a new swing bridge is therefore totally useless. We require a flyover or tunnel to cope with this.
Con3/E046	Why go backward to go forward. The shortest line is straight across the river and canal. This proposal is all about making land available for housing development.
Con3/E047	Inverness does not need yet another swing bridge, enough delays already with two between scheduled closures and malfunctions.
Con3/E048	Do not agree with proposed plans. All about pandering to Tesco and Tullochs.

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 5: Any suggestions for the name of the bridge crossing the River Ness
Names were suggested which reflect criticism of the Council decision to proceed with Option 6 as the preferred option for the Inverness West Link.	

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 6: Any suggestions for the name of any of the roundabouts
Names were suggested which reflect criticism of the Council decision to proceed with Option 6 as the preferred option for the Inverness West Link.	

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 7 Any further comments / General Comments
Con3/E050	This route appears to be a short-sighted attempt to relieve an issue that is beginning to plague the city.
Con3/E050	The city of Inverness is growing at a huge rate and in thirty years this road will be all but obsolete. The provision of a high level bridge, as set out in one of the other options would provide not only a far superior and simpler route, it would also not be overrun and remain fit for purpose as the city inevitably grows. It would also work better as a bypass as well as a link road, alleviating Kenneth Street and the Longman of much of their heavy commuting traffic.
Con3/E050	If it takes another couple of years to attain the funding for this option (if indeed it is more expensive), then wait another couple of years. The bridges that now cross areas such as the Inverness, Cromarty and Dornoch firths are examples of building for the future rather than just for the present and the same should be applied in this case
Con2/E192	This proposal seems to be driven by Highland Councils apparent desire for further developer contributions - despite the fact that developments at Robertson Homes sites in Westercraigs and other areas lie unfinished with little demand for new housing
Con3/E002	Option 6 is a poor, unambitious choice. A single, high level bridge over the river and canal which would necessitate a much shorter length of roadway is the obvious, best choice. The housing development area would be equivalent to the option 6 area

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 7 Any further comments / General Comments
Con3/H001	A waste of money and THC are lying about the full cost of this.
Con3/E004	I understand that the city is crying out for this development, but going for the cheapest option of a swing bridge will hamstring the city for years. If a more suitable alternative is too expensive at the moment, save up until it is affordable. Waiting a few more years to get a more appropriate solution is better than just settling for a poorer one now. A poor decision now will be with us for decades to come.
Con3/H009	A tunnel is a much simpler cost effective solution which would leave our recreation space untouched.
Con3/H010	This option allows for unnecessary complicated road works and goes against the wishes of the community. It would seem to satisfy only Building Contractors. It is destructive and procedures taken make a mockery of "public consultation".
Con1/E041	It has all been said over the last few years. This must be the worst decision to come out of the HRC ever. The public are not wrong why implement such a controversial decision which will affect the future generations and be viewed in the years ahead akin to how Bridge Street Inverness is viewed by the public to-day.
Con3/E021	Despite the denials, I feel that the development for housing of the land along the chosen route was a factor in the decision making.
Con3/E023	At a recent meeting of the Inverness Local History Forum, our members unanimously agreed to support The Inverness Civic Trust and numerous other individuals and organisations in asking the Council to re-assess their proposals for the West Link Crossing in Inverness. The main objection from our Forum is the destruction of a historic area of Inverness, from which generations of Invernessians and visitors to our city have had a great deal of pleasure. To go ahead with this proposal will remove access to the peaceful walk along our canal bank; spoil the canal for walkers and other users. It will also bring noise, pollution and general disturbance to a wide length of the Ness riverbank. Once this overcomplicated, destructive scheme gets the go-ahead there will be no going back and a lovely haven, one of the few within walking distance of our city centre, will be gone forever. We appeal to our councillors to think this over very carefully, please do not repeat some of the atrocities that have ruined Inverness in the past. We should be finding a way to conserve, protect and safeguard this green gem within our city.
Con1/E054	I have attended meetings etc re. the proposal to choose Option 6. During these meetings I felt that Councillors had already made up their minds and were unwilling to look at new options. I reiterate what I have felt all along that this plan is going to ruin the peaceful area of the Bught. Please give this matter your careful consideration again and don't lose the opportunity to build further down the river at what will in all probability be of similar cost in the long run.

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 7 Any further comments / General Comments
Con3/E027	Stop the crazy proposed option 6 We have quite enough hair brained schemes already, the only sensible option is a tunnel going to where is meant to go ,not half way back to the city!!
Con3/E028	Please come up with something more sensible and viable in the long term. Building a road through Inverness' most beautiful park is just a bad idea. Most aspects of this option are bad ideas, there must be an alternative.
Con3/E031	It is ridiculous that given the overwhelming amount of public opposition to this hugely flawed route that councillors are even contemplating going ahead with it. This needs to be stopped now, because if it goes ahead, there will be no way back from the ruination of one of the best areas of Inverness. A high level bridge is the solution.
Con3/E033	The option 6 proposal with the duel swing bridges is making Inverness the laughing stock of Scotland. Only in Inverness could someone seriously propose a swing bridge solution in the 21st century. Ditch option 6 now and go for either the tunnel of high level bridge it will save money!
Con3/E034	This stubborn approach by Inverness Council to push through, without, as usual, any thought to the future development of this city, just reeks to the ordinary person, as thoughtless, stupid and above all has no regard for the wishes and concerns of its residents. Our planners are thinking as though we are still in the eighties, when the 1st phase was started. Much has changed in Inverness since then, especially TRAFFIC!!! Surely a bye-pass means just that. Take the majority of vehicles away from the city centre where possible, not round it and back in again. STUPIDITY is an award Inverness could win hands down, in my opinion. I don't know enough about the commercial carrots being dangled in the Councils faces, but I just wonder how many supposed councillors are QUALIFIED to make OPTION 6 the call. Engineers can recommend their beliefs, especially, after gaining University degrees etc. they should know what the right decision is is. How many of our self important, indignant councillors' fall into this category, I wonder. Very few, all talk, no real skills.
Con3/E036	The population of Inverness don't want this. It seems like the proposed route would benefit Tesco and Tulloch most - which asks the question of the councils relationship to these organisations? When are the next council elections?
Con3/E040	Option 6 route is crazy. It is an indirect route that doubles back on itself, destroys sports grounds and park land and will shift the traffic congestion problems from one side of the river to the other. The route should be further west.
Con3/E041	The original decision to proceed with Section 6 was ill advised and short sighted. The recent decision to proceed with the decision in the face of a massive protest by the people of Inverness who do not wish to see their recreational land destroyed is

Examples of Public Comments that did not adhere to the request to submit comments on the Detailed Design on display.	
Ref.	Comment 7 Any further comments / General Comments
	totally reprehensible and in the light of the protest, totally undemocratic.
Con3/E045	Please do not destroy the most precious landscape I have. Please. This feels really short sighted and just plain wrong. If you take those spaces away, the mental health of many of the townsfolk will suffer, and I for one will no longer want to live in the place that I have been in since birth, 39 years ago. Please don't take this from me and from your sons and daughters, please, please, please.
Con3/E047	<p>Why offer the public a variety of options and when over 80% of the public select their preferred route, the councillors elected by the public to represent the public go totally against their wishes (with the exception of those few who actually listened to the people that elected them)</p> <p>This is not what the people of Inverness want for their present or their future - stop wasting public money on something that only councillors and other "interested parties" seem intent on driving forward AGAINST THE WISHES OF THE PUBLIC.</p>
Con3/E048	This should be going from Dores to Torvean Quarry. Not necessary to rework Golf Course etc. I wonder what the final cost of all this will be??