

Lara Moore
Ashfords LLP
Ashford House
Grenadier Road
Exeter EX1 3LH

17 April 2024

l.moore@ashfords.co.uk

Dear Lara

1. I refer to your email of 22 December 2023 on behalf of your client, Caledonian Maritime Assets Limited (CMAL), constituting your client's notice of its intention to submit a works Harbour Revision Order in respect of Port Ellen.
2. It is intended that the proposed works will be authorised by a Harbour Revision Order (HRO) made under Section 14 of the Harbours Act 1964. A Marine Licence under Part IV of The Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 will also be required.
3. Under paragraph 4 of schedule 3 of the Harbours Act 1964, Ministers must decide whether a proposed application relates to a project which requires an environmental impact assessment (EIA), or "screening decision". At the same time as giving a screening decision, Ministers may also give their opinion under paragraph 6 of schedule 3 about the scope and level of detail which the applicant will be required to supply in an environmental statement, where one is needed.
4. As you will be aware, where Scottish Ministers are notified of a proposed HRO which authorises a project they are required in terms of paragraph 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 3 to the 1964 Act to decide:
 - Whether that application relates to a project which is of a type specified in Annex I or Annex II to Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment as amended ("the EIA Directive"); and
 - If it relates to a project which is of a type specified in Annex II, whether taking into account the selection criteria, the project is a relevant project.
5. Ministers are also required to determine whether the project is likely to have a significant effect on a European site and, if so, whether an appropriate assessment is required in terms of regulation 48 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats & Etc) Regulation 1994.
6. Paragraph 6(4) Part 1 of Schedule 3 to the Harbours Act 1964 sets out that, before giving their scoping opinion, Scottish Ministers must consult with such bodies with environmental responsibilities or local or regional competencies as ministers considers appropriate.

7. Consequently, Transport Scotland has contacted its environmental consultees – Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA), NatureScot and Argyll and Bute Council – on whether an Environmental Statement should be provided by the applicant under the terms of the Directive, and if so, the extent of the information referred to in Annex IV to the Directive which the applicant should supply in the statement.

8. In addition, consultees were also requested to confirm whether, in their view, the project is likely to have a significant effect on a European site and, if so, whether an appropriate assessment is likely to be required under regulation 48 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, etc.) Regulations 1994.

9. The consultation period has now concluded. Please find the responses from the various consultees as **Annex A** to this letter. We trust that you will be able to address any issues raised by the various consultees before submitting your formal application for an HRO. It would, of course, be open to the consulting bodies to object to this application for consent if they still have concerns when the application is presented.

10. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss any aspect of this letter or the application process.

Yours sincerely



Dario Dalla Costa
Ports Policy Advisor

SCOTTISH ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**Advice to the determining authority**

To streamline planning, please note in accordance with Table 1 of Planning Advice Note 1/2013 we need only be consulted at the screening stage in exceptional circumstances. Based on the information submitted to us we consider that, with respect to interests relevant to our remit, the proposed development will be unlikely to have a significant effect (in the context of the Regulations) on the environment and therefore Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is not required. This is on the assumption that standard and reasonable environmental mitigation measures will be put in place.

We note that the report concludes: Following the EIA Screening Assessment, it has been determined that there is potential for significant effects on the following topics:

- Cultural heritage.
- Landscape and visual amenity.
- Noise and vibration.
- Marine ecology.
- Coastal processes.
- Population and human health.
- Climate change.

We agree with the topics scoped out in relation to our interests. SEPA has no comments or information on the above topics scoped in in relation to this proposal. We note that in relation to water environment and coastal processes: There is potential for significant environmental effects on the coastal environment from both construction and operation of the proposed development, hydrodynamic and sediment modelling will be carried out to determine the extent of the effect. However, SEPA does not provide site specific comments on the marine environment and refers the applicant to [SEPA standing-advice-on-marine-consultations](#).

Whether or not EIA is required, this must be demonstrated through the information we have requested below.

- Map and assessment of all engineering works within and near the water environment and details of any related CAR applications.
- Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures.

A schedule of mitigation supported by site specific maps and plans must be submitted. These must include reference to best practice pollution prevention and construction techniques and regulatory requirements. Please refer to the [Guidance for Pollution Prevention](#) (GPPs) and our [water run-off from construction sites webpage](#) for more information. Guidance on discarding of materials may be found in the document [Is it waste - Understanding the definition of waste](#).

Regulatory advice for the applicant

Regulatory requirements Proposed engineering works within the water environment will require authorisation under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended). Management of surplus peat or soils may require an exemption under The Waste Management Licensing (Scotland) Regulations 2011. Proposed crushing or screening

will require a permit under The Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012. Consider if other environmental licences may be required for any installations or processes.

Details of regulatory requirements and good practice advice for the applicant can be found on the [Regulations section](#) of our website.

For further queries, please contact info@transport.gov.scot

NATURESCOT

Environmental Impact Assessment Screening and Scoping Request

- The applicant has submitted two reports, an Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Report and an Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report. Below we comment on the EIA Scoping Report because that is the second stage of the application.
- The application falls under Annex II of the EIA Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and is regarded as a relevant project.
- The proposed works (the proposal) could affect the South-East Islay Skerries Special Area of Conservation (SAC) protected for its Harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) population and consequently the consenting authority for that SAC (Marine Directorate) will need to consider the effect of the proposal before it can be consented.
- The proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on other nearby protected areas (detailed below) for which Transport Scotland is the consenting authority, but some mobile species associated with those sites (e.g. birds) may need further surveys (see 2.2).
- The proposal could impact protected species out with the protected areas. Transport Scotland is the consenting authority for bats and otters, and Marine Directorate is the consenting authority for Priority Marine Features and cetaceans.

A scoping opinion response relating specifically to the marine development works below MHWS (construction and dredging) of Port Ellen Ferry Terminal was sent to the Marine Directorate on 5 Dec 2023. A copy of that response can be found below.

1. Summary of our advice

The site of proposed works (the proposal) is located within 5 km of:

- South-East Islay Skerries Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and
- Ardmore, Kildalton and Callumkill Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

And within 10 km of:

- The Oa Special Protection Area (SPA) and SSSI;
- Laggan SPA;
- Laggan Peninsula and Bay SSSI; and
- Eilean na Muice Duibhe SPA, SAC, Ramsar site and SSSI.

While the proposal is out with the boundaries of each of those natural heritage sites, there are species on which the proposal could have likely significant effect, e.g. the harbour seals of South-East Islay Skerries SAC.

The proposal could also impact Priority Marine Features (PMFs), e.g. kelp, maerl, and European Protected Species (EPS), e.g. bats, otters, and cetaceans.

In the applicant's scoping report, bats and otters are included within chapter 7 on terrestrial ecology. In this response, we have considered them separately with terrestrial ecology in section 2.2, and bats and otters in section 2.4.1.

2. Our assessment of the proposed approach

Assessments and surveys have been outlined in the applicant's EIA Scoping Report that aim to gauge the likely impact from disturbance, noise, sediment dispersion, and pollution on the area's features of interest.

2.1 South-East Islay Skerries SAC

The site's status means that the requirements of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 as amended (the 'Habitats Regulations') apply. Consequently, the consenting authority (in this case Marine Directorate) is required to consider the effect of the proposal on the qualifying features of the SAC before it can be consented (commonly known as Habitats Regulations Appraisal).

Chapter 8 of the scoping report covers marine ecology including South-East Islay Skerries SAC which is designated as a pupping, moulting and haul-out site for harbour seals. Hydrological connection is recognised for sites up to 10 km apart. The area of Port Ellen redevelopment site below MHWS is less than 5 km from the SAC. In addition, harbour seals are known to feed within 40-50 km of their haul-out sites, so Port Ellen harbour is well within their range. Therefore, there is a possibility that these works could have a likely significant effect on the qualifying feature of the SAC, and as such, Marine Scotland would be required to complete an appropriate assessment.

We agree with the report that assessments relating to the Harbour seal feature need to be scoped in.

As noted in our response to Marine Directorate (attached), we are satisfied that the approaches outlined in Chapter 8 of the scoping report aim to assess the potential impacts on the harbour seals in the vicinity of Port Ellen redevelopment.

2.2 Nearby SPAs, SSSIs and Ramsar sites

Chapter 7 of the scoping report covers terrestrial ecology including potential impacts to birds with reference to the following protected sites:

- Ardmore, Kildalton and Callumkill Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI),
- The Oa Special Protection Area (SPA) and SSSI,
- Laggan SPA
- Laggan Peninsula and Bay SSSI, and
- Eilean na Muice Duibhe SPA, SAC, Ramsar site and SSSI.

We are satisfied that the approaches outlined in Chapter 7 aim to assess the potential adverse impacts to the protected habitats and species within 10km of Port Ellen redevelopment.

We appreciate that surveys have already been completed on breeding birds and over wintering birds within or near the construction site's zone of influence (ZoI), and additionally note that "no qualifying species of any statutory designated sites within the wider study area were recorded"

(7.3.6). We welcome further pre-work surveys for works happening during the bird breeding season, and we note the aim to minimise noise and vibration to limit impacts on over-wintering birds (7.4.4).

We agree that “a dedicated terrestrial ecology assessment may be scoped out” of the EIA report, but that otters as a European Protected Species, and ornithological interests associated with the designated sites, will be scoped in (7.4.6). In the event birds associated with any of the designated sites are identified within the Zol, the consenting authority (in this case Transport Scotland) will need to do an HRA and potentially an appropriate assessment before work can be consented.

2.3 Priority Marine Features (PMFs)

The proposal could impact protected features including but not limited to PMFs like maerl and kelp, which have been identified in the harbour’s benthic community.

We are satisfied that the approaches outlined in Chapter 8 of the scoping report aim to assess the potential impacts to the habitats and species in the vicinity of Port Ellen redevelopment.

We agree that assessments relating to maerl, kelp and other PMFs need to be scoped in.

PMFs were covered in our response to Marine Directorate. For additional advice please see [Priority Marine Features](#).

2.4 European Protected Species

The proposal could impact European Protected Species (EPS) including but not limited to otters, bats, and cetaceans. EPS are given protection under the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended). We provide an advisory role on EPS through the provision of standing advice. Links to the relevant webpages are included below.

2.4.1 Otters and bats

We agree with the report that assessments relating to otters and bats need to be scoped in.

It is important to note that the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) pre-construction survey conducted by Mott MacDonald in December 2022 will not be valid by the time construction is due to start in Spring 2025.

Section 7.3.6 of the scoping report states that an otter survey in June 2023 identified spraint 40m east of the site boundary but identified no rest sites within the proposal’s zone of influence. Please see the [full standing advice on otters](#).

7.3.6 states that two species of bats –long eared (*Plecotus auritus*) and common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*)—have been identified within 2km of the development site. Presence/absence surveys carried out on 6-7 th July 2023 noted a transitional roost for non-breeding common pipistrellus in a building withing the zone of influence. Please see the [full standing advice on bats](#).

New otter and bat surveys may need to be completed before construction work begins. Survey results will determine if the applicant needs to adopt species protection plans. Please see further information on [species protection plans](#).

EPS licenses may need to be applied for. Please see [more information on licensing](#).

2.4.1 Cetaceans

The JNCC has indicated that the zone of influence for underwater noise propagation for piling is 15 km.

The scoping report states that Marine Mammal Observer (MMO), Marine Mammal Monitoring and Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM) will be used with agreed timings for last sighting before works can commence (sections 2.5 and 8.4). Section 8.4.1 lists relevant mitigation strategies to limit potential impacts on mobile marine mammals.

We agree that assessments relating to cetaceans need to be scoped in. We are satisfied that the approaches outlined in Chapter 8 of the scoping report aim to assess the potential impacts to cetaceans in the vicinity of the proposal. If surveys indicate the presence or potential presence of cetaceans within the ZoI, species protection plans will need to be adopted and EPS licenses may need to be applied for. Please see [further information on cetaceans](#).

Scoping opinion response sent to the Marine Directorate on 5 December 2023

Summary

NatureScot is broadly in agreement with the recommendations of the scoping report relating to proposed works below MHWS necessary for the development of Port Ellen Terminal. Assessments and surveys have been outlined in the scoping report that aim to gauge the likely impact on the features of interest from disturbance, noise, sediment dispersion, and pollution. Licenses will need to be applied for if there is the potential to adversely affect any protected habitat or species. It is recommended that the construction methods section in the scoping report is amended.

Assessment of proposed approach

The proposed redevelopment work at Port Ellen Ferry Terminal could impact protected features including but not limited to the harbour seals associated with the South-East Islay Skerries Special Area of Conservation (SAC), European Protected Species (EPS) such as cetaceans and otters, and kelp and maerl priority marine features (PMFs).

Chapter 8 of the scoping report identifies the marine ecological receptors and sets out the following key information:

8.6.2 Further assessment and surveys. The following assessments and surveys will be undertaken to inform the EIA in relation to marine ecology:

- A subtidal fauna and sediment characterisation survey (samples and locations to be decided);
- Underwater noise modelling will be undertaken to determine the extent of any potential harm or disturbance on marine fauna;
- Sediment dispersion modelling (to include suspended sediment and sedimentation rates) to determine the potential extent and magnitude of impacts on species and habitats present; and

- A desk study and stakeholder engagement will be undertaken to determine if there is a risk of the planned works resulting in an adverse effect on European Protected Species (i.e., cetaceans, etc.). This will include consultation with Marine Directorate and NatureScot. Where potential adverse effects are present a European Protected Species Licence will be required in support of any marine licencing.

NatureScot is satisfied that the above outlined approaches aim to assess potential adverse effects to the habitats and species of interest in the vicinity of Port Ellen Terminal development. Licenses will need to be applied for if it is likely that any protected habitat or species will be adversely affected. For information on licencing please see our [webpage](#).

Construction methods

NatureScot recommends that within the construction methods section of the scoping report, reference is made to blasting and explosives, e.g. when might this last resort become necessary; what impact assessments and mitigation strategies would be planned over and above existing assessments/strategies for piling and dredging; and, should blasting become necessary, the intention to issue a method statement and risk assessment. The method statement would need to include information on the durations and timing of dredging/piling/blasting to be able to fully assess the impacts of the work.

For further queries, please contact Cathy King, Operations Officer, Operations West (cathy.king@nature.scot).

ARGYLL AND BUTE COUNCIL

Submissions clarify that the ferry terminal is within the Port Authority Area of Port Ellen. The current ferry terminal lies within the statutory limits of Port Ellen harbour, and CMAL who are the Statutory Harbour Authority will apply for a Harbour Revision Order (HRO) to consent the proposed development. The HRO will be applied for under Section 14 of the Harbours Act 1964 that is administered by Transport Scotland on behalf of Scottish Ministers.

The proposed works comprise:

- *Land reclamation over existing pier structure and out in a south-west direction (approximately 22,000m²), bound by rock armour to the north-west (approximately 8000m³ – includes area below fixed ramp and linkspan), a sheet piled quay wall to the south-east to form a new commercial berth of approximately 170m and replacement of the fishing berths to the east of the reclaimed area of approximately 110m.*
- *Land reclamation will be infilled with a suitable imported granular material (approximately 1000,000 m³) with concrete capping and geotextile to prevent loss of fines, land reclamation to facilitate formation of marshalling area, unaccompanied trailer area, new terminal building area and associated parking. Where appropriate and feasible, dredge material obtained as part of the proposed development will be used as infill.*
- *Construction of a new open-piled finger pier with reinforced concrete deck and associated pier furniture, in south-west/north-east orientation (this is subject to confirmation during detailed design), approximately 150m in length, with roundhead structure to support vessel manoeuvring.*
- *Construction of a new linkspan and supporting structures adjacent to the finger pier (south side).*
- *Construction of a new fixed ramp or linkspan and supporting structures adjacent to the finger pier (north side).*

- *Construction of rock armour revetment below the new fixed ramp and linkspan structures with suspended deck above.*
- *Dredging of the new berths at the finger pier and commercial berth, along with the navigational channel adjacent to the new commercial berth (approximately 22,000m³ softs, approximately 10,000m³ rock – based on Geophysical Survey and to be confirmed by GI).*

Activities included in the proposed development which are above MHWS include:

- *Partial demolition of the existing pier, terminal building and marshalling area reclamation structures. Includes removal of existing fenders, fender sponsons, bollards, fencing, grain handling equipment, etc.*
- *Provision of increased marshalling area on reclaimed land to accommodate the car carrying capacity of the new ferries.*
- *Rerouting of existing access roads through the terminal.*
- *Provision of segregated unaccompanied trailer facilities.*
- *Construction of a new terminal building to accommodate the passenger waiting facilities.*
- *Ticketing and CalMac Ferries Limited (CFL) operational facilities.*
- *Provision of car parking facilities for CFL staff and customers.*
- *Bus drop offs etc.*
- *Installation of shore power equipment.*

Additionally, during operation it is anticipated that maintenance dredging periodically within the inner harbour will be required. The level and frequency of maintenance dredging will be determined once wave modelling and sediment transportation modelling has been undertaken.

It is clarified that a separate screening and scoping submission has been made to Marine Scotland in respect of the Marine EIA regulations.

I note that it has been accepted by the submitted screening report submission dated September 23 that an EIA is required under the relevant regulations. The Planning Authority is in agreement with the findings of this report that the development is EIA development and development that requires an EIAR submission.

This view is further reflected in the submission of an accompanying Scoping Report. The Planning Authority therefore responds to the consultation on the matters that should be scoped into the relevant EIAR.

Section 1.2 of submissions clarifies that:

The aim of the Scoping Report is to provide sufficient information to allow Transport Scotland and Statutory Consultees to state their opinion as to the scope of assessment and level of information to be provided in the EIA report (EIAR). This in turn will support the development of an EIAR which will form part of the Harbour Revision Order (HRO) application.

Section 1.3 of the scoping report also clarifies that:

The HRO is intended to designate specifically the nature of the development authorised and the land upon which it may be carried out within the scope of Part 11 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1992, so that subject to obtaining the local planning authority's prior approval of the detailed plans and specifications within the scope of paragraph 29(2) of Schedule 2 (buildings, piers, access roads etc), the proposed

development will be able to rely on permitted development rights in respect of planning permission.

The planning Authority accepts that the proposals fall within the provision Class 29 (1) (c), subject to a prior notification to the Planning Authority in respect of any proposed works to the public road as set out at Class 29 (2) (b). Still allowing Class 29 (c) and the Harbours Act 1964 to form the primary basis of submissions and to utilise permitted development rights.

I also note that the proposed development is not excluded from utilising permitted developments rights, even as an EIA Schedule 2 EIA development, as an exception granted under the Permitted Development (Exception to the Town and Country Planning EIA provisions). Planning Circular 1/2017 at paragraph 157 clarifies that the use of permitted development right is not excluded for Class 29 (1) (c) development subject to an EIA (as is the case in this instance).

I would however ask you to note the comments of the Area Roads Engineer in respect of potential off site road safety improvements which may be required, which will be related to Class 29 (2)(b) and would trigger the need for prior approval to be sought from the Planning Authority for such works. Further commentary on road safety concerns are set out at a later stage in this response and at **Appendix 1**.

Comments on the content of the Scoping Report

Officers note both the contents of the Scoping report and the conclusions as set out Table 20.1 of the submissions, which clarify the matters proposed to be scoped in and scoped out of the EIAR. Given that there is no related planning application, the Planning Authority must have regard to those material planning considerations which it considers the proposals should address.

Given this procedural situation, the Planning Authority must balance any permitted development rights given for such projects, with the need for the proper control of development which could have adverse impacts on matters of materiality to the terrestrial planning system and interests of acknowledged importance.

In this respect the Planning Authority welcomes the conclusions of Table 20.1 and the provided summary commentary which scopes into the EIAR the following matters:

Cultural Heritage

I note that separate consultation with the Council's Conservation Policy Officer has been undertaken as part of the scoping process. I note by e-mail dated 12.1.24 to Ross Cameron it has been confirmed that:

The proposed study area is likely to be adequate to identify significant impacts on cultural heritage. A full assessment will require to be undertaken within the EIA identifying the character of the conservation area and the setting of each cultural heritage asset within the proposed study area.

Notwithstanding this, at this point I would comment that as the proposed development does not include a change of use (albeit an intensification of use) there is unlikely to be a significant change to the overall character of the conservation area or the setting of cultural heritage assets

within and around this. However the proposed changes to the pier will bring about changes to the appearance of the conservation area and will affect key views from cultural heritage assets.

Therefore following an assessment of the setting of each cultural heritage asset identified within the Scoping Report, it is likely that assets with no inter-visibility to the proposal will not be significantly affected. However those whose key views will be affected would, and in particular it would be helpful if visualisations are provided from the following cultural heritage receptors:

- LB12002 (144-145 Frederick Crescent)
- LB49190 (St John's Parish Church)
- LB11971 (Port Ellen Distillery)

Any further discussions on these matters should be undertaken with the Conservation Officer (Kim.deBuiteleir@argyll-bute.gov.uk).

- Landscape and visual amenity
- Marine ecology
- Airborne Noise and Vibration
- Underwater Noise (construction)
- Water environment and coastal processes
- Climate
- Commercial and recreational navigation
- In-combination and cumulative effects

Screening and Scoping Consultation Response Summary

The Planning Authority are in agreement with the screening report and its conclusions that the proposals comprise Schedule 2 development and that an EIA is required. The Planning Authority is also in agreement with the matters proposed to be scoped into the EIAR as set out at Table 20.1 of the Scoping Report.

The Planning Authority would wish the following additional matters to be taken into consideration in the design, construction and operation of the project;

European Protected Species

There is a need to ensure that any surveys related to European Protected species are up to date and good practice and toolbox talks should be provided particularly in respect of any potential Otter interactions with the development site during construction. I would also advise you, as part of the Marine EIA screening and scoping process being undertaken by Marine Scotland to ensure that the Council's Marine Policy Officer Lorraine Holdstock is consulted on the proposals and potential impacts on the Marine Environment (lorraine.holdstock@argyll-bute.gov.uk).

Road Safety Matters

Discussions with the Area Roads Engineer have resulted in concerns over the potential impact of pedestrian and road safety on the surrounding public road network associated with both the construction and operational phases of the development. His comments and suggested conditions/matters to be addressed are included as **Appendix 1** to this letter.

It is my understanding that these are also matters of concern to the local community. The capability and operational characteristics of the public road network and the safety of vulnerable

users in the vicinity of the Ferry Terminal are matters that the Planning Authority consider require to be addressed as part of the overall project design. It is however accepted that these matters do not require to be scoped into the EIAR.

I note the undertaking of any works to the public road to improve safety could be undertaken under Class 29 (c), but subject to a prior notification to the Planning Authority. Still allowing Class 29 (c) and the Harbours Act 1964 to form the primary basis of submissions, but addressing the concerns of the Area Roads Engineer in respect of construction and operational safety matters that are considered critical to the successful design and implementation of this project and its integration into the roads fabric of the town.

I would therefore refer you to the suggested conditions set out at **Appendix 1** and also advise that further discussions are undertaken with Ross James the Area Roads engineer (james.ross@argyll-bute.gov.uk).

I trust this is of assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions in respect of this matter (david.moore@argyll-bute.gov.uk).

Appendix 1

The biggest concern about this is the large quantities of rock required for infill. I have had a couple of Teams meetings with the consultants and CMAL and they can't confirm if they will import by sea or take stone from Ballygrant Quarry. They think it will be by sea and they think Ballygrant stone will be unsuitable for coastal works. They will of course have to import aggregate for sub base and concrete.

The conditions I would apply if this was a Planning Application, are as follows:

- Traffic Management Plan to be submitted for approval by Roads & Infrastructure Services, prior to any work starting on site. The Traffic Management plan should include details of all materials, plant, equipment, components and labour required during the construction phase.
- A detailed Method Statement in relation to access and transport of materials, plant and equipment. Method statement to be submitted for approval by Roads & Infrastructure Services prior to any work starting on site.
- A detailed condition survey to be carried out between Ballygrant Quarry and the application site, prior to any work starting on site. The condition survey to be recorded by means of video and photographs. A copy of the video and photographs to be submitted to Roads & Infrastructure Services for written approval.
- The section of the A846 public road, from the junction of Charlotte Street and Frederick Crescent to the application site, to have inspections carried out on a weekly basis, to ensure the carriageway remains in a safe condition. Details of inspection to be agreed with Roads & Infrastructure Services prior to any work starting on site.
- The applicant will be responsible for the cost of carrying out repairs to the carriageway which are directly attributable to the works, as they appear. Construction details for repairs to carriageway to be agreed with Roads & Infrastructure Services, prior to any work starting on site.
- An adoptable standard footway to be provided between the junction of Charlotte Street and Frederick Crescent and the application site, minimum width of footway to be not less than 2.00 metres. Details to be submitted for approval by Roads & Infrastructure Services, prior to any work starting on site.