

FORTH BRIDGE WORLD HERITAGE CONSULTATION: Summary and Analysis



The Consultation Process

- The public consultation occurred over a twelve-week period between 20th May and 11th August 2013, and took the form of an online questionnaire, supported by four public meetings, a publicity initiative in Edinburgh Waverley Station, and the establishment of a dedicated website through the Forth Bridges Forum at a www.forthbridgeworldheritage.com.
- Its principal purpose was to focus on issues relating to the local communities situated around the Forth Bridge for whom the impact of World Heritage is likely to be most intense. Fifty-eight valid responses were received via the online questionnaire. Of the four public events that were held, two were hosted in Queensferry, and one in North Queensferry, together attracting 93 people. The meetings took the form of facilitated workshops and proved to be lively and constructive events.
- The Consultation took place prior to Network Rail's announcement that it is exploring the possibility of opening visitor centres that may provide access to the Bridge. This potential development did not form part of the Consultation, although some respondents actively anticipated such a possibility.

Summary of Response to the Consultation

- The response to the consultation was broadly very positive, with the overwhelming majority of online respondents welcoming the nomination of the Bridge. Of those who were less confident about the perceived benefits of World Heritage inscription, most were also in favour, but were worried about potentially negative impacts upon the quality of life in the two communities.
- Much of the concern in the online questionnaire unsurprisingly focused on road infrastructure, parking, potential congestion and worsening traffic hazards. These were perceived by many to be problems that already exist, and so the World Heritage nomination was thought by some to be a good opportunity for the local authorities to take the initiative and propose solutions before the situation gets even worse. There was a consensus that action needs to be taken as soon as possible, rather than waiting until potential inscription in 2015.
- These issues also emerged strongly in the workshops, where it was stressed that a co-ordinated, sustainable approach to transport and parking was needed. Suggested solutions included better use both of train services and of boat transport, as well as an expansion of park & ride facilities.

- A small number of people expressed regret at the likelihood of a surge in the number of visitors impacting the existing character of the communities on both banks of the Forth, and some concern was also raised at what was thought to be a the potentially negative impact on the natural environment.
- However, overall, responses were both positive and helpful, and once fully collated, will be incorporated into the Management Plan, which together with the Nomination Document, will comprise the nomination dossier that is submitted to UNESCO in January 2014.
- Many believe that World Heritage will bring with it opportunities for business, including tourism, and has the potential to feed into many forms of education. Perceived benefits ranged in scale from those affecting local businesses to national and international developments. There was an almost universal sense of pride and cultural value associated with the Bridge, even amongst those who were less keen on World Heritage inscription.
- All the workshops hoped that World Heritage would result in the attraction of more investment into the communities, with better networking, improved and better co-ordinated public transport, and with this, the potential for 'Green Tourism'. There was therefore a strong feeling that effective management will be needed to ensure adequate systems and infrastructure are enhanced to minimise the potentially detrimental effects of more traffic and people, if World Heritage inscription is achieved in 2015.
- Meanwhile, the widespread support for the nomination was further demonstrated during a day of promotion at Edinburgh's Waverley Station. No negative reactions to the nomination were detected amongst a wide range of passing passengers and other pedestrians throughout the day. Some even expressed surprise that the Forth Bridge is not already a World Heritage Site.



The Forth Bridge and Hawes Pier, Queensferry (Duncan Peet, Historic Scotland)

Response to the Consultation by Theme

General Support for the Nomination

- Amongst the many supportive comments, it was noted that The Forth Bridge is already in reality a World Heritage site, and that the nomination process is merely a means of gaining formal recognition, which is long overdue. Another respondent noted that, 'The Forth Bridge does far more than carry trains - its girders provide a vital support for the people of Scotland, both now and for years to come.' At a national scale, it was suggested that World Heritage has the potential to raise the profile of Scotland, demonstrating '...that we are, and were a great innovative nation and that iconic bridge stands testament to our heritage and skills'.
- There was a widespread sense of pride in the Bridge being 'one of the engineering wonders of the engineering world', but also in its special place within the local communities. The view was expressed that if the Bridge gets the recognition it deserves, it will raise the profile of the Queensferry, and better transport connections, international recognition and a growth in tourism will ensue. There was also the sense that it will put this part of Scotland 'on the map', and in the case of North Queensferry, reinforce its distinctive identity. Most people viewed this as a good thing, but a few suggested it would change things for the worse and saw little if any benefit for local people.
- There was an enthusiasm for the many stories of the Bridge to be properly told. For example, it was noted that before the recent restoration project, years of neglect almost resulted in terminal decline. It was also suggested that the Bridge's setting was considered perfect because it can be seen so easily from so many different locations, and it was suggested that, '... the Bridge is a very rare example of a man-made structure enhancing the natural scenery.' With the restoration project complete, it is in excellent condition and looks splendid, especially with the night-time illumination. The feeling is that '... it oozes enduring quality and design', and that '...it has aged well, demonstrating durability and usefulness.' At the same time, it was also felt that World Heritage listing would add an extra level of designation that would safeguard future of the bridge.
- The point was made that the Bridge is already a cultural icon, having featured in many movies (including 'The 39 Steps', several times), and has also been the inspiration for some of internationally renowned fiction. On a daily basis, it has since it was built featured in commercial advertising and the logos of hundreds of local businesses and clubs, confirming that it is '... a globally recognised symbol of something beyond mere technological excellence and 19th century human endeavour.' The value of the Forth Bridge as an intellectual construct with contemporary resonance (as well as an engineering one with the historical equivalent) cannot therefore be overstated, and it was noted by one respondent that this should be reflected in the wording of the final statement submitted to UNESCO. In practical terms, it was also noted that inscription will ensure the bridge is maintained

and preserved in the longer term, and will help guarantee the monitoring of the state of conservation of the Bridge and its immediate vicinity.

- Other comments asserted that the Bridge is a national symbol which 'opened up the country' and united the United Kingdom, enabling, for example, overnight transportation between Aberdeen and London. Some regard it as '... as a structure which defines a nation', and others as the pinnacle of the Victorian era. The engineering innovations embodied in the bridge at the point of design and build are thought to be exceptional, and it is considered by some to be a '...very early and exceptional example of large-scale bridge-building.' Those who believed it to be massively over-engineered were proved wrong by the Quebec Bridge disasters a quarter of a century later, and so there is a sense that the Forth Bridge is also considered to be an engineering benchmark.

Defining the World Heritage Site and a potential Buffer Zone

- There was discussion about the scale and extent of the nomination, with some disappointment that it is defined as only the Bridge itself and does not include North Queensferry and Dalmeny Stations. The point was made, however, that demonstrating the outstanding universal value of the stations would have added disproportionately to the complexity of the nomination, and might have weakened the case.

- The importance of the adjacent existing Conservation Areas in providing protection of the setting of the Bridge was noted, as was their potential role if Buffer Zones are required. A comment was made that '...the communal pride North Queensferry has for the Bridge is probably the best buffer zone that there is...'

- The option of not having Buffer Zones for the proposed World Heritage site was welcomed. Discussion in the workshops tended to conclude that there are better ways to protect the Bridge from unsuitable development and change. It was noted that if there was to be a Buffer Zone, defining its boundaries would be difficult. This is one of the reasons why the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh are protected by Key Views instead.

- The point was made that if there is to be no Buffer Zone, then the existing Conservation Areas in the north and the south will be relied upon to provide protection through the planning system, and it will be important to develop an understanding of the key views.

Economic Benefits

- There was considerable discussion on the potential economic impact that might follow World Heritage inscription, with the balance of opinion assuming that the benefits would outweigh the drawbacks. The key challenge was seen to be taking advantage of and maximising the anticipated business benefits whilst attempting to minimise the negative impact, especially on local infrastructure. In addition to benefits for local businesses, there were also

perceived to be potential regional benefits. It was, for example, suggested that there will be a big tourist opportunity for the whole of Fife. However, some respondents were, for example, '...not clear what the benefit would be for local residents of North Queensferry other than the handful who own or are employed by tourism related businesses.'

- There was therefore a sense that more small businesses coming into the communities (e.g. arts & crafts type outlets) would be welcome. At the same time, the point was made that World Heritage listing will bring no benefits if tourists cannot get to the Queensferrys, so a review of public transport is necessary, especially buses. It was also stressed that businesses will benefit from encouraging visitors to spend more time in both communities.
- With this in mind, it was noted that there will be an opportunity to design packages for people coming by train, including guided walks and other self-propelled visitor experiences. Equally, the tourist sector would have the opportunity to create new tourism packages that incorporate visits to the two communities. More visitors were seen as potentially raising the profile, status and identity of Queensferrys, generating opportunities for food and drink sales/services businesses and new shops, attracting inward investment and more jobs.
- Whilst there was support for encouraging more business and tourism, there was perceived to be an urgent need to manage and control potential increases in road traffic, which is already a major issue. There was a strong sense that both City of Edinburgh and Fife Councils need to commence taking action now, before the application is submitted to UNESCO. Several people noted that interest in the three Bridges has already increased visitor numbers, so without action, the situation is likely to deteriorate further, hampering rather than promoting local business.
- The potential for links with Scotland's existing World Heritage sites was also noted, as was the increasing power and currency of the World Heritage brand. In particular, a link between the Antonine Wall and the Forth Bridge was suggested because the former was '... a barrier to keep Britannia and Caledonia apart, whilst the latter is a bridge that brings them closer together.'
- In North Queensferry, the nomination was seen as a potential driver for attracting more funds to invest in local businesses and infrastructure, including harbours and waterside areas. Repairing the piers was seen as an urgent priority, with funds being invested in upgrading and maintaining the village also seen as important.
- Sustainability was also thought to be a major priority, with green tourism being seen as desirable. This would include better public transport, roads, paths and green spaces. In addition to promoting more local businesses, the hope was that opportunities to promote surrounding historical sites would grow, together with tourist and business attractions that stress the historical importance of North Queensferry, possibly including a new visitor centre in the village.

- It was also stressed that the visitor experience need not be centered solely around heritage - the three bridges in close vicinity allow the focus to shift from the past to the present, presenting an opportunity to explain and celebrate engineering techniques from the late 19th century to the early 21st century. There is nothing comparable anywhere in the world. This should be a greater draw than the Golden Gate Bridge, or the Sydney Harbour Bridge, both of which attract general, and technically minded tourists in large numbers.
- More generally, many respondents believe World Heritage for the Bridge has benefits for the wider Scottish community, pointing out that '... its importance goes way beyond the bridge and its local communities. There's a great story to tell.' Equally, parallels are drawn with the opening of the Bridge in 1890, which had a positive economic impact on Fife communities, making them accessible from the south, raising esteem for the area and rendering it a better place to live. The hope is that World Heritage can have a similar positive effect on communities now living around the Bridge.
- A further benefit of World Heritage was the possibility of generating more successful charity work, building on well-established activities such as those of CHSS.

Development Pressures

- A range of views was expressed on the impact of potentially enhanced development pressure that might follow inscription. The point was made, for example, that development is one of the main results of the bridge being built in the first place, and that this was viewed as a positive consequence. It therefore follows that it should be viewed positively now, and not merely as a pressure.
- In the case of Queensferry, it was suggested that it has a strong historical position as the most easterly ferry crossing point on the Forth. Its location, completely surrounded by three major family estates, Dalmeny, Hopetoun and Dundas has ensured the integrity of the settlement, protecting it from urban sprawl. It was therefore stressed that any further development should respect the heritage value of the Royal Burgh as well as the bridge.
- The point was also made that it is crucially important that no intrusive developments are permitted anywhere near the bridge that affect how the area looks presently. The view was that this principle should extend as far as the road bridges (old and new). In other words, the whole Forth Bridges area has a fantastic setting which must not be spoilt.
- It was also noted that enhanced development pressure is likely to impose increased demands on the planning authorities on both sides of the Forth. It was therefore felt important that both local authorities ensure sufficient resources are allocated to the proper implementation of planning control and enforcement. With this in mind, the Forth Road Bridge development site was

cited as an example where a co-ordinated approach is required by City of Edinburgh Council. The view was that more care and analysis of the potential impact of proposed developments is needed before permission/consent is granted.

Queensferry Local Issues

- On the South Bank of the Forth, there is support for the nomination, but with concerns about the possibility of rising property prices, potential development pressure and increased stress on already stretched infrastructure. Interest was expressed in the possibility of a Visitor Centre, its potential location, and the long-term role of the Forth Bridges Contact & Education Centre. Representatives from Queensferry & District Community councillors had been in favour of the new centre in the belief that it would become the new official visitor centre for the Bridges, which is why they supported it. If another Visitor Centre location is chosen, it was suggested that it incorporates a drop-off point for buses.
- The most serious and consistent concerns of respondents and workshop participants related to how more people visiting Queensferry can be accommodated, bearing in mind the existing car parking issues. There was a strong feeling that parking issues should be addressed now and not after World Heritage status is achieved. The point was made that during most weekends and throughout summer, the Hawes Pier area of Queensferry is already unbearably congested. There was therefore agreement that much will depend on the commitment of the City of Edinburgh Council to ensure the upgrading of the infrastructure, traffic flow and visitor parking away from the central area. Without major improvements, an increase in visitor numbers could prove damaging to the quality of life of residents.
- Co-ordinated planning by City of Edinburgh Council is therefore required, and the Forth Road Bridge development site was cited as an example. More care and analysis of the potential impact of proposed developments is needed before permission/consent is granted.
- Maintenance of signage was raised as a major issue. It was noted that there is no longer signage for footpaths provided to Dalmeny Station (via Jacobs Ladder), which has now deteriorated into a poorly maintained 'no-mans-land'. The hope is that World Heritage can reverse this sort of decay. Queensferry Ambition is assessing signage, but resources remain an issue (and have been so for 20 years). It was noted that it will be important to have high-quality co-ordinated signage in advance of World Heritage inscription. This is all the more vital because some of the best views of the Bridge were considered to be Back Braes. If this is to continue, management of trees and vegetation is required, as well as improved signage and interpretation.
- Further comments were made about traffic congestion and parking issues. It was noted that traffic congestion is exacerbated by sat-nav digital mapping data that routinely directs drivers wanting to see the Forth Bridge through the centre of town. There was a suggestion that Queensferry Ambition might

consider sponsoring a town bus service. It was also suggested that the site of the old motel should be used to expand car parking capacity, with potential for a viewing site and tourist centre. It was thought important that these benefits are expressed to any new owner of taking over site.

- The importance of taking a co-ordinated approach to tourism was also stressed. It was noted, for example, that visitors will increase when the piers of the new bridge (Queensferry Crossing) start to rise from the water. In particular, the hope was expressed that sustainable tourism is promoted, with an emphasis on co-ordinated public transport, and better use of boat transport. The ease with which cruise liner traffic can be organised demonstrates the potential for more boat-based transport.

- Finally, the existence of a local Civic Trust, the 'Queensferry Association', was mentioned, its purpose being to promote and safeguard the local architectural and cultural heritage. It was suggested that there is now an opportunity to revive its work by forming a new 'Queensferry Heritage Trust' to focus attention on the physical and historical heritage, supporting the work of the Community Council, especially in the context of potential World Heritage for the Bridge.

North Queensferry Local Issues

- There was a wider divergence of views north of the Forth on potentially increased visitor numbers – some welcome the potential for inward investment and new business, whilst others fear the change it will induce in the village. However, World Heritage was seen by many as a good facilitator for positive developments within the community, but only if the views of the village are taken into account. It was also observed that there are different traffic experiences in the two distinct halves of the village, and that inscription will therefore have a variable impact.

- There was a suggestion that priority should be given to the identification and enhancement of the best viewpoints for the Bridge, such as the Well area, Mount Hooly. It was also noted that there is scope for improvement around the West Bay.

- There was also the suggestion that The Forth Bridge is of greater value to Fife than it is to Edinburgh, the assumption being that whilst it is vital to Fife, it is more peripheral to Edinburgh, which already has a World Heritage Site at the heart of the city. It follows that the achievement of World Heritage status is likely to have a greater impact for neighbouring Fife Communities such as Dunfermline, Inverkeithing, and Dalgety Bay, than it will for Edinburgh. It was therefore felt that businesses north of the river are more likely to cite the World Heritage site as an asset than their Edinburgh-based counterparts. For this reason, it was suggested that North Queensferry needs its own local museum, such as there used to be at Queen Margaret Hotel.

- In addition to making the point that World Heritage is likely to make the already bad parking situation worse, specific traffic hotspots were identified.

For example, Main Street is already very difficult to traverse, with current parking on both sides, and issues with double-decker buses. The Brae was also identified as a significant choke point. Other issues that were discussed included the diversion of cars to Deep Sea World, and the potential use of the Marina as a car park, together with a possible shuttle bus.

- As with Queensferry, an appetite was expressed for the co-ordination of public transport, an associated car management plan including better use of park & ride (including Ferry Toll), and the promotion of sustainable transport by train, boat, bicycle and footpaths. It was also stressed that if rail passengers are to be encouraged, the provision of some sort of public transport up and down the Brae will be necessary.
- For some people, meanwhile, it is not clear how North Queensferry can accommodate an additional influx of tourists, the suggestion being that there is no space for additional cars or coaches, and that the focus for enhanced access to the Bridge should be from south of the river. More ambitiously, others suggested that the only sustainable solution would be to create out-of-village parking and encourage visitors to walk or cycle in.
- A particular focus of interest was the perceived need to reclaim the public space under Fife cantilever tower at the north end of the bridge. Frustration had been previously expressed at Network Rail who had been thought by some to be preventing public access. This was thought to be an excellent viewpoint which has been allowed to deteriorate into a poor state. One of the problems is thought to be health and safety, and insurance.
- Some discussion focused worries about an increase in the numbers of people visiting the village. Issues ranged from security for homes and businesses to parking, litter, and speeding road traffic. Specific concerns for some people included an uncontrolled influx of large buses and campervans. Some expressed a preference for no car parks in the village, whilst others wanted more car parking without affecting local people's amenities. As was the case in Queensferry, the hope was these issues are addressed now rather than waiting for World Heritage listing to be conferred.
- Stronger feelings were also noted such as, '... the village is a village and not a Walt Disney destination', and '...the roads were built for hand carts and not mega buses.' This was reiterated by the comment that, 'There can be no increased access to the property from N Queensferry - our community and environment would be ruined by an influx of visitors. N Queensferry is itself a historic site and SSRI at West Bay, and should not be developed at all.' There was a sense that the village is itself seen by some as an extraordinarily good viewing point, and that some people in the community wants it and its setting to remain completely unchanged.
- Physical access to the bridge for visitors (e.g. a viewing platform) on the North Queensferry side was also thought by a few respondents to risk too much congestion in the lower village. Any increase in parking facilities to support such access would, it was suggested, endanger very valuable built

and natural features which are highly valued by residents and visitors alike. Once again, the view was expressed that any development would be better suited to the South Queensferry shore. 'The north shore should remain protected from any further influx of visitors.' Similar comments included, 'North Queensferry is a superb place to live, just as it is. I cannot support anything that will increase tourist numbers through our narrow streets. Large increases in tourists would be disastrous for this community.'

- In the same vein, it was asserted that, 'Increased tourism in North Queensferry could be catastrophic especially for the residents in the lower part of the village. Already, one person suggests, '... residents have problems with parking, and pavements are dangerously narrow for pedestrians and dog walkers. If numbers of visitors were to increase, the only way to preserve the safety and tranquillity of the village would be to prevent visitors arriving by motorised transport.'

- In contrast, others feared the reverse, and that if no improvements to the village are realised, the resulting lack of management of visitors will result in any benefits of inscription going to South Queensferry, where there is thought to be more parking and potential new capacity. In general, therefore, by far the majority of respondents and workshop attendees saw World Heritage for the Bridge as being potentially very positive. The key challenge is therefore perceived to be managing the impact of inscription, and counteracting the negative pressures that might ensure.

Proposed Access Solutions for Visitors

- A number of views were expressed about visitor access to the environs of the Bridge, and onto the structure itself. Amongst the most ambitious was the proposed installation of a funicular railway coming down from North Queensferry railway station, which could potentially accommodate a surge in visitor numbers using the train.

- The need for an integrated public transport solution was mentioned several times, together with the suggestion that discussions with public transport providers and local authorities should be commenced as soon as possible. Once again, suggestions included better use of train and boat travel, and the use of remote car parks, and park & ride type arrangements.

- One respondent was concerned about the possibility of visitor experience on the Bridge itself, and the potential adverse impact on the integrity of the structure. Another, while in favour of the World Heritage nomination, was much more hostile to such a proposal, urging that the current platform and lift on the North Cantilever tower be removed as they are '... a detriment to the sheer beauty and elegance, and originality of the original structure.' The respondent was especially concerned that the current status quo regarding free access to the base of the Bridge will change, particularly vehicle access to the shores on both sides, fearing parking might be used as a means of managing traffic flow, at the expense of free access.

- Finally, it was suggested that promotion of the Bridge should not rely completely on the website, and should diversify into social media, expanding awareness and virtual access to the Bridge. In addition, it was suggested that its international appeal could be widened by making the website multi-lingual.

Perceived Educational Benefits – Engineering

- There was widespread enthusiasm and high expectations expressed that World Heritage listing will bring educational benefits, especially in the context of generating an interest amongst young people in engineering as a profession.
- The belief is that the Bridge can be used to showcase engineering, and its associated story can be more widely used nationally and internationally for education in Engineering, Geology and Architecture courses at various educational levels. There was also a hope that this will raise the profile of engineering and has the potential to emphasise what engineering has done and can do to improve the world. It was therefore hoped that a strong educational component can be incorporated into any visitor attractions that might be developed in the future. Through the development of a world-class visitor centre, World Heritage is therefore seen as an opportunity to market Scotland as a centre of excellence for the promotion of engineering.
- The point was also made that tourism focusing on the Bridge is nothing new. ‘We must acknowledge that it was a WONDER of the WORLD in its day, and brought droves of tourists to marvel at its magnificence.’ Once again, the view is that Scottish Engineering could be greatly rejuvenated by spreading knowledge of the Forth Bridge.

Proposed Actions and Opportunities

- The workshop sessions and online consultation questionnaire stimulated a number of proposed actions and opportunities. These are listed below:
 - Co-ordination of public transport
 - The development of a visitor and interpretation centre that is truly revolutionary and world class – ‘... a “beat that” challenge.’
 - Investment by both local authorities in local infrastructure, including the repair of key elements such as piers and harbours
 - The levering in of other funds (such as the Heritage Lottery Fund) to augment infrastructural projects focused on heritage
 - The development of designated pedestrian walkways and car parks
 - Encouragement and help for small businesses that can enhance the cultural experience associated with the Bridge and satisfy raised expectations
 - Explore the development of sustainable, eco tourism, with a greater focus on footpaths, bicycling, outdoor experiences, and public transport.
 - There are many existing good views and pathways that could be developed and enhanced for the benefit of both local people and visitors.
 - Integration into the Bridges Festival, and the celebration of all three bridges

- North of the River, the development of tourism packages extended to Dunfermline and surrounding area, and Fife-wide.
- Better use of ferries and more boat transport, with the development of coastal links being important.
- Management of non-residents' vehicles, with the alternative of good public transport links, which might include shuttle bus services. For example, there were thought to be a number of nearby sites that might be suitable for park & ride solutions.
- Adjacent landowners could provide affordable facilities for waiting buses and coaches, as well as possible park & ride for cars.
- Investment in financial assistance for improvements to amenities within both communities, including roads, lighting, litterbins, and public toilets.
- In the context of greatly increasing visitor numbers, review security, with the option of CCTV.
- More engagement with UK and foreign travelers, especially those already tuned into UNESCO World Heritage sites. This could involve a 'UNESCO passport stamp' for travelers who wish to visit all world heritage sites in the United Kingdom.
- Opportunity to make more of Sir William Arrol, the man whose company was responsible for building the Bridge, and who is currently a shortlisted candidate for the Scottish Engineering Hall of Fame. (<http://www.engineeringhalloffame.org/index.html>), 2013 being the centenary of his death.
- Incorporation of the Forth Bridge, and Scottish engineering more generally, into standard education modules, not least the Curriculum for Excellence

Natural Environment

- A small number of responses expressed concern about potential harm to the natural environment that might be caused by the inscription of the Bridge, and increased road traffic volume in particular. It was observed that the bridge straddles a 'special protection area', and 'makes footfall in a bay that is protected as a 'site of special scientific interest', and SNH should be consulted. Protecting the integrity of the surrounding areas such as the bays and the estuarine environment was seen as essential, with the North Queensferry side being particularly vulnerable, with its muddy bays for wading birds and islands supporting their nesting grounds.
- It was also suggested that the whole of the Firth of Forth shoreline is protected under European Legislation, and that the natural setting is immensely valuable. There was therefore a real fear that inscription might encourage significant development that could '...destroy the relative peace and tranquility...' so valued by our community, and that the potential negative impact has not been assessed. At the same time, it was suggested that, 'We don't want better roads in N Queensferry - they are fine the way they are and any increase in road size and/or parking would be at the expense of the local environment.'

- With this in mind, particular concern was expressed at locally mooted suggestions of bays being filled in to create car parking in North Queensferry, as well as walkways and viewing platforms being built on the shoreline. The respondent felt strongly that this could have a ‘devastating’ effect on important local ecosystems, ‘and raises great concerns among many local residents about the proper scope of plans being aired and discussed surrounding this issue.’ Worry was also expressed at the potential for the proposed vegetation management of footpaths and viewpoints to damage rare trees, ecosystems and biodiversity.
- For this respondent, there was a sense that the natural environment is under siege, with woods and islands having already been destroyed, and Sites of Special Scientific Interest dug up and built on. The concern is that World Heritage status for the Bridge would just bring more of the same, unless it is embraced as an opportunity to reverse the trend.

The Nomination Process: Offers of Assistance and Engagement

- Suggestions of additional people and organisations who should be involved included the Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE), Ullapool Museum and Community (Sir John Fowler links to Lochbroom and Braemore area), Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS), the National Trust for Scotland (NTS), the Edinburgh rock band ‘Bwani Junction’, Balfour Beatty (main contractors who worked on the Bridge restoration), local history groups, and West Lothian Council (not to be forgotten, especially as it used to border on the south end of the Bridge prior to boundary changes in the 1990s).