

**From:** Bill Barr [mailto:bill\_barr@blueyonder.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 10 October 2009 16:04  
**To:** MacDonald J (Jim)  
**Subject:** Engineering Structures comments

RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM: HISTORIC SCOTLAND GUIDANCE NOTES – MANAGING CHANGE IN THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT Please complete the details below and return it with your response. This will help ensure we handle your response appropriately. Thank you for your help.  
Name: Dr William Barr

1. Are you responding: **(please delete the line that does not relate to your situation)**  
(a) as an individual go to Q2a/b and then Q4

### **INDIVIDUALS**

2a. Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government website)?  
**(please delete the line that does not relate to your situation)**  
Yes (go to 2b below)

**2b. Where *confidentiality is not requested*, we will make your response available to the public on the following basis **(please delete the lines that do not relate to your situation)****  
Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address

### **SHARING RESPONSES/FUTURE ENGAGEMENT**

4 We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for the Scottish Government to contact you again in the future in relation to this consultation response?  
**(please delete the line that does not relate to your situation)**  
Yes

August 2009

Engineering  
Structures

Consultation Draft, Aug 2009

Question 1 No involvement.

Question 2 Comments on text:

Under Key Issues, the reference to “carrying capacity” clearly applies to bridges, but seems less appropriate for some of the other structures. A more general terms or additional terms should be used.

Would “substituted” not be a better term than “supplanted”, which in one of its dictionary definitions implies something underhand?

This section might be read as requiring wrought iron to always be replaced by wrought iron which I would disagree with in general on grounds of properties, cost and availability.

Under Historic Bridges, section “Iron and Steel”, the term “plate bonding” is ambiguous.

In the same section, the reference to less painting of steel compared with iron is a throw away comment which I would query. Cast iron may give the impression that it corrodes less than steel because the corrosion film is more adherent. More importantly, the need to properly prepare the surface before applying a corrosion treatment should be emphasised. The use of the term “painting” down plays the advances which have been made in modern corrosion treatments. There is a trade off between the cost of corrosion treatment and the cost of maintenance.

Question 3: One of the figures illustrates the terms used to describe the various parts of a bridge, but there are no equivalent figures illustrating the parts of other structures. For example, the term “oversailer” was new to me and I had to look it up. There should be consistency in defining or not defining specialist terms.

Question 4: No comment