

ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE Finance and Resources Committee

DATE 25 July 2013

DIRECTOR Pete Leonard

TITLE OF REPORT Haudagain Upgrade – A Way Forward (Middlefield)

REPORT NUMBER: H&E/13/046

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the outcomes of the first meeting of Council and NESTRANS officers with Transport Scotland on the future progress and delivery of the Haudagain Junction Improvements by the Scottish Government and the Council's regeneration proposals for the wider Middlefield area, taking into account the instructions of the Finance and Resources Committee of 13 June 2013, which were subsequently approved by Full Council on 26 June 2013.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Committee is recommended to

- a. note the minutes appended (Appendix 1) to this report of the meeting held by Officers of the Council, NESTRANS, Transport Scotland and their Consultants on 28th June 2013; and
- b. acknowledge that Transport Scotland have agreed to arrange a meeting with the District Valuer and Aberdeen City Council to discuss financial compensation arrangements for Council assets as soon as possible; and
- c. note the Council's proposed plan (Appendix 2) to start the regeneration project within the next two years; and
- d. note that a further Equality Human Rights Impact Assessment is required in light of the Council proposal to shorten the project timescales and that this is currently being developed, and
- e. note that officers in the project team are developing a communications strategy for local residents that will provide regular updates on progress as the project develops.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial implications, as they are currently known, are recorded in the minutes of the meeting appended to this report.

4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Legal – no immediate implications arising directly from this report, however future involvement of Legal colleagues will be imperative throughout all stages of this project.

4.2 Resources – An extra member of staff from housing management in the area has been appointed to be a specific point of contact for all housing and re-housing matters. Other resource implications are expected, such as the involvement of Asset Management and Roads Management colleagues and this will be determined as the project progresses.

4.3 Risk Management – A risk register will be developed on agreement of the programme.

5. BACKGROUND/MAIN ISSUES

5.1 **Background**

5.1.1 Reference is made to the Finance and Resources Committee of 13 June 2013, which considered a report entitled Haudagain Upgrade – A Way Forward (Middlefield) (H&E/13/042). The decision of this Committee, which was subsequently referred to and further agreed at Full Council on 26 June 2013, is as follows:

(i) to note the words of Keith Brown, Minister for Transport and Veterans, who stated in the Scottish Parliament on 22nd May “We have stated on a number of occasions our commitment to funding the design and construction of the road improvement, which will include associated land and compensation costs for the delivery of the Haudagain scheme. As is the case with all of our schemes, landowners, including the local authority, will be compensated for any land or property that is required to enable the construction of the road improvement”

(ii) to note paragraph 7.1 of the report which states “There is as yet no detailed information from government on the financial arrangements to be made to purchase assets required to deliver the Haudagain junction improvements” and therefore to instruct officers to enter into negotiations with the Scottish Government within the next 30 days with a view to agreeing a legally binding contract as soon as possible ensuring the Council and other land owners were suitably and properly compensated for the land or property that was required to enable the construction on the road improvements with a view to

starting work on the Haudagain roundabout within the next two years rather than in 2018/2019 as proposed by the SNP;

(iii) to note with complete disappointment the decision to postpone the arranged meeting between the Council and Transport Scotland on 27 May 2013, and reschedule the meeting until 28 June 2013, a clear sign that the Haudagain roundabout improvements were not a key priority for the Scottish Government;

(iv) to note the speed in which the Scottish Government were prepared to compensate landowners, including building a brand new International School in Cults, long before the AWPR work had started and questions the Scottish Government's resolve to fully compensate the people and residents of Middlefield which was the most deprived area of the city in terms of employment, health, income, education and training quickly and efficiently as they did in the most prosperous area of the city; and

(v) to suspend standing order 3(4)(a) and to instruct officers to bring a report to an additional meeting of the Finance and Resources Committee on 25 July 2013 on the meeting with Transport Scotland, including detailed information from the Government on the financial arrangements to be made to purchase assets required to deliver the Haudagain junction improvements and setting out the Council's objectives to start this project within the next two years; and

(vi) to request officers to advise all members, by email, whether a further Equality Human Rights Impact Assessment was required in light of the proposal to shorten the project timescales.

5.2 Council Officer/Transport Scotland Meeting Outcomes

5.2.1 A meeting between Transport Scotland, their Consultants Jacobs, and Aberdeen City Council and NESTRANS officers was held on 28th June 2013 to establish a working format for the delivery of the Haudagain Improvements Project with the Regeneration proposals of the Council. The following paragraphs summarise the key outcomes/discussion points of the meeting, as minuted at Appendix 1 and agreed by all who attended, with particular reference to the Council instruction detailed above.

5.2.2 As can be seen from Item 2 in the appended minute, Council officers informed the meeting of the 28th June of the Council instructions and requested that they be discussed during the meeting. This was agreed and the responses are recorded in the appended minutes.

5.2.3 With reference to point (ii) of the Council instruction:

- This first meeting of the Council and Transport Scotland is considered to be the start of negotiations regarding compensation within the 30 day timescale.

- The aims of the project objectives are agreed as appropriate and Transport Scotland agreed to update these, where necessary, to ensure a robust design.
 - Transport Scotland advised of their indicative key milestones in project development and delivery, as follows;
 - Stage 2 Assessment and confirmation of the preferred route - Spring 2014
 - Stage 3 Assessment and draft order publication - Summer 2015
 - Statutory processes anticipated to take up to 15 months, subject to objections and a Public Local Inquiry – programmed completion Autumn 2016
 - Procurement phase up to 18 months
 - Construction start Spring 2018
 - In response to Council questions on accelerating the procurement process, Transport Scotland agreed to prepare a paper on alternative processes and agreed that the programme would be refined as the project progresses.
 - Transport Scotland have agreed to arrange a meeting with the District Valuer as soon as possible to enable Council officers to understand and negotiate the likely compensation package to inform future investment.
 - In order to understand possible advanced compensation agreements prior to draft order publication, Transport Scotland agreed to explore and report back to the group.
 - Council officers will provide information to Transport Scotland in support of compensation discussions/programming etc as the project proceeds.
 - Council officers will also work with Transport Scotland on a communication strategy.
 - The project progress group will meet quarterly after this meeting, with the next meeting now arranged for 2 August 2013, and smaller working groups of key officers will be arranged as and when required throughout the project.
- 5.2.4 With reference to point (v) of the Council instruction, the minute of the meeting with Transport Scotland demonstrates that the Council's objectives have been raised in full and reflects the responses from Transport Scotland. Where Transport Scotland were unable to provide definitive responses, commitment has been given to come back with more information for discussion as soon as it is available.

5.3 **Equalities and Human Rights Impact Assessment**

- 5.3.1 With reference to point (vi) of the Council instruction, an accelerated project programme is likely to have a greater impact in terms of re-housing people and therefore another impact assessment will require to be undertaken. All Members will be emailed about this advice.

5.4 **Other Matters**

- 5.4.1 A draft project programme of housing regeneration to be started in two years is included for information at Appendix 2.
- 5.4.2 The future progress of this project will be reported to the Housing and Environment, and Enterprise Planning and Infrastructure Committees and where financial details start to emerge, reference will be made back to the Finance and Resources Committee.
- 5.4.3 Officers in the project team are also developing a communications strategy for local residents that will provide regular updates on progress as the project develops.

6. **Impact**

- 6.1 The Single Outcome Agreement refers to a need to enhance the quality of housing and environment for individuals and the community.

Furthermore within “Aberdeen – the Smarter City”, the Council’s policy document for 2012-2017, the following policy targets are set out:

Smarter Economy (Competitiveness)

We will improve access to affordable housing in both social rented and private sector, by supporting first time buyers, regenerating areas within the city and by working with developers to maximize effective use of developer contributions.

Smarter Mobility (Transport and ICT)

We will provide and promote a sustainable transport system, including cycling, which reduces are carbon emissions.

Smarter Governance (Participation)

We will seek to develop a sense of community in Aberdeen based on principles of openness, fairness, reciprocity and responsibility.

- 6.2 This report will be of interest to the local community and wider public, given the housing and transportation impacts and benefits of this project.
- 6.3 The requirement for a further EHRIA is identified in Section 5.3.

7 Management of Risk

- 7.1 Project programmes and risk management strategies will be prepared for both the housing regeneration and the junction improvement in accordance with the appropriate project management procedures.

8 Background Papers

- 8.1 No background papers used other than that appended to this report.

9 REPORT AUTHOR DETAILS

John Quinn
Head of Regeneration and Housing Investment
jquinn@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Tel: 439202

And

Joanna Murray
Team Leader - Transportation Strategy and Programmes
joannamurray@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Tel: 522618

Appendix 1

(Note of Meeting of Council Officers and Transport Scotland on 28th June 2013)

(Proposed 2 year regeneration programme)

Meeting Location	Aberdeen City Council, Marischal College, Aberdeen	Client	Transport Scotland
Meeting Date/Time	28 June 2013, 12pm	Project	A90/A96 Haudagain Improvement
Subject	Strategy Workshop	Project No.	B1557630
Participants	Refer to Item 1	Notes Prepared By	JUK

File

cc:

Item	Subject	Description	Action
1	Attendees		
	(i)	<p>Transport Scotland (TS):</p> <p>Duncan McCallum – Project Director John MacIntyre – Project Manager</p> <p>Aberdeen City Council (ACC):</p> <p>Maggie Bochel - Head of Planning and Sustainable Development Joanna Murray - Team Leader Transportation Strategy and Programmes Ken Neil - Senior Engineer Transportation Strategy and Programmes John Quinn - Head of Housing and Regeneration Investment Graeme Stuart - Housing Strategy and Performance Management Martin Smith - Housing Manager Paul Genoe - Regeneration Consultant Paula Martin - Project Manager Maria Thies - Project Manager</p> <p>NESTRANS (NES):</p> <p>Derick Murray - Director Jenny Anderson - Transport Executive - Programmes</p> <p>Jacobs (JUK):</p> <p>Rob Galbraith – Commission Director Andy Mackay – Scheme Manager Chris Hutt – Senior Engineer</p>	
2	Introduction		
	(i)	<p>All attendees introduced themselves. JUK noted the workshop aims as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to review key issues relating to scheme development and promotion 	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 2 of 8

		<p>to seek to agree the most appropriate strategy for taking the scheme forward through the design stages and statutory processes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• to consider the programme for the project; and• to consider the approach to stakeholder mapping to support preparation of engagement and consultation strategies and communication protocols <p>In addition, ACC requested that the compensation process and the possibility of progressing the construction programme as outlined within the following six points arising from the Council meeting on 22 May be discussed:</p> <p>(a) “ to note the words of Keith Brown, Minister for Transport and Veterans, who stated in the Scottish Parliament on 22nd May “We have stated on a number of occasions our commitment to funding the design and construction of the road improvement, which will include associated land and compensation costs for the delivery of the Haudagain scheme. As is the case with all of our schemes, landowners, including the local authority, will be compensated for any land or property that is required to enable the construction of the road improvement”</p> <p>(b) to note paragraph 7.1 of the report which states “There is as yet no detailed information from government on the financial arrangements to be made to purchase assets required to deliver the Haudagain junction improvements” and therefore to instruct officers to enter into negotiations with the Scottish Government within the next 30 days with a view to agreeing a legally binding contract as soon as possible ensuring the Council and other land owners were suitably and properly compensated for the land or property that was required to enable the construction on the road improvements with a view to starting work on the Haudagain roundabout within the next two years rather than in 2018/2019 as proposed by the SNP;</p> <p>(c) to note with complete disappointment the decision to postpone the arranged meeting between the Council and Transport Scotland on 27 May 2013, and reschedule the meeting until 28 June 2013, a clear sign that the Haudagain roundabout improvements were not a key priority for the Scottish Government;</p> <p>(d) to note the speed in which the Scottish Government were prepared to compensate landowners, including building a brand new International School in Cults, long before the AWPR work had started and questions the Scottish Government’s resolve to fully compensate the people and residents of Middlefield which was the most deprived area of the city in terms of employment, health, income, education and training quickly and efficiently as they did in the most prosperous area of the city;</p> <p>(e) to suspend standing order 3(4)(a) and to instruct officers to bring a report to an additional meeting of the Finance and Resources Committee on 25 July 2013 on the meeting with Transport Scotland, including detailed information from the Government on the financial arrangements to be made to purchase assets required to deliver the Haudagain junction improvements and setting out the Council’s objectives to start this project within the next two years; and</p>	
--	--	--	--

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 3 of 8

		<p>(f) to request officers to advise all members, by email, whether a further Equality Human Rights Impact Assessment was required in light of the proposal to shorten the project timescales. “</p> <p>The officers present have been requested to raise the points relating to compensation and programme with the group, prepare a report on the discussions and report back to the Council meeting on 25 July. It was agreed that the note of this meeting would be attached to the report.</p>	JUK
	(ii)	<p>In relation to the above points, the following was recorded:</p> <p>(a) This point was noted.</p> <p>(b) It was noted that this meeting formed the commencement of the negotiations and that it was within the 30 days requested by the Council. Further matters discussed regarding compensation are recorded in these notes below.</p> <p>(c) TS noted that various provisional dates had been considered for this first meeting but that no date had been confirmed. TS highlighted that the meeting with ACC on 27 May 2013 had therefore not been postponed.</p> <p>(d) Matters relating to compensation were discussed during the course of the meeting and are recorded below.</p> <p>(e) This point was noted. ACC advised that their report would need to be finalised by 16 July 2013.</p> <p>(f) No comments were made in relation to this point.</p>	
3	Scheme Objectives		
	(i)	<p>The scheme objectives developed as part of the STAG appraisal process were noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce congestion and unreliability by improving and sustaining base year 2004 journey times for commercial and public transport traffic until 2021; • Measures must minimise the risk of transport related accidents especially for vulnerable users in the vicinity of the junction to improve on 2001– 2004 casualty levels; • To make socially-inclusive and healthy transport modes more attractive to use, including cycling, walking and public transport measures to be promoted in all measures; • To minimise traffic induced severance on communities by ensuring measures do not have a significant detrimental impact on 2004 walk time accessibility; and • To contribute to the City Council’s regeneration aims by complementing the development of the Logie/Manor area of Middlefield. 	
	(ii)	<p>JUK noted that the objectives provide specific targets to be achieved, particularly in relation to congestion, safety and community severance.</p>	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 4 of 8

		JUK noted that the STAG appraisal was undertaken in 2008 and sought clarification regarding how the specific benchmark and target dates within the objectives (i.e. 2004 and 2021) had been set. JUK noted that based on a preliminary review of ACC's current traffic modelling and future traffic forecasts, there were changes in the present day and future traffic conditions compared with those envisaged in the STAG appraisal. As such, JUK indicated that it was not certain that developing the scheme to take account of the benchmark and target dates in the current objectives would ensure the same level of service to that anticipated in the STAG appraisal would be provided.	
	(iii)	JUK noted that one of the objectives related to the regeneration of the Middlefield area and advised that in developing trunk road schemes, the Scottish Ministers have to give consideration to local and national planning policies/objectives. NES noted that ministers have responsibilities across a variety of sectors and TS confirmed that the design of the improvement could therefore take appropriate account of and complement the Council's regeneration objectives and plans, rather than being designed to directly facilitate them.	
	(iv)	All agreed that the aims of the objectives were appropriate and that a review of the objectives should be undertaken and if necessary, the objectives should be updated to ensure a robust design, taking account of the most up to date traffic information and forecasts available, including a review of the baseline timescales.	TS/JUK
4	Scheme Development Process		
	(i)	JUK noted Transport Scotland's processes would require completion of a DMRB Stage 2 Assessment before progressing to complete a DMRB Stage 3 Assessment and publication of draft orders. The importance of following the correct processes was discussed, particularly to ensure a robust scheme design and to ensure that at any Public Local Inquiry into the draft orders, objections relating to the scheme development process followed did not affect or delay the outcome of the Inquiry and ultimately the decision to progress with the scheme.	
	(ii)	<p>JUK provided information from their preliminary review of ACC's current traffic modelling and future traffic forecasts. JUK advised that it appeared that, consistent with traffic patterns nationally, the growth in traffic anticipated from 2004 had not occurred in recent years. As such it appeared that the current traffic levels were lower than anticipated at the time of the STAG appraisal. JUK also noted, however, that due to the changes in the local development plan, the future traffic conditions were also likely to be different from those anticipated at the time of the STAG appraisal.</p> <p>NES suggested that as roads are typically designed for 15 years after the date of opening there is therefore a possibility that the projected growth may materialise, albeit not as quickly as anticipated at the time of the STAG appraisal. NES indicated that the differences between the traffic assessments in the STAG appraisal and the current forecasts may therefore balance out in future years as proposed development materialises.</p> <p>JUK indicated that developing a detailed understanding of the traffic patterns and traffic growth assumptions in the current traffic model was vitally important to the development of a robust design for the junction</p>	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 5 of 8

		improvement. JUK explained that this would take some time and that this would form part of the DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. This process would also allow alternative options to be reviewed to ensure that they were fully evaluated against the current traffic forecasts and that the decisions on the preferred option were robust.	
	(iii)	ACC asked for an indication of the timescales for completing this work and the subsequent DMRB Stage 3 Assessment leading to draft order publication. JUK advised that the Stage 2 Assessment would be completed in Spring 2014 and the Stage 3 Assessment and draft order publication would be in Summer 2015.	
	(iv)	ACC referred to the Council request that construction commence within two years and requested clarification regarding when it would be possible to get a firmer position on the land and property required for the scheme. NES noted that it would be difficult to enter into land negotiations until the design was fully developed. JUK advised that a reasonable degree of certainty regarding land and property requirements would be reached early in the DMRB Stage 3 process and that the final land and property requirements would be confirmed at the time of draft order publication. It was noted that small changes to the design of the scheme could change the land and property requirements.	
	(v)	JUK referred to the letter from TS to ACC of August 2010 which indicated that when taking the project forward, the first package of work would be to undertake a review against the updated traffic model and that the mechanism for this would therefore be the DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. NES and ACC noted that it is important that this work is undertaken in a proportionate way to ensure that a robust scheme design is developed. It was noted that there are risks associated with progressing this work too quickly.	
	(vi)	It was agreed that TS should progress with the update of the traffic modelling as part of a DMRB Stage 2 Assessment as quickly as possible.	TS/JUK
5	Approach to Statutory Process		
	(i)	JUK noted the expectation that Scottish Ministers use the powers vested in them through the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 when promoting trunk road projects. There is confidence in the process through its regular use and that it is anticipated that it will be used to promote road orders for the Haudagain Improvement scheme.	
	(ii)	Consideration was given to whether progressing through the planning process would provide a quicker alternative. All agreed that there did not appear to be any benefit to the programme compared to the conventional road orders process.	
	(iii)	It was agreed that TS should progress on the basis of publishing road orders using the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984.	TS/JUK
6	Programme		
	(i)	JUK outlined the following indicative programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Stage 2 Assessment Report and confirmation of the preferred route would be delivered by Spring 2014; 	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 6 of 8

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Stage 3 Assessment would be undertaken in advance of publishing the Draft Orders and Environmental Statement in summer 2015; The timescale for the Statutory Process would depend on the objections and the need for a PLI and as such 15 months is normally allowed, with the process anticipated to be completed in Autumn 2016; and Procurement Phase including Preparation (6 months), Tender Competition and Design Lead-in (3 months) could take around 18 months resulting in construction starting in Spring 2018. 	
	(ii)	<p>Whilst acknowledging that the timescales are aligned with previous commitment from TS to commence construction following completion of the AWPR, ACC queried whether the procurement phase could be progressed more quickly.</p> <p>JUK explained the process involved in procuring projects of this scale and it was agreed that the programme will be refined as the project progresses.</p> <p>JUK were asked to prepare a paper to explain the advantages and disadvantages of possible procurement models.</p>	JUK
	(iii)	<p>ACC noted that, the road will ultimately be adopted by ACC and they would want the opportunity to influence the design. JUK confirmed that ACC would be consulted during the development of the design and the preparation of the tender documents. JUK also advised that the Contract will include mechanisms to ensure that the Contractor will comply with the Council's agreed requirements on matters set out in the Contract.</p>	
	(iv)	<p>JUK summarised the timescales from draft order publication to the start of construction and it was noted that this would be approximately 2 ½ to 3 years. It was therefore noted that even if draft orders could be published immediately without reviewing the traffic modelling, producing a robust design and preparing an Environmental Statement, the process would not allow construction to begin within 2 years.</p>	
	(v)	<p>ACC asked if it was possible for construction to start once sections of the AWPR are complete. JUK noted that the reductions in traffic at Haudagain associated with the AWPR would not be achieved until it is completed in its entirety.</p>	
7	Property Impacts and Regeneration Programme		
	(i)	<p>ACC stressed the urgency associated with identifying the houses that need to be demolished. There is currently a shortfall in council housing with approximately 8000 people on a waiting list and new housing would need to be constructed prior to the demolition of existing housing. ACC explained that identifying the extent of demolition would allow them to determine the number of houses that would need to be built and subsequently the amount of land that they would need to purchase/transfer to Housing Revenue Account.</p>	
	(ii)	<p>Referring to the increased certainty that would be provided as the design work progressed, ACC noted that there may be an option for them to undertake a risk based approach to demolition on the basis of the information received during the design process, thereby beginning work on the regeneration within 2 years.</p>	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 7 of 8

	(iii)	JUK asked if ACC could share details of their construction and re-housing programme based on the road construction programme (construction starting 2018) and for ACC's desired programme (starting construction within 2 years). ACC advised that a two year programme was currently being developed. All parties noted the benefits of working together and sharing key programme dates. ACC confirmed that programmes would be available for issue within 3 to 4 weeks.	ACC
	(iv)	ACC noted that on the basis of Option 5, they estimate that 325 properties will require to be demolished for the junction improvement and the adjacent triangular area for regeneration, based on a number of assumptions. JUK requested if ACC could provide details of the land and properties under ACC or private ownership and the assumptions made with respect to property demolition required as a direct result of the road scheme. ACC agreed that this information would be provided.	ACC
8	Compensation		
	(i)	<p>ACC noted that they wish to get early views on land and property requirements so that they can progress acquisition of land for replacement housing.</p> <p>ACC requested details of the payment mechanism for purchasing the ACC owned property that would be demolished. TS noted that following draft order publication and any PLI decision, the orders would be made and then a General Vesting Declaration would follow. This would likely be in autumn 2017 at which point landowners could then claim compensation. The level of compensation would be set by the District Valuer. JUK added that the same process would be followed with private owners.</p> <p>ACC asked if they could meet with the District Valuer to try to develop an understanding of how compensation would be evaluated. ACC explained that this could assist them to prepare budgets and identify any funding shortfalls by evaluating potential build costs, income from compensation and sales of development land. ACC advised it would be important to understand if advance demolition of housing would affect the value of the land in compensation terms. TS agreed that a meeting with the DV and ACC will be arranged.</p>	TS
	(ii)	ACC noted that this process would result in compensation being received later than the programme for rehousing and asked if there was a mechanism whereby acquisition could occur earlier by agreement. ACC advised that that they want to ensure that demolition does not occur without agreement regarding how compensation would be evaluated and paid.	
	(iii)	ACC asked if TS would enter into a legally binding contract committing to providing funding. NES added that caveats could be discussed as necessary, for example, that the road alignment may change. JUK noted that the normal statutory process entitled ACC to compensation and an agreement would not be required to achieve this. ACC explained that they are seeking agreement to advance compensation if possible and added that if funds were made available in advance of draft order publication, the agreement could obligate ACC to return any compensation it received if the scheme design changed or PLI decision affected the property required for the scheme.	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 8 of 8

	(iv)	ACC asked if there were any other options for Government funding that could be considered. JUK were asked to prepare a paper, exploring possible compensation options. ACC requested that the paper be prepared and issued to ACC by 16 July. JUK highlighted that this timescale was not possible as it would require consideration by the Scottish Government and their solicitors.	JUK
	(vii)	TS requested that the information used to produce the STAG cost estimates, including the anticipated demolition and land costs, be provided by ACC. ACC confirmed they will provide any information that is available. It was agreed that a meeting may be required to review the assumptions made. TS noted that the current scheme cost estimate is based on the STAG report of 2008 where the costs are estimated at 2007 prices and as a result, these costs would be likely to increase significantly as the project progresses.	ACC/ JUK
9	Stakeholder Engagement		
	(i)	ACC advised that they would provide a list of key contacts within their organisation and the stakeholders they represent.	ACC
	(ii)	ACC offered to prepare a paper, for discussion, outlining the process to disseminate information to the public. JUK noted that there will occasionally be teams of people in the area with high visibility clothing and suggested that letter drops to the community would be beneficial. JUK also noted that on previous projects a leaflet advising regarding the type of surveys that could be carried out and what surveys land owners and tenants could expect to see occurring.	ACC
	(iii)	It was agreed that a Stakeholder working group would be formed to manage community engagement.	
10	Any Other Business		
	(i)	It was agreed that a meeting of the group should be held quarterly. The first meeting would be arranged for week commencing 29 July, possibly by video conference, and will allow ACC to provide a de-brief of the Council meeting on 25 July. It will also allow all parties to report on progress.	JUK
	(ii)	It was agreed that a small number of working groups will also be formed to facilitate communication between parties to aid project development.	All
	(iii)	TS advised that they would be issuing a press release following this meeting. ACC requested that a copy be issued to their press officer.	TS

Note on risks of a two year programme, as follows:

- The two year programme requires the decant period of the original programme to be shortened by 18 months this will require additional staff. The risk is therefore both budgetary and availability of suitable staff.
- The two year programme means that no new build would be completed within the two year period. The risk is therefore that all tenancies (325 households) would require to be re-housed within the existing Council stock. The risk is therefore a lack of suitably available stock for re-housing.
- The two year programme means that no new build housing would be completed within the two year period. The risk is therefore, is there will be no cleared site for roadworks to commence
- The two year programme means that no new build housing would be completed within the two years. The risk would be that community perception considers there to be no regeneration other than the triangular piece of land for commercial purposes if no new build housing occurs in the short to medium term.

Haudagain programme two year programme 14 7 13

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	Predecessors	Resource Names
1	New Road	30 days	Mon 07/01/13	Mon 18/02/13		
2	✓ New Road Proposal	6 wks	Mon 07/01/13	Fri 15/02/13		
3	New Road Complete	0 days	Mon 18/02/13	Mon 18/02/13 2		
4	Housing Mix	60 days	Mon 07/01/13	Mon 01/04/13		
5	✓ Current Housing Mix	12 wks	Mon 07/01/13	Fri 29/03/13		
6	Housing Mix Complete	0 days	Mon 01/04/13	Mon 01/04/13 5		
7	Decant & Demolition	630 days	Mon 16/09/13	Tue 05/04/16		
8	Information gathering	12 mons	Mon 16/09/13	Tue 02/09/14		
9	Decant phase 1	6 mons	Mon 05/05/14	Fri 17/10/14 8FS-6 mons		
10	Demolition Phase 1	2 mons	Mon 20/10/14	Fri 12/12/14 9FS-22 wks		
11	Decant Phase 2	6 mons	Mon 04/08/14	Mon 02/02/15 10FS-22 wks		
12	Demolition Phase 2	2 mons	Mon 09/02/15	Mon 06/04/15 11		
13	Decant Phase 3	6 mons	Mon 03/11/14	Wed 06/05/15 12FS-22 wks		
14	Demolition Phase 3	2 mons	Mon 11/05/15	Fri 03/07/15 13		
15	Decant Phase 4	9 mons	Mon 02/02/15	Tue 13/10/15 14FS-24 wks		
16	Demolition Phase 4	2 mons	Wed 14/10/15	Tue 08/12/15 15		
17	Decant Phase 5	9 mons	Tue 07/04/15	Tue 15/12/15 16FS-35 wks		
18	Demolition Phase 5	2 mons	Wed 16/12/15	Wed 24/02/16 17		
19	Decant Phase 6	6 mons	Mon 13/07/15	Mon 11/01/16 18FS-38 wks		
20	Demolition Phase 6	2 mons	Mon 08/02/16	Mon 04/04/16 19		
21	Decant Phase Complete	1 day	Mon 04/04/16	Tue 05/04/16 8,9,10,11,12,13,1-		
22	Scottish Government Negotia	738 days	Fri 28/06/13	Mon 20/06/16		
23	✓ Meeting with Scottish Gove	1 day	Fri 28/06/13	Fri 28/06/13		
24	Meeting with Scottish Gove	1 day	Mon 09/09/13	Mon 09/09/13 23		
25	Meeting with Scottish Gove	1 day	Tue 07/01/14	Tue 07/01/14 24		
26	CPO process	12 mons	Wed 01/07/15	Fri 17/06/16 25		
27	Scottish Government Nego	0 days	Mon 20/06/16	Mon 20/06/16 23,24,25,26		
28	Calculate the Cost o fRe- Prov	171 days	Mon 01/07/13	Wed 12/03/14		
29	Demolition Costs	1 mon	Mon 01/07/13	Fri 26/07/13		
30	Housing management Statu	1 mon	Mon 01/07/13	Fri 26/07/13 29FS-1 mon		
31	Calculate the cost of Provisi	0 days	Wed 12/03/14	Wed 12/03/14 29,30		
32	Calculate the income from tri	379 days	Mon 19/08/13	Wed 04/03/15		
33	Soft Market testing (Triangl	3 mons	Mon 19/08/13	Fri 08/11/13		
34	Brief and Invitation to Bid	6 mons	Mon 17/03/14	Mon 01/09/14 33		
35	Securing Land Deal (Value)	6 mons	Tue 02/09/14	Tue 03/03/15 34		
36	Finalisation of Scottish Gov	2 mons	Tue 16/09/14	Mon 10/11/14		
37	Calculate the income from	0 days	Wed 04/03/15	Wed 04/03/15 33,34,35,36		
38	Reconcile Cost & Value	60 days	Mon 10/11/14	Tue 17/02/15		
39	Reconcile Cost & Value	3 mons	Mon 10/11/14	Mon 16/02/15		
40	Reconcile Cost & Value Con	0 days	Tue 17/02/15	Tue 17/02/15 39		
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						