

95 Bothwell Street
 Glasgow, UK
 G2 7HX
 +44.(0)141.243.8000 Fax +44.(0)141.226.3109

Meeting Location	Video Conference	Client	Transport Scotland
Meeting Date/Time	01 November 2013, 10am	Project	A90/A96 Haudagain Improvement
Subject	Quarterly meeting with ACC and Nestrans	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>David Anderson - Head of Planning and Design John MacIntyre – Project Manager</p> <p>Aberdeen City Council (ACC):</p> <p>Joanna Murray - Team Leader Transportation Strategy and Programmes John Quinn - Head of Housing and Regeneration Investment</p> <p>NESTRANS (NES):</p> <p>Derick Murray - Director</p> <p>Jacobs (JUK):</p> <p>Robert Galbraith – Project Director Chris Hutt – Assistant Project Manager Graham Bell – Senior Traffic Engineer</p>	
2	Introductions and Apologies		
	(i)	Apologies were received from Duncan McCallum (TS), Andy Mackay (JUK), Maggie Bochel (ACC) and Paul Genoe (ACC).	
3	Minutes of Previous Meeting		
	(i)	It was noted that the minutes from the previous meeting, held on 02 August 2013, were agreed on 15 August 2013.	
4	Actions from the Previous Meeting		
	(i)	<p>JUK confirmed that updated traffic models were received from ACC and that a meeting was held with SIAS and ACC. The meeting assisted JUK's understanding of the model assumptions and local development forecasts.</p> <p>A meeting will also be arranged soon with MVA to discuss details of the</p>	JUK

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 2 of 6

		ASAM model, including traffic forecasts relating to the future development of the airport.	
	(ii)	JUK confirmed that the procurement paper was issued to ACC on 20 August 2013. ACC noted no further comments.	
	(iii)	JUK confirmed that they had received ACC's two year and 2018 rehousing programmes.	
	(iv)	JUK confirmed that they issued a drawing to ACC displaying JUK's initial view of properties that would require to be demolished, based on ACC's option 5 road design. JUK added that the drawing also highlights those properties where demolition could potentially be avoided if a suitable means of access was provided. ACC noted that the demolition assumptions aligned with their own initial understanding.	
	(v)	ACC advised that a request had been made to their legal team to provide information relating to the extent of land owned by ACC. Details would be provided to JUK following receipt.	ACC
	(vi)	<p>JUK confirmed that a meeting was held on 06 September 2013 between JUK, TS, ACC and the VOA. Following the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) JUK are progressing with design iterations with a view to fixing the designs for assessment in early December. The designs will be issued to ACC at that time; and 2) JUK asked if ACC could provide an update with regard to the timescales required to achieve vacant possession. ACC noted that process of achieving vacant possession was already underway. ACC agreed to provide an estimate of overall timescales. 	JUK ACC
	(vii)	JUK confirmed that the land acquisition and compensation paper was issued to ACC on 21 October 2013. It was agreed that the paper would be discussed in detail at the end of the meeting under AOB.	
	(viii)	ACC advised that they were currently retrieving details of their cost estimate from archive. ACC asked JUK what level of detail they would like to receive. JUK noted that they did not expect to receive a full break down of calculations and explained that the next level of detail would be helpful. This would allow visibility of the assumptions made and what items were allowed for, including land compensation assumptions.	ACC
	(ix)	JUK noted that a key contacts list was now in place and that it included details of those involved in each of the three working groups.	
	(x)	<p>JUK confirmed that they received a draft paper from ACC outlining a strategy for community engagement. JUK added that the first stakeholder and community engagement working group was held in Aberdeen on 02 October 2013. JUK commented that it was a very positive meeting with a number of actions for both ACC and JUK.</p> <p>JUK added that progress had already been made on the publication of a 2nd edition of Middlefield Matters which will include information from both ACC's regeneration work and TS's Haudagain Improvement Project. The publication will also include details of a drop in centre to be attended by both ACC and JUK/TS, in Middlefield, on 10 December 2013. A</p>	ACC/JUK

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 3 of 6

		<p>subsequent edition of Middlefield Matters could then provide feedback from the drop-in centre and details for any further drop-in centres.</p> <p>ACC agreed that the work being taken forward by the group was very positive and would benefit all parties.</p>	
	(xi)	<p>JUK confirmed that the members of the three working groups were now known and noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The first stakeholder and community engagement group meeting was held on 02 October; 2) JUK will contact ACC on week commencing 04/11/13 to arrange the first engineering / traffic working group. JUK aim to hold the meeting in early December; and 3) JUK will arrange an environmental working group meeting in early January following initial work to establish the environmental baseline. 	<p>JUK</p> <p>JUK</p>
5	Progress on Haudagain Improvement Project		
	(i)	<p>JUK advised that they undertook a sifting workshop where all 40 STAG concepts were appraised against criteria such as operation and environmental impact along with additional JUK designs. JUK added that three design concepts passed the sifting criteria and are now being developed as part of the DMRB Stage 2 Assessment process. JUK confirmed that the three options were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Option 5 from the STAG Report (Option 5); 2) A signalised crossroads based on Option 4 from the STAG Report (Option 4); and 3) A bigger roundabout based on Option 13 from the STAG Report (Option13). <p>NES queried if JUK were comfortable that no grade separated junctions would be considered further. JUK noted that the sifting process ruled out grade separation and that the decision in that respect was therefore an issue to be addressed as part of current activity in the event of any future public local inquiry.</p>	
	(ii)	<p>With regard to Option 5, JUK explained they are currently optimising the junction location and the roads connecting the junction to both the development land and Manor Avenue.</p> <p>JUK added that they are refining the tie-ins to Auchmill Road and North Anderson Drive to minimise house demolition. For the same purpose, JUK are also reducing the length of the northbound auxiliary lane on North Anderson Drive.</p>	
	(iii)	<p>With regard to Option 4, JUK noted that the current design has a 3 or 4 lane approach to the junction on each arm. JUK explained that they are considering the benefits associated with widening the structure over the railway on Mugiemoos Road.</p> <p>JUK noted that there would be difficulties associated with this option in terms of disruption during construction and the impact on the petrol station.</p>	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 4 of 6

	(iv)	With regard to option 13, JUK noted they are currently looking at various layouts of roundabout, all with a diameter of 70-100m. JUK added that they are considering layouts with and without signals and, similarly to Option 4, they are considering the widening of the Mugiemoos Road railway structure.	
	(v)	JUK noted that they had met with SEPA and are currently developing a drainage strategy that considers attenuation and water treatment.	
	(vi)	JUK noted that they had contacted 20 utility companies including all those known to have apparatus in the vicinity of Haudagain roundabout. JUK added that the large majority of utilities companies had responded and the location of apparatus is being transferred onto a drawing.	
	(vii)	JUK noted that a Phase 1 Habitat Survey had been undertaken and the findings are currently being documented in a report. JUK added that letters are also in the process of being issued to all relevant stakeholders in an attempt to gather as much environmental baseline information as possible.	
	(viii)	JUK advised that a topographical survey was now complete and that the team would return in two or three weeks to undertake a drainage survey. JUK to confirm the date of the survey to ACC in advance.	JUK
	(ix)	JUK recorded that they have been delayed due to the late receipt of traffic models from ACC but added that they still expected to achieve the overall programme for completion of the DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. With regard to current traffic modelling progress, JUK noted that the reference cases were in development, design iterations were ongoing between the traffic and roads teams, ASAM was up and running and the approach to the economic assessment was under development. JUK added that the journey time objective remained under review at this time.	
	(x)	TS noted that the Civil Engineering Environmental Quality Assessment & Award Scheme (CEEQUAL) approach is being considered for developing sustainability objectives for the scheme. JUK will prepare a paper outlining the objectives and will issue the paper to ACC. ACC agreed to review the objectives and advise where they could align with ACC sustainability objectives. The environmental working group could consider convening earlier than January as currently planned to agree the scheme sustainability objectives.	JUK / ACC
6	Progress on Middlefield Regeneration		
	(i)	ACC noted that their Strategic Infrastructure Plan had been recommended to the council for approval. One of the key goals of the plan was to enable the delivery of affordable houses. ACC explained that, in meeting this goal, they would deliver approximately 1000 new houses, on council owned land, within three years. ACC added that they would work with the private sector in an attempt to deliver a further 1000 new houses within the same three year period. These new properties would be used to rehouse Middlefield residents as required.	
	(ii)	ACC explained that there is a need to extend the range of available housing and as a result ACC would develop a joint venture. ACC can only make use of funding allocations for council houses but by entering a joint venture the likes of mid-market rental properties could also be provided.	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 5 of 6

	(iii)	ACC explained that they were currently reviewing the community facilities within the footprint of Option 5 and were aiming to compile a report by January 2014.	
	(iv)	ACC noted that a permanent office was being set up in the Logie Area where local residents could find out about the regeneration plans.	
7	Any Other Business		
	(i)	TS / JUK queried when the exact details would be known for the development 'triangle'. JUK noted that if they were to take account of the proposals for the development 'triangle' they would need to have a high degree of certainty at the start of the DMRB Stage 3 Assessment process. ACC noted that soft market testing was underway but there will be no certainty of the development layout until a Contractor had produced a design.	
	(ii)	<p>JUK noted that regardless of the development layout they need to make an assumption now with regard of the type of development. JUK added that the traffic trips generated from retail could be significantly different from residential properties. This could have an impact on the operational performance of each option. NES noted that the area of land was quite small and that the difference in traffic generated may be minimal in overall terms.</p> <p>ACC confirmed that they would provide details of assumptions that could be used in respect of retail and housing development scenarios to enable differences in traffic generation to be assessed. It was acknowledged that the scenarios would be preliminary in nature.</p>	ACC / JUK
	(iii)	<p>With regard to the land acquisition and compensation paper NES noted that the conclusion is solely based upon a trunk road scheme and suggested that a case could be made for advance compensation if the road improvements and regeneration were considered as a single scheme. TS explained that they have no legal powers to treat the trunk road scheme and regeneration as one project, adding that the Road Scotland Act provides the necessary powers for the trunk road scheme in isolation.</p> <p>ACC added that they did not understand the argument about treating other private owners differently from ACC. TS explained that the site could not be fully utilised until all the necessary land was under the ownership of Scottish Ministers. ACC pointed out that there are only approximately seven private owners who would be impacted and that they are all engaged with ACC. ACC added that ACC, as neighbours, could engage with those private owners and that it should not be insurmountable for TS to reach a separate agreement with those private owners.</p> <p>ACC indicated that they could repay any money received if the scheme did not go ahead, therefore removing a key risk from Scottish Ministers. TS referred again to the issue of private owners and also to the issue of removing burdens. Burdens cannot be removed by agreement and would require a formal process such as CPO or Lands Tribunal. ACC agreed to engage with their legal team to establish what burdens exist and the options to remove those burdens.</p> <p>TS concluded the discussion by noting that the land acquisition and compensation paper was their default position, a position that their legal</p>	ACC

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 6 of 6

		team was comfortable with. If TS were to deviate from that default position they would need further persuasion and justification. TS noted that they would welcome ACC's input to reduce the risks associated with burdens and private owners and would consider any further proposals that had solid legal basis, which did not increase risk for the Scottish Ministers.	
8	Date of Next Meeting		
	(i)	The next quarterly meeting will take place on Friday 07 February 2014 at 10:00. JUK to issue agenda in advance.	JUK