



Annex A

Email Correspondence - Extracts in relation to Orange and Violet Routes

From	To	Date	Extract:
AmeyArup	SNH	07/05/2018	<p>Hello [REDACTED]</p> <p><i>I realise you may not be the pearl mussel guru, please ping this on to the appropriate person if this is the case. The SNH website has you as Ecosystems and Biodiversity senior policy officer and therefore a good place to start.</i></p> <p><i>I'm working on the dualling of the A96 (blurb below). We are currently trying to identify potential risks, one of which we think could be Freshwater Pearl Mussels at/ near water crossings. The two catchments we could impact are the Bogie/ Deveron and the River Don and the respective rivers authorities have suggested we contact SNH to get advice about FWPM distribution. I am aware that the location of FWPM are not in the public domain but their presence within a river we may need to cross would constitute a significant risk, especially if they are present at a potential crossing point. Is there any avenue though which we could access the FWPM distribution to identify if they are present within the project area and ideally avoid them?</i></p> <p><i>Yours sincerely,</i></p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p><u><i>Project information</i></u></p> <p><i>In July 2017 Transport Scotland appointed AmeyArup to take forward the East of Huntly to Aberdeen scheme. The scheme extends from East of Huntly to the A96 junction with the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR) at Craibstone – a distance of 42km (26 miles).</i></p> <p><i>We have been appointed to take the indicative improvement strategy corridors identified from DMRB Stage 1 forward and develop and assess route options as part of the DMRB Stage 2. During Stage 2</i></p>

			<p><i>we will look at a number of route options. This will include an engineering, environmental, traffic and economic assessment of the potential impacts of each option to inform a preferred option choice.</i></p> <p><i>To inform the design development and environmental assessment of route options, we are engaging in a programme of engagement with stakeholders and organisations to help inform the design and environmental assessment of the route. We are currently undertaking a desk study to collate all of the environmental and ecological data within the study area.</i></p> <p><i>This data will be used for the purpose of this project and environmental assessment going forward. If you have data and are willing to share that with us, I look forward to hearing from you how best we can receive it, either electronically or if this is not possible how best we can access it. We understand that we may need to obtain official permission to use any data you provide, if so could you please inform us who to contact to obtain this.</i></p> <p><i>Additional information about the scheme can be found on the scheme website:</i></p> <p>https://www.transport.gov.scot/projects/a96-dualling-inverness-to-aberdeen/a96-east-of-huntly-to-aberdeen/</p> <p><i>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss anything further.</i></p>
SNH	AmeyArup	21/05/2018	<p><i>Hi [REDACTED]</i></p> <p><i>I was sent your email by [REDACTED]. Hope this finds you well.</i></p> <p><i>Both the Deveron and the Don are in the same position wrt freshwater pearl mussels. They are both catchments where pearl mussels have been recorded historically. I'm not aware of any contemporary records from either river since the first national survey for pearl mussels was done in the late '90s. However since then shells have been found on both rivers. Most recently the floods associated with Storm Frank, that badly flooded areas around Inverurie, threw up pearl mussel shells in that part of the Don. So there may be some relic populations left in either river.</i></p>

			<p><i>So, basically what I'm saying is that the species may be found in both of these catchments. There are no recent records but neither have our searches for them been comprehensive. My personal advice would be that it may be prudent to include surveys for them around watercourse crossings etc where there is suitable habitat, at least so as to satisfy one's self that they won't be accidentally damaged should any remain (such finds do turn up from time to time) and to protect the developer from inadvertently committing a wildlife crime.</i></p> <p><i>Best wishes,</i> </p>
AmeyArup	SEPA	25/06/2018	<p><i>There are a few specifics that we probably need to looked at too, and we'll develop a fuller list, but this will include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The widening of the existing road at Blackburn, which is already in the flood plain and could also be classified as a water retaining structure.</i> <i>• There's another section of the existing road shown to be in the flood plain to the south of Kintore.</i> <i>• The road at the existing crossing of the Don is also shown to flood, but we're not sure this is correct!</i> <i>• The crossing of the Don and building in the associated flood plain.</i> <i>• The crossing of the Urie and building in the associated flood plain.</i> <i>• Realignment of watercourses – acceptability and any SEPA 'rules'.</i>
AmeyArup	SEPA	16/04/2019	<p><i>Morning </i></p> <p><i>Thanks for taking my call yesterday afternoon.</i></p> <p><i>As discussed, AmeyArup have now received and reviewed the models from JBA / Aberdeenshire Council and, based on what we've found, we would like to make some amendments to the scope agreed with SEPA back in October 2018. Having not seen the models at the time, it was stated that "any AmeyArup changes to the model would be limited to representation of proposed crossings". We would now prefer to make some changes to the modelling scope for this phase before carrying out our before and after comparisons.</i></p>

			<p><i>The Inverurie model extends from just north of the confluence of the Urie and the Shevock, to Parkhill, north of Dyce. However, because the model has been prepared with a FPS for Inverurie in mind, the upper reach of the model (from u/s end to Inverurie) is represented in 1D-only, using extended cross sections, so the 2D domain only begins at the railway crossing of the River Urie, just north of Inverurie. We have points of interest north of this point and we believe these would be better represented in a 1D-2D model. We are therefore proposing the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• We would like to split the model into two separate models to make it more efficient and shorten running times. The inflow for the downstream model would be the output from the upper reach model.</i> <i>• We are looking to convert the 1D only upper reach model, into a 1D-2D model, using LiDAR data.</i> <i>• We would also like to trim the model at its downstream end, near Cothal, where ground levels constrain the floodplain and a simple normal-depth boundary is feasible. We appreciate from our earlier meetings with SEPA, that JBA had issues with the downstream boundary at Parkhill, however, we don't think these issues will impact our analysis.</i> <p><i>We hope you agree that these changes are appropriate for what we are looking to do at this stage and we look forward to your confirmation. If possible, we'd appreciate a quick response on this as, due to delays in receiving the models, we are now very pressed for time.</i></p> <p><i>Please give me a call if there is anything you wish to discuss.</i></p> <p><i>Best regards,</i></p>
HES	AmeyArup	17/04/2019	Extract from A96 Huntly to Aberdeen: Comments from Historic Environment Scotland February Site Visit document:

			Asset No.	Asset Name	Designation	Potential Impact Type	Comments
			BTL11	Battle of Harlaw	Inventory Historic Battlefield	Potential direct impact / Potential impact on setting	<p>The options appear to be located outwith the Inventory battlefield.</p> <p>The applicant should refer to the relevant Inventory description and use our Managing Change Guidance on Battlefields. Particular attention should be given to assessing the impact on special qualities, key landscape characteristics and cumulative impacts and mitigation and enhancement should be considered.</p>
			SM70	Drimmies, symbol stone	Scheduled Monument	Potential direct impact and impact on setting	<p>Pictish Class I Symbol Stone currently set into the garden wall to the E of the stable entrance behind Drummies farmhouse just E of the A96.</p> <p>Direct physical impacts on the scheduled area of the monument should be avoided and impacts on its setting assessed.</p>
			SM12465	Deer's Den, roundhouses	Scheduled Monument	Potential direct impact and impact on setting	<p>The remains of 7 Iron Age round houses visible as cropmarks immediately W of the A96 at Kintore.</p> <p>Direct physical impacts on the scheduled area of the monument should be avoided and impacts on its setting assessed.</p>

			GDL00232	Keith Hall	Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape	Potential direct impact and impact on setting	The Violet option is located close to the eastern boundary of the Inventory GDL. In assessing the impact on this site the applicant should refer to the relevant Inventory description and use our Managing Change Guidance on Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
			SM12118	St Apolinaris' Chapel and burial ground	Scheduled Monument	Potential direct impact and impact on setting	<p>A chapel within a walled burial ground located 2.2km W of the existing A96. We have significant concerns about the proposed road (Yellow Section 03) which would be located in very close proximity to the monument.</p> <p>Direct physical impacts on the scheduled area of the monument should be avoided and impacts on its setting assessed.</p> <p>The monument is located within a river valley with good outward views along it. The monument is also visible in views from its surrounding landscape. In addition, the landscape character that surrounds the monument adds to the setting of the monument and its sense of place.</p> <p>The proposed road would be highly prominent in views both from and towards the monument. The proposed road also has the potential to negatively impact on the monument's sense of place.</p>

						<p>Given the potential adverse impact, an assessment should be undertaken in relation to the monument and agree that there would be an adverse impact on its setting and would welcome any mitigation measures that lessen this impact.</p> <p>Should this option be taken forward, impacts on its setting using our Setting Guidance should be undertaken and photomontages would be useful as part of this assessment. Mitigation measures should be considered to minimise the impact.</p>	
			SM12195	Dillyhill, enclosure 510m WNW of	Scheduled Monument	Potential impact on setting	<p>A prehistoric circular enclosure with a concentric internal feature visible as a cropmark and earthwork and located 1.3km W of the existing A96.</p> <p>The proposed road (Orange: Section 02) which would be located just 210m to the NE of the monument. Impacts on its setting should be assessed in line with our Managing Change Setting Guidance.</p>
			SM12302	Pitscurry, cairn	Scheduled Monument	Potential impact on setting	<p>A Bronze-Age burial cairn located on elevated ground and 1.3km N of the existing A96.</p> <p>The proposed road (Purple: Section V1) would be located just 350m to the N of the</p>

						<p>monument. Impacts on its setting should therefore be assessed in line with our Managing Change Setting Guidance.</p> <p>There are good panoramic views both from and towards the monument. There are some trees in the vicinity which restrict views, however these trees are in the process of being removed and these views will open up in future.</p>	
			SM12434	Hill of Selbie, cairn	Scheduled Monument	Potential impact on setting	<p>A cairn, possibly a ring-cairn (i.e. a circular cairn with a central court) of probable Bronze Age date on elevated ground located. 4.2km E of the existing A96.</p> <p>The proposed road (Purple: Section V3) would be located just 260m to the S of the monument. Extensive views are possible from this cairn, including to Bennachie to the SW. Route Violet 3 would be located just 250 to the SW. We welcome that the route has been amended to lessen impacts on the cairn by respecting the topography. However, impacts on its setting should still be assessed in line with our Managing Change Setting Guidance.</p>
			SM12523	Bruce's Camp, hillfort	Scheduled Monument	Potential impact on setting	<p>Late prehistoric hillfort located on elevated ground which is now within a forestry plantation and is 730m W of the existing A96.</p>

							<p>The proposed road (Orange: Section 02) would be located just 390m to the NE of the monument. Impacts on its setting should therefore be assessed in line with our Managing Change Setting Guidance.</p> <p>Photos from 2017 show that there are some views from the summit, although these are largely screened by trees.</p>
			SM90126 / PIC242	East Aquhorthies Stone Circle	Scheduled Monument & Property in Care	Potential impact on setting	<p>A Neolithic/Early Bronze Age recumbent stone circle (dating to around 2000 BC - 1500 BC) located on sloping ground 3.6 km W of the existing A96. Panoramic views from the monument are one of its key characteristics.</p> <p>While the proposed road (Orange: Section 02) would be located over 1km to the NE of the monument and impacts on its setting should therefore be assessed in line with our Managing Change Setting Guidance.</p>
			LB2819	Bourtie House	Category A Listed Building	Potential impact on setting	<p>An assessment should be provided on both views to and from this site, considering its relationship with its wider surroundings including the water feature to the south. To note per the minutes we cannot find any record of this having been an Inventory GDL.</p>

			SM 90	Balquhain Castle	Scheduled Monument	Potential impact on setting	<p>The monument comprises the remains of a tower house, additional buildings and associated barmkin of later medieval date. It is situated at 95-100m AOD at the top of a steep slope leading down to Strathnaterick Burn.</p> <p>The proposed road (Orange: Section 02) would be located 730m to the NE of the monument. Impacts on its setting should therefore be assessed in line with our Managing Change Setting Guidance.</p>
			SM 3961	Mains of Balquhain, stone circle 715m NE of	Scheduled Monument	Potential impact on setting	<p>The monument comprises a recumbent stone circle measuring 21m across. It may have comprised as many as fourteen stones, though only nine are currently present. It is situated on the lower slopes of Gallows Hill.</p> <p>The proposed road (Yellow 03) would be located just 175m to the NE of the monument.</p> <p>The proposals raises significant issues for our interests which may therefore raise issues of genuine national importance. This is because of the potential adverse impact on the setting of the monument. Its key characteristics include panoramic views from the monument and good views towards the monument. The landscape</p>

						<p>character that surrounds the monument adds to the setting of the monument and its sense of place.</p> <p>The proposed road Yellow 03 would be visible in views to the east of the monument, and in views looking towards the monument from the surrounding landscape. In addition, the proposed road has the potential to negatively impact on the sense of place.</p> <p>Should this option be taken forward, impacts on its setting using our Setting Guidance should be undertaken. Photomontages would be useful as part of this assessment. Mitigation measures should be considered to minimise the impact.</p>	
			SM 90188	Kinkell Church and burial ground	Scheduled Monument & Property in Care	Potential impact on setting	<p>The monument comprises a late medieval church and its burial ground. The monument lies at around 50m OD.</p> <p>The proposed road (Purple: Section V3) would be located 1.5km to the NE of the monument. Impacts on its setting should therefore be assessed in line with our Managing Change Setting Guidance.</p>
			SM 7920	Fullerton, ring ditches	Scheduled Monument	Potential direct	The monument comprises a complex of prehistoric funerary remains, visible as

				& cairn circle 420m SE of		impact and impact on setting	standing structures and cropmarks. It is located just 50m E of the existing A96. The proposed road (Orange: Section 04) would be located in close proximity to the monument. Direct physical impacts on the scheduled area of the monument should be avoided and impacts on its setting assessed.
SEPA	AmeyArup	29/04/2019	<p><i>Hello [REDACTED]</i></p> <p><i>Apologies again for the delay in getting back to you about this one.</i></p> <p><i>We have no concerns with you changing the scope of the modelling from what you had previously discussed with us if now reviewing the models you think that a better approach is more appropriate. Your judgement on the approach taken should be used, but we welcome proposals to make the existing model better suited for the purpose of your study, and look forward to reviewing this in due course.</i></p> <p><i>Kind regards</i> [REDACTED]</p>				
AmeyArup	HES, SEPA & SNH	07/06/2019	<p>Dear all</p> <p>This figure shows the eastern end of the scheme, Whiteford / Pitcaple to Kintore.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>FIGURE PROVIDED BELOW</p>				

Figure provided by email to HES, SEPA & SNH on 07/06/2019

