

## Annex B

Meeting Notes – Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes.

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Historic Environment Scotland
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	12/12/2017
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Initial meeting with Historic Environment Scotland
<b>Attended by:</b>	AmeyArup HES

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Key historic environment constraints</b>
3.2	Keith Hall GLD – ■■■ and ■■■ noted that there have been previous proposed developments where HES have provided comments upon in relation to potential impacts on Keith Hall, which should provide useful information. This include proposed development land and the Inverurie bypass and should be available on the planning portal. ■■■ noted that she would review the file for any useful comments from previous consultations regarding developments affecting Keith Hall.
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Historic environment data</b>
4.2	■■■ and ■■■ advised that they will provide advice on whether any gardens and designed landscapes and/or scheduled monuments within the study area are likely to be either added or removed from the inventory/schedule. Balbithan House GDL was noted as being under review.

<b>Meeting with:</b>	SEPA
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	17/07/2018
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Consultation with SEPA
<b>Attended by:</b>	AmeyArup SEPA

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>4.0</b>	<b>Flood Prevention Scheme Studies</b>
4.1	█ tabled a sketch, received from Aberdeenshire Council, showing the extent of the flood modelling currently being undertaken by Aberdeenshire Council as part of the ongoing Inch and Inverurie Flood Prevention Scheme (FPS) studies.
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Existing A96 Flooding, South of Kintore</b>
8.1	█ tabled a sketch to show the existing A96 flooding. Based on the SEPA flood maps, the existing A96 is shown to be at risk of flooding over a length of approximately 275m. This section of road is already dualled and it is the intention to keep this section dualled.
8.2	SEPA have no record of this section of road flooding previously and are not aware of any errors in the current model. █ to forward a sketch and █ will speak to the SEPA modellers to see if they have flooding information.
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Potential Crossing of the River Don</b>
9.1	█ tabled a sketch to show a potential river crossing area. Crossing of the River Don potentially requires a 600m structure (bridge/viaduct) when considering the associated flood plain.
9.2	SEPA suggested reviewing the DMRB Stage 2 report for the A9, with reference to the River Spey crossing. SEPA reiterated the principles of avoidance, reduce impact and then mitigate.

	Detailed modelling of the River Don would be required to justify this proposal.
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Potential Crossing of the River Urie</b>
10.1	<p>█ tabled a sketch to show a potential river crossing area.</p> <p>The potential crossing of the River Urie includes a possible skewed 600m structural crossing (bridge/viaduct) of the associated flood plain.</p>
10.2	<p>Same rules apply as to the River Don crossing.</p> <p>Skewed crossings are not ideal but SEPA appreciate there are other influencing factors.</p>
<b>12.0</b>	<b>Flood Plain at Lochter Burn / Kings Burn Confluence</b>
12.1	<p>█ tabled a sketch to show the confluence area.</p> <p>A 600m viaduct crossing of a large flood plain (800 x 800m approx.) may be required.</p>
12.2	<p>█ stated that any flood plain removed in this area would likely just push the boundaries of the flood plain further out. There are no set rules on what to do in this situation.</p> <p>SEPA stated that, so long as it could be shown that the pass forward flows were not increased, and flood risk to people / properties also was not increased, any adjustment to the existing flood plain would likely come down to an agreement with the land owner.</p>

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Historic Environment Scotland
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	19/07/2018
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Consultation with Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
<b>Attended by:</b>	AmeyArup HES

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Potential impacts on Inventory Gardens and Designated landscapes (GDL)</b>
3.1	Keith Hall GDL (GDL00232) – a section of one alignment runs through the very north eastern corner of the GDL. ■ noted that there could be scope for development in this area, subject to mitigation it would not be a major concern.
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Potential impacts on Inventory Historic Battlefields</b> ■ noted that the starting point is the relevant Inventory description and 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.
5.1	Battle of Harlaw (BTL11) – a section of one alignment cuts through the north western corner of the battlefield and another alignment section runs to the east of the battlefield affecting its setting. ■ agreed that the alignment would have major impacts and that further assessment is needed to determine mitigation. ■ advised that the areas affected appear to be outwith the main areas of fighting.
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Potential impacts on Scheduled Monuments</b>
6.1	Drimmies, symbol stone (SM70) – the stone is embedded within a boundary wall which is within the 100m corridor of one alignment. ■ noted that major impacts are likely if the wall requires to be moved for the scheme; however, this may not be necessary depending on the position of the route within the 100m corridor. Further detail is required on whether the wall will remain in situ. Impacts on setting are considered unlikely.
6.2	Deers Den, roundhouses (SM12465) – the cropmark lies adjacent to the existing A96 at Kintore and may be directly affected by a section of one alignment depending on where it ties into the existing section of dual carriageway. The discussion noted that further information on the alignment design and junction arrangements is required to determine

	whether direct impacts can be avoided. ■ noted that impacts on setting are expected to be negligible due to the presence of the existing A96.
6.9	St Apolinaris' Chapel and burial ground (SM12118), Dillyhill, enclosure 510m WNW of (SM12195), East Aquhorthies stone circle (SM90126 and PIC242) and Bruce's Camp, hillfort (SM12523) – sections of two alignments run close to all four scheduled monuments and are likely to have major impacts on the setting of these features due to their proximity. ■ noted this these impacts – particularly on Easter Aquhorthies - are likely to be of considerable concern. Given that this site is a PiC, the impact on people visiting the site should also be considered.
6.10	Pitscurry cairn 410m N of (SM12302) is located on elevated ground. The sections of three alignments run to the north of the cairn. There are likely to be major impacts on the setting of the cairn with further work required to establish mitigation.
6.11	Hill of Selbie, cairn 440m SE of Little Hillbrae (SM12434) – sections of two alignments run to the east and west of the cairn, which is in an elevated position in the landscape. ■ noted that in this area the section of the alignment between the cairn and Keith Hall appears to have the greater impact due to its proximity to these two receptors.

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	20/07/2018
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Consultation with SNH
<b>Attended by:</b>	AmeyArup SNH

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>4.0</b>	<b>Ecology</b>
4.1	<p>Ecological Features Identified</p> <p>█ provided a summary of the ecological features that have been identified as key constraints. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Watercourse crossings, including likely crossings of the River Don and River Urie;</li> </ul>
4.6	<p>River Don and River Urie</p> <p>█ enquired as to whether SNH had any concerns about any potential crossing of either river. █ indicated that the River Don Trust, in a recent meeting, highlighted their main concern was more around how a crossing was constructed rather than specifically where it was located. SNH agreed with this sentiment.</p> <p>█ indicated that as the River Don and River Urie have no statutory designation (unlike the River Dee), SNH have little involvement. █ suggested that the River Dee Trust may hold records for the River Don and so it would be worth contacting █ for any relevant information.</p>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Landscape</b>
5.4	<p>General Landscape Comments</p> <p>█ observed on the basis of information presented at the meeting that Pitcaple could be a key pinch point given the multiple environmental elements coming together – wooded landscape, River Urie floodplain, cultural heritage assets and the close alignment of river, road and rail</p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Pitcaple and Legatsden Quarries Geological SSSI</b>

6.1

█ discussed the status of this SSSI and that in 2002 it was identified as likely to be delisted. █ confirmed this to be the case. She indicated that this SSSI is made up of two sections, east (Legatsden Quarry) and west (Pitcaple Quarry), and that the east area is disused, partially infilled and that there are better examples elsewhere of this designated feature. The Management Statement for this SSSI suggested that the Legatsden section of the site no longer meets the criteria of the SSSI status and █ enquired whether this would therefore be delisted as indicated in 2002. █ indicated that the citation is still current, it has not been delisted yet and there are no imminent plans to change the designation due to SNH resource constraints.

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Aberdeenshire Council
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	31/10/2018
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Cultural Heritage and Landscape Consultation with Aberdeenshire Council
<b>Attended by:</b>	Aberdeenshire Council AmeyArup

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Public Exhibition</b>
3.1	█ described the Public Exhibition held from 8 to 11 October 2018 at Inverurie, Huntly and Blackburn and outlined the exhibition display panels.
3.7	<p><b>Options O1 to O4 (Orange):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>█ noted that there is potential for a visual impact on St Apolinaris' Chapel Scheduled Monument from the proposed crossing of the River Don in this area. █ advised that the full extent of the burial ground associated with the chapel is not known and if the proposed river crossing were changed it may have a direct impact on any surviving burials, which could potentially lead to extensive mitigation measures being required (i.e. excavation (and re-internment) of human remains).</li> <li>█ advised that they did not foresee any specific issues regarding potential impacts on the setting of Bruce's Camp Scheduled Monument.</li> <li>█ advised that the route has the potential to affect a Special Landscape Area (but that shouldn't be an absolute restriction on its potential to accommodate a carefully designed road corridor). Although located in part of the Bennachie SLA the impact is more on the River Don Valley which forms a key part of the SLA but the potential for creating a positive visual statement at the River Don crossing was noted.</li> </ul>
3.8	<p><b>Options V1 to V3 (Violet):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>█ advised that they considered the core area of the Inventory Battle of Harlaw Battlefield to be key to understanding the site and any direct impact on the core area should be avoided.</li> <li>█ advised that the implications of routing through high ground should be taken into account and the road should be designed to fit in with the landscape.</li> </ul>

3.9

**Options G1 (Green)/V1 (Violet):**

No particular concerns regarding the effect on the landscape were raised but ■ noted the need to be aware of impacts on the LNCS.

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Aberdeenshire Council, Historic Environment Scotland, SEPA, and Scottish Natural Heritage
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	15/11/2018
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Consultation with Statutory Bodies and Aberdeenshire Council (Flood Team)
<b>Attended by:</b>	AmeyArup HES SEPA SNH TS

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Ecology</b>
3.1	█ stated that invasive species are a known key issue on the River Don.
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>
5.1	<p>The views from Bruce's Camp were an important consideration.</p> <p>█ stated that the proximity of the proposed bridge to the St Apolinaris Chapel and Burial Ground is likely to result in a significant impact. The setting of the chapel is important, and the design of the bridge would need to take this into account and consider how this could be mitigated.</p> <p>At Pitscurry Cairn and Hill of Selby there are 360 degree views from these cultural heritage features, but they would be subject to less impact than the other receptors noted above (Daviot Stone Circle and St Apolinaris Chapel and Burial Ground) by any new dual carriageway alignments.</p> <p>█ noted that the landscape around Bourtie House, Hill of Selby and Keith Hall was of a high sensitivity.</p>

<b>Meeting with:</b>	SEPA and Aberdeenshire Council
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	27/11/2018
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Consultation with SEPA / Aberdeenshire Council
<b>Attended by:</b>	Aberdeenshire Council AmeyArup SEPA

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>4.0</b>	<b>Flood Modelling Scope – Technical Note</b>
4.3	<p>█ and █ confirmed that the final hydrology report for the R Don / R Urie had not yet been approved but that an updated rating at Pitcaple had now been agreed.</p> <p>█ confirmed that he would issue this report to AmeyArup when it is available.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: The Inverurie Hydrology report was issued by Aberdeenshire Council on 09 January 2019.</p>
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Specific examples using sketches</b>
9.1	<p>█ tabled a set of sketches that were tabled at the previous SEPA meeting in July, alongside updated versions. This showed that in a number of locations, previous comments had been taken on board and the route options had been moved to reduce the impact on associated watercourses.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A proposed crossing of the River Don had been removed as the route option had been dropped.</li> <li>• A skewed crossing of the River Urie had been reduced in length by designing the route option to be more perpendicular to the watercourse.</li> <li>• A potential diversion of the Glen Water had been removed by moving the proposed route option.</li> <li>• A proposed crossing of the Lochter Burn and its associated floodplain had been reduced in length by moving the proposed route option.</li> </ul>

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Historic Environment Scotland
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	11/12/2018
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	To discuss heritage features identified during previous meetings
<b>Attended by:</b>	AmeyArup HES

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>4</b>	<b>Potential impacts on Scheduled Monuments</b>
4.3	Dilly Hill – ■ explained that the engineering design team aimed to tie in online at Drimmies Farm (O1/O2) but are constrained by existing properties and the desire to maintain the existing A96 as a local collector road. ■ noted that the location of junctions on the orange alignment could potentially affect the setting of Mains of Balquhain stone circle (SM3961) and Balquhain Castle (SM90). ■ indicated that junctions are currently being developed and this may involve limited movement at both junctions or bringing both together at a single location. ■ indicated there would be impacts on the setting and views from Dilly Hill, enclosure (SM12195) and potential impacts on the setting of Mains of Balquhain stone circle and Balquhain Castle from the proposed road alignment.
4.4	St Apolinaris Chapel – ■ noted that the proposed river crossing structure at this location (O3) is likely to be substantial in size. ■ indicated the area that could potentially be impacted due to the height of the proposed structure over the River Don and ■ noted that this would be a significant change from the current baseline. ■ also advised that the chapel currently stands in woodland/trees, but they may be removed as part of future site management. ■ added that currently there is no significant infrastructure in this area and the proposals would likely have a major impact on the valley setting of the chapel. ■ indicated that it would significantly alter views of the chapel site from the public roads looking down the river valley.
4.5	Bruces Camp – ■ noted that viewing the site on google maps it appears more open in nature than suggested by the background on the base plan which indicates it is surrounded by forest. ■ noted that the site is close to the existing A96 but would be even closer to the proposed O3 alignment. ■ explained that there is a 1km long cutting with 1:3 side slopes and as more information on ground conditions becomes available, AAJV would look to reduce the side slopes if possible. ■ advised to work as much as possible with the natural topography so as not to change the appearance of it in the area surrounding Bruces Camp. Views from the scheduled monument should be considered as well as views to it from the wider landscape.

4.6	<p>█ raised concern about potential demolition of Thainstone Lodge – a Category B listed building at Thainstone Roundabout. █ explained that it is not currently proposed that this building will require to be demolished. █ and █ asked about alignment section O4 and what road development is likely to occur along this section. █ explained it is the existing A96 and it is dual-carriageway at this location. █ explained that minimal works may only be required such as additional lane widening to assist the proposed junction operation.</p>	
4.7	<p>█ indicated the presence of other features along the O4 section, including Broomend, Henge, Standing Stone and Symbol Stone (SM18) and Fullerton, Ring Ditches &amp; Cairn Circle (SM7920). █ noted that the setting of these features had already been impacted by the existing A96 road, the presence of Kintore Business Park and Kirkwood Commercial Park. █ advised AAJV to consider views between Bruces Camp and these additional sites.</p>	
4.9	<p>█ prompted a short discussion regarding battlefields, where confirmation was given by AAJV that the options do not enter any Inventory Battlefield sites.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>	
5.2	<p>HES asked for further information to facilitate future discussion on alignment options that might affect Durno Roman Camp, Keith Hall GDL, Mounie Castle and Bourtie House. It was noted that HES commented that visualisations would greatly assist them to understand the potential impacts especially at the Daviot area.</p>	

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Historic Environment Scotland
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	12/02/2019
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Consultation with Historic Environment Scotland
<b>Attended by:</b>	AmeyArup HES TS

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>2.0</b>	<b>Previous Minutes</b>
2.5	<p><b>Dilly Hill Enclosure, Balquhain Castle and Mains of Balquhain Stone Circle</b></p> <p>■ advised that HES had visited Balquhain Castle and Mains of Balquhain Stone Circle. HES were not as concerned about the impact of the route section (O3) on the setting of Balquhain Castle (SM90) as it was set down in the valley and located further from the Orange Route.</p> <p>■ advised that given the proximity of the O3 route section to Balquhain Stone Circle (SM3961), it is likely that there will be a significant impact on the setting of the stone circle.</p> <p>■ raised concerns in relation to junctions and requested more information, particularly in relation to Mains of Balquhain stone circle (SM3961).</p> <p>■ (AAJV) advised that junctions and side roads were still being developed.</p> <p>■ reiterated that there would be impacts on the setting of Dilly Hill enclosure (SM12195) from the O3 route section.</p>
2.6	<b>St. Apolinaris Chapel (SM12118)</b>

	<p>■ stated that HES have major concerns in relation to the proposed river crossing structure at this location (O3 route). The introduction of a new river crossing would likely lead to a substantial change of the valley setting of the church and would particularly affect views of the scheduled monument from the west.</p> <p>■ advised that although the chapel site is currently surrounded by trees, these may be reduced or removed in the future through management of the site.</p> <p>■ stated that their previous comments remain valid and a further site visit is planned with further comment to be provided.</p>	
2.7	<p><b>Bruce's Camp (SM12523)</b></p> <p>■ stated that his previous comments about the potential impact of the O3 alignment on the setting of Bruce's Camp still remained valid.</p> <p>■ reiterated that AAJV would look to reduce the side slopes of the route alignment cutting if possible where it runs along the slope to the northeast of the scheduled monument.</p>	
4.0	<p><b>Keith Hall Inventory Garden &amp; Designed Landscape &amp; Hill of Selbie Cairn</b></p> <p>■ stated that HES was content that Keith Hall GDL will be avoided.</p> <p>■ (AAJV) advised that further engineering design had taken consideration of the current topography of the hill on which Hill of Selbie Cairn (SM12434) stands and that the route section (V3) where it passes the scheduled monument had been moved further to the south and down slope from the cairn, in order to reduce the potential impact of the route section on the setting of the scheduled monument.</p> <p>■ welcomed this amendment to the route section and appreciated the level of detail provided for the meeting and to assist the HES proposed site visits. ■ requested further time for HES to carry out a site visit to Hill of Selbie and Keith Hall and would provide further comment thereafter.</p>	
6.0	<p><b>Bourtie House - Category A Listed</b></p>	

	<p>■ (HES) advised that the pond visible to the south of Bourtie House may be an ornamental pond associated with the house. He advised that there were views from Bourtie House out to the wider landscape, particularly to the south.</p> <p>■ (AAJV) advised that Bourtie House was not included in the GDL Inventory, however, it was identified as a Non-Inventory Designed Landscape (NIDL) in the Aberdeenshire HER. The extent of the NIDL is tightly constrained around Bourtie House and the pond is not included in its extent.</p> <p>There were discussions between HES and AAJV if Bourtie House had been delisted and this required to be confirmed by HES.</p>	
7.0	<b>Next Steps</b>	
7.3	HES to advise if designed landscape around Bourtie House has been delisted.	

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Aberdeenshire Council Planning
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	20/02/19
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Consultation meeting with Aberdeenshire Council Planning
<b>Attended by:</b>	Aberdeenshire Council AmeyArup

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<p><b>5.0</b></p>	<p><b><u>Aberdeenshire Council development planning update, including LDP 2021 MIR</u></b></p> <p>Orange Route/Thainstone Junction - ■ did not have any concerns about the route and impact on the 2017 LDP land allocation (i.e. strategic reserve land for business/industrial use) as a potential over provision was highlighted in the area taking account of the nearby Thainstone Mart development that was recently approved on appeal. ■ noted the developer may take a different view of any junction proposals but, as the development requires to provide a grade separated junction, ■ reiterated it would be worth consulting with ■ and ■ to understand what progress is being made with the developer.</p>
<p><b>6.0</b></p>	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <p>■ advised that in terms of planning, AC planners prefer the northern bypass (Violet) option and highlighted environmental impacts of the Orange route option on Bruce's Camp, and the River Don crossing with the potential impact on the St. Apolinaris Chapel.</p> <p>■ suggested a junction should be considered at the B993 (Violet/green) to improve connectivity with Whiterashes/Newmacher and the AWPR.</p>

<b>Meeting with:</b>	Historic Environment Scotland, SEPA and Scottish Natural Heritage
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	25/04/2019
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Environmental Steering Group Meeting
<b>Attended by:</b>	HES SEPA SNH TS AmeyArup Jacobs Mott MacDonald-Sweco

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>4.0</b>	<p><b>East of Huntly to Aberdeen Update – AAJV</b></p> <p>■ advised that HES are receiving a number of public comments from north of Inverurie regarding Keith Hall GDL. ■ has looked at these comments and what has been sent to AAJV shows where HES think there are significant impacts.</p>
------------	---

<b>Meeting with:</b>	SEPA
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	01/07/2019
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Consultation with SEPA, focussed on flood risk
<b>Attended by:</b>	AmeyArup SEPA

*Extracts in relation to orange and violet routes*

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Flood Risk Simple Assessment</b>
3.1	<p>■ set out the structure of the proposed FRSA report and discussed sections of the draft document.</p> <p>■ agreed at the previous meeting, the report will include a section on the sequential approach and follows the scope agreed with SEPA and Aberdeenshire Council previously.</p> <p>The report will cover the six remaining sections (Cyan, Red, Pink, Brown, Violet and Orange) that make up the eight end-to-end alignments that will be taken through the full DMRB Stage 2 process.</p> <p>The report will cover the individual interfaces and will identify the sensitivity of each interface.</p> <p>Although focussed on fluvial flooding, the report will also have a high-level review of pluvial and groundwater flooding, identifying areas which may require more attention at DMRB Stage 3.</p> <p>There were no questions or comments on the proposed FRSA report at this stage. SEPA will comment on receipt, though agreed that the discussions on the draft document appeared to cover all the items that it should.</p>