

## Main points of difference in new Environmental Assessment, September 2007

### Summary of Main Changes:

- Changes to A96 junction and deletion of Kirkhill industrial estate junction;
- The lack of effectiveness of the mitigation proposals;
- Noise issues affecting houses;
- Sustainability issues;
- SNH landscape assessment highlighting problems at Dee Valley

### Index List of Changes:

This has been sourced by running through the index volume 1 of the old EA, and comparing this with the hard copy of the new EA – a brief run through.

Where it says (old) this was in the previous EA, but I included for information.

The old vol 13 has been split into 2 volumes vol 14 is the Fastlink.

Volume	Para	Heading
1	2.4.3	National Transport Strategy – Strategic Transport objectives
	3.10	AWPR preferred Route refinement 2006-07
	3.10.1	Refinement A96 Junction – no longer Grade Separated
		South Kirkhill removed
		A90 Blackdog junction changed
		Bridge crossing – viaduct, not bow arch
	4.2.1	Design, Build, Finance and Operate (DBFO) i.e.the contractor decides on final design, materials, sourcing etc. (old)
	5.3	Traffic Data and EIA guidance
	5.3.1	ASAM3b Model (old)
	6.2	Road Haulage Association – Key issues raised by consultees
		No issues raised or no response. (old)
	6.5.	Conclusion of key issues
5.	58	Sustainable appraisal – potential reuse of 18 million tonnes of earthworks material and 1.4m tonnes of aggregate Means 800,000 vehicle movements within the site
	58.3.2	Transport generates 17% of Scotland's greenhouse gases. And 27% increase by extra CO2 emissions, expected to rise by 8% between 2000 and 2010. (Check this!)
	58.3.9	"The proposed scheme is expected to bring about a small 9% increase in CO2 by 2026" – while national strategy is to reduce it! Construction, operation and materials transportation will all add to CO2 emissions.
	58.3.15	Transportation of materials mainly from South. No rail freight. Contractor chooses his sources.
	59	Conclusions – Cumulative assessment
	59.1.2	Cumulative visual impacts may be significant for outdoor receptors (Translates as "Look – what a heck of a mess!")

	59.1.3	Major disruption during construction
	59.1.6	Future development may have cumulative impact on agriculture
		Post mitigation cumulative impacts are possible at Kingcausie, Dee Crossing, Milltimber, Kirkhill Forest etc. ie they can't mitigate the problems away.
	59.1.9	"The contractor will ultimately decide where and how materials will be sourced although he should be encouraged to follow sustainable practices" (Ha ha)
6	1	Introduction
	8, 8.1	Impacts of blasting on groundwater (N leg)
	15	A15.3 List of properties moderate/above threshold noise impacts
8 S. leg	23.1	Private water supplies
	24.5	Simcat modelling (re water)
	A24.6	Sediment modelling
	26.2	SNH landscape character assessment
	26.3	Origin of landscape character
	29	Air quality
	30.4	DMRB summary tables
	30.5	Properties with significant noise impacts
9 S. leg	25.11	Winter birds
	25.12	Mitigation
10 F/link	37.4	Poultry assessment
	38.1	Private water supplies
	42.1	SNH landscape character assessment (re Dee Valley)
	44	Air quality
	45.2	Ambient noise data
	45.3	DMRB summary tables
11 Fastlink	40.10	Wintering birds
	40.11	Ecology mitigation
12	3.30	Preferred route summer 2007
13 graphics	26.5 h-p	Landscape and ecology mitigation Cross sections and wire line
	27.5 a-c	Day and Night Winter year of opening
	32.3 a-h	View from Charleston
14	40.6 a-f	Wintering birds
	41.5 a-f	Ecological mitigation crosssections and wirelines; Photomontage
	47.1 a-f	View from AWPR year of opening
	47.2	View 15 years on

The above summarise the main changes.

I think the main issues for objection are the mitigation measures, sustainability issues, noise data and SNH landscape assessment.

Henry Irvine-Fortescue  
09.10.2007