

**Roads (Scotland) Act 1984  
The Compulsory Purchase by Public Authorities (Inquiries  
Procedure) (Scotland) Rules 1998**

**Public Inquiry into Objections against Draft Road Orders for  
Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route and associated  
Environmental Statement**

*Statement of Case*

**On behalf of  
*RoadSense***

**1. Introduction**

This *Statement of Case* is submitted by *RoadSense*. It is founded upon and develops the Objections submitted by *RoadSense* to the Draft Road Orders and the Environmental Statement in February and October 2007.

*RoadSense* is an organisation that was formed to oppose the proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR) and to promote full and proper evaluation of alternatives. It consists of private individuals drawn mainly from the suburbs and other settlements situated along and close to the chosen route. *RoadSense* is governed by a written constitution and this can be viewed on the internet at [www.road-sense.org](http://www.road-sense.org).

*RoadSense* was formed in January 2006 shortly after the then Transport Minister selected the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route for the Aberdeen bypass. We have held numerous public meetings with attendances ranging from 300 to 1,200 people. Nearly 10,000 Objections were submitted to Transport Scotland against the chosen route by means of post cards, letters and a *RoadSense* website. Further details about the sources of the various Objections can be found in the Statutory Consultation Objection Analysis Report on the AWPR web site.

In brief, without prejudice to our case at the public local inquiry, *RoadSense* will contend

and contest that Transport Scotland as promoter of the scheme has failed to demonstrate that the preferred route is the most suitable route having regard to considerations of, *inter alia*, financial costs, economic efficiency and environmental impact. *RoadSense* also believes that if there is to be a bypass around Aberdeen then there are superior alternative route options, including tunnels.

This *Statement of Case* is structured as follows:

**First**, *RoadSense* considers and contends that Transport Scotland has failed to justify the selection of the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route having regard to its own stated transportation objectives as well as those of planning policy, environmental impact, sustainability and so on. *RoadSense* will present evidence examining the route selection process and outcome. This will include evidence on, *inter alia*, the requirements of Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG), the transport analysis and associated traffic modelling undertaken by Transport Scotland and their agents and the views of Civil Servants and Ministers as revealed through correspondence obtained under the provisions of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002.

**Second** *RoadSense* considers and contends that Transport Scotland and its agents have failed to have regard to the required environmental appraisal procedures apropos the Environmental Impacts Directive, the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and the Habitats Directive.

**Third**, *RoadSense* considers and contends that the traffic modelling and analysis undertaken by Transport Scotland and its agents to support the case for the AWPR and for the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route is materially deficient.

**Fourth**, *RoadSense* considers and contends that Transport Scotland and its agents have failed to design a scheme that will be justified in terms of projected volumes of traffic usage and congestion relief, and safe in terms of the gradients of specific links and the configuration of junctions. They have also failed to demonstrate that the proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route will not have a materially adverse impact upon the communities and environments through which it will pass. Indeed, it is *RoadSense's* view that this impact will be very significant.

**Fifth**, *RoadSense* considers and contends that there are more appropriate alternative routes. We will examine the respective merits of the routes put forward by Transport Scotland at the April 2005 public consultation exercise as well as other potentially suitable routes.

*RoadSense* will be represented at the public inquiry by Stuart Gale QC and Mr. Alasdair Burnet, both of the Terra Firma Chambers at the Faculty of Advocates in Edinburgh. Our preliminary list of expert witnesses is identified at the end of this *Statement of Case* and our list of documents is shown as Appendix 1. *RoadSense* has noted the promoter's list of Core Documents nos. 1-56 and nos. 1-144 appended to the Transport Scotland Statement of Case dated 17th June 2008. To avoid duplication *RoadSense* appends to this *Statement of Case* a list of additional documents to which it intends to refer. We reserve the right to add to this list as a result of further information obtained in preparation of our case. As far as possible, we undertake that any such documents will be lodged by the due date.

## 2. The Process of Route Selection

*Road Sense* will argue that Transport Scotland and its agents have failed to meet the necessary tests to justify the selection of the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route for the AWPR. It will argue that the failure in many instances to pursue and apply the correct procedures in a timely, duly sequenced and transparent manner as laid down in documents and protocols such as the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidelines (STAG), planning policy guidelines, environmental assessment regulations and so on has led to the selection of an unsuitable route having regard to the Government's own transportation, environmental and policy objectives such as, including but not limited to, value for money, relief of vehicular congestion, transport integration, social inclusion, environmental sustainability and environmental impact.

In this section we identify the critical documents and events relevant to the route selection choice in chronological sequence and briefly outline the principal points to emerge from them in order to provide a context for the arguments, which we will develop in more detail later in this *Statement of Case*. *RoadSense* will present evidence drawing upon these materials to demonstrate that proper procedures were not always robustly and rigorously followed.

The relevant context in the decision making process includes, but is not limited to, the following documents and events:

### **November 1994 - Grampian Regional Council WPR Summary Report:**

- A large number of routes were identified and analysed
- Routes 12 (Pifodells) and 14 (Murtle) performed best and were taken forward to Environmental Assessment
- Routes west of Murtle were materially less effective
- No tunnel options were identified and analysed.
- The Netherley-Milltimber Brae route was not identified or considered

### **1996 - Grampian Regional Council Recommendation**

- Grampian Regional Council recommended adoption of Route 14 by Aberdeen City Council & Aberdeenshire Council.

### **1998 - Sustainable Transport Study for Aberdeen**

- Multi-modal transport study for Aberdeen
- Assessed 20 transport scenarios for Aberdeen.
- Adding AWPR to scenarios had little impact on peak period traffic

### **August 2000 - Delivery of an Integrated Transport Study for the North-East of Scotland**

- Report commissioned by North East of Scotland Economic Development Partnership and prepared by Halcrow Fox
- Sought to promote the WPR within a demonstrably integrated transport strategy including CrossRail.

### **December 2000 - Aberdeen Local Transport Strategy**

- Promoted WPR as part of an integrated transport strategy for Aberdeen.
- WPR in form of a reverse-D.
- Each WPR junction linked to proposed park and ride scheme.

### **December 2001 - North East Scotland Together (Structure Plan)**

- No explicit policy provision for an AWPR.
- Passing textual references only.
- Provision for AWPR on Key Diagram in shape of inverted 'D'.
- No provision for a 'Fastlink' connection to Stonehaven.
- All of AWPR shown within Aberdeen Greenbelt.

### **2003 – Modern Transport System (MTS)**

- MTS recommended an overall strategy comprising a *package* of transport measures.
- Package included, *inter alia*, an AWPR together with CrossRail (Stonehaven Inverurie rail link), 5 Park and Ride Sites and Bus Priorities.
- The identified AWPR was based upon Murtle (Route 14) at a cost of £120 million.
- No provision was made for a 'Fastlink' component.
- The Netherley-Milltimber Brae route was not the basis for the Modern Transport System STAG appraisal.

### **April 2004 – National Planning Framework**

- Commitment to principle of AWPR.
- No reference to specific alignment or to a Fastlink.

### **10<sup>th</sup> March to 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2005 - AWPR Public Consultation exercise**

- The Murtle Route was advanced as the 'preferred route'
- 4 other possible routes identified: Pitfodels; Milltimber Brae; Peterculter – Charleston; Peterculter - Stonehaven.
- All routes subject to a STAG 1 appraisal.
- The Netherley-Milltimber Brae route was not identified or included in the exercise.
- Only the preferred route, Murtle, was accompanied by visualisations.
- Information on the remaining 4 routes was presented in summary form only.
- Some members of the public were advised by officials against submitting responses to the non-preferred routes.

### **July 2005 - Report of inquiry into Objections into Aberdeenshire Local Plan (ALP)**

- Aberdeen Greenbelt Alliance (AGA) and other parties objected to identification and inclusion of specific (Murtle) route in ALP.
- Reporters note absence of Policy reference in NEST to AWPR.
- Reporters recommend deletion of Murtle route from ALP map.
- Reporters recommend insertion of policy to protect Murtle route from sterilising development.

### **7<sup>th</sup> July 2005 – AWPR Preferred Options Study – Workshop**

- Route choice process based on comparing inner pair and outer pair.

- Netherley-Milltimber Brae route was not identified for purposes of comparison.
- Murtle route considered to be most suitable.
- Pitfodels route considerably better than Milltimber or Peterculter routes.

#### **October 2005 - Transport Minister meets with Pitfodels Conservation Group (PCG)**

- PCG expresses concern to Transport Minister about Pitfodels route.
- Meeting is unminuted.

#### **21<sup>st</sup> October 2005 - Advice from Chief Roads Engineer (CRE) to Minister**

- CRE advises Minister to select Murtle route.

#### **14th November 2005 – Route Selection Meeting**

- Transport Minister selects 'hybrid route'.
- Meeting is unminuted (as revealed following subsequent request for Minute by *RoadSense*).
- Transport objectives for the AWPR are changed to include relief of traffic congestion on A90.

#### **17<sup>th</sup> November 2005 – AWPR Policy Option Appraisal**

- Chief Roads Engineer identifies deficiencies of hybrid route.
- Chief Roads Engineer notes need for Minister to persuade Aberdeen City Council leader of scheme merits.

#### **November 2005 MVA - AWPR scheme testing report**

- Comparison of Hybrid Route, Murtle Route and Milltimber Brae Route.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> December 2005 - Transport Minister announces route choice**

- 'Hybrid' route chosen. Hybrid route comprises “combination of Milltimber Brae and Peterculter – Stonehaven options”.
- Hybrid route not subject to a STAG1 appraisal.
- Hybrid route has not been subject to any geo-technical investigation or evaluation.
- Hybrid route is not Netherley-Milltimber route.

#### **30<sup>th</sup> January 2006 - Announcement of route corridor**

- Route corridor identified as being up to 3 miles wide in places.

#### **15<sup>th</sup> March 2006 - Release of map showing possible route options**

- 7 options within route corridor identified.
- None of options subject to STAG 1 appraisal.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> May 2006 - Publication of finalised Netherley-Milltimber Brae route**

- Fastlink now Dual Carriageway.

#### **November 2006 - Publication of Project Development 2005-2006 Consolidation Report**

- Attempted justification of proposed routes.

**September 2007 – Report of inquiry into Aberdeen City Local Plan –  
*GreenSpaces–New Places***

- Residents had objected to references to development associated with AWPR.
- Reporter concluded that "...WPR is not intended as a development access road..."
- Council Committee accepted Reporter's recommendations.
- Implication is that Tunnel should be acceptable.

**October 2007 – Netherley-Milltimber Brae STAG 1 published on AWPR Website**

- STAG 1 does not appraise proposed scheme.
- Appraises single carriageway for Netherley Fastlink.

**January 2008 – *National Planning Framework for Scotland 2 (NPF2)***

- AWPR not identified as a 'national development'.
- Textual reference to assumed completion of AWPR.
- Road Sense submitted representations to NPF2 objecting to assumed approval of AWPR.

**May 2008 – Revised Scottish Government STAG guidelines**

- Very explicit about need to justify the deletion of STAG 1 options.
- Requirement for STAG2's for all options carried forward from STAG1.

As stated in the preamble to this section, detailed analysis of the above documents and sequence of events will show that, notwithstanding a process that might have produced a non-road based solution, Transport Scotland failed to pursue the correct procedures and protocols in promoting the AWPR and in identifying and selecting the route. *RoadSense* will present evidence that will demonstrate that the selection of the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route can not be supported by reference to Transport Scotland's own analysis of how the various route options identified by it at the start of the route selection process performed against its own transportation and policy criteria.

*RoadSense* will present evidence demonstrating that STAG has not been complied with in the route selection exercise in that there was a failure to carry out the necessary comparative appraisal of viable alternative routes including the "hybrid" route at the STAG 1 appraisal stage. Further, there was a failure to carry forward all viable alternative routes to the detailed STAG 2 appraisal stage. Finally there was a failure to observe the public law requirements of openness and transparency in decision making.

### **3. Environmental Appraisal Failures**

*RoadSense* contends that Transport Scotland has failed to comply with the requirements imposed by European Union legislation with respect to assessing the potential adverse environmental impacts that the scheme might generate.

The development and approval of plans for the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route must meet the requirements of, *inter alia*, EU Directive 85/337/EEC (the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive); EU Directive 2001/42/EC (the SEA Directive); and EU Directive 92/43/EEC (the Habitats Directive).

The River Dee is designated a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) under the Habitats Directive. It is a site of European interest and part of the Natura 2000 Network of protected sites. The promoter of a plan or project must make certain that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of a Natura 2000 site. All aspects of the plan or project which can, by themselves or in combination with other plans or projects, affect the site's conservation objectives must be identified in the light of the best scientific knowledge in the field. The burden of proof is upon the promoter to ensure that there are no adverse effects.

In line with the need to prevent undesired impairment to the Natura 2000 network, the thorough revision and/or withdrawal of a proposed plan or project should be considered when significant negative effects on the integrity of a site have been identified. The competent authorities have to analyse and demonstrate first the need of the plan or project concerned. The zero option should be considered at an early stage.

If appropriate, the competent authorities should examine the possibility of resorting to alternative solutions which better respect the integrity of the site in question. All feasible alternatives, in particular, their relative performance with regard to the conservation objectives of the Natura 2000 site, the site's integrity and its contribution to the overall coherence of the Natura 2000 Network have to be analyzed. Such solutions should normally already have been identified within the framework of the initial assessment carried out under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive. They could involve alternative locations or routes, different scales or designs of development, or alternative processes.

Under the amended Conservation Regulation the provisions of the Habitats Directive applies to all plans likely to affect such a site. Thus any transport plan which is likely to have an impact upon a Natura 2000 site like the River Dee must be subject to an appropriate assessment. It must be shown that any option put forward is the least damaging for habitats, for species and for the integrity of the Natura 2000 site, regardless of economic considerations, and that no other feasible alternative exists that would not affect the integrity of the site.

The MTS was the transport plan which led to the AWPR project. That plan has never been subjected to appropriate assessment or any other provisions of the Habitats Directive despite the clear effects it would have upon the Dee SAC. The procedure which resulted in the MTS and which led to the formulation of more detailed plans for the AWPR fails to meet the requirements of the Habitats Directive.

Directive 2001/42/EC obliges public authorities to consider systematically whether the plans and programmes they prepare come within its scope of application and hence whether they need to carry out a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of their proposals.

Article 3(2) of the Directive makes SEA mandatory for plans and programmes which are

prepared for transport, and which set the framework for future development consent for projects listed in Annexes I and II to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive; or which, in view of the likely effect on sites, have been determined to require an assessment pursuant to Article 6 or 7 of the Habitats Directive. On this basis, any transport plan which involves potential damage to a Natura 2000 site must now be subject to SEA.

*Road Sense* will argue that the MTS is seriously deficient in terms of meeting the objects of two major European Directives. In this respect the proposal for the AWPR has not been subjected to the level of overall scrutiny that is now expected of major road schemes under European law.

*Road Sense* is not aware of other alternatives being assessed under the provisions of the Habitats Directive. *Road Sense* will suggest that there are other route options, including the no road option, which would meet the objectives of the MTS, but which would have less damaging effects upon the Dee SAC.

It is for the promoter to demonstrate that mitigation measures will overcome any adverse effects, and that this route, with full mitigation measures applied, is less damaging to the integrity of the Natura 2000 site than any other route option which also has mitigation measures applied. *Road Sense* will argue that the developer's agents have not proved to the high scientific standard required by the Directive that the mitigation measures they propose for the current route would be sufficient to overcome the adverse effects of the AWPR upon the Dee SAC, whether for this route alone, or for this route in comparison with other routes. Or that mitigation measures for any route would compare favourably with the option of no route at all. Finally with respect to mitigation *RoadSense* will argue that the measures proposed in the accompanying Environmental Statement for much of the rest of the route are materially inadequate.

*Road Sense* is of the view that there are alternative options, including the no AWPR option which will reduce adverse impacts upon the Dee SAC. *Road Sense* will present some of those options to the Inquiry. Reference is made to Section 6 of this Statement of Case

#### **4. Transport Appraisal and associated Traffic Modelling**

*RoadSense* considers and contends that the analyses of the five options put forward for public consultation in March-April 2005 and the associated traffic modelling demonstrates that the eastern routes of Pitfodels and Murtle perform considerably better than any of those located to the west. The Charleston - Milltimber Brae route performed at best 3<sup>rd</sup> out of the few options considered by the promoters.

*RoadSense* also contends that the traffic modelling used to appraise the various options does not meet expected standards and thus materially compromises the justification for the selection of the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route and in particular the modelled assignment of traffic to the Netherley Fastlink which justifies its status as a dual

carriageway road. Specifically an audit of the Aberdeen Sub Area Model 3 Calibration and Validation Report and its appendices produced by MVA in May 2005 and the Aberdeen Sub Area Demand Model Development and its appendices produced by MVA in August 2005 reveals a number of areas of concern. These include: the poor representation of some junctions; the construction of observed matrix from roadside interview data is potentially flawed due to double counting of through trips across Aberdeen; the unexplained addition of a large number of trips between Westhill and North Aberdeen which may be modelled to use the AWPR; the failure to account for trip frequency and peak spreading; a large deficiency of data to West and South of Aberdeen – e.g. South Deeside; the failure of the model calibration to meet Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) criteria; the failure of the model validation to meet DMRB criteria; the failure of the public transport and Park and Ride models to meet DMRB criteria; the uncertainty as to whether or not the CSTM Demand Model is relevant to the Aberdeen area; the relative insensitivity of the model to costs – which questions the ability of the model to forecast demand for AWPR; the use of elasticities lower than expected and recommended in the DMRB; the use of elasticities for fuel based upon prices lower than the DMRB ranges and lower than those currently applying; and the failure to forecast trips which begin and end outside Aberdeen.

*RoadSense* will present evidence on the issues of transport appraisal and associated traffic modelling.

## **5. The Design and Impact of Netherley-Milltimber Brae route**

*RoadSense* will contend and contest that the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route is the least desirable route since it fails to meet industry engineering design standards and stated transport, environmental and planning objectives.

The proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route is considerably longer than most other options and this will discourage road users from using it. Increasing fuel costs will only deter road users further. There is only a weak justification provided for constructing the 'Fastlink' to dual carriageway standard. Some of the junctions such as those connecting the AWPR to the A90 (Charleston), A93, A944 and A96 might constitute a safety hazard by virtue of their tapering, radius, gradient and/or capacity. Certain link sections of the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route might be hazardous by virtue of their gradient. These include link sections at Stonehaven; Kingcausie; Milltimber; and Silverburn. No evidence of the completion or outcome of Stage 1 road safety audits has been presented. There is no justification given for designating the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route with 'Special Road' status. Only 1.5km of the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route will have projected vehicular flows in excess of 41,000 movements per day. The majority of the route will have low levels of vehicular traffic flow. *RoadSense* will present evidence to support these arguments.

The proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route will fail to relieve City Centre vehicular congestion. It will have a very limited congestion relief impact on Anderson Drive. It will

increase traffic levels on some arterial routes. It will create localised traffic congestion due to the limited number of junctions. It will create new 'rat runs' or make existing rat runs worse. *RoadSense* will present evidence to support these arguments.

The Environmental Statement lodged in support of the proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route is inadequate. It fails to provide a 'Mitigation Vision Statement'; it does not contain a satisfactory audit of the current position; it expresses mitigation measures in generic terms only; the impact of the mitigation measures have not been assessed; there is no statement that the mitigation measures meet required standards and it fails to acknowledge likely significant habitat severance at Kingcausie and Silverburn. *RoadSense* will present evidence to support these arguments.

The proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route will have a substantial adverse impact upon the environment. The potential environmental impacts at Kingcausie and other locations will be materially adverse because they will: greatly reduce available area in which species, such as red squirrel, can live; they will disrupt migration paths; they will disrupt required feeding and breeding areas and; they will cause initial and secondary species extinctions in affected areas. The route will adversely impact upon 12 Ancient Woodlands, in particular those at Kingcausie and Craibstone. It will also destroy several Veteran Trees and associated ecosystems. The proposed route will also have a material adverse impact upon the River Dee SAC. It will adversely impact upon the Bogenjoss Burn and upon the Lily / Corby SSSI. It will lead to substantial adverse increases in CO2 levels. *RoadSense* will present evidence to support these arguments.

The proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route will generate substantial adverse levels of noise and light pollution impacting upon residents living in affected communities such as Milltimber, Silverburn and Netherley. The route will also sever existing communities, such as at Milltimber, as well as rights of way. *RoadSense* will present evidence to support these arguments.

The proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route will have an adverse visual impact upon areas of important landscape value such as the Dee Valley. The overall landscape assessment for the southern leg is put at substantial / severe after 15 years, and the 'most negative outcome' principle means that this would apply to the overall scheme assessment. The route adversely affects Areas of Landscape Significance which are protected through land use development plans. It is acknowledged in the Environmental Statement that a highly sensitive landscape will be permanently changed and there is recognition that the visual impact will not be lessened over time through tree growth introduced as mitigation. It will have a substantial negative impact on the very high amenity values offered by Rotten o'Gairn, Kingshill and Kirkhill woods and will adversely affect important long distance views of the Cairngorm Mountains from them. The Netherley Fastlink will adversely affect an attractive area of open moorland. The landscape impact on Kingcausie estate parkland and the setting of the house is severely adverse. Whilst landscape quality is not a reason for greenbelt designation it is a factor in determining scheme appropriateness. It is evident that the scheme will have an adverse impact on large swathes of greenbelt land such as at Milltimber. *RoadSense* will present evidence covering landscape appraisal and impact issues.

The proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route will materially conflict with important

land use planning policies such as those promoting sustainable development, giving protection to green belts, areas of ecological and scientific interest, open countryside and historical buildings. The scheme is not identified in NPF2 as a 'national development'. There is no explicit policy provision in the approved Structure Plan for the AWPR and there is no provision in the key diagram for a Fastlink connecting Stonehaven to Maryculter. It is inevitable that there will be significant pressure for new development along the route which, if allowed, may undermine the economic regeneration of Aberdeen city centre, cause unacceptable visual impact upon attractive areas of open countryside and induce additional levels of traffic along the route with the attendant problems of congestion and pollution. The route will also impact adversely upon listed buildings such as Kingcausie. *RoadSense* will present evidence covering land use planning issues.

The proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route will cause localised problems of flooding. Evidence will be presented in relation to water quality and flooding, in relation to the scheme as a whole and looking at particular areas. The effects of the road on water quality and flooding will also be examined, both during and after construction. How sensitive species will be affected will also be examined. The impacts on fluvial geomorphology and the mitigation proposed will also be examined.

*RoadSense* will present evidence on this issue.

## **6. The availability of more suitable alternative routes**

Notwithstanding the potential of non-road based transport options, *RoadSense* will contend that there are a number of better alternative routes to the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route.

The public consultation exercise undertaken by Transport Scotland in April 2005 identified five routes. In particular the Murtle and the Pitfodels routes were, according to the information in the accompanying Appraisal Summary Tables (ASTs), shorter, less financially expensive, less environmentally damaging and more effective in terms of congestion relief than those routes further to the west at Milltimber and Peterculter. Detailed like for like comparison is not possible because of Transport Scotland's failure to produce a STAG 1 for the relevant Netherley-Milltimber Brae scheme.

*RoadSense* will present evidence on the merits of the alternative routes considered by Transport Scotland at the public consultation exercise in 2005 in comparison with the Netherley-Milltimber Brae route option.

*RoadSense* understands that other parties to the public local inquiry will promote other routes including: Eastern Tunnel without West of Peterculter upgrade; Eastern Tunnel with West of Peterculter upgrade; Hazlehead – Pitfodels Tunnel; Murtle with Fastlink; Murtle with A90 connection; 'Improved Pitfodels'; West of Peterculter; and Milltimber to Foggieton. While *RoadSense* considers that the Pitfodels and the Murtle options represent routes materially preferable to that proposed it also considers that these other alternatives are in their own ways preferable to the proposed Netherley-Milltimber Brae route.

## List of Witnesses

*RoadSense* proposes to present witnesses as follows:-

*RoadSense* as an organisation – William Walton, Chairman  
Corridor Selection/Scheme Design and Route Selection – David McGuigan of Colin Buchanan and Partners  
Strategic Traffic Issues and Transport Appraisal – David McGuigan of Colin Buchanan and Partners  
Detailed Traffic Modelling Issues - David Siddell of Colin Buchanan and Partners  
STAG issues – Alan James  
Planning Policy – William Walton  
Environmental Appraisal Issues, including Dee SAC – AD Hawkins  
Noise – A witness is shortly to be instructed  
Air Quality and Human Impact – Caroline Fraser  
Landscape and Visual, including Cultural Heritage – Alan James  
Flooding, Hydrology and Groundwater – Roger Murray  
Environment and Ecology, including mitigation measures – Nigel Astell  
Alternative Routes - Henry Irvine-Fortescue  
Costs – Dave Robb

It should be noted that the above list is not definitive, and *RoadSense* reserves the right to put forward additional witnesses as appropriate. *RoadSense* is also in contact with other objectors to see if any coordination of cases is possible, which may assist in the conduct of the inquiry.

It is considered that the witnesses dealing with strategic issues would be leading their evidence at the initial session of the inquiry. Those witnesses dealing with particular areas would present evidence at the appropriate stage.

*Road Sense's* preference would be for the strategic issues to be dealt with first, then the Fastlink evidence, followed by the Southern Leg and the Northern Leg thereafter.

List of Documents – Attached in separate document.