

**West Link Stage 2 - Community Liaison Meeting No. 2**

Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2019, 7pm Council HQ.

**Present**

Cllr Graham Ross (GR)	The Highland Council
Cllr Bill Boyd (BB)	The Highland Council
Colin Howell (CH)	The Highland Council
Mike Stephens (MS)	The Highland Council
Iain MacLennan (IM)	The Highland Council
Adam Marshall (AM)	The Highland Council
Steve Scott (SS)	RJ McLeod (Contractors) Ltd
George Greig (GG)	Inverness West Community Council
Maria De La Torre (MDLT)	Lochardil & Drummond Community Council
Brian MacKenzie (BMCK)	Highland Cycle Campaign
Paddy Walsh (PW)	Inverness Rowing Club
David Rothwell (DR)	Inverness Rowing Club
Roy Sinclair (RS)	Inverness Rowing Club

Point	Item	Action
1.	<b>Chairman's Introductions &amp; Purpose of Meeting</b>	
1.1.	Cllr Graham Ross opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.	
1.2.	Apologies Bryan Stout (BS) Principal Engineer Highland Council Ross Polworth - Police Scotland	
2.	<b>Approval of Minutes</b>	

Point	Item	Action
2.1.	<p>Bryan Stout still to action</p> <p>5.1 Roy Sinclair requested up to date drawings of the scheme. Bryan advised that they are the same as previously shared with the club but will forward copies of the canal infrastructure drawings once these are up-revved for construction use and issued to the Contractor.</p> <p>5.2 Brian Mackenzie commented on the staggered bollard arrangement proposed instead of the large hoop style fences used at stage 1 which Sustrans were not so keen on. Bryan to forward bollard layout detail to Brian.</p> <p>5.3 Roy Sinclair and Robert Gordon commented on a potential conflict issue when rowing boats may enter the restricted space between the bridges and felt there is a need for discussion with Scottish Canals to see how this can be managed. SC to be invited to next liaison meeting.</p>	<p>BS</p> <p>BS</p> <p>BS</p>
3.	<b>IWL Stage 2</b>	
3.1.	<p>Steve Scott, Project Manager RJ McLeod gave a short presentation regarding the works (available on the website). He started by giving a brief summary regarding RJ McLeod Contractors Ltd. The presentation contained a review of the company, its history and recent projects. Regarding IWL2 as an experienced Contractor they had identified the need for utility diversions, traffic management and the needs of the local community. SS listed the extensive community benefits that RJ McLeod proposed including local employment opportunities. SS gave an overview of the programme at this time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of General Booth Road</li> <li>• Golf Clubhouse demolition</li> <li>• Drainage Works</li> <li>• Underpass Construction</li> <li>• Canal Piling</li> </ul> <p>Are all intending to start in 2019, work will continue into 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canal Piling continues</li> <li>• Road construction on A82</li> <li>• Road construction access to new bridge</li> <li>• Landscaping works</li> <li>• New bridge constructed</li> <li>• Works are due to be complete in December 2020</li> </ul>	
3.2	<p>BMcK asked if the stages ran into each other ?</p> <p>SS confirmed that they did and many would be ongoing at the same time. SS stated that the programme is subject to change and amendment as the construction progresses to optimise construction or address risks and issues that are encountered,</p>	
3.2.	<p>MDLT asked if access would be maintained to the canal tow path during the construction works.</p>	

Point	Item	Action
	<p>SS confirmed that access would be maintained but that some diversions may be needed and at times banksmen may be required to direct pedestrians.</p> <p>All diversions will be signed.</p> <p>SS will provide plans regarding any proposed diversions.</p>	SS
3.3.	<p>RS asked for a copy of the programme to clarify when the anchor wall is constructed as this may impact on the Rowing Club access.</p> <p>IM will provide RS with a copy of the initial programme once it has been accepted</p>	IM
3.4.	<p>GR asked what the ICE Bridge was that was mentioned in the Community Benefits section of the presentation.</p> <p>SS said it was a bridge that was taken to schools by the local branch of the Institution of Civil Engineers. The children then build the bridge, the intention being that this may help the children develop an interest in Civil Engineering.</p>	
3.5.	<p>RS asked would it be possible to arrange site visits as the works progressed</p> <p>RJ McLeod and THC would be happy to arrange this</p>	SS/IM
3.6.	<p>MDLT asked about cycle access and in particular bollard arrangements</p> <p>BS to provide a presentation of the cycling access provision at the next meeting</p>	BS
4.	<b>IWL Control Building</b>	
4.1.	<p>Adam Marshall, Architectural Technician THC gave a presentation (available on the website) regarding the ongoing control tower works.</p> <p>The new tower would provide the bridge operator unrestricted view of both bridges, supplemented by CCTV and a speaker system. Once complete it would provide a more efficient swing bridge operation.</p> <p>The works started in April 2019 and were scheduled to take 14 weeks. AM confirmed the works were on programme at this stage. Steelwork had been erected today - that will indicate the location and scale of the building.</p>	
4.2.	<p>RS asked about the route of the diverted water supply to the Rowing Club.</p> <p>AM confirmed that the water main went to the front of the building and would be undergrounded as part of the works.</p>	
4.3.	<p>DR asked about the available distance at the front of the building</p> <p>AM stated that there would be 5m available at the front, this would allow the Rowing Club to get boats passed both during the construction phase and following completion.</p>	
4.4.	<p>RS asked if the bridge would be remotely controlled rather than</p>	

Point	Item	Action
	manually operated CH confirmed the bridge operation would be controlled by the bridge operator remotely from the tower.	
4.5.	SS confirmed that both bridges would be operated from the tower by the end of 2020 when the new swing bridge is commissioned.	
4.6.	RS asked what the clearance would be under the new swing bridge. BS to confirm clearance at the next meeting.	BS
<b>5.</b>	<b>AOCB</b>	
5.1.	IM will provide contact details for the site to all parties once the onsite phase of the works commenced.	IM
5.2.	PW asked for clarification regarding canal access and in particular that there would be no public access via the Rowing Club access ramp. IM said that the access was for the Rowing Club use however if a problem developed regarding public use, signs would be erected redirecting the public. If the problem was to continue following the erection of signs further measures would be discussed with the Rowing Club	
5.3.	RS asked what the budget was for the West Link Project. CH responded that the project was on target financially, and following completion of Stage 1 there was a remaining budget. CH confirmed that the tender awarded to RJ's was of a value that maintained a level of contingency for the West Link. CH confirmed that any underspend, which is encouraged, would be diverted to other Council Projects already in the capital programme. All financial matters are reported to the Environment Development and Infrastructure committee and were therefore a matter of public record.	
5.4.	GR commented that the meeting had been productive and he identified that the in canal works were crucial to the success of the project. SS agreed with this comment and informed the meeting that there would be an archaeological watching brief during draining of the canal	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
6.1.	Monday 2 <sup>nd</sup> September at 7pm	