

ANNEX A  
CONSULTATION RESPONSE TABLE

**Table A1: Consultation Response Table**

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
<b>Cyclists' Touring Club Scotland</b>	Mike Harrison	20.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North bound cyclists would be likely to enter the village to use the facilities such as the youth hostel and shop</li> <li>Cyclists should have the opportunity to move safely into the correct lane as they approach the southern roundabout. This requires that the approach to and the curves on the roundabout force traffic to significantly reduce speed</li> <li>A badly designed roundabout would allow northbound traffic to pass without slowing down</li> <li>Any solution suggesting cyclists dismount to cross the road is unacceptable</li> </ul>	Cyclist and pedestrian provision has been included at both roundabouts (see Sections 3.2, 6.8 and 15.8)
<b>Cycling Scotland</b>	Correspondence via Alfreda Brown	10.04.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use/refer to the 'Cycling by Design' standard</li> </ul>	Noted and used to inform the design
<b>Deer Commission Scotland</b>	Donald Fraser	18.07.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomed the approach to protecting planting and a deer fencing strategy and offered to review the plans (or the relevant deer officer). He would also be happy for us to include a contract commitment (i.e. in the mitigation) for the final plans to be discussed with the Deer Commission if substantially different from ours</li> <li>Each road is a different case and there is not a standard solution but in principle the approach is sensible</li> </ul>	Noted and used to inform the deer fencing principles (see Section 3.4.2)
<b>Forestry Commission Scotland</b>	David Anderson Woodland Officer Loch Lomond and the Trossachs	24.04.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A constraints check on the proposed corridor for the bypass indicated no particular woodland designations, although a 500m buffer zone contained areas of semi-natural broadleaf woodland</li> <li>information that may be useful for your appraisal can be obtained from Forest Plans covering the FCS woodland to either side of the corridor</li> <li>The FCS Ewich forest block to the west of the corridor is covered by an Indicative Forest plan, while the Inverarden Block to the east has recently been amalgamated with the Ben more block to form the Crianlarich Forest Plan; the new Crianlarich Forest Plan is currently on the public register and has been sent to consultees for comment</li> <li>Further information can be obtained from Bill Green, Planning Forester, Lorne Forest District, Millpark Rd, Oban, Argyll, PA34 4NH, 01631 566155, <a href="mailto:bill.green@forestry.gsi.gov.uk">bill.green@forestry.gsi.gov.uk</a></li> </ul>	Information obtained and used to inform the EIA (see Chapters 6 and 10)
<b>Forestry Commission Scotland</b>	Donald McNeill	4.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted the current West Highland Way (WHW) link path between the railway station and the forest has a small car park and some signage on it adjacent to the existing A82, stated the Forestry Commission would like</li> </ul>	Access to the WHW would be maintained by a diversion of some 100m south and an underpass under

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			to see this car park facility maintained on the bypass and the crossing point of the WHW link made safe for users and landscaped as appropriate, including the re-erection of WHW signage	the road. This would link in with the existing car park (see Section 6.8 and 15.8) Cyclist provision has been included at the northern roundabout and ties in with the Sustrans route (see Section 3.2)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The same issues could apply with the Tyndrum to Crianlarich Sustrans route, which is due for completion spring 2008</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted the future forest road access will be needed for Ewich Forest and it would make sense to incorporate this into the bypass at the design stage. The most sensible location for this would be at the southern roundabout and it would be helpful if a short spur could be constructed from the roundabout to allow later onward construction into the forest</li> </ul>	Noted and a spur off the southern roundabout has been included in the design
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted any trees felled or fence removed from Ewich Forest as part of the bypass or for sightlines should be cut far enough back to present an attractive forest edge to road users and allow compensatory amenity planting or fence replacement where appropriate</li> </ul>	Line of felling agreed in consultation with the Forestry Commission (see Sections 3.4.1, 6.8 and 9.11)
<b>Forestry Commission Scotland</b>	Donald McNeill	26.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter received with a plan marking the proposed landscape felling area which will ensure all conifer crop is far enough back from the edge of the road to minimise any future health and safety complexities when the remaining trees are felled in the future</li> <li>The net area to be felled is estimated at 10.3ha with a standing volume of approximately 100m<sup>3</sup> per ha</li> <li>Several features of archaeological importance and some that may be of archaeological importance have been identified. These are also included on the attached plan</li> <li>There are two large spruce which are on Forestry Commission land If practicable these should be retained.</li> <li>Forestry Commission own a field on the west of the A82. Any embankment work should be aligned to allow future vehicular access to this field from its north west corner</li> </ul>	Line of felling agreed in consultation with the Forestry Commission (see Sections 3.4.1, 6.8 and 9.11)  Archaeological features identified have been included in the detailed Cultural Heritage assessment (see Chapter 11)
<b>Forestry Commission Scotland</b>	Donald McNeill	29.04.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with the forestry commission to discuss the felling proposals.</li> <li>Forestry Commission explained that the required felling would take the trees back to a wind firm edge.</li> <li>Discussion as to who would undertake the felling, Forestry Commission or Transport Scotland – Forestry Commission to discuss with harvesting colleagues and get back with preferred method</li> </ul>	Noted and used to inform the EIA

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
<b>Forestry Commission Scotland</b>	Donald McNeill	25.05.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forestry Commission confirmed it would be preferred for Transport Scotland to undertake the felling and they would give it's full support to the chosen contractor</li> </ul>	Noted and used to inform the EIA
<b>Forestry Commission Scotland</b>	Peter Clark Gordon Donaldson John Hair	31.08.09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting to discuss the proposals with the new Forestry Commission officers who will be involved in the scheme in the future</li> <li>An update was provided and the scheme explained</li> <li>The Forestry Commission indicated that there would be a review of the wind-firm edge (previously provided by Donald McNeill of the Forestry Commission) and respond with any changes</li> <li>It was agreed that the trees would be felled, extracted and removed as an advance works contract before the main bypass works started. The tree removal area was in the region 6.5 hectares and that this work would take in the region of 2-3 months to complete. The removed trees could be used for pulp</li> <li>Access onto the site to remove the trees would require some two hundred metres of haul road most likely from the stub area at the south roundabout. Forestry Commission would provide input into the specification of the haul road. Tape would be used to de-lineate the tree to be removed from those that were staying</li> <li>The Forestry Commission could comment on a contractor's suitability but that a list of preferred contractors was not maintained</li> <li>Works would be programmed to take place in year 2011 / 2012, subject to funding</li> <li>A set of the draft Orders and the ES would be sent to FC after publication</li> <li>The ES would indicate where deer proof fencing would be located within the scheme</li> </ul>	<p>Information noted</p> <p>A measure has been included in the ES (see Section 3.4.1) stating that the final wind-firm edge would be agreed with the Forestry Commission on the ground prior to works commencing</p> <p>See Section 3.4.2</p>
<b>Health &amp; Safety Executive</b>	G A Cook Principal Inspector of Health & Safety	17.11.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HSE's principal concerns are the health &amp; safety of people affected by work activities</li> <li>HSE cannot usefully comment on what information should be included in the environmental statement of the proposed development. However, the ES should not include measures which would conflict with the requirements of the Health &amp; Safety at Work etc Act 1974 &amp; its relevant statutory provisions</li> </ul>	Noted and considered in the ES
<b>Historic Scotland</b>	Lily Linge Longmore House Salisbury Place	11.12.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic Scotland (HS) were fully involved in the route appraisal and EIA undertaken in the mid 1990s and were able to confirm then that the western option would have no significant impact on the historic environment</li> </ul>	There would be no impact on the military road or the Glenbruar Viaduct as a result of the scheme (see Section 11.8 and Appendix 11.3)

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
	EH9 1SH		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are two minor issues identified for further mitigation:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Archaeological excavation/evaluation/recording as necessary concentrated in a small area at the extreme western edge of the scheme where the proposed bypass rejoined the existing Tyndrum road and where it was thought that a small section of Caulfield's military road might be affected at the tie in point; and</li> <li>○ Pier protection works to the non-listed Glenbruar Viaduct. These were not directly related to the route of the western bypass itself but were potentially an issue arising out of associated traffic calming measures then proposed on the existing A85</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Subsequent memos in 1995 indicated that no traffic calming measures would be undertaken in the area of the viaduct and so there would be no impacts on it and that the scheme did not affect the line of the military road which lay beyond its tie in point</li> <li>• Due to extensive afforestation and other destructive land uses in the area of the western bypass route, this area was excluded from Kirkdale's original stage 2 report. The likelihood of archaeological remains surviving in this area is extremely low and no further general archaeological mitigation along the western bypass route as a whole.</li> <li>• The general line of the western bypass route shown in current plans is virtually identical to that proposed in the 1990's and no new information has come to light in the intervening period and so HS have nothing further to add on the earlier appraisal of historic environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Should the position on the two minor outstanding issues covered in an earlier letter remain as reported HS will have no outstanding concerns with this scheme and no requirements for any specific archaeological mitigation</li> </ul>	
<b>JMP Consulting</b>	Ian Buchan Senior Transport Planner	04.12.06	<p>A number of issues should be considered when assessing the merits of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The suitability of the access onto the trunk road in terms of visibility and construction</li> <li>• The ES should provide information relating to the preferred route options for the movement of heavy loads, staff movements via the trunk road network once operational and appropriate mitigation measures</li> <li>• Potential trunk road related environmental impacts such a noise, air</li> </ul>	Noted and used to inform the EIA

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<p>quality, safety, severance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where impacts have been assessed and are considered to be of little or no significance it is sufficient to validate that part of the report by stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ That the work has been undertaken</li> <li>○ What this has shown</li> <li>○ Why it is not significant</li> </ul> </li> <li>• It is not necessary to include all the information gathered during the assessment although the information should be available if requested</li> </ul>	
<b>Local Bat Group</b>	Anne Youngman	12.04.07	<p>There are likely to be 5 species of bat present in the general area (2 pipistrelle species, Brown Long eared, Daubenton's and Natterer's bats). These are all European Protected Species.</p> <p><b>Roost records- sources of information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local bat group - has copied email to John Haddow of Central Scotland Bat Group, in case he knows of any roost records in the area. If we hear nothing he has no information.</li> <li>• BCT – Has emailed colleague in BCT to find out if any records. (BCT run a National Bat Monitoring programme where volunteers carry out surveys and send their results to BCT ) Think it is unlikely that there is any information. Not because here are no bats but because there is no-one carrying out any NBMP survey in that area.</li> <li>• SNH – suggests contacting SNH to check if they have any roost records.</li> <li>• local people</li> </ul> <p><b>Issues to consider</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider impacts on; Bat roosts, Bat flight lines, Bat feeding/foraging areas</li> <li>• Also consider opportunities to add benefits for bats should the scheme go ahead.</li> </ul> <p><b>Bat roosts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bats roost in natural and man made features (natural features include trees and rock faces. Man-made may include bridges, buildings (old fashioned and modern), bat boxes)</li> <li>• Check for bats/signs of bats where: rock faces may be cleared/blasted, trees may be felled or branches lopped (especially big old trees with lots of holes, splits nooks and crannies)- check for bat boxes on trees – unlikely but possible, where bridges/tunnels/ stone culverts may be</li> </ul>	An initial protected species walkover survey was undertaken in March 2007. It was considered that no further bat surveys were required lack of suitable roosting or shelter sites in the area (see Section 9.5)

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<p>demolishes/ re- pointed/ strengthened, where buildings may be demolished/ repaired / altered.</p> <p><b>Consider Flight lines</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bats will follow linear features in the landscape and these can be very important as navigation routes. Such features include – tree lines, hedges, riparian woodland. If the new road will sever such features you may have to provide alternative links (e.g. green bridges, new hedge planting) to help the bats either continue their usual route or find a new one.</li> </ul> <p><b>Feeding areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bats feed in insect rich areas such as over rough grassland, around gardens, in or beside woodland and over water. If valuable feeding areas will be lost then there may be scope to enhance other habitats to make up for this e.g. by pond creation, hedge/woodland planting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Designing for bats</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There may be scope to make improvements for bats e.g. by the incorporation of bat tubes, bat bricks and or bat boxes into built structures. Is there to be an underpass to allow people to use the path west of the village without crossing over the new road? If so bat boxes/bricks and tubes could be incorporated very easily into the roof and walls of the underpass.</li> </ul> <p><b>Effects of Street lights</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Street lights can be a mixed blessing – benefiting some bat species while deterring others. In this situation (i.e. a rural setting where there have not been lights before) its probably better to maintain the status quo and avoid lights if this is an option.</li> </ul> <p>No bat records or bat recorders in the Crianlarich area</p>	
<b>Loch Lomond and Trossachs</b>	Gordon Watson Planning Services	29.11.06	The National Park Authority considers the main impacts of the development to be the landscape/visual impact and ecological impact	Noted and used to inform the EIA

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
National Park			<p><b>Options</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consideration of different sites and layouts should be demonstrated and the rationale for the selection of the proposed development provided, particularly in terms of landscape</li> <li>• The impact of the different options on the landscape should be analysed and their potential for assimilation into the landscape evaluated</li> </ul>	Noted and included in the ES (see Chapter 2)
			<p><b>Planning Policy Background and Guidance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clackmannanshire and Stirling Structure Plan, Approved 2002;</li> <li>• Stirling Council Adopted Local Plan, 1999; and</li> <li>• Stirling Council Finalised Plan, Alteration 1B, 2002 are all relevant to the proposal</li> <li>• The four Statutory Aims of the National Park will be a material consideration in the determination of the proposal</li> <li>• The National Park Plan Consultative Draft is a material planning consideration.</li> <li>• The ES should provide an assessment of the proposal in relation to the National Park Plan. The sections on special qualities, landscape, using resource wisely and development quality are of particular relevance</li> <li>• Lists national guidelines to include</li> </ul>	The scheme has been assessed against all relevant plans and programmes and broadly complies with National Government guidance and Structure and Local Plan policies, including the National Park Plan
			<p><b>Landscape and Visual</b></p> <p>The Guidance for Landscape and Visual Assessments (Spons Press, 2002) should be referred to in terms of assessment methodology. The following should be included in the ES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of methodologies and techniques used in assessment</li> <li>• Measures and criteria of impacts</li> <li>• Thresholds of significance consideration of alternatives and options</li> <li>• Details of proposals including all stages of the project life cycle</li> <li>• Baseline information on landscape and visual resource</li> <li>• All potential impacts identified with predicted magnitude and significance</li> <li>• Mitigation measures</li> </ul> <p>Visualisations should be undertaken to show</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actual visual impacts from significant visual receptors</li> <li>• Design principles</li> </ul> <p>Additional information should include</p>	Noted and included in the EIA

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topography of road route and typical sections through the route</li> <li>• Confirmation of the requirement of rock blasting</li> <li>• Assessment of impacts on woodland and ground flora</li> <li>• Where tree felling, a detailed tree survey should be undertaken by an arborculturist</li> </ul> <p>The site is within an Area of Great Landscape Value and the National Park. An assessment of impacts on landscape character should be included. Guidance is provided on potential visual receptors and landscape receptors.</p>	
			<p><b>Ecology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is within the catchment of the River Tay SAC, designated for three species of lamprey, Atlantic salmon and otter, and for oligotrophic (containing little nutrient material) standing waters. The effect of the road on these species needs to be considered.</li> <li>• European Protected Species; the following species should be surveyed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bats</li> <li>○ Pine martin</li> <li>○ Red squirrel</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Black grouse and merlin are known in the area. A comprehensive bird survey will be required and the carrying out of works should be avoided in the bird nesting season.</li> </ul>	<p>Information noted and used to inform the EIA</p> <p>The scheme has been assessed and is not considered to have a significant effect on the qualifying interests of the SAC (see Section 9.11 and Annex B)</p>
			<p><b>Public Access and Recreation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the bypass on existing path links to the West Highland Way should be considered and provision of a safe pedestrian link provided across the road</li> </ul>	<p>Access to the WHW would be maintained by a diversion of some 100m south and an underpass under the road. This would link in with the existing car park (see Section 6.8 and 15.8)</p>
			<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The environmental statement should consider the following : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The potential to secure socio-economic benefits to local communities and how any cost/harm is minimised</li> <li>○ Measures to ensure any features of archaeological interest discovered are properly considered</li> <li>○ Necessary pollution prevention measures</li> <li>○ Analysis of transport related impacts, including during</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Noted and included in the ES (see Chapters, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 15)</p>

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ construction phase</li> <li>○ The potential for any adverse impacts during construction</li> </ul>	
<b>Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park</b>	Bridget Jones (Senior Access Officer)	26.3.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Strathfillan to Glen Dochart cycle route is proposed for 2007/08, a section of which runs through Crianlarich</li> </ul>	Cyclist provision has been included at the northern roundabout and ties in with the Sustrans route (see Section 3.2)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loch Lomond and Trossachs Core Paths Plan is currently being written. The West Highland Way and Strathfillan to Glen Dochart cycle route are likely to be designated as core paths</li> </ul>	Access to the WHW would be maintained by a diversion of some 100m south and an underpass under the road. (see Section 6.8 and 15.8)
<b>Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park</b>	Vivien Emery and Catherine Stewart	05.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed landscape receptors and landscape character areas were submitted to LLTNPA. These will be passed on to the landscape officer for comment</li> <li>• Lighting for the road was discussed. It is proposed to minimise the lighting of the new scheme as much as possible to minimise the impact on the community and wider landscape. LLTNPA asked that any concessions or departures from standard should be clearly set out in the Environmental Statement (ES) to help support the application</li> <li>• The area between Willow Brae and the policeman's new house is zoned for housing in the existing Stirling Local Plan. As the new planning authority the LLTNPA is developing a local plan and re-looking at the development areas. NC to include existing Local Plan information in the ES</li> <li>• There are still plans to develop a timber yard/ transport facility in the north of the village. These proposals would include the introduction of traffic lights at the railway bridge to facilitate access on to the trunk road network. LLTNPA to provide contact details for the developer and GM to consult</li> <li>• The LLTNPA Plan makes reference to 'tranquillity' at several points, in particular referencing remote areas such as Balquhiddier Glen and Loch Lubnaig in Breadalbane, Loch Eck in Argyll Forest and Strathard in The Trossachs. Given that 'tranquillity' is usually associated with remoteness, and bearing in mind the vicinity of Crianlarich village and the local road and rail network, the team has not considered the area around the proposed development to have the same tranquil 'Special quality'. The LLTNPA were asked to confirm it was happy with this approach</li> <li>• NC/PPCA explained that mitigation for noise and landscaping impacts</li> </ul>	<p>Landscape proposals have been included in Chapter 11)</p> <p>Lighting has been restricted to 60m approaches to the roundabouts (see Section 3.2.2)</p> <p>The potential effects of the scheme have been assessed against plans and programmes and broadly complies with National Government guidance and Structure and Local Plan</p>

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			would be balanced to provide the best mitigation possible. LLTNPA asked to see the mitigation proposals once they were further developed to discuss the proposals and to understand “balance”	
<b>Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park</b>	Bridget Jones	19.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is necessary to incorporate off-road access both round and across the northern roundabout for pedestrians and cyclists</li> </ul>	Cyclist and pedestrian provision has been included at the northern roundabout and ties in with the Sustrans route (see Section 3.2)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed cycle path and WHW spurs to the north west will require to be served with appropriate roadside access</li> </ul>	Access to the WHW would be maintained by a diversion of some 100m south and an underpass under the road. This would link in with the existing car park (see Section 6.8 and 15.8)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preference would be for access to be guided along the southern side of the roundabout, anticlockwise, to enable access to be taken from the roadside footway into Crianlarich and under the railway using the existing footway</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What arrangements are being made to facilitate the WHW spur (CS374)?</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There would be opportunity to have appropriate warning signage for road users advising them of pedestrian and cyclists at points where crossing of the road/roundabout is likely</li> </ul>	Appropriate signage would be included (see Section 3.2.2)
<b>Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park</b>	Sara Melville Landscape Officer	31.01.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since the Special Qualities work was carried out there has been no further detailed survey of LLTNP and the experiential qualities of landscape such as tranquillity. Recent methodologies used elsewhere have studied the effects that people, landscape and noise have on perceived tranquillity. It is not always remoteness that gives people a sense of tranquillity</li> <li>The approach regarding the immediate area around Crianlarich given the existence of road, rail, pylon line and settlement is fine. However the relevance of tranquillity to the Special Qualities of Breadalbane, notably Strathfillan and Glen Dochart are more relevant to the higher areas of the West Highland Way above Crianlarich, and the approaches through Glen Falloch and Strathfillan, Glen Dochart and the Munros surrounding the area</li> <li>I think the most relevant issue is not tranquillity but is definitely</li> </ul>	Noted and information used to inform the assessment (See Chapter 13)

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			'experiential' – in particular the approach to Crianlarich via the scenic quality and atmospheric effect of Glen Falloch and the relict Caledonian Pinewoods. This is highly significant to the local area, the Park and the UK and a distinctive landmark feature in the transitional zone on the route north – creating a sense of entering the Highlands. The West Highland Way and the 14 Munros in the area are large contributors to the actual outdoor experiences that are experienced	
<b>Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park</b>	Patrick Cleary Project Officer	12.03.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a drawing of the proposed Glen Dochart Cycle Route which was lodged with the planning application week beginning 03.03.08. The drawing shows that no provision for cyclist have been included through Crianlarich</li> </ul>	Cyclist and pedestrian provision has been included at both roundabouts (see Sections 3.2, 6.8 and 15.8)
<b>Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park</b>	David Harrison Sarah Melville Alan Bell	24.09.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme is very much part of a strategic improvement to the A82 and not a true bypass. The Route Action Plan identified the two bridges and the priority junction as constraints on the trunk road which this scheme would mitigate</li> <li>• Rebuilding the west highland line to Oban could be very expensive and may involve property demolitions and so has not been taken forward as a serious option</li> <li>• CPO lines on all figures to be checked for consistency</li> <li>• Check ES includes speed limit for the road</li> <li>• The transport interchange is not part of the scheme but the scheme does not preclude this if the Council wished to take this forward</li> <li>• The area of forestry to be removed has been agreed with the Forestry Commission (there are no immediate plans for FC to fell the forest- probably 10-15 years away). Felling to an agreed wind firm edge would probably be completed before the main contract but after the scheme is consented. The extraction route is not yet determined (it could be a route in the forest or the lie of the road)</li> <li>• A spur will be provided off the southern roundabout to allow for future forestry operations</li> <li>• The West Highland Way access spur will be maintained through construction (possibly diverted with diversion signed) and in operation via an underpass</li> <li>• Peat and other materials removed form site will be used in landscaping to 'naturalise' the scheme-the remainder of materials will be taken off site to a suitable site chosen by the contractor (with all necessary licences)- re-use of materials will be encouraged</li> </ul>	Noted – the design speed of the road has been included in Section 3.2.2.1

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>re-use of materials will be encouraged</li> <li>Transport Scotland is in discussion with the National Industrial Symbiosis Programme (NISP) <a href="http://www.nisp.org.uk/">www.nisp.org.uk/</a> an organisation seeking to broker materials from construction</li> <li>The quantity of cut may reduce-1:3 slopes have been assumed and there is anticipated to be rock in some sections</li> <li>Rock outcrops will be left where practical and will be designed to be natural in appearance</li> <li>Lighting will be restricted to the roundabouts and 60m either direction (provided that a departure is granted). The effects of lighting should be carefully assessed in the ES</li> <li>It is anticipated that the bog will dry out below the road on the village side and habitats will change in character</li> <li>The LLTNP would welcome natural regeneration rather than seeding if possible and re-use of turfs and brashings etc</li> </ul>	<p>The effects of lighting has been considered in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects</p> <p>Noted. The slopes would be left to naturally regenerate unless there is a stability problem in which case a low vigour seed mix would be used (see Section 10.7)</p> <p>Noted. The visual and landscape effects of the scheme are assessed in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects</p> <p>Noted and most up to date figures sent</p>
<b>Rail Freight Development</b>	Lorne Anton	12.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite a few funding issues the timber terminal proposals in Crianlarich are still live however the scheme is not anticipated to affect the proposals</li> </ul>	As the scheme has not been consented or a planning application lodged it has not been included as part of the ES
<b>RSPB</b>	Andy Robinson Conservation		<p><b>Habitats &amp; Species Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed route is close to the existing village of Crianlarich.</li> </ul>	An initial protected species walkover

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
	Officer, Argyll & Bute		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RSPB has limited knowledge about any species or habitats of conservation concern within this area</li> <li>However, black grouse (LBAP species) are known to occur in forestry in this areas to the West of the development. RSPB advises that work takes place, or initial clearance occurs, outwith the bird breeding season (March – July) to avoid any disturbance to nesting birds</li> </ul>	<p>survey was undertaken in March 2007 and no signs of black grouse identified</p> <p>A breeding bird survey was undertaken between May and July and the results used to inform the EIA. No significant effects on breeding birds are anticipated (see Section 9.6.4 and 9.11 and the Confidential Annex)</p>
<b>RSPB</b>	Andy Robinson Conservation Officer, Argyll & Bute	4.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that looking at the proposed Western route bypass RSPB have no further comments to add than those previously submitted on the 21<sup>st</sup> November. Black Grouse as mentioned have been reported in the forestry to the South &amp; West – its unlikely that this proposal would impact upon them and RSPB are currently unsure of their status in this area. Any survey work should seek to establish that no leks are present in site footprint. If required positive management for the species could be carried out for example by feathering edges of the forestry plantation/planting native broadleaves etc – these measures could be applied as part of any road side landscaping</li> </ul>	An initial protected species walkover survey was undertaken in March 2007 and no signs of black grouse identified
<b>Scottish Badgers</b>	Ian Hutchinson Development and Education Officer	05.12.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little knowledge about badgers in the area and it is suggested that a full survey carried out as part of the EIA to establish the presence or absence of badgers.</li> <li>There are no sett records and only one recorded traffic accident on the A85 ~ 1km northwest of Crianlarich. This is an old record at NN 376 258 from 1998</li> </ul>	A walkover survey for badger was undertaken in March 2007 and further checks undertaken during further survey. No signs of badger were identified (see Section 9.5 and 9.6.4)
<b>Scottish Badgers</b>	Ian Hutchinson Development and Education Officer	17.11.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Records show nothing new since consultation in 2006</li> </ul>	
<b>Scottish City Link</b>	Mike Dean	04.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed that Scottish Citylink service will continue to serve Crianlarich irrespective of the final route of the bypass</li> </ul>	The effects of the proposals on land use have been assessed in Chapter 6
<b>Scottish Enterprise Forth Valley</b>	Paul McCafferty Tourism Team Leader	12.04.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Breadalbane Corridor – A Destination Development Framework – much information on Crianlarich.</li> </ul>	Noted and used to inform the EIA

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
<b>Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)</b>	Sean Caswell  Malcom MacConnachie  Nikki Board	05.02.08	<b>Flooding</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project does not fall under the River Fillan flood plain and any flood risk is likely to arise from improperly culverted streams</li> <li>• Ian Young of Stirling Council should be contacted to discuss local flooding</li> <li>• No strategic flood risk assessments are available for the region.</li> <li>• No flood risk assessment will be required for the EIA. An assessment of peak flood flows will be required using FEH rainfall-runoff methods appropriate to small catchments. SEPA to confirm requirements for flood risk &amp; hydraulic assessment of culverts</li> </ul>	A flood risk assessment has been undertaken following DMRB guidance. No significant flooding effects are predicted for the proposals (see Section 8.9 and Appendix 8.6)
			<b>Road Drainage and Pollution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discharge to streams from attenuation tanks likely to fall under the General Binding Rules of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2005 (CAR)</li> <li>• A hydrogeological conceptual model to investigate flow and groundwater/surface water relationships in proximity to the road and drainage channels should be developed from the findings of the site investigation works</li> <li>• Seasonal watercourses may present a heightened pollution risk as pollutants may store up and then be mobilised when streams fill. Storage in attenuation ponds should be made large enough to mitigate this</li> <li>• A method statement from contractors on preventing pollution from construction would be required, details of what should be included in this should be provided in the Environmental Statement</li> <li>• A method statement for site investigation works would be needed. Method statements to include contingency planning and risk assessments</li> <li>• Nicki McIntyre of SNH to be contacted to discuss the importance of the wetland habitat by the River Fillan</li> <li>• A soak-away could be used at the south end of the scheme as an alternative to attenuation pond. Which option used depends on the permeability of the ground at the south end, to the east of the existing</li> </ul>	The need for CAR licences has been considered (see Section 8.4)  A hydrological model has been developed and the findings used to inform the EIA (see Chapter 8 and Appendix 8.2) Noted and used to inform the drainage design and included as mitigation in Chapter 8   This option was investigated but not considered viable
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of hydrogeological conceptual model are likely to be quite qualitative but backed up by site investigation data. SEPA are happy with this approach</li> <li>• A water features survey (WFS) will need to be carried out to identify both abstractions (receptors) and septic tanks/discharges (potential sources)</li> </ul>	A Water Features Survey has been undertaken and used to inform the EIA (see Section 8.5, 8.9 and Appendix 8.1)

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			of contamination). SEPA to confirm whether this can be restricted to a desk study search or whether a walkover survey is also required. SEPA also to confirm whether WFS needs to include surface water features other than abstractions and discharges	
			<p><b>Peat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEPA has no formalised guidance on how to deal with peat</li> <li>• Carbon release is an issue as well as loss of peat as a resource</li> <li>• SEPA advocate avoidance of removal of deep peat</li> <li>• SEPA request a more extensive survey of existing peat (See SI above)</li> <li>• SEPA Concern that the diversion of existing small streams could lead to the drying out of the currently boggy and peaty area to the east of the proposed route</li> <li>• Isla Smail should be contacted for advice on dealing with peat. SEPA to arrange for Isla to contact project team (or provide contact details) to discuss scope of works necessary</li> <li>• Results of peat probing should be included in the ES</li> <li>• Possible ways of disposing of the excess peat discussed including using it for landscaping. SEPA to provide any potential areas for disposal of surplus material</li> </ul>	<p>Further peat probing work has been undertaken and the information used to inform the EIA (see Chapter 7 and Appendix 7.1)</p> <p>The volume of peat to be disposed of has been minimised where possible (see Section 10.7)</p> <p>Possible locations for peat disposal have been considered (see Chapter 4)</p>
			<p><b>Culverting and Realignment of Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEPA stated that the design of culverts is important. Culverts will need to be placed deep enough for the stream to establish a natural bed at the bottom and to avoid any step or overhang</li> <li>• The timing of any culverting should be such that natural events such as spawning should not be disrupted</li> <li>• The design parameters for the culverts should be stipulated in the ES. Nikki MacIntyre to be contacted with regard to the effect of stream diversion on wetland</li> </ul>	Information noted and used to inform the drainage design (see Section 8.8, 8.9 and 9.11)
			<p><b>Landscaping Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEPA request that native species are used for mitigation planting for attenuation ponds and landscaping.</li> <li>• native species of local provenance (where possible) would be used</li> <li>• Planting on bunds to take the form of native scrub</li> </ul>	Information noted and used to inform the landscape mitigation planting proposals (see Section 10.7 and Figure 10.9a-c)
<b>SEPA</b>	Isla Smail	28.03.08	<p><b>Water Features Survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be required in desk study form and should include surface water features (wetlands, issues and seepages, streams etc), surface water and groundwater abstractions, and discharges (SW drainage, septic tanks etc).</li> </ul>	A Water Features Survey has been undertaken and used to inform the EIA (see Section 8.5, 8.9 and Appendix 8.1)

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The survey needs to identify discharge points for septic tanks as well as to identify minor wetland features and unlicensed abstractions. There is no specific WFS reporting format, unlike in England and Wales, but the output required will be similar i.e. summary tables and a map. Each figure will need a 10 figure NGR reference</li> </ul> <p><b>Hydrogeological requirements for ES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEPA will require a hydrogeological characterisation of the groundwater regime (i.e., a conceptual model) under existing and future conditions, with particular reference to at risk features identified by the WFS. This should include all available SI and groundwater level information, so SEPA may require it to be updated following the SI in April/May and more detailed design. The study needs to consider both flow and water quality, particularly where wetlands are concerned.</li> <li>Groundwater monitoring, particularly in relation to sensitive features like the wetland adjacent to the R Fillan will be required. This is both to give a baseline and also to identify whether any adverse groundwater impacts observed in the future are due to the road or other factors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Peat impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is necessary to understand what the drawdown is likely to be in the peat and, if this is excessive in terms of the radius of influence and depth, what mitigation measures can be put into place to reduce this. The drawdown pattern and whether there is more than one aquifer horizon will depend on the type of peat. Mitigation measures include, for example, engineering the drainage ditch to have standing water (and therefore reduce the potential drawdown) but then again this might adversely affect the flood risk. SEPA will look at the trade off between positive and negative benefits.</li> </ul>	<p>A hydrogeological characterisation and assessment of the groundwater regime has been undertaken and included in Appendix 8.2.</p> <p>Groundwater monitoring has been undertaken (see Section 8.9)</p> <p>The hydrogeological effects of the scheme and the effects on peat have been assessed and are included in Chapters 7 and 8 and Appendices 7.3 and 8.2.</p> <p>Mitigation has been designed to ensure that the scheme will not increase the flood risk of the area (see Section 8.8 and Appendix 8.6)</p>
SEPA	Scott Leith	24.07.09	<p><b>Drainage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An update on the scheme was provided describing the works and that it was anticipated that draft orders and the Environmental Statement would be published in September 09</li> <li>The scheme is divided into three drainage networks namely: A; B; and C It is proposed to collect surface water run-off from the carriageway by edge of carriageway filter drains and catchpits, which would have a collecting sump. This would provide the first level of SUDS treatment</li> <li>The roundabouts and their approaches would be kerbed and these</li> </ul>	

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<p>would be drained by gullies discharging into carrier drains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The second level of treatment for Networks A and B would be a detention basin with a filter trench providing treatment for Network C. At present there is not a third level of treatment</li> <li>• The detention basins and filter trench outfall into watercourses which discharged into the River Fillan, which forms part of the River Tay SAC</li> <li>• Upon clarification that the filter drain would accept all surface water runoff along the entirety of the scheme, SEPA agreed this was an acceptable first form of treatment</li> <li>• SEPA agreed that the use of the two detention basins and the filter trench prior to discharge was an acceptable second form of treatment though a third level would be required for SEPA to approve the proposals. Owing to land constraints, SEPA suggested that an underdrain below the basins / trench would be an acceptable third form. This is a relatively new SUDS measure and the detail is not included in the SUDS Manual</li> <li>• SEPA agreed it was a similar system employed in a dry swale though would seek guidance from SEPA's SUDS expert based in their Edinburgh office, Neil McLean, with regard to obtaining a detail or further information on the underdrain and forward to Grontmij by email</li> <li>• It was agreed that an underdrain was an appropriate solution which could be adopted once the detail / further information is received from SEPA</li> </ul>	<p>SEPA's suggestion for an underdrain at the detention basins and filter trench has been incorporated into the design and this design has been used in the assessment (see Sections 8.8.1 and 8.9)</p>
			<p><b>CAR Licence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regard to the point discharges from the three drainage networks, SEPA confirmed that these would not require CAR licences as none of the networks are greater than 1km in length, however, the relevant General Binding Rules and current best practices must be adhered to</li> <li>• For the culverts, SEPA stated that if the watercourse does not appear on the 1:50,000 OS map it is considered a minor watercourse and does not require a CAR licence</li> <li>• One watercourse did appear on the 1:50,000 OS map at the end of the project (approx. chainage 1260). It was explained that this culvert has to be extended at the upstream end due to the earthworks at this point. The extension would match the characteristics of the existing (capacity, shape, slope). With this information, SEPA stated that this would not require a CAR licence as long as the relevant General Bindings Rules</li> </ul>	<p>The CAR requirements have been noted and the information included in Sections 8.4 and 8.8.2</p>

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			and design best practices are followed	
			<b>Additional Information</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was agreed that draft mitigation measures for water and drainage chapter of the ES could be sent to Sean Caswell at SEPA for comment in advance of publication of the ES</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)</b>	Darren Hemsley	24.11.06	<b>Tay Special Area of Conservation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main concerns relating to the SAC are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Control of sediment run-off onto watercourses</li> <li>Potential increase to nutrient input to the rivers which might be caused as a consequence of the road construction and operation</li> <li>The maintenance of navigable stretches for any feeder burns for the species concerned</li> </ul> </li> <li>An appropriate assessment will need to be carried out in relation to this site and information should be provided to inform this</li> <li>Where judgement is made that there is no impact to natural interests the written documents should clearly state the reasoning behind this decision in order to provide an adequate audit trail</li> </ul>	<p>The scheme has been assessed and is not considered to have a significant effect on the qualifying interests of the SAC (see Sections 8.9, 9.11 and Annex B)</p> <p>Information to inform the Appropriate Assessment has been included in Annex B</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SNH does not hold any data on species in this area and therefore the following surveys should be carried out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Badger</li> <li>Bats</li> <li>Otter</li> </ul> </li> <li>Any potential impacts from loss of local habitat or species should be assessed in relation to the LBAP process and Scottish Biodiversity Strategy</li> </ul>	<p>An initial protected species walkover survey was undertaken in March 2007 No signs of badger were identified (see Section 9.5 and 9.6.4). It was considered that no further bat surveys were required lack of suitable roosting or shelter sites in the area (see Section 9.5)</p> <p>A protected species survey was undertaken in March and April 2007 and some signs of otter identified. The information has been used to inform the EIA and no significant effects on otter are anticipated (see Section 9.6.4, 9.10, 9.11 and the Confidential Annex)</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The West Highland Way runs close by and a spur descends down Creag Bheannain into Crianlarich which is used by walkers to access hotel and transport. This will therefore be important in terms of general access provision and landscape considerations</li> </ul>	Access to the WHW would be maintained by a diversion of some 100m south and an underpass under the road. This would link in with the existing car park (see Section 6.8 and

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
				15.8)
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)</b>	Darren Hemsley	19.11.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated the peat probing works are unlikely to affect the River Tay SAC (ie unlikely to have a significant effect on the site and therefore not requiring an appropriate assessment) in any way</li> <li>The main concern would be any interference in the well-used access routes and paths out of Crianlarich but the method statement appears to confirm that this will not be an issue</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)</b>	Darren Hemsley	20.11.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any potential impacts to the River Tay SAC through the input of sediment and nutrient construction and operation</li> <li>Protected species and habitats might be affected by the development.</li> <li>Landscape and visual impacts of the proposal</li> <li>Recreation and Access impacts, especially in relation to the West Highland Way and the economic viability of Crianlarich from recreation tourism</li> </ul>	The scheme has been assessed and is not considered to have a significant effect on the qualifying interests of the SAC (see Sections 8.9, 9.11 and Annex B) Information to inform the Appropriate Assessment has been included in Annex B
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)</b>	Nicki McIntyre	17.11.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SNH is content that, provided the mitigation measures outlined are implemented, there will not be an adverse impact upon the integrity of the River Tay SAC from this proposal</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)</b>	Nicki McIntyre	07.09.09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SNH confirmed that following the proposed changes to the drainage strategy that have been incorporated into the Information to Inform the Appropriate Assessment they are still content that provided the mitigation measures outlined are implemented, there will not be an adverse effect upon the integrity of the River Tay SAC from this proposal</li> </ul>	Noted Information to inform the Appropriate Assessment has been included in Annex B
<b>Scottish Ornithological Club, Stirling</b>	Roger Gooch	22.11.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The members of the committee considered there would be very little or no disturbance to any vulnerable bird life in the area by the works shown on the map</li> <li>Noted surprise that only half a by-pass is to be built with traffic from Lix Toll direction still passing through the village, noted cost as being the only motive</li> </ul>	A breeding bird survey was undertaken between May and July and the results used to inform the EIA. No significant effects on breeding birds are anticipated (see Section 9.6.4 and 9.11 and the Confidential Annex)
<b>Scottish Water</b>	Gina Temple Customer Connections Administrator on behalf of	4.4.07	<p><b>Comments from Technical Team</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"According to our records there are existing water mains at various locations within your proposed works. At the start of the works on the southern side of the A82 the outlet and raw water inlet mains from Crianlarich service reservoir cross the existing A82 and heads north into</li> </ul>	Utilities in the area would be diverted where necessary. If any short interruptions in utilities were required during construction all residents, businesses and community facilities

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
	Technical Team		Crianlarich. These mains and also the bulk meter feeding Crianlarich will possibly require diversion and re-siting. Alterations may also be required at the proposed Southern Village Access. There is also an existing 4" main which terminates outside 11 Tyndrum Crescent. Diversion may be required to take this small section of main out of the road and into the footpath if road alignment is changing at this point."	would be notified in advance (see Section 6.8.1)
<b>Scottish Water</b>	Laurajne Taylor 419 Balmore Rd Glasgow G22 6NU	17.07.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are Scottish Water Assets in the area that may be affected by the proposed development and it is essential that these are protected from risk of contamination or damage</li> <li>• A detailed method statement and risk assessment must be submitted to Scottish Water</li> <li>• Every effort must be made to reduce the risk of soil erosion and pollution from oils etc during and after the construction stage</li> <li>• All structures must be a minimum distance of 10m from the nearest water main</li> <li>• All structures must be a minimum distance of 3m or depth plus 1mk whichever is greater from the nearest sewer</li> <li>• No stationary plant, equipment, scaffolding, construction or excavated material should be placed over or close to any Scottish Water Assets</li> <li>• Special care must be taken to avoid covering or filling any Scottish Water assets. Arrangements for altering the levels of any chambers must be made in agreement with Scottish Water and constructed in accordance with their specifications. The developer will have to cover costs of this work</li> <li>• Excavation or pumping should not be carried out in the proximity of the water main without due notice having been given to Scottish Water.</li> <li>• Special care should be taken to prevent the removal of ground support systems at the outside of bends on any pipework., If exposed they must be re-supported and covered according to Scottish Waters requirements</li> <li>• Full information must be provided to Scottish Water on all proposals for piling or other construction methods that may create vibrations in pipelines or ancillary apparatus. Methods of construction must adhere to accepted Scottish Water standards in order to minimise vibrations and their effects on the pipelines which could create damage or leakage</li> <li>• Temporary protection should be provided where construction plant crosses Scottish Water apparatus to spread the weight on water pipes and sewers to within safe working limits</li> <li>• The flow of water mains or water pipes should not be interrupted</li> </ul>	Utilities in the area would be diverted where necessary. If any short interruptions in utilities were required during construction all residents, businesses and community facilities would be notified in advance (see Section 6.8.1)

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to Scottish Water assets must be maintained at all times</li> <li>• Free discharge of scours should not be interfered with</li> <li>• Scottish Water or representatives should be allowed to inspect protection measures for pipelines and check if Scottish Water special protection measures are being observed</li> <li>• The EIA should highlight mitigation measures to ensure minimum pollution to watercourses/bodies</li> <li>• A Development Impact Assessment Form must be filled in</li> </ul>	
<b>Scotways</b>	Jo Doake Assistant Secretary	14.11.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The National Catalogue of Rights of Way show: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CS374, a link off the West Highland Way into the Village, in the vicinity of the new route; and</li> <li>○ CS316 to the west and north and has an underpass already allocated to it</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There may be other informal rights of way in the area that have not been recorded</li> <li>• There are now general access rights under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003</li> </ul>	Access to the WHW would be maintained by a diversion of some 100m south and an underpass under the road. This would link in with the existing car park (see Section 6.8 and 15.8)
<b>Scotways</b>	Jo Doake Assistant Secretary	19.11.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is worth being aware of core paths, currently being prepared by local authorities as part of their duties under the Land Reform Scotland Act 2003</li> </ul>	Information noted
<b>SEERAD</b>	Lynda Marshall	11.04.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After consultation with their area officer - no comments</li> </ul>	
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Kate Smithson Roads Manager (Transport Development), Environment Services	21.3.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting to discuss the potential integration of a transport interchange into a bypass scheme</li> <li>• Stirling Council have commissioned a report into the provision of a bus interchange in either Crianlarich or Tyndrum for implementation ASAP</li> <li>• Noted that the timing of the construction of the bypass did not seem to suite Stirling Council as they are looking to put something in sooner than 2010. However, long term may lead to incorporation of interchange in the bypass so some sort of partnership cannot be ruled out</li> </ul>	The effect of the scheme on other consented schemes in the area has been assessed and no significant effects are predicted (see Section 5.7)
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Kate Smithson	06.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council is keen to have direct access off the bypass to any future transport interchange</li> <li>• The council has commissioned a report which recommended an interchange at Crianlarich rather than Tyndrum which faced local opposition</li> </ul>	

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The whole Crianlarich community favoured a transport interchange located in the vicinity of the railway station</li> <li>The council believed the construction of the interchange and the bypass should proceed at the same time.</li> <li>There are potential sources of finance for the project</li> <li>Stirling Council asked Transport Scotland to comment on the acceptability of providing a T-junction access on to the bypass for a interchange</li> <li>Stirling Council confirmed the draft core paths plan was being finalised</li> <li>Planning issues such as zoning or consented developments were covered for LLTNP</li> <li>The railway bridge on the Tyndrum road (existing A82) would benefit from being lit. SNH should be consulted if lighting is proposed</li> </ul>	
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Arthur Law	05.12.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no current noise complaints/issues in Crianlarich and that the dominant noise source throughout the village is road traffic, although there will be an input from rail traffic, both passenger and freight.</li> <li>Noted there is no industry, as such, in the area however there is some intermodal transfer of timber from road to rail at the railway siding at Crianlarich Station which has raised noise issues previously, particularly from idling freight locomotives late at night. This problem was addressed by EWS Rail and there has been no recurrence of complaints.</li> <li>Although the current Local Plan was formulated by Stirling Council its implementation is now the responsibility of the National Park Authority and any comments should be sought from them (included the address and contact details).</li> </ul>	Information noted and used to inform the EIA (see Chapter 13)
		10.07.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed approach to the noise assessment for the ES</li> <li>Noise could be managed through good liaison with the local community</li> </ul>	Information noted and used to inform the EIA (see Section 13.7)
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Lorna Main	11.04.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refers to original consultation email dated 16.11.06</li> <li>Has re-read the original Kirkdale report from 1994 and notes that although it concentrated on two other bypass routes, some work was done on the western route, although this was limited by the presence of forestry plantations. No new sites have been recorded in the area which would require the original survey to be redone.</li> <li>Two sites of particular interest were noted on the west - the 18<sup>th</sup> century military road and bridge (site 23), which should be avoided, and a possible fortification (site 24) which lies in woodland and may not be affected the route of the new road. If either were to be affected I would expect a suitable scheme of mitigation to be proposed.</li> </ul>	Information noted and used to inform the EIA (see Chapter 11)

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Lorna Main	17.02.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stirling Council is happy with the draft gazetteer and mitigation proposed and has nothing to add</li> <li>If there are any artefacts which merit recovery then liaise with Elspeth King at the Smith Museum in Stirling to see if she is interested in acquiring them</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Lorna Main	02.05.08	<p>Additional potential Cultural Heritage sites identified by the Forestry Commission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees with the recommendation that field evaluation as a first stage on sites 6 and 7 with the further option of additional investigation or a watching brief if required along with additional documentary research. Re site 2 is this worth a section?</li> <li>Re sites 5, 9, 11 and 13 can I assume that these are either not affected by the bypass or they are not archaeological?</li> </ul>	Information noted and used to inform the EIA (see Chapter 11)
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Lorna Main	30.05.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation that the methodology and mitigation put forward for the additional sites is satisfactory</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Kate Smithson Angus Kennedy Raymond Travers	13.11.08	<p><b>Scheme Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was confirmed that the bypass is approximately 1.3km in length. It is single carriageway, 7.3 metres wide with 1 metre hardstrips and a minimum 2.5 metre wide "soft" verges. There are two roundabout junctions, towards the extremities of the scheme, which will be lit</li> <li>An underpass will be built to facilitate walkers using the West Highway Way Spur. The road proposals will require a minor re-alignment of the current "Right of Way"</li> <li>The scheme was progressing towards the publication of draft Orders and the Environmental Statement possibly in the next month, however, this was still subject to confirmation</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport Interchange</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Scotland stated it wasn't possible to provide a T-junction access on to the bypass for a transport interchange, however, the de-trunking of the A82 road (Glenfalloch Road) would assist any future siting of any transport interchange along this road. Transport Scotland also indicated that the timber yard adjacent to the railway station was up for sale</li> </ul> <p><b>Detrunked Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stirling Council mentioned that the "hand-over" condition of the de-trunked section of road (Glenfalloch Road) was of particular interest to</li> </ul>	<p>Stirling Council confirmed that the preferred location of the interchange was now Tyndrum</p> <p>Transport Scotland indicated that this was likely to be an issue for himself,</p>

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<p>trunked section of road (Glenfalloch Road) was of particular interest to them</p> <p><b>Cyclists / Pedestrians</b> It was indicated that the scheme proposals facilitated cyclists and pedestrians through both roundabouts and asked if there was any further news on the implementation of the Glen Dochart Cycle Route</p> <p><b>Other Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport Scotland indicated that the scheme was likely to produce in the region of 90,000m<sup>3</sup> of excess material and asked if SC knew of any possible disposal locations</li> <li>• Stirling Council asked if there are any plans for the “Gateway Features” at the entrances to Crianlarich village within the scheme proposals</li> <li>• Stirling Council indicated that it had its own compost making operation should any compost material be needed for site operations</li> <li>• RJT handed over a draft copy of drawing nos. P346600/100/0100/023F General Layout (engineering drawing) and P346600/100/0100/029A General Layout (colour plan) to KS</li> </ul>	<p>John Withers (Network Manager – Transport Scotland) and Transerv</p> <p>Stirling Council offered to try and find out about this</p> <p>Transport Scotland stated that nothing had been decided about these at present Noted</p>
<b>Stirling Council</b>	Kay Bryson	26.11.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no additional private abstractions that the authority has been made aware of since we did the Water Features Survey in April</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>Strathfillan Community Council</b>	Moir Robertson (public meeting attendees)	09.08.07	<p><b>List of Concerns with existing situation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic Speeds on downhill (northbound) A82 approach to village</li> <li>• Accidents and delays at “S-bend” rail bridge</li> <li>• Traffic Calming is required (speed cameras were mentioned as a deterrent, but the policeman explained that he had been told there were no suitable sites)</li> </ul> <p><b>List of Concerns over a Bypass</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Isolating” Tyndrum Terrace between two trunk roads</li> <li>• Noise impact of the new road, due to higher speeds</li> <li>• Loss of business, due to limited access to the village</li> <li>• HGV movements all pass via A85 anyway</li> <li>• Why not just widen/replace the “S-bend” rail bridge?</li> <li>• Traffic lights on “S-bend” rail bridge could be a short-term fix</li> <li>• Land take may deter future development of the village restricting growth</li> <li>• A roundabout between the A82 and A85 may cause long queues which</li> </ul>	<p>The scheme has been designed to minimise effects to the local community as far as possible. Where the design could not be altered (e.g. due to engineering constraints) additional mitigation has been included to minimise potential impacts (see relevant chapters and Appendix C). An assessment of the residual effects on the local community has been undertaken (see Sections 4.3, 4.4, 6.8, 10.9, Appendix 10.1, 12.913.8, 14.9, 15.8 and 16.8)</p>

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<p>would back-up through the village (computer modelling would not capture all eventualities)</p> <p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local business owners have written to the local newsletter expressing their opposition to a bypass</li> <li>• It was requested that Transport Scotland investigate the cost of replacing the “S-bend” rail bridge</li> <li>• If no bypass is constructed then some form of traffic calming is required to slow the traffic</li> <li>• The local policeman has never witnessed/attended and accident at the other rail bridge but has attended numerous accidents at the “S-bend” rail bridge</li> <li>• Consultation with SCC would continue, but most likely be in 4-6 months time</li> <li>• Point of contact should remain as John Riley (who appeared at the meeting for 5 minutes but had to give his apologies), but copy to Moira Robertson</li> </ul>	
<b>Strathfillan Community Council</b>	Isla Craig	15.06.08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Community Council are extremely concerned that the proposed route is far too close to the housing at Willow Brae, Willow Square and Tyndrum Terrace – in many cases just a few metres from the ends of their gardens. Just how close the proposed route is to these houses has become particularly apparent following the drilling work recently carried out by your contractors</li> <li>• As you will be aware, Crianlarich is a small, fairly remote, rural village. People who live here value the peace and tranquillity of the area, as well as the open outlook from most homes. The route as currently proposed will sandwich these houses between the trunk roads of the A82 and A85, exposing the residents to significant noise and traffic pollution day and night</li> <li>• The proximity of the proposed bypass to these houses was discussed in some detail at the public meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2007, attended by Mark Connelly and Grant Keys, and our concerns were raised at this meeting</li> <li>• Throughout the project the Community Council have asked to be involved in the design of the route, and been given assurances that we will be. However, it seems that these assurances were empty promises, as the views on the route expressed at the public meeting have been</li> </ul>	Information has been noted and a meeting to be scheduled to address concerns where possible and explain the scheme and mitigation measures proposed

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<p>largely disregarded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We ask that you review the proposed route as a matter of some urgency, and before the draft plans are published, in order to find a route which is acceptable to the residents of our community</li> <li>The Community Council wish to remain closely involved with the design of the route, and will be happy to provide you with any further information or assistance which you may need</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Strathfillan Community Council (Meeting to provide information to the Community Council and understand their concerns)</b></p>	<p>Isla Craig Cameron Taylor John Riley Moir Robertson Bruce Crawford (MSP)</p>	<p>13.11.08</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CC indicated that there are sections of the A82 route more in need of upgrade than Crianlarich, so why is the bypass being promoted before these sections?</li> <li>The CC stated that the bypass has been 'talked about' since the 1930s but has never been taken forward to completion. The CC is reluctant to take plans to the village and begin discussion if the bypass is to be "shelved" as appears to have happened in the past.</li> <li>The CC has concerns over the proximity of the bypass to the village, in particular to Willow Brae and Tyndrum Terrace. It asked why the route could not be moved west further into the Ewich Forest so that it was better screened from the village.</li> <li>It was noted by the CC that the route presented at this meeting was further away from Tyndrum Terrace and Willow Brae than the route they had anticipated when the Ground Investigation (GI) Works was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<p>Transport Scotland (TS) responded that the whole of the A82 route was under review but the Crianlarich Bypass (along with the Pulpit Rock scheme) were in Transport Scotland's current Scottish Motorway and Trunk Road Programme.</p> <p>TS assured the CC that there is a commitment to build the scheme, which is currently programmed for completion in financial year 2011/2012. However, this timescale is subject to future review.</p> <p>TS/ Natural Capital (NC) explained that an alternative route through the forest had been investigated, however, it was considered that the topography of the area would make construction very difficult and expensive and the resulting adverse impact on the landscape of the area (within Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park) would be much more severe than the current route</p> <p>TS explained that the GI Works covered the width of the route "footprint" and not just the actual carriageway. NC further explained that the route had been designed to minimise the impacts on the houses and mitigation had been included in</p>

Consultee	Name	Date	Information/Comments	Response/Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="757 587 1581 643">• The CC asked if better footway provision would be included in the scheme for properties at the southern edge of the village</li> <li data-bbox="757 727 1581 866">• The CC expressed concern that the bypass would remove vital trade from businesses in the village (shop, cafe etc). They recognised that the community would have to approach the National Park for plans to develop and improve facilities within Crianlarich but wanted to know what signage would be included in the scheme for existing Crianlarich services</li> <li data-bbox="757 951 1581 1007">• The CC asked if there was provision in the scheme for a transport interchange opposite the railway station</li> <li data-bbox="757 1091 1581 1147">• Grontmij stated that Scottish Citylink bus operators had indicated that they would still stop in the village after the bypass was completed</li> <li data-bbox="757 1152 1581 1224">• TS stated that the current programme was to publish draft Orders and the ES in late October 2008 after which there would be a public exhibition of the scheme proposals</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1608 312 2013 584">the form of bunds and fences to screen the properties from noise and visual impacts. It was also explained that although there would be an increase in noise at the back of these properties (which is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES)) there would be a decrease at the front resulting from the reduction in traffic on the Tyndrum Road</p> <p data-bbox="1608 588 2013 727">TS confirmed that a new footway would extend to facilitate Stronua Cottage and would provide better provision than the existing gravel path.</p> <p data-bbox="1608 732 2013 948">TS explained that Crianlarich village would be sign posted from the bypass but that it was not in its remit to sign individual businesses. Crianlarich would still get passing trade from the A85 traffic and cyclists would be encouraged (by provision of cycle lanes) to go through the village.</p> <p data-bbox="1608 952 2013 1224">TS confirmed that the interchange was not part of the scheme but that it did not prevent such a facility being constructed and that once the A82 (Glenfalloch Road) was de-trunked it would be easier to get permission for an access directly on to Glenfalloch Road. TS indicated that the interchange was a matter for Stirling Council.</p>
<b>Tay District Salmon Fisheries Board</b>		13.04.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="757 1238 1032 1262">• No comment to make</li> </ul>	