

## Appendix A2.2: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Monitoring Framework

**Table 1: SEA References**

A9 Dualling Programme – SEA Monitoring Framework – Design Section Constraints	
A9 Design Section – South	Design Project – Killiecrankie to Glen Garry (approx. 21.6km)
<p><b>SEA References:</b>                      SEA Environmental Report – Section 5                      Environmental Report Addendum – Section 3, Section 4 and:                      Appendix B (Detailed Assessment Matrices, Sections B1) – Appendix C (Revised GIS Mapping – Ancient Woodland Inventory)                      Appendix D (Indicative Junction Locations Constraints Review Tables) – Appendix E (Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) and Programme-level Appropriate Assessment (AA) Report)                      Appendix F (Strategic Landscape Review) – Appendix G (Strategic Flood Risk Assessment)</p>	

**Table 2: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Monitoring Framework**

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
Special Area of Conservation (SAC)	River Tay SAC Approx. crossing refs.: NN825657	Refer to ER Addendum Appendix E, HRA and Programme-level AA Report.  Embed range of strategic principles on biodiversity, and avoidance of SAC site boundaries and impacts wherever possible.	Secure early consultation with Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling Environmental Steering Group (ESG)) to agree project level HRA Screening requirements for crossings of, and drainage to, the River Tay SAC.  Consultation with SNH to determine alternative alignment option impacts on River Tay designations, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.	Project level HRA/AA must be completed and agreed with SNH in advance of DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement finalisation to inform final preferred alignment design.  To include means to address potential spillage, run-off, pollution and sedimentation/hydrological risks/effects on river geomorphology, with mitigation, management plans and exclusion zones /timescales for qualifying species.	Regular meetings with the ESG, which includes SNH, have been held and SNH has been consulted for specific topic items such as the HRA approach.  Baseline data gathering required for DMRB Stage 2 was agreed through the forum of the ESG and compiled in an Outline Approach to Consistency in A9 Ecology Survey Extents document.	Regular meetings with the ESG, which includes SNH, have been held and SNH has been consulted for specific topic items such as the HRA approach.  SNH provided comments on a draft of the HRA prior to finalisation of the ES.
	Crossing on the approach to Pitagowan/ House of Bruar travelling north from Killiecrankie NN891642	Any crossings of the River Tay SAC, or encroachment upon the SAC boundaries, will require consideration via project level HRA.  Drainage/SuDS outfalls to the River Tay SAC, and its tributaries are also likely to require consideration via project level HRA.	SNH consultation to advise requirements for surveys and mitigation for qualifying interest species and means to address pollution/ sedimentation risks and effects on river geomorphology, to inform the approach to more detailed Appropriate Assessment, as required to support DMRB Stage 3 detailed design and Environmental Statement.	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation or compensatory works required.	TDSFB have been consulted and their data included in our DMRB Stage 2 assessment. Advice from TDSFB is that there is a large pool used by Atlantic salmon immediately upstream of the Essangal Crossing. This information has been reflected in the assessment of option impacts.	DMRB Stage 3 assessments detailed in the ES were informed by DMRB Stage 2 assessments, further surveys and liaison with the appropriate consultees (including TDSFB, SNH and SEPA) and input from various disciplines (including geomorphology and hydrogeology). Mitigation workshops have included consideration of outfall design to avoid adverse effects on site integrity. Chapter 7 (Scoping and Consultation) and the accompanying appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses) provides further information regarding consultation
	NN848653	Should include consultation with Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) and Tay District Salmon Fisheries Board (TDSFB) on	SEPA should be included in discussion on levels of SuDS treatment, CAR		A minimum of two levels of SuDS will generally be included for all mainline road drainage prior to discharge to receiving watercourses, as agreed with SEPA and SNH. Three levels will be considered for designated	
	NN845656					
	NN836656					

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
	<p>NN825657</p>	<p>drainage, SuDS and CAR aspects.</p> <p>Refer to SNH's River Tay SAC advice to developers at:</p> <p><a href="http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/publications/designatedareas/River%20Tay%20SA_C.pdf">http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/publications/designatedareas/River%20Tay%20SA_C.pdf</a></p>	<p>requirements and opportunities to improve crossings for fish passage (eg. flood risk implications).</p> <p>TDSFB should be included in terms of protected species/spawning beds, etc.</p>		<p>sites where practicable, in agreement with SNH.</p> <p>Geomorphological input will inform the design of watercourse crossing structures, any necessary channel realignment and outfall location, at DMRB Stage 3.</p> <p>Opportunities to improve/maintain fish passage through culverts will be undertaken at DMRB Stage 3.</p> <p>CAR authorisation requirements will be discussed and agreed with SEPA at DMRB Stage 3.</p>	<p>with TDSFB, SNH and SEPA.</p> <p>Two levels of SuDS will generally be included for all mainline road drainage prior to discharge to receiving watercourses, with the exception of a small number of constrained locations where alternative run-off collection measures will be implemented (<b>Mitigation Items P05-W41, P05-W42 and P05-W43</b>).</p> <p>Applications and discussions on CAR authorisation undertaken with SEPA will be undertaken during detailed design, through the CAR application process (<b>Mitigation Item SMC-W1</b>).</p> <p>The construction of the proposed scheme will be required to comply with all relevant environmental legislation and protection such as the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011, relevant Pollution Prevention Guidelines (PPGs) aimed at managing run-off, accidental spillage and sediment release and other good practice guidance (<b>Mitigation Items SMC-W4, SMC-W6, SMC-W7, SMC-W8 and SMC-W9</b>).</p> <p>Essangal crossing designs have been informed by multidisciplinary discussions to minimise implications for the SAC. See Appendix A7.2 for consultation undertaken with regards to the Essangal Crossing design.</p> <p>Culvert designs to improve/maintain fish passage were informed by DMRB Stage 3 surveys and assessments and designs were refined through discussion with various disciplines (including geomorphology, hydrology and structures).</p>

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
						<p>Input to the HRA included a geomorphological assessment of the River Garry which involved considering the geomorphological processes and characteristics that influence the physical habitat conditions supporting SAC qualifying species.</p> <p>Geomorphological input has been provided throughout the design process, including influencing the positioning of outfalls, SuDs features and bridge design. Geomorphological input has also been integral to the design of minor watercourse crossings and associated diversions.</p>
Special Area of Conservation (SAC)	Tulach Hill and Glen Fender Meadows SAC	Refer to ER Addendum Appendix E, HRA and Programme-level AA Report 200m wide corridor encroaches on site boundary at approx. ref.: NN870647 and between NN859651 and NN852651.	Secure early consultation with SNH and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to agree project level HRA Screening requirements for the Tulach Hill SAC.  Consultation with SNH to determine alternative alignment option impacts on Tulach Hill designations, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.	Project level HRA/AA must be completed and agreed with SNH in advance of DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement finalisation to inform final preferred alignment design DMRB Stage 3 report will also require separate consideration of impacts on, and mitigation for the SSSI designation, including any SSSI consents required.	Strategic principles have been applied to the DMRB Stage 2 assessment. The DMRB Stage 2 route options do not encroach on the SAC site boundaries.  The DMRB Stage 2 HRA has included Tulach Hill and Glen Fender Meadows SAC.	Regular meetings with the ESG, which includes SNH, have been held and SNH has been consulted regarding the HRA approach. A summary of each meeting is provided in Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses).
	Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Tulach Hill SSSI	Embed range of strategic principles on biodiversity and avoiding land take from designated sites where possible.  Avoidance of site boundary removes risk of direct impact; however, consult with SNH on risks to sensitive species, e.g. disturbance or pollution risks.	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation or compensatory works required.	The Tulach Hill and Glen Fender Meadows SAC will be included in the DMRB Stage 3 HRA.	SNH provided comments on a draft of the HRA prior to finalisation of the ES.  The DMRB Stage 3 design of the proposed scheme does not encroach on the SAC site boundaries.  The Tulach Hill and Glen Fender Meadows SAC was assessed in the DMRB Stage 3 HRA. As part of the Programme Level Appropriate Assessment (AA), SNH has advised that none of the qualifying interests present in the Glen Fender Meadows part of the site would be affected by the A9 dualling programme. Mitigation design for other features (e.g., reptile habitats) and compensation for features such as ancient woodland has included consideration of the conservation

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
						objectives of this SAC ( <b>Mitigation Items P05-E35, P05-E38 and P05-E50</b> ),
<b>Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Aldclune and Invervack Meadows SSSI	<p>Multiple site designation.</p> <p>Current A9 crosses site in vicinity of Aldclune junction, approx. ref.: NN891642 – next to the River Garry (River Tay SAC) crossing.</p> <p>SNH have highlighted access issue concerns as existing access at approx. ref.: NN839657 may be closed.</p> <p>Given its proximity to the road in a number of locations, there is potential for direct losses of SSSI habitat.</p> <p>SNH are likely to consider any losses of SSSI habitat as significant adverse effects on the Aldclune and Invervack Meadows SSSI sites.</p>	<p>Secure early consultation with SNH and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on these SSSI site locations, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.</p> <p>Determine potential requirements for additional studies and surveys related to SuDS and drainage into the SSSI, the avoidance and minimisation of habitat impacts, and guidance on SSSI consents, alternative access arrangements and mitigation or compensation works requirements.</p> <p>Embed range of strategic principles on biodiversity, and avoiding land take from designated sites and consider opportunities to provide wildlife crossing opportunities to secure multi-species benefit where possible.</p>	<p>Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation or compensatory works required.</p> <p>Where habitat compensation is not achievable in situ, Environmental Statement should identify where compensation will be delivered.</p> <p>Stage 3 reports will also require separate consideration of impacts on, and mitigation for the SSSI designation, including any SSSI consents required.</p>	<p>Strategic principles have been applied to the DMRB Stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>Regular meetings with the ESG, which includes SNH, have been held and included consultation on alignment option impacts on SSSIs.</p> <p>The drainage design will continue to be developed and assessed in detail as part of early work at DMRB Stage 3. This will include review of options to refine shape and position, type of treatment proposed and further consultation with statutory consultees.</p> <p>Potential mitigation outlined at DMRB Stage 2 to account for loss of terrestrial habitat includes enhancement of existing habitat. Details will be further developed at DMRB Stage 3.</p>	<p>Regular meetings with the ESG, which includes SNH, have been held and included consultation on alignment option implications for SSSIs. A summary of each meeting is provided in Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses).</p> <p>SNH were consulted on the mitigation and management strategy/habitat restoration plan for areas of the SSSI where land take from the proposed scheme is required (<b>Mitigation Item P05-E18</b>).</p> <p>DMRB Stage 3 assessments detailed in the ES were informed by DMRB Stage 2 assessments, further surveys and liaison with the appropriate consultees (including SNH and SEPA) and input from various disciplines (including geomorphology and hydrogeology).</p> <p>Degradation of SSSI habitat will be mitigated by the implementation of standard mitigation commitments including those relating to dust and other pollution protection measures (<b>Mitigation Item P05-E18</b>).</p> <p>Mitigation design for other features such as reptile habitat; and the location of compensation planting for ancient woodland, has taken into account the requirements for maintaining or improving the conservation status of this SSSI (<b>Mitigation Items P05-E35, P05-</b></p>

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
						<b>E38 and P05-E50).</b>
<b>Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Glen Garry Geological SSSI	A9 runs through Glen Garry SSSI and the A9 and River Garry GCR sites at various locations (multi-site designations) SSSI and GCR designations consist of various rock exposure/ A9 cuttings sites.  Embed range of strategic principles on geodiversity and avoidance of designated site boundaries where possible SNH guidance is to avoid additional cuttings through these sites if possible; however, if unavoidable, dualling works should result in exposures of equal or better quality for geodiversity interest.	Secure early consultation with SNH and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on these SSSI and GCR sites, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.  Consultation with SNH should also consider Ancient Woodland constraints in the vicinity of the SSSI/ GCR sites.  SNH also keen to see provision of lay-by(s) and safe crossing(s) in this stretch as any unavoidable exposures will be of geodiversity (study) interest.  Consider opportunities to provide wildlife crossing opportunities to secure multi-species benefit Stage 2 will also require consideration of any SSSI consents required to inform DMRB Stage 3.	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation or compensatory works required.  Where exposures are unavoidable, Environmental Statement should include guidance (agreed with SNH) on mitigation measures to ensure an equal or better standard of provision, including any rock cutting and landscape treatment required.	All DMRB Stage 2 route options developed for Project 6 would directly affect Glen Garry SSSI and GCR designations which is unavoidable.  SNH and BGS have been consulted and have suggested that mitigation through the provision of fresh exposures can potentially offset any effects. Profiles may be required to ensure safeguarding of features of geological importance.  Opportunities to view the Glen Garry SSSI and A9 and River Garry GCR rock exposures has been considered at DMRB Stage 2 as part of the positioning of proposed lay-bys on the A9 mainline and this will be further developed at DMRB Stage 3 through any refinement of proposed lay-by locations.	Consultation with SNH and BGS has been undertaken at DMRB Stage 3 regarding the potential impacts of the proposed scheme on Glen Garry SSSI. A summary of this consultation is provided in Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses).  Chapter 10 (Geology, Soils, Contaminated Land and Groundwater) assess the impacts on the Glen Garry SSSI and GCR sites and recommends mitigation measures ( <b>Mitigation Item P05-G17</b> ) following discussions with SNH and BGS.
<b>Geological Conservation Review Site (GCR)</b>	A9 and River Garry GCR					
<b>Ancient Woodland (of semi-natural origin)</b>	1 x AW (SNO) Wood ID 17553 NN783671 (Category 1a & 2a)  c. 10x AWI (SNO) (Category 1a & 2a)	A mixture of AWI woodlands lie to both sides of the existing A9 in this section.  Embed range of strategic principles on biodiversity, woodland and avoidance where possible.  However, as much of this section is bordered by AWI woodlands on both sides, secondary aim must be to minimise losses and fragmentation where woodlands are unavoidable.	Secure early consultation with SNH and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on all AWI woodlands, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.  Determine potential requirements for additional surveys and studies where AWI woodlands are unavoidable and where compensation may be required.  Consider mechanisms to provide compensatory habitat solutions that will deliver an equal or greater amount of habitat to the standard of that which is lost.  Ancient Woodland Inventory mapping should be supplemented with Native Woodland Survey of Scotland (NWSS)	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation or compensatory works required.  Where AWI woods are unavoidable, aim to minimise fragmentation and maintain woodland integrity.  Cumulative woodland impact to include woodland edge effects.  Where habitat compensation is not achievable in situ, Environmental Statement should identify where compensation will be delivered.	Regular meetings with the ESG have been held. Consultation with SNH has been undertaken during ESG meetings.  Requirements for additional surveys of ancient woodland sites have been determined.  Compensatory habitat solutions will be considered in detail at DMRB Stage 3.  AWI mapping has been supplemented with NWSS data at DMRB Stage 2.	Regular meetings with the ESG have been held and there has been further consultation with SNH regarding woodland loss and planting including AWI. Further information on consultation is provided in Chapter 7 (Consultation and Scoping) and Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses).  An assessment of the impact of the proposed scheme on ancient woodland sites has been undertaken as discussed in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation) and Chapter 13 (Landscape). Woodland edge effects and measures to minimise fragmentation have been taken into consideration in woodland planting mitigation ( <b>Mitigation Items P05-</b>
<b>Ancient Woodland (Roy)</b>	1 x AW (Roy) Wood ID 17554 NN791666 (Category 3)					

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
<b>Ancient (Long established of plantation origin)</b>	1x AWI (LEPO) (Category 1b) Wood ID: 17941  Approx. ref.: NN868651 to NN860653  (between A9 and Blair Atholl)	conservation value.	data.			<p><b>E39, P05-E44 and P05-E47).</b></p> <p>Chapter 8 (People and Communities - Community and Private Assets) considers the risk of windthrow and exposing new woodland edges. The wind damage risk status is assessed to be low for all forest coupes.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts on loss of woodland including areas of AWI have also been considered and are discussed further in Chapter 20 (Cumulative Impacts). Compensatory habitat solutions have been considered in detail at DMRB Stage 3 and have been informed by discussions with landscape architects and use of the woodland connectivity tool. To identify suitable areas for planting, this tool has been used along with consideration of other factors such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• landscape requirements;</li> <li>• objectives for maintaining and enhancing permeability for species using woodland; and</li> <li>• the conservation objectives of adjacent designated sites that are designated for features other than woodland.</li> </ul> <p>Figure 13.5 (Chapter 13, Landscape) provides proposed ecological and landscape mitigation which includes, but is not limited to, compensatory planting areas and areas of woodland to be retained.</p>
	<b>Historic Environment including Unscheduled Archaeology</b>	Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes identified by SEA	Unscheduled archaeology was outwith the scope of route-wide SEA studies and should be considered at an early stage in consultation with Historic Environment Scotland and the relevant Local Authority archaeology	Secure early consultation with Historic Scotland, CNPA and Local Authority archaeology or heritage team and obtain historic environment records to determine the location of any locally important sites and features.  Route alignment studies to be informed	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation required for unscheduled archaeology.	Undesignated archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscape have been considered in the DMRB Stage 2 assessment. Consultation was undertaken with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and Perth & Kinross



**A9 Dualling Programme: Killiecrankie to Glen Garry**  
**DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement**  
**Appendix A2.2: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Monitoring Framework**



SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
	are discussed below	teams.  Cairngorms National Park Authority (CNPA) also have an interest in non-designated historic features and gardens within the Park boundaries.	by consultations to avoid such sites in the first instance, and to determine scope of further studies where avoidance is not possible.		Heritage Trust.	CNPA as part of the ESG. A description of the detailed consultation undertaken at DMRB Stage 3 is provided in Chapter 7 (Consultation and Scoping) which is accompanied by Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses).  Avoidance of undesignated assets has been undertaken where possible, and where avoidance has not been possible, suitable mitigation strategies have been identified ( <b>Mitigation Items P05-CH2 to P05-CH15</b> ).
<b>Scheduled Monuments (SM)</b>	Old Faskally Farm, church  Approx. ref.: NN918631	This SM lies outwith the 200m wide corridor – no direct impact expected; however, may have to be included in terms of visual impact on historic sites/receptors/setting.  Embed range of strategic principles on historic environment and avoidance where possible.	Secure early consultation with Historic Environment Scotland and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on this heritage feature, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.  Seek agreement on whether or not additional studies are required for DMRB Stage 3 assessment of visual impact/impact on setting.	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation required.	No DMRB Stage 2 options developed for Project 05 will impact on this asset.	The proposed scheme does not impact on this Scheduled Monument.
<b>Scheduled Monuments (SM)</b>	Clach na h'Iobairt, standing stone  300m E of Pitagowan  Approx. ref.: NN876652	This SM lies within the 200m wide corridor and may be directly affected by dualling.  Dualling alignment will be informed by location of a new River Garry (River Tay SAC) crossing at approx. ref.: NN825657.  Need to balance SM issues with River Tay SAC and flood plain constraints.  Embed range of strategic principles on historic environment and avoidance where possible Aim to avoid	Secure early consultation with Historic Environment Scotland and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on this heritage feature, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.  Where avoidance is not possible within the 200m online corridor, DMRB Stage 2 alignment studies should consider local alternatives outwith the 200m corridor.  Embed strategic principles approach to avoid where possible, and discuss Scheduled Monument consent requirements with Historic Environment	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken, assessment of impacts on features and their setting, appropriate mitigation measures and any construction stage monitoring required, to the satisfaction of Historic Scotland.	Secure early consultation with Historic Environment Scotland and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on this heritage feature, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.  Where avoidance is not possible within the 200m online corridor, DMRB Stage 2 alignment studies should consider local alternatives outwith the 200m corridor.  Embed strategic principles approach to avoid, and discuss Scheduled Monument consent requirements with Historic Environment Scotland should	Chapter 4 (Iterative Design Development) outlines that potential impacts on a number of cultural heritage assets have been avoided or reduced through iterative design process. Earlier alignments during DMRB Stage 3 were refined such that the final design avoids the Scheduled Monument completely.  There are no significant impacts on the standing stone during construction or operation of the proposed scheme. There will be a Slight impact on the setting of the standing stone. Protection measures will be put in place during construction to avoid accidental damage to the Scheduled

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
		direct impacts on SM and maximise clearance between heritage features and dualling works.	Scotland should this feature prove unavoidable.		this feature prove unavoidable.	Monument ( <b>Mitigation Item P05-CH11</b> ).
<b>Battlefields Listed Building LB (Cat B)</b>	Killiecrankie Battlefield	<p>Site extends from existing Pass of Killiecrankie dual carriageway to Aldclune junction at the River Garry (River Tay SAC) crossing.</p> <p>Existing A9 single carriageway dissects the battlefield site.</p> <p>All dualling alignment and junction options within the battlefield site require detailed engagement with Historic Scotland, Local Authority archaeology team, CNPA, SNH and other relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Embed range of strategic principles on historic environment, landscape and avoidance where possible.</p>	<p>Secure early consultation with Historic Scotland, PKC, CNPA and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on the battlefield site, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.</p> <p>Will also require detailed engagement on junction options, unscheduled archaeology and potential mitigation and compensation measures.</p> <p>Also Ancient Woodland issues within the battlefield site – embed strategic principles approach to avoid where possible.</p> <p>Also requires detailed consideration of drainage and SuDS provisions within the overall footprint.</p> <p>Seek early agreement on additional studies/investigations required for DMRB Stage 3, including assessment of landscape and visual impacts, impact on setting and battlefield interpretation.</p>	<p>Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken, assessment of impacts on battlefield features, their setting and interpretation, appropriate mitigation measures and any construction stage monitoring required, to the satisfaction of Historic Scotland, CNPA and other relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>All DMRB Stage 2 options developed for Project 05 would directly affect the battlefield through removal of any present archaeological remains and changes to topography. Temporary noise/visual intrusion and topographical changes to battlefield was also identified.</p> <p>Presence of junction would also impact on how the battlefield would be experienced by southbound drivers,</p> <p>Landform and road alignment necessitates that SuDS are located within the battlefield area. SuDS basins preferred over swales within the battlefield area due to lower land take and lower visibility. SuDS provisions in this area have been discussed with the ESG.</p> <p>Broad recommendations for mitigation were presented.</p>	<p>Regular consultation with HES has been undertaken and a presentation on Killiecrankie Battlefield was given at the ESG (September 2016). Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses) provides further details of the discussion undertaken during this ESG meeting.</p> <p>The grading out of varied earthwork slopes, feathered into the adjoining landform, and the return of land to agricultural use, where practicable, will reduce effects on its historic landscape character. (See Chapter 4: Iterative Design Development)</p> <p>A Level 2 survey (English Heritage, 2007) will be undertaken to record those areas of Killiecrankie Battlefield (HLT 23) affected by construction of the proposed scheme in their current form and condition (<b>Mitigation Item P05-CH09</b>).</p> <p>An archaeological metal detecting survey of the affected areas of the battlefield will also be undertaken (<b>Mitigation Item P05-CH10</b>).</p> <p>The Level 2 survey and archaeological metal detecting survey will be undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance provided by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists and Historic England, and a Written Scheme of Investigation which will be agreed with Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust and Transport Scotland's heritage advisor.</p> <p>As part of the mitigation, a report on the results Level 2 survey and the</p>



SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
						<p>archaeological metal detecting survey will be prepared and submitted to the Perth and Kinross Historic Environment Record and the National Record of the Historic Environment, along with an ordered archive which will be submitted to an appropriate repository.</p> <p>Based on the guidance provided by Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Historic Battlefields (HES, 2016), opportunities to offset the effects on Killiecrankie Battlefield through measures such as increased interpretation and/or additional research to increase the ability to understand the battlefield will be explored with interested parties including Historic Environment Scotland, the National Trust for Scotland and the Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust (<b>Mitigation Item P05-CH15</b>).</p>
<b>Listed Building (Cat B)</b>	Shierglas Farmhouse LB 337556	Particular historic environment pinch point at Shierglas Farm/ Steading/ Quarry, approx. ref.: NN884642.  Need to balance LB issues with River Tay SAC and flood plain constraints to the opposite (northern) side of the carriageway.	Embed range of strategic principles on historic environment and avoidance where possible.  Where avoidance is not possible within the 200m online corridor, DMRB Stage 2 alignment studies should consider local alternatives outwith the 200m corridor.	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken, assessment of impacts on features and their setting, appropriate mitigation or compensation measures and any construction stage monitoring required, to the satisfaction of Historic Environment Scotland and other relevant stakeholders.	No DMRB Stage 2 options developed for Project 05 will physically impact Shierglas Farmhouse. However, given the close proximity of the asset and its current state of disrepair, there is potential for all options to result in accidental damage during construction.	Chapter 4 (Iterative Design Development) outlines that the DMRB Stage 3 design has been refined to ensure the demolition of Shierglas Farmhouse has been avoided.  To avoid this constraint, the design requires a shallow retaining feature which will reduce the overall footprint of the proposed scheme at Shierglas Farmhouse, avoiding physical impact.
<b>Listed Building (Cat C(S))</b>	Shierglas Steading LB 337557		Secure early consultation with Historic Scotland, Local Authority heritage team and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG), to present local options and determine their recommendations to inform selection of a preferred alignment.		Potential impacts on the setting of the asset and Shierglas Steading were also identified, and broad recommendations for mitigation were presented.  Due to significant environmental constraints including Shierglas Quarry, the River Tay SAC, Tulach Hill and Glen Fender Meadows SAC and the existing route of the A9, local alternatives out-with the 200m corridor to avoid Shierglas Farmhouse were not considered.	Measures to reduce accidental damage during construction are also included through fencing ( <b>Mitigation Item P05-CH08</b> ), and dilapidation survey and vibration monitoring ( <b>Mitigation Item P05-CH7</b> ).

**A9 Dualling Programme: Killiecrankie to Glen Garry**  
**DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement**  
**Appendix A2.2: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Monitoring Framework**

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
Listed Building (Cat C(S))	Allt Essan, Tollhouse LB 351660	Located in Ancient Woodland within.  100m of existing transition between single/dual carriageways on entrance to Killiecrankie Battlefield, approx. ref.: NN918623.  Embed range of strategic principles on historic environment and avoidance where possible Unlikely to be directly affected by dualling, and likely to be screened by existing woodland.	Secure early consultation with Historic Scotland, Local Authority heritage team and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG), to present local alignment options and determine their recommendations to inform selection of a preferred alignment.	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken, assessment of impacts on features and their setting, appropriate mitigation or compensation measures and any construction stage monitoring required, to the satisfaction of Historic Environment Scotland and other relevant stakeholders.	No DMRB Stage 2 options developed for Project 05 will impact on this asset.	The proposed scheme will not impact on this asset.
Listed Building (Cat B)	Clunes Lodge LB 337526 Approx. ref.: NN781671	LB is at the outer extent of the 200m-wide corridor, but is unlikely to be directly affected by dualling.  Screened from existing A9 by Ancient Woodland; however, the Glen Garry SSSI (Geological) constrains dualling on the opposite side of the carriageway.	Embed range of strategic principles on historic and avoidance where possible.  Secure early consultation with Historic Environment Scotland, Local Authority heritage team and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG), to present local alignment options and determine their recommendations to inform selection of a preferred alignment.	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken, assessment of impacts on features and their setting, appropriate mitigation or compensation measures and any construction stage monitoring required, to the satisfaction of Historic Environment Scotland, SNH and other relevant stakeholders.	No DMRB Stage 2 options developed for Project 6 will physically affect these cultural heritage assets.  Potential impacts on the setting of the assets were identified, and broad recommendations for cultural heritage mitigation were presented.	Land-take from the grounds of Clunes Lodge will be required for widening of the existing A9 cutting and the construction of an access bridge, however these areas are located at the periphery of the grounds, and will not result in the loss of any historic features or designed elements, neither will they be visible from the Listed Building.  Consultation with PKC, Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust, CNPA and HES was undertaken to discuss the impacts of the proposed scheme on Dalnamein New Bridge. Further details of this consultation are outlined in Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses).
Listed Building (Cat B)	Dalnamein New Bridge on former route of A9 LB 399556 Approx. ref.: NN755695	These LB bridges are within the 200m-wide corridor, but are unlikely to be directly affected by dualling.  Only other major constraint in the area relates to the 1:200-year flood risk zone Listed Building around the Allt Anndeir watercourse.	Dualling in the vicinity of Clunes Lodge will require consultation with SNH due to the presence of Ancient Woodland and geodiversity SSSI features in close proximity.  Historic Environment Scotland may identify the bridges as sensitive visual receptors and require an assessment of potential impacts on setting.			
Listed Building Cat C(S)	Old Bridge over Allt Anndeir, Old Bridge LB 337528 Approx. ref.: NN754696					Project specific mitigation has been developed to ensure a record of the current form and condition of Dalnamein Bridge and Old Bridge over Allt Anndeir is undertaken (Mitigation item P05-CH12).
		A9 runs through and alongside Blair Castle GDL from approx. ref.: NN872647 to NN839657.	Secure early consultation with Historic Scotland, CNPA, Local Authority heritage team and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG), to	Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken, assessment of impacts on features and their	Potential impacts on modern tree planting and the area of open parkland at Tulach Park which forms part of the Blair Castle GDL were for all DMRB Stage 2 options. Broad	Consultation undertaken with HES, CNPA, SNH and PKC on landscape mitigation design at Blair Castle GDL. See Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
<b>Inventory Gardens &amp; Designed Landscapes (GDL)</b>	Blair Castle GDL	Dualling also constrained by Ancient Woodland, River Garry (River Tay SAC), Aldclune and Inverack Meadows SSSI and Tulach Hill designations within this stretch.  Refer to and embed range of strategic principles on historic environment, landscape and avoidance where possible.	present local alignment options and determine their recommendations to inform selection of a preferred alignment.  Seek early agreement on additional studies/ investigations required for DMRB Stage 3, including assessment of landscape and visual impacts, including impact on setting.	setting, appropriate mitigation or compensation measures and any construction stage monitoring required, to the satisfaction of Historic Scotland, CNPA and other relevant stakeholders.	recommendations for cultural heritage mitigation were presented. However, there would be no impact on the majority of the historic landscape elements within the GDL.  No DMRB Stage 2 options developed for Project 05 will impact on the Blair Atholl CA or Pitlochry & Kinross CA.	Responses) for further information.  Construction of the proposed scheme would result in land-take from this designed landscape due to widening of the existing A9 cutting to the south between ch6200 and ch8550, construction of access tracks to the south of the cutting, and the construction of access tracks and SuDS to the north of the existing road between ch6200 and ch7300. This would remove some areas of woodland shown on the 1st edition 25" Ordnance Survey map of 1867 between the existing A9 and the River Garry. Widening of the existing A9 cutting to the south would not result in the loss of any historic features, and would not affect the legibility of the surviving 18th century layout of Tulloch Park. The impact on this GDL is assessed as Slight and is not significant.
<b>Conservation Area (CA)</b>	Blair Atholl CA  Pitlochry & Kinross CA	Both of these Conservation Areas are outwith the 200m wide corridor and are unlikely to be directly affected by dualling.  May have to consider impacts in terms of sensitive visual receptors and noise.	Secure early consultation with Historic Scotland, CNPA, Local Authority heritage team and other relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine whether these CAs require consideration as sensitive visual and/ or noise receptors.			
<b>National Scenic Areas (NSA)</b>	Loch Tummel NSA	Start of section is within the Loch Tummel NSA, from the existing Killiecrankie dual carriageway and into the Battlefield.  Refer to A9 Strategic Landscape Review (ER Addendum Appendix F) and secure early consultation with SNH and CNPA to discuss landscape issues related to NSA special qualities.  Aim to minimise impacts on woodland within the NSA.  Consider opportunities for enhanced laybys and viewpoints in consultation with SNH, CNPA and Historic Scotland.	Embed strategic landscape principles and secure early consultation with SNH, CNPA and Historic Environment Scotland to discuss DMRB Stage 2 alignment options and determine their recommendations and requirements to inform the selection of a preferred alignment.  Seek opportunities to incorporate key views to enhance visitors' experience of this NSA (and Killiecrankie Battlefield), including potential for enhanced laybys and interpretation features.  Agree range of visual receptors with SNH and CNPA for detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) at next stage.	DMRB Stage 3 LVIA to inform design to integrate the road with its surroundings and minimise the impacts of road furniture.  Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken, assessment of landscape and visual impacts, appropriate mitigation measures and any construction stage monitoring required, to the satisfaction of SNH, CNPA and Historic Scotland.	SNH and CNPA have been consulted as part of the ESG for their opinions on the proposed route options and the assessment methodology.  Opportunities to provide enhanced laybys along the route, including the locations suggested in the Enhanced Layby Strategy developed as part of the A9 Dualling Programme Environmental Design Guide, have been considered as part of the design development of the route options. Technical constraints have ruled out many opportunities, but further consideration will be made as part of the Stage 3 assessment following the identification of a preferred route option.  The locations of the representative viewpoints that have been selected have been chosen to include or represent the views from key features and visitor attractions around the	DMRB Stage 3 LVIA has informed design to integrate the road with its surroundings and minimise the impacts of the proposed scheme.  The ES includes a record of consultation and further studies undertaken as well as an assessment of the landscape and visual impacts along with mitigation measures as discussed in Chapter 13 (Landscape).  The proposed ecological and landscape mitigation for the proposed scheme are also shown on Figure 13.5.  Consultation with SNH, CNPA and HES has been undertaken throughout the DMRB Stage 3 process which is outlined in Chapter 7 (Consultation and Scoping) and the accompanying Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses)

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
<b>Cairngorms National Park (CNP)</b>	The full section is either within, or runs along the boundary of, the Cairngorms National Park	<p>CNPA have a duty to promote and enhance the natural and/or cultural heritage via any developments within the Park boundaries (ref. National Park Aim 1).</p> <p>CNPA will require effective consideration of non-designated natural heritage sites, protected species, geodiversity, NMU, access, layby and landscape/ visual/ battlefield issues within this sensitive corridor section.</p>	<p>Ensure early and ongoing consultation with CNPA on the full range of design and environmental issues and options to secure their advice and agreement on the preferred dualling alignment.</p> <p>Will require detailed consultation to work with CNPA to determine their requirements for additional studies on landscape/visual effects assessments and mitigation to inform DMRB Stage 3.</p>	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation required.	study area. SNH and CNPA have been consulted on the viewpoint locations, and their input has been taken into consideration. Some of the locations they have recommended have been omitted from the Stage 2 assessment as the viewpoints would not aid in the selection of a preferred route, but they may be incorporated into the Stage 3 assessment as receptors.	<p>DMRB Stage 3 LVIA includes visual assessment of a full range of viewpoints, including locations suggested by consultees, but not assessed at DMRB Stage 2.</p> <p>Regular meetings with the ESG have been held during the DMRB Stage 3 process. These meeting discussions are summarised within Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses).</p> <p>The ES includes a record of consultation (Chapter 7: Consultation and Scoping) and further studies undertaken as well as an assessment of the landscape and visual impacts along with mitigation measures as discussed in Chapter 13 (Landscape).</p> <p>The proposed ecological and landscape mitigation for the proposed scheme are also shown on Figure 13.5. DMRB Stage 3 assessments detailed in the ES were informed by DMRB Stage 2 assessments, further surveys and liaison with the appropriate consultees (including SNH and SEPA) and disciplines (including geomorphology and hydrogeology).</p> <p>Compensatory habitat solutions have been considered in detail at DMRB Stage 3 and have been informed by the woodland connectivity tool which has been used (along with consideration of other factors such as landscape requirements, and objectives for maintaining and enhancing permeability for species using woodland), to identify suitable areas for planting.</p> <p>In addition, design of mitigation planting of all habitat types affected by the proposed scheme has included consideration of the maintenance of habitats of relevance to CNPA's priority non-protected species.</p>

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
<b>Peat Soils</b>	Peaty soils identified throughout this section	<p>Peat deposits identified in the same area as the Glen Garry SSSI/ GCR sites.</p> <p>Embed strategic principles approach to avoid disturbance of peat soils; however, where unavoidable, minimise impacts/ risks to peat soil hydrology and ecology.</p>	<p>Secure early consultation with SEPA and SNH to determine alternative alignment option impacts on peat soils, to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment and to determine requirements for additional surveys and studies to inform peat habitat management and restoration plans.</p> <p>Should also include consultation on presence of, and further requirements on, Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE).</p>	<p>Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, further peat or GWDTE studies undertaken (if required), any mitigation or compensatory works required, and an agreed peat habitat management and restoration plan in accordance with applicable guidance.</p>	<p>Peat identified as having limited spatial extent and poor groundwater potential.</p> <p>All DMRB Stage 2 route options developed for Project 6 would have some direct effects on peat soil hydrology and ecological receptors with potential groundwater component as a result of excavations. In excavation areas confirmed to intercept these receptors, it is acknowledged that specific mitigation may be required – this will be assessed in further detail at DMRB Stage 3.</p>	<p>GWDTE assessments were undertaken at DMRB Stage 3 and are reported in Chapter 10 (Geology, Soils, Contaminated Land and Groundwater) and Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation). Sites with a potential for groundwater dependency that fall within a potential zone of influence from earthworks were identified and evaluated in detail.</p> <p>The presence of peat has also been recorded and volume losses have been estimated as discussed in Chapter 10 (Geology, Soils, Contaminated Land and Groundwater). It is envisaged that a small amount of peat is likely to be encountered during construction, which will be extracted, excavated and stored, with any off-site removal undertaken in cognisance of 'Development on Peatland: Guidance on the Assessment of Peat Volumes, Reuse of Excavated Peat and the Minimisation of Waste' (Scottish Renewables and SEPA, 2012) (<b>Mitigation Item G10</b>).</p>
<b>SEPA 1:200 year Flood Zone</b>	<p>Existing route crosses Flood Zone at various points in this section, given the proximity to the River Tay SAC and its tributaries</p> <p>Existing route crosses Flood Zone at various watercourse crossings Approx. crossing refs.:</p>	<p>Refer to ER Addendum Appendix G (Strategic Flood Risk Assessment).</p> <p>Embed strategic principles approach to avoid encroachment in the flood zone; however, this stretch is bordered by the River Tay flood zone to the west side of the road and is unlikely to be avoided at all locations.</p> <p>Any loss of functional flood plain will require compensatory storage.</p>	<p>Alignment studies should aim to strike a balance between avoidance of other constraints and the 1:200-year flood zone.</p> <p>Secure early consultation with SEPA to determine alternative alignment option impacts and to determine requirements for flood risk assessment, SUDS drainage and CAR requirements.</p> <p>Consider where drainage designs can include improved wildlife crossing and fish passage opportunities to secure multi-species benefit.</p>	<p>Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation or compensatory works required.</p> <p>Incorporate appropriate drainage, compensatory storage and management measures to ensure no net change to flood risk.</p> <p>Make recommendations to avoid works compounds within the functional floodplain where possible.</p>	<p>Alignments have been developed to minimise encroachment in floodplain given other environmental constraints and the selection of an online route.</p> <p>Detailed hydrology and Flood Risk Assessment underway and engagement with SEPA commenced to agree baseline and detail for Stage 3 assessment.</p> <p>Multi objective design workshops held to ensure all watercourse crossing design constraints understood and to inform design at Stage 3.</p>	<p>The proposed scheme has been assessed for flood risk and avoids encroachment into the functional floodplain where practicable.</p> <p>Flood risk assessment has included the assessment of the route against the SEPA 1:200-year flood zone and the hydraulic modelling flood zone (for high flood risk locations). See Appendix A11.3 (Flood Risk Assessment) for further information.</p> <p>Compensatory storage has been investigated for a number of locations along the route in order to offset any impacts to flood risk due to floodplain encroachment/the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Ongoing consultation with SEPA has occurred throughout the DMRB</p>

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
	<p>NN825657                      NN789665                      NN769688                      NN755695                      NN734702</p>					<p>Stage 3 assessment to discuss flood risk and proposed mitigation. For further information regarding consultation see Chapter 7 (Consultation and Scoping) and the accompanying Appendix (A7.2: Summary of Consultation Responses).</p> <p>Culverts and crossings have been designed with input from flood risk specialists. Channel realignments have also been designed to allow for existing flows and mimic (if not improve) existing channel cross-sections.</p> <p>Appendix A11.8 (Watercourse Crossings Report) provides information on the culverts and where provision for mammal crossings.</p>
<p><b>Highland Mainline (HML)</b></p>	<p>HML crossing identified at approx. ref.:                      NN891642                      NN811657</p>	<p>Mainly an engineering constraint; however, likely to affect scale and location of dualling earthworks required for a new crossing.</p>	<p>Secure early consultation with relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on HML crossings and inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.</p> <p>Consider opportunities to provide wildlife crossing opportunities to secure multi-species benefit.</p>	<p>Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation or compensatory works required.</p>	<p>All HML crossing options have been developed to provide the same consistent clearance envelope at the Essangal Underbridge (the only interface point between the A9 Dualling and the HML on this Project) matching the existing clearance envelope therefore a comparison of alternative impacts on the HML is not required. Environmental Stakeholders have been consulted with through the regular ESG forums. Network Rail have been consulted and were advised of the Stage 2 Options at a meeting on 25/06/15. Subsequently drawings were provided that highlighted the interface point between the A9 Dualling and the HML for Project 5 and all other Projects and interface points within the Southern Section of the A9 Dualling.</p>	<p>There has been ongoing consultation with Network Rail (NR) during the DMRB Stage 3 design development phase. This is to ensure NR is provided with updates in relation to interfaces with NR infrastructure. See Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses) for details.</p>
	<p>NCN7, Perth and Kinross Council and Cairngorms                      National Park Core Paths within</p>	<p>Refer to ER Addendum Section 4.3.                      Various Core Paths and the NCN7 run in proximity and / or parallel to the A9 in this</p>	<p>Secure early consultation with relevant stakeholders (as agreed with Transport Scotland and the A9 Dualling ESG) to determine alternative alignment option impacts on NCN7, Core Paths and any other identified NMU routes and</p>	<p>Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies undertaken and any mitigation or compensatory works required to</p>	<p>Consultation was undertaken with various access, cycling, equestrian and walking groups to inform the baseline assessment and ensure the path network described and assessed is accurate. The consultees provided information regarding the</p>	<p>The proposed scheme assessed at DMRB Stage 3 is the result of an iterative design process in which provision for maintaining and enhancing NMU journeys was taken into account. As such, the proposed scheme already includes embedded</p>



SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
<b>Non-Motorised Users (NMU)</b>	this section	section.	crossings to inform selection of the preferred dualling alignment.	ensure an equal or better standard of provision than existing.	locations and usage of paths and key crossing points. Rights of way data received from ScotWays.	mitigation such as underpasses, provision of footpaths/cycleways and planting which reduces impacts on NMUs.
	Approx. crossing refs.:	Refer to and embed strategic principles approach to NMU and cycling provisions.	Consider opportunities to provide wildlife crossing opportunities to secure multi-species benefit and to link NCN7 to enhanced layby facilities.	DMRB Stage 3 EIA to include construction mitigation requirements on provision of appropriate diversionary routes and signage to maintain overall access provisions during construction.	Consultation with various stakeholders also took place in two NMU forums (in November 2014 and May 2015). Information gained from stakeholders during these discussions was used to inform the baseline in this assessment. The consultation process informed the identification of potential conflict areas between NMUs and the proposed route options assessed in the Stage 2 Report. This information will also be taken into account during the Stage 3 assessment, where mitigation measures will be further developed and incorporated into the design of the preferred route option. Additional consultation will also be undertaken at DMRB Stage 3 to inform the assessment process and the development of mitigation.	Consultation with various stakeholders (including PKC, CNPA, Sustrans, British Horse Society, ScotWays and Cycle UK) also took place through the A9 Dualling NMU Forum in May 2015 and May 2016. Information gained from stakeholders during these discussions was used to inform the baseline in this assessment. Consultation with the Accessibility Forum (including People Friendly Design and Mobility and Access Community for Scotland (MACS)) took place in March 2017 to ensure accessibility is fully considered within the design.
	NN917628					
	NN891642	NMUs to include pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.	Selection of preferred alignment to be informed by an 'access audit', as required by Chapter 6 of Transport Scotland's 'Roads for All: Good Practice Guidance for Roads' and a 'cycle audit', as required by Chapter 11 (see Fig. 11.1) of Transport Scotland's 'Cycling by Design' good practice guidance.			
	NN890642					
	NN870648	CNPA is the access authority within the Park boundaries.				
	NN839657					
	NN825657	Non-motorised user (NMU) access may be impacted during construction and existing crossing points may be rationalised to provide safer crossing opportunities.				
NN813657						
NN825657						
NN813657						
NN789665						
<b>Wildlife Crossings</b>	The existing A9 is considered to act as a barrier to species movement	Embed the principle of 'multi-species benefits through route permeability' across all design sections.	Identification and implementation of wildlife crossing provisions should be embedded within the consideration of drainage, watercourse crossings, NMU routes, junctions and other road and rail crossing opportunities.	Preferred alignment design and Environmental Statement to include appropriate record of consultation, all further studies and surveys undertaken and any mitigation, compensatory or improvement works required to deliver a suitable range of wildlife (e.g. mammals and fish) crossings	The provision of wildlife crossing opportunities as a principle is included within the project. Detailed provision will be considered at DMRB Stage 3.	Regular meetings with the ESG have been held. Consultation with SNH has been undertaken during ESG meetings; and guidance from the ESG has been taken into account in the design and location of wildlife crossings, associated fencing and landscape planting. Details of consultation undertaken is detailed in Chapter 7
	However, the location of any wildlife crossing opportunities was		Secure early consultation with SNH, and CNPA within the Park boundaries, on appropriate species and habitat		Regular meetings with the ESG have been held. Consultation with SNH has been undertaken during ESG meetings.	

SEA Identified Constraints	Description of Constraint	SEA Comment	Recommendations for later DMRB Stages		Record how addressed at:	
			DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3	DMRB Stage 2	DMRB Stage 3
	outwith the scope of the SEA		survey requirements.	and passes.		<p>(Consultation and Scoping) and accompanying Appendix A7.2 (Summary of Consultation Responses)).</p> <p>The provision of wildlife crossing opportunities (including, providing mammal ledges on culverts, dry mammal underpasses and fencing) was informed by the DMRB Stage 3 surveys and assessments and locations were refined through discussion with other technical teams (including highways, drainage and landscape).</p> <p>The location of crossing points and mammal fencing in relation to the proposed scheme is shown on Figure 13.5. Measures have also been identified to ensure the implementation of the appropriate mitigation (<b>Mitigation Items P05-E42, P05-E43, P05-E44, P05-E45, P05-E47 and P05-E48</b>).</p>