

Appendix A7.2: Summary of Consultation Responses

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This appendix contains a summary of the key environmental input provided by both statutory and non-statutory consultees through the consultation process described in Chapter 7 (Consultation and Scoping). This includes input from the A9 Environmental Steering Group (ESG) which was established by Transport Scotland to provide a mechanism for cross-party discussions on environmental issues throughout the A9 dualling programme. The ESG generally meets on a monthly basis, consisting of the following environmental bodies:
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
 - Perth & Kinross Council (PKC)
 - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
 - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
 - The Highland Council (THC)
- 1.1.2 Further consultation has also been undertaken through the Environmental Forum and non-motorised user (NMU) Forum.
- 1.1.3 Table 1 below provides a summary of both statutory and non-statutory consultee comments in relation to the proposed scheme and the response to this consultation. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the environmental issues that were discussed at ESG meetings held between April 2016 and May 2017 inclusive that are relevant to the proposed scheme; and Table 3 provides a summary of the issues raised at the Environmental Forums, while Table 4 summarises issues raised at the NMU Workshop in April 2016 and a NMU Forum held in May 2016. Table 5 summarises issues raised at public exhibitions.
- 1.1.4 A number of consultees were contacted and asked to provide comments on the DMRB Stage 3 design development but raised no specific comments or concerns. These are listed below:
- Visit Scotland;
 - Deer Commission Scotland (part of SNH);
 - First Group;
 - National Trust for Scotland;
 - Scottish Government, Rural payments and Inspections Directorate;
 - Scottish Mink Initiative; and
 - National Farmers Union of Scotland.

Table 1: Summary/Response to Consultee Comments

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
Statutory Consultees		
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	<p>Following a consultation request to confirm assets to be considered in the assessment, HES noted that there are a number of scheduled monuments within the 200m study area which should be included.</p> <p>HES further noted the substantial number of Category B and Category C Listed Buildings and conservation areas in the study area, however acknowledged that comment is being sought from Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust in this regard.</p>	<p>Archaeological remains, historical buildings and historical landscapes identified within the study area for the cultural heritage assessment (200m from the proposed scheme), including those highlighted by HES, have been considered. Designated cultural heritage assets up to 1km from the proposed scheme have also been included as part of the baseline due to the potential for impacts on their setting.</p> <p>The consultation has been used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage).</p>
	<p>Following data requests, HES provided data on heritage paths that are used regularly by NMUs or are actively promoted by Historic Scotland.</p>	<p>These data have been used to inform Chapter 9 (People and Communities - All Travellers) and Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage).</p>
Marine Scotland (MS) (at Pitlochry)	<p>MS was contacted to request fish data and any other relevant environmental data. MS responded that it did not hold any such information.</p>	N/A
Perth and Kinross Council (PKC) (including PKC Heritage Trust)	<p>Following a consultation request to confirm assets to be considered in the assessment, PKCHT identified a number of Listed Buildings to be included within the 200m study area.</p>	<p>Archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes within 200m of the proposed scheme have been considered in the cultural heritage assessment. In addition, as confirmed with PKHTC, a number of assets outside the proposed 200m study area were also included in the assessment on setting.</p>
	<p>Following data requests PKCHT provided data on conversation areas, biodiversity species locations, major parks and amenity areas, contaminated land, local development plans and planning applications.</p>	<p>These data have been used to inform Chapter 19 (Policy and Plans).</p>
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	<p>Following a request for, SEPA provided the following data/information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water quality monitoring data for watercourses within 1km radius of the existing A9; • flood extents (surface water and fluvial) with associated depths and velocity; • ecological and cultural heritage flood receptor datasets; and • groundwater abstraction and discharge license locations. <p>SEPA also provided information on any known contaminated land and Pollution Prevention Control (PPC) licenses to cover past and current waste activities located within 500m of the existing A9.</p>	<p>Information/data provided by SEPA was incorporated into the EIA in relation to Chapter 10 (Geology, Soils and Groundwater) and Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and Water Environment).</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
<p>SEPA</p> <p>Minor Watercourses and Flood Risk meeting – 28 July 2016</p>	<p>A meeting was held on the 28th July 2016 to discuss the proposed approach to the assessment of minor watercourses and the completion of the associated Watercourse Crossing Report (WCR), included as Appendix 11.8 of the ES. In this respect, SEPA had no specific issues on the proposed approach outlined. In addition to this, the approach to Flood-Risk Assessment was discussed.</p> <p>SEPA indicated that where compensatory flood storage is to be provided, like-for-like compensatory storage locally would be preferred, particularly where there are sensitive receptors, although it was acknowledged that, where this was not possible, then a modelling approach to show the effectiveness of compensatory storage provided more remotely would, if necessary, be acceptable. Such an approach would need to look at potential receptors. To secure areas as floodplain SEPA's preference would be to include the land affected within the CPO boundary as was used in Project 1 (Luncarty to Pass of Birnam).</p> <p>SEPA noted that culvert screens are not favourable because of the risk of blockage and clarified that blockage would need to be assessed as a residual risk.</p> <p>SEPA also noted that Network Rail had plans for culvert/structure improvements/changes and that these should be incorporated into the proposed scheme design.</p> <p>SEPA identified a risk that agreement on acceptable culverts could potentially be changed at detailed design stage without recognition of the CAR licence process or requirements of the FRA and ES.</p> <p>SEPA agreed to the recommended approach of assessing construction impacts using the probability of an event occurring within the construction period linked to the risk considered by SEPA over the lifetime of the development i.e. 200-year flood is considered high risk over the lifetime (100yrs). This has a similar (but not exactly the same) probability of a 20-year event occurring in a 10-year construction period and as such both could be considered High Risk</p> <p>In addition to the above, SEPA stated that SuDS should be considered for the construction site. SEPA also noted that the risk of failure of SuDS on flood risk to people would need to be incorporated.</p>	<p>Jacobs agreed that the approach to FRA will include a clear decision process to justify choice of mitigation where potential significant impacts were identified.</p> <p>Jacobs noted that it would be the responsibility of the road maintenance provider to maintain culverts and that, in key locations, an increased frequency of inspection may be necessary. This has been set out in the A9 wide operation and maintenance plan.</p> <p>Jacobs noted that Network Rail had been consulted and that Transport Scotland will continue to engage with them on Network Rail's culvert/structure improvements and changes.</p> <p>In response to flood risk assessment concerns, Jacobs agreed to issue the draft Watercourse Crossing Report to SEPA for review in advance of publishing the ES/FRA.</p> <p>Agreement noted. Jacobs also considered other non-structural mitigation measures in response to construction risks e.g. warning and flood risk management plans.</p> <p>Reference is made to Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment). Specifically, it outlines the recommendations made by the Strategic Environmental Assessment in regards to SuDS. In addition to this, a residual risk of flooding is also acknowledged throughout the operational life of the proposed scheme and so a range of standard and specific mitigation measures are also provided.</p>
<p>SEPA</p> <p>Carriageway Drainage Meeting - 28 September 2016</p>	<p>A meeting was held on 28th September 2016 to discuss the potential carriageway drainage design to include treatment and attenuation options for the dualling of Pitlochry to Killiecrankie and Killiecrankie to Glen Garry Projects. Meeting included discussion of constrained catchments and the proposed drainage design options.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>SEPA</p>	<p>A progress meeting with SEPA was held on the 28th November 2016 to discuss progress made to date on the assessment of flood risk, with particular focus on flooding and</p>	<p>Jacobs confirmed that discussions would be undertaken with SNH and PKC through the ESG to confirm the mitigation approach.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) and Appendix 11.3</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
Flood Risk Assessment update meeting (28 November 2016)	<p>hydrology.</p> <p>Jacobs provided an update on the hydrology and hydraulic modelling that has been undertaken since the previous meeting with SEPA on 28th July 2016 and advised that the baseline modelling for the Principal Watercourses of Loch Faskally and River Tummel has been undertaken for return periods of 1 in 30 year and 1 in 200 year plus 20% climate change. The baseline hydraulic models are being used to test the Preferred Option along with the various bridge options to categorise the flood risk.</p> <p>Jacobs advised that 21 minor watercourse crossings are being assessed using the method described in the SEPA meeting on 28th July 2016. Where culverts pass the design flow without surcharging then the culvert can be extended; however this can result in additional losses and increase in upstream water level. Where culverts require to be increased in size an assessment will be done for pass forward flow and resulting impact downstream.</p> <p>SEPA advised that risk to upstream receptors needs to be assessed as well as flood risk downstream. JUK confirmed this will be undertaken as part of the assessments.</p>	<p>(Flood Risk Assessment) detail the assessment and mitigation measures proposed.</p> <p>This information has been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).</p>
SEPA February to July 2017	Following the meeting with SEPA on 28 th September 2016, JUK provided technical notes for drainage design proposals for drainage catchments where variations on conventional SuDS were proposed. SEPA provided comments in response on water quality and further information was provided to SEPA.	This information has been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).
SEPA Webex (27 April 2017)	Presented results of FRA, hydraulic modelling and discussed proposed mitigation measures at the Tummel crossing.	Used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).
SEPA (19 October 2017)	. It was agreed that, across the A9 Dualling projects, CAR license applications would be drafted up in conjunction with a specimen design after submission of the ES and draft Road Orders.	N/A
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)	<p>Consultation with SNH included a request for confirmation of viewpoints to be considered at various locations surrounding the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Following a request for consultation, SNH provided information that included data on mammal and aquatic receptors, designated sites and deer vehicle collisions.</p>	<p>Comments on viewpoints have been taken into consideration in the visual impact assessment as discussed in Chapter 14 (Visual).</p> <p>Information/data provided by SNH was incorporated into the EIA, specifically in relation to the assessment detailed in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).</p>
Transport Scotland – Standards Branch	<p>Initial consultation with Standards Branch was undertaken during DMRB Stage 2 for the Pitlochry to Killiecrankie Project where the overall design principals for the scheme was discussed.</p> <p>During DMRB Stage 3, an initial set of drawings and a summary table for departures from standards were submitted to Standards Branch for comment in November 2016 concerning departures considered fundamental to the scheme design.</p> <p>A meeting was subsequently held with Standards Branch on the 11th of November 2016 to discuss the submissions and inform the developing Stage 3 design.</p> <p>A further departures from standard submission has been prepared for all departures</p>	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
	following development of the Stage 3 design and this has been submitted to Standards Branch in August 2017 for their comment and approval.	
Scottish Water	Scottish Water were consulted in September 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. Scottish Water responded to the request in January 2017. Scottish Water identified 440m of apparatus which would need to be diverted.	This information has been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).
	Further consultation will take place as part of the C4 process once the Stage 3 design has been produced.	This information has been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).
	Scottish Water were consulted regarding water supplies to the industrial estate and asking for confirmation if there is an abandoned water main running through the hillside in the Tay Forest, lying to the north of Pitlochry and east of the existing A9. Scottish water confirmed via the C3 response in January 2017 the location of the supplies within the industrial estate. They confirmed that the abandoned main running through the hillside would be unaffected by the proposed works.	This information has been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).
Non-Statutory Consultees		
Arqiva	Arqiva were consulted in April 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. No response was received from Arqiva.	N/A
British Horse Society (BHS)	Following a request, BHS provided details on important paths being used by equestrians, bridleways in use or nearby equestrian facilities such as stables, as well as information relating to how equestrians cross the existing A9. BHS, along with Paths for All, invited JUK to attend the Paths for All demonstration site with discussions focusing on considerations on creating/designing multi-use access networks and an equestrian access demonstration by BHS.	This information has been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers). This information has been used to inform the design process and the assessment reported in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
British Trust for Ornithology (BTO)	Following data requests, BTO provided data on the Bird Atlas 2007-2011.	These data have been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
BT (Openreach)	BT were consulted in September 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. BT responded to the request in October 2016 identifying several locations where apparatus would be affected by the proposed scheme. This included long length optical fibre cables and main copper cables. Further consultation will take place as part of the C4 process once the Stage 3 design has	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
	been produced.	
Cycling Scotland	Cycling Scotland was satisfied with the scope of the potential impacts on NMUs outlined to them in consultation and considered that most NMU concerns had been given serious consideration and that the proposed solutions appeared to be in line with current good practice. General comments include adequate lighting for underpasses, the need for access ramps and Equality Acts compliance in all NMU provisions made.	As part of the ES, Chapter 9 (People and Communities –All Travellers’) includes mitigation measures that provide for the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 to be incorporated into the proposed scheme wherever practicable e.g. any bridges, ramps or footpaths shall take into account potential barriers (such as the gradient or surfacing) to people with disabilities.
EE 3	MBNL were consulted in September 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. MBNL responded to the request immediately stating that they had no apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	N/A
Forestry Commission Scotland (Perth and Argyll)	Following a request, the Forestry Commission Scotland provided data on the Native Woodland Survey of Scotland.	These data have been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3EIA discussed in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
	Forestry Commission Scotland (Forestry Enterprise) provided information and discussion regarding the timber extraction from the hillside on the east side of the A9, north of Pitlochry. If timber above the A9 is to be removed ahead of the works, and restocking is not envisaged on site then a Licence to Fell will only be given following the approval of a viable roads scheme. However, the intention is to fell the timber and restock it with native species to stabilise the hillside. A meeting was held with Forestry Commission in September 2017 to discuss land-take requirements and proposed access arrangements.	This has informed the assessments in Chapter 8 (People and Communities = Community and Private Assets), Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation), Chapter 13 (Landscape).
National Grid	National Grid were consulted in September 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. National Grid responded to the request in September 2016 stating that they had no apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	N/A
Police Scotland	A meeting was held with the Police Scotland in April 2016 in order to gain input from the emergency services providers in relation to the proposed route options currently under development for the Southern Section of the A9 Dualling Programme from Pass of Birnam to Glen Garry. Transport Scotland and Jacobs were keen to gain feedback with respect to potential property access issues and how the construction process will affect the Police operations. Police Scotland raised the potential for impact on the existing national cycle route and what facilities will be provided as some cyclists currently cycle on the existing A9 even though there is a parallel cycle route in many locations.	Police Scotland highlighted that Transport Scotland/Jacobs should fully consider the potential impacts of the A9 dualling programme on the official diversion routes which are implemented during road traffic accidents. Jacobs indicated that this would be considered as the design develops and that there may be provision to open the central reserve in certain areas once the dualling has been completed to allow contra flow operations to take place should road traffic accidents close one of the carriageways. However, it should be noted that given the route will be of a dual carriageway standard it is anticipated that the accident rates will fall in the future resulting in a reduced need to close the carriageways.
Ramblers Association	Requested that NMU access be included in the EIA.	The impact assessment of the proposed scheme on NMU access is provided

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
		in Chapter 9 (People and Communities –All Travellers’).
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) – Tayside and Firth (Scotland)	Following requests, RSPB provided data on breeding bird records within 2km in either direction of the existing A9.	This data has been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA, Reference is made to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
	<p>Protected areas</p> <p>The RSPB raised concerns that the proposed scheme is adjacent to designated areas and therefore there is a potential that the proposed scheme could affect these; and therefore encroachment should be avoided, or minimised if unavoidable.</p>	The assessment of the proposed scheme on designated sites of nature conservation interest is provided in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
	<p>Ancient and native woodland</p> <p>The RSPB raised concerns of a potential loss of ancient woodland as a result of the proposed scheme and identified areas where any removal of native woodland could be detrimental.</p> <p>Minimising the loss of trees from within the development site was advocated along with offsetting any unavoidable loss. Added that there should be firm proposals to plant alternative areas with native woodland in accordance with the Cairngorms National Park woodland expansion scheme, and away from wader breeding habitat and that biodiversity should be maximised.</p>	Potential impacts on ancient woodland and habitats and recommended mitigation measures, such as compensatory woodland and planting are discussed in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation) and Chapter 13 (Landscape).
	<p>Capercaillie</p> <p>The RSPB confirmed signs of Capercaillie breeding and habitat occupation have been found in the area surrounding the proposed scheme. The RSPB were also of the view that the proposed scheme would not have an adverse impact on Capercaillie in this area, however, suggested that there is an opportunity for compensatory woodland planting to increase habitat availability for this species. The RSPB further welcomed the opportunity to offer advice on suitable areas for, and the design and management of, compensatory woodland provision.</p>	Planting proposals were developed with consideration of species records including black grouse, Capercaillie and waders. Reference is made to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation) and Chapter 13 (Landscape).
	<p>Black grouse</p> <p>RSPB Scotland raised concerns of black grouse leks (mainly through the Perthshire Black Grouse Study Group) in close proximity to the proposed scheme at several locations. Although the proposed scheme would not affect these sites directly in terms of land take, the RSPB have concerns about disturbance of these lekking sites during the construction phase. The RSPB indicated that work should not take place between March and May, particularly at dawn and dusk, and no compensatory tree planting should be located in the areas where there are records of leks, as grouse usually display in open habitats so would be adversely affected by such tree planting.</p>	RSPB concerns regarding the disturbance of lekking sites during construction has been taken into consideration during the EIA as part of the ecology and nature conservation assessment presented in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation). Mitigation measures to address potential impacts on black grouse include black grouse-specific surveys to confirm locations and monitor activity at known lek sites, which will inform a species management plan, including specification on timing of construction work and establishing protection zones. Comments on compensatory tree planting have been incorporated into planting proposals, shown on Figure 13.5. Further information is provided in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
<p>Waders</p> <p>RSPB provided important wader records for the area, especially within the Tulach Hills SSSI</p>	Data provided by the RSPB was taken in to consideration as part of the planting proposals and ecology and nature conservation assessment as	

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
	<p>and the Tulach Hill and Glen Fender Meadows SAC in addition to wader hotspots at Dalnaspidal and at Loch Moraig, close to the proposed scheme. RSPB requested that tree planting in these areas should be avoided as waders breed in open habitats with low vegetation.</p> <p>Other species/records RSPB provided information on behalf of a local biodiversity recorder, who highlighted the presence of local wildlife in certain areas along route of the proposed scheme. RSPB requested that these areas be avoided by the proposed scheme and that potential impacts are considered as part of the EIA.</p> <p>Watercourses RSPB also highlighted the need to avoid run off from road and construction works into the River Garry SAC located directly adjacent to the proposed scheme particularly adjacent to the Aldclune junction. Encroachment into the SAC is to be avoided if possible.</p> <p>Breeding birds In response to a data request, RSPB provided records for a number of breeding birds in the area surrounding the proposed scheme, RSPB also requested that any works involving removal/disturbance of features which can be used by breeding birds should be undertaken outside the main bird breeding season. If disturbance to such features during the season is unavoidable, RSPB stated that a survey by an experienced ecologist must be undertaken immediately in advance of the works to check for nesting birds and that, should breeding birds be found, works in the area should cease until the young have fledged.</p> <p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) RSPB considered that SuDS ponds should be managed for biodiversity benefits, in addition to their water management function.</p>	<p>discussed in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).</p> <p>Local ecosystems and habitats are considered in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).</p> <p>The drainage design for the proposed scheme includes appropriate treatment of runoff and construction works, including in the vicinity of the River Tummel. Reference is made to Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) and Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).</p> <p>Information/comment provided was taken into consideration in the assessment presented in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation). Measures to mitigate impacts on breeding birds are included.</p> <p>The biodiversity aspects of SuDS ponds have been taken into consideration as part of the EIA in relation to ecology and nature conservation. However, in some cases engineering constraints dictate that SuDS ponds are required to be constructed as dry detention basins. Details on SuDS is provided in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) while Appendix 13.7 (SuDS Design Principles) sets out design principles for the Contractor to implement for SuDS to provide a biodiversity benefit.</p>
<p>Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS)</p>	<p>A meeting was held with SAS and Jacobs in April 2016, in order to gain input from the emergency services providers in relation to the proposed route options currently under development for the Southern Section of the A9 Dualling Programme from Pass of Birnam to Glen Garry.</p> <p>Transport Scotland and Jacobs were keen to gain feedback from SAS with respect to potential property access issues and how the construction process will affect them. Discussion topics included route diversions, direct (tier 3) access routes, road traffic accidents, and layby provisions.</p> <p>Scottish Ambulance Service expressed concerns in relation to the diversion times associated with Side Road Option 1. They highlighted that they travel to a number of incidents on Foss Road on a regular basis associated with the canoeing and camping activities located in the area. Given the potential increased journey times associated with Option 1, this option it</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
	could represent a significant issue should an incident occur.	
Scottish Badgers	Scottish Badgers raised no specific comments or concerns in relation to the proposed scheme.	N/A
Scottish Fire and Rescue Services	A meeting was held with the Scottish Fire and Rescue Services, Transport Scotland and Jacobs in May 2016, in order to gain input from the emergency services providers in relation to the proposed route options currently under development for the Southern Section of the A9 Dualling Programme from Pass of Birnam to Glen Garry. Transport Scotland and Jacobs were keen to gain feedback with respect to potential property access issues and how the construction process will affect the Fire Service operations. Discussion topics included route diversions, direct (tier 3) access routes, road traffic accidents, hill fires, fire appliances and lay-by provisions.	The Scottish Fire and Rescue Services raised the requirement for ongoing consultation at appropriate points in the process, in order to plan route diversions and create contingency plans during the construction phase. Explanation was provided for the A9 Dualling lay-by strategy including standards and location of proposed lay-bys.
Scottish Gas Network	SGN were consulted in September 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. SGN responded in November 2017 advising that approximately 50m of 63mmPE pipe and 315m of 125mmHDPE pipe would be required to be replaced and diverted,	N/A
Scotways	Following a request, Scotways provided data to assist in the re-digitising of Rights of Ways within 500m of the existing A9, incorporating details of how NMUs cross the existing A9.	This data has been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA. Refer to Chapter 9 (People and Communities –All Travellers).
	Scotways also provided feedback on the ‘A9 Dualling Programme Non-motorised User Forum 2 Report’ and considered that the “Layby Strategy” referred to within the report, does not sufficiently address NMU’s interests. Scotways consider the laybys to have at least three functions: primarily to allow travellers on the A9 to rest from driving; secondly to allow visitors to enjoy some amazing views; thirdly to allow access to the hills or other features, which NMUs may wish to explore on foot or by bicycle. It is considered that the positioning of these laybys needs to reflect this third purpose very closely. Although the existing A9 laybys are considered to be more or less well positioned, Scotways understood that certain laybys will have to be shifted or closed with the proposed dualling of the A9, and convey the importance of fully involving NMUs in discussions about these changes.	Information provided has been taken into consideration in the NMU assessment as reported in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
Scottish Southern Energy Scottish Hydro (SSE)	Following a request for consultation, SSE provided information on habitat conditions and fish distribution in the River Tummel and several large tributaries.	This data has been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA, see Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
SSE Power Distribution	SHEPD were consulted in November 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. SHEPD responded to the request in December 2016 identifying a number of locations where apparatus would be affected by the proposed scheme. A meeting was held in October 2017 to discuss land-take requirements and scheme update. Further consultation will take place as part of the C4 process once the Stage 3 specimen design has been produced.	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
SSE Telecom	SSE Telecom were consulted in November 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. SSE Telecom responded to the request in November 2016 stating that they had no apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	N/A
SSE Transmission	SHETL were consulted in May 2017 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. SHETL is still to respond. SHETL advised during a meeting in April 2017 that apparatus is contained within the Clunie Bridge.	N/A
SUSTRANS	Following a request, SUSTRANS provided data on important paths being used by cyclists in the study area, including National and Regional Routes.	This data has been used to inform the assessment, see Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN)	Following the NMU Workshop in May 2016, TACTRAN stated a desire that the A9 dualling programme should be taken forward as a Transport Corridor with improvements to all forms of transport including road, rail, bus, coach, walk and cycling rather than a roads scheme only. Tactran Partnership's views on this were stated as being articulated at both A9 NMU workshops and also at several A9 Local Authority Regional Transport Partnership (A9 LARTP) Forum meetings. In addition, TACTRAN also expressed a concern that the lack of a segregated NMU facility along the newly dualled A9 could cause road safety issues as cyclists may be inclined to cycle on the new 70mph dual carriageway where no obvious direct cycle facility is provided. Providing a traffic free NMU facility along the length of the new dualled A9 would give a clear signal as to the intent to promote cycling and walking nationally, as well as providing a valuable tourist and everyday asset.	Jacobs responded to TACTRAN explaining that the constrained nature of the A9 corridor places significant constraints on what is achievable without increasing project costs and environmental impacts. NCR7 exists in relatively close proximity and runs roughly parallel to the proposed scheme. This serves as safer alternative to cycling on the A9 and makes the provision of an additional route directly adjacent to the A9 appear unnecessary. In addition, the organisation tasked with maintaining and developing this network of cycle routes has indicated that provision of a route parallel to the A9 is not a priority and that it is more important for the National Cycle Network to serve local towns, villages and communities in order to ensure their prosperity. The DMRB Stage 3 design of the proposed scheme includes NMU route diversions and dedicated crossing points that ensure connectivity is maintained within the A9 corridor. These are considered in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers)
Tayside Biodiversity Partnership	Following a request for consultation, Tayside Biodiversity Partnership provided data on watercourses within 500m of the existing A9 as well as data on mammals within 500m of the existing A9.	These data have been used to inform the assessment, refer to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation)
Tayside District Salmon Fisheries Board (TDSFB)	TDSFB provided information on fish distribution and fish habitat in the River Garry and several larger tributaries as well as information on invasive, non-native species and freshwater pearl mussel. TDSFB also suggested other sources where fish data could be obtained.	These data have been used to inform the assessment, refer to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
Tayside Raptor Study Group (TRSG)	Following a request for consultation, TRSG provided data for the southern projects of the A9 dualling programme.	These data have been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA, refer to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
Trafficmaster	Trafficmaster were consulted in September 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback	Response
	by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. Trafficmaster responded to the request in September 2016 stating that they had no apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	
Virgin Media	Virgin Media were consulted in September 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. Virgin Media responded to the request in September 2016 stating that they had no apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	N/A
Vodafone 02	Cluttons were consulted in September 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets which could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs.	N/A

Table 2: Summary/Response to Environmental Steering Group Comments

Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
ESG June 2016	<p><u>Scoping</u> An overview of the DMRB Stage 3 scoping report was presented to the ESG. No specific comments were received.</p> <p><u>Freshwater Pearl Mussels</u> Jacobs gave an outline of the survey methodology for detecting Freshwater Pearl Mussels (FWPM) following the results on initial shallow water surveys. It was agreed that where FWPM have been identified in shallow water, there is an assumption that they are also present in associated deep water. Deep water surveys in areas where FWPM have been identified in the shallow water will therefore not be undertaken. Subsequent updates on FWPM surveys were provided at the August ESG and through a technical paper issued to the ESG which showed that FWPM are not affected by outfall distribution and are more likely to be affected by other factors such as suitable habitat.</p>
ESG August 2016	<p>A summary of the updates to the A9 dualling programme wide approach to SuDS design. The key notes included the updated guidance on SuDS design and changes to the CIRIA SuDS manual, HD33 and Regulatory method 8 (SEPA guidance on sustainable drainage). HD33 has been updated to provide additional information on the different types of SuDS and what level of treatment they provide in relation to suspended solids and heavy methods. The discussion included the provision of a justification for scenarios where less than two levels of SuDS treatment are proposed.</p>
ESG September 2016	<p><u>Woodland Connectivity Discussion</u> SNH noted that they have met with Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) to discuss the use of previous ancient woodland sites in terms of potential mitigation sites for lost Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI). FCS has a policy requirement of 'no net loss of woodland' to meet Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal. As such FCS look at loss in terms of hectares and not quality. Therefore, if re-use of previous ancient woodland sites requires the loss of some lower quality woodland to provide improved quality woodland as offset mitigation, FCS would still consider this to be a loss. In choosing areas to plant, the steps in the Woodland Connectivity – Ancient Woodland Compensation Strategy (Transport Scotland, 2016) were followed. The location of woodland being lost has been considered and where possible planting has been proposed as close to the areas of loss as possible. As well as other factors, areas of replacement woodland planting have been identified; to where possible maximise the biodiversity benefit of planting, as best as possible maintain connectivity of existing Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) sites and provide the best chance to maintain functionality of local ancient woodland communities. Planting proposals are shown on Figure 13.5 (Chapter 13: Landscape).</p>
ESG December 2016	<p>Vehicle accesses to the SuDS have been reduced, as feedback indicated that the minimum required was vehicular access to the inlet and outlet rather than a full turning circle. TS asked if the surfacing design had been considered in terms of the material used etc. JUK indicated that individual SuDS access would not routinely be surfaced.</p> <p><u>River Tummel Crossing</u> In regard to bridge design options, SNH indicated that options with piers within the water present complex issues in terms of HRA. PKC also noted that Tummel Crossing Options with heavy engineering options, it is unlikely that these will sit as comfortably in the landscape as the bow string arch structure and noted there was a real conflict with the deeper deck option. In this regard, SNH noted that in order to construct the bow string arch bridge, a temporary pier within the watercourse may be required.</p> <p><u>Mammal Fencing</u> Jacobs presented an outline of the approach and principles that have been used to develop an early draft of the mammal fencing proposals which seek to obtaining the correct balance between landscape and ecological requirements. SNH raised that SuDS can become a point of attraction for otters, so fencing design should consider this. CNPA – commented that the landscape principles being applied are sensible. Raised that consideration should be given to tying in woodland mitigation planting with the fence</p>

Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
	<p>line. Raised if there is scope to not include the 'crank' at the top of the fencing. SNH commented that they will discuss with their mammal specialist and confirm if this is possible who subsequently confirmed that this was possible. The planting proposals shown in Figure 13.5 considers where screening proposed mammal fencing is necessary while mammal proof gates are proposed at SuDS access where necessary. SuDS can become a point of attraction for otters, so fencing design should consider this. SNH to confirm if the 'crank' at the top of the fencing is to be scoped out, to be confirmed after discussion with their mammal specialist. The landscape principles being applied are sensible. Raised concerns that consideration should be given to tying-in woodland mitigation planting with the fence line.</p> <p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u> A high level list of cumulative impacts across the A9 dualling programme was issued to the ESG prior to the December 2016 meeting. ESG members were asked to identify any impacts which were not included in this list. SNH noted that there may be a cumulative impact on non-protected species that may be regularly occurring, such as aspen and wetlands. Consideration should be given to the possibility of barrier effects on species other than fish. Comments have been considered as part of the Cumulative Assessment reported in Chapter 20 (Cumulative Impacts).</p>
ESG February 2017	<p><u>Rock Cuttings</u> Jacobs presented on the techniques used to create rock cuttings and the different appearance of the rock cuttings depending on the technique used. The two types of technique that are being considered for the programme are pre-split blasting and bulk blasting. It was agreed that different techniques will be required at different locations depending on a number of different factors such as exiting slopes and visual impact.</p> <p><u>Aesthetic Forum</u> An update on the work being undertaken by the aesthetic forum (formed of the Lot Consultants) was provided. This forum has been preparing the design guide. A route hierarchy to identify the key locations where a number of aesthetic principles that should be applied,</p>
ESG March 2017	<p><u>Flood Risk Assessment</u> Jacobs presented the initial outcomes from the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) of the proposed scheme SEPA asked why the minor watercourse crossings were being designed for the 1 in 100 year flood rather than 1 in 200 year. Jacobs advised that although the 1 in 100 year flood event was used for the design, it was tested against the 1 in 200 year level, and where the design didn't pass the test, additional work was being completed with the river engineering team. SNH enquired if anyone was looking at erosion risk due to reduced storage capacity and potential increase in energy in the channel. SNH advised that changes to the river morphology could potentially have an impact on functional habitat on the Natura site. Potential increases in energy in the channel and changes to river morphology are considered as part of the Habitat Regulations Appraisal for the proposed scheme.</p> <p><u>Soil Nailing and Landscaping</u> Jacobs explained that, depending on ground investigation information, soil nailing may be required to steepen slopes where there would be adverse impacts on other important considerations. Where there may be a requirement for soil nailing, the environmental team are considering options for covering the areas with vegetation to reduce the visual impacts. This is provided for in the ES as Mitigation Item P04-LV5.</p>
ESG April 2017	<p><u>New Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations</u> Discussion on the impact of the new EIA Regulation regime that came into effect on 16th May 2017. TS discussed the legal advice that had been sought and confirmed that as all the projects had been scoped in 2016 along with the Record of Determination for each project prepared prior to the 16th May that all of the projects fall under the current regulatory regime. Jacobs highlighted outstanding feedback on Tummel Crossing in terms of landscape from PKC.</p>

Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
ESG May 2017	<p><u>Tree Species</u></p> <p>Discussion led by CNPA. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for a mix of native species, with the use of exotics (Larch, beech etc.) where there is cultural/historical justification, and planting design needs to consider the landscape and local context. An agreement that it would be beneficial to the programme for there to be a common position from the Statutory Consultees on the principles that should be applied. SNH indicated to be mindful of using willow at SuDs locations as they can impact the functionality of the SuDs, and that any planting design should consider soil conditions when selecting species mix. The work being undertaken on the tree stock and wildflower seed bank for the programme was also discussed. <p>Comments have been taken into account and used to inform the assessment in to Chapter 12 (Ecology & Nature Conservation) and Chapter 13 (Landscape).</p>
ESG June 2017	No technical discussions took place at the June meeting, only project updates.
ESG July 2017	<p><u>Pitlochry to Killiecrankie draft ES</u></p> <p>Jacobs provided a summary overview of the draft ES for the Pitlochry to Killiecrankie Project.</p> <p><u>Feedback on the schedule of commitments</u></p> <p>There was a discussion on the draft Schedule of Environmental Commitments reviewed by the ESG through the review of the Draft ES for the Killiecrankie to Glen Garry Project. The feedback from the discussion has been considered in the development of Chapter 21 of this ES.</p>
ESG August 2017	No technical discussions took place at the August meeting, only project updates and summaries of Glen Garry to Dalwhinnie, and Tomatin to Moy draft ESs.
ESG September 2017	No ESG held, instead a project update was submitted: draft ES being reviewed by ESG and Auditors and landowner discussions regarding compensatory planting were held in August.
ESG October 2017	<p><u>Pitlochry to Killiecrankie draft ES</u></p> <p>Jacobs provided an update on the Pitlochry to Killiecrankie Project. The ESG were invited to provide feedback on the draft environmental statements; no specific comments relating to the Pitlochry to Killiecrankie Project.</p>

Table 3: Summary/Response to Environmental Forum Comments

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Forum Meeting, February 2017</p> <p><u>Attendees:</u> Transport Scotland SNH The Cairngorms National Park Authority (CNPA) RSPB</p>	<p><u>Mammal Fencing</u></p> <p>Information was presented at the Forum, using P05 has an example, as it was the most advanced in design. The design of P04 aims to balance the requirements of the DMRB (which is the design manual for new roads and bridges) with the landscape impacts from fencing. As the A9 is an existing road, designers have aimed to minimise new fencing being introduced in an effort to minimise visual impacts. Having said this, Otter fences and Badger fencing will be constructed and targeted to key areas such as along watercourses and adjacent to Badger Setts. It was agreed that 'cranks' at the top of such fencing will not be required.</p> <p><u>Badger Mitigation</u></p> <p>Information was also presented on the approach to and assessment of Badger presence on the southern section projects (P02-P05).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Haugh of Kilmorich baseline surveys were completed in January 2015; 	

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
Spey District Fishery Board; Scottish Badgers British Deer Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecologists identified two active outlier setts, the rest were identified as being inactive; The area was resurveyed, which identified a main sett that was still in use. Guidance for sett closure procedure will be followed, allowing for inspections to be undertaken and cameras to be installed to verify the closure process. <p>Sett replacement was not confirmed at this stage but information was provided to the Forum from another Transport Scotland Project on how such a process could take place.</p>	
	<p><u>Deer Permeability</u></p> <p>Mammal permeability was presented at the previous meeting of the Environmental Forum with agreement that specific case would be presented at the next meeting of the Environmental Forum. As a result, information was provided on the permeability of Deer along the A9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mammal vehicle collision data from 2008 until present has been processed and analysed to identify "hot spots" along the A9. Permeability of existing structures along the A9 have been taking into account of the permeability of deer with some landowners blocking passage through their lands. <p>Deer fencing will be on the basis of replacing fencing that has been removed as well as those areas identified as mammal vehicle collision "hotspots".</p>	
Environmental Forum Meeting, November 2017	No formal meeting; a progress update for each of the projects was provided.	

Table 4: Summary/Response to additional Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) Comments

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
NMU Workshop April 2016 <u>Attendees:</u> British Horse Society Cairngorms National Park Authority Cycling UK John Muir Trust Perth & Kinross Council Scotways Sustrans	Why is the central reserve wider at various locations within the scheme?	The central reserve and verge is widened to accommodate the necessary forward visibility on the dual carriageway. This will be reviewed as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment to determine if the central reserve and/or verge can be reduced, while maintaining driver safety.
	Will NMU provision along the Foss Road and Rob Roy Way be maintained?	Rob Roy Way currently crosses the A9 via an at-grade crossing. The proposed scheme design includes provision of a new underpass connecting Foss Road to the Rob Roy. This therefore maintains connectivity and would provide a safer crossing point at this location as NMUs would no longer have to cross the A9 at grade.
	There is an existing crossing point of the Highland Main Line railway immediately to the north of the Railway Cottages (Pitlochry) for a local path. Will this be affected?	The local path network appears to be incorrect as there is no rail crossing point in the location suggested. The only crossing point in the locality is to the railway cottages (Faskally Cottages), which is south of the suggested location. <i>Post-meeting note: Perth & Kinross Council records confirm that there is no railway crossing north of the cottages and that only occasional access is taken along a track through the garden of Faskally Cottage to access pedestrian gates across the railway. Landowner accepts this arrangement but route should not be promoted as it crosses the railway and goes through a private garden.</i>

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
		Network Rail are being consulted as part of the A9 Dualling Programme and have suggested they would like to reduce or remove level-crossings where possible.
	Will road restraint systems be provided alongside NMU routes, separating NMUs from the adjacent dual carriageway?	Provision of road restraint systems will be determined during detailed design. Road restraint systems will be provided if necessary following a suitable risk assessment in accordance with the DMRB.
	Will arrangements for collection of school children be considered?	Consultation has been undertaken with Perth & Kinross Council and bus companies to determine current and future usage. This will be continued during detailed design.
	Will lay-bys and rest areas be provided?	In accordance with the DMRB lay-bys are included as part of the design of the proposed scheme.
<p>NMU Forum May 2016</p> <p><u>Attendees:</u> A9 Action Group Birnam Association of British Riding Schools British Horse Society ByCycle UK CNPA Cairngorms Local Outdoor Access Forum Cycle UK Cycling Scotland Highland Cycle Campaign HITRANS Living Streets National Access Forum Paths for All Perth & Kinross Council Perth and Kinross Countryside Trust (PKCT) Ramblers for Scotland Scotways</p>	<p>NMU Stakeholders raised a series of general concerns with regards to the four individual projects comprising the southern section lot (Pass of Birnam to Glen Garry).</p>	<p>The iterative route design has taken into account where practicable the general comments from the NMU Forum.</p>
	<p>Should structures be proposed across the A9 dual carriageway to accommodate junctions, provision should be included to allow these to be utilised by NMUs to improve connectivity to paths to the east and west of the current A9 and Highland Main Line railway.</p>	<p>Enhanced NMU connections to Tay Forest Park (Craigower) from the A924 via a new bridge are included as part of the proposed scheme, further details are provided in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers)</p>
	<p>Current proposals around Faskally Wood do not maintain the current circular route. Improved connectivity between Faskally Woods and the opposite side of the A9 is desirable.</p>	<p>No potential impacts on journey length are expected for NMU routes in Faskally Wood during operation of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Due to the constraints associated with the Highland Main Line Railway, the existing A9 and the proposed location of the offline widening of the A9 at Craigower Forest, enhanced connectivity between Faskally Wood and Craigower Forest for NMUs at this location has not been possible. However, improved connectivity for NMUs has been provided from the A924 at Faskally Cottages, which would enable NMUs to link to the core path along Clunie Bridge Road, connecting to Faskally Wood.</p>
	<p>Why is the central reserve wider at various locations within the scheme?</p>	<p>The central reserve and verge is widened to accommodate the necessary forward visibility on the dual carriageway. This will be reviewed as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment to determine if the central reserve and/or verge can be reduced, while maintaining driver safety.</p>

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
SNH Scottish Outdoor Access Network SUSTRANS The Mountaineering Council of Scotland TACTRAN The Highland Council Transport Scotland	Will NMU provision along the Foss Road and Rob Roy Way be maintained?	Rob Roy Way currently crosses the A9 via an at-grade crossing. The proposed scheme design includes provision of a new underpass connecting Foss Road to the Rob Roy Way. This therefore maintains connectivity and would provide a safer crossing point at this location as NMUs would no longer have to cross the A9 at grade.
	There is an existing crossing point of the Highland Main Line railway immediately to the north of the Railway Cottages (Pitlochry) for a local path. Will this be affected?	The local path network appears to be incorrect as there is no rail crossing point in the location suggested. The only crossing point in the locality is to the railway cottages (Faskally Cottages), which is south of the suggested location. <i>Post-meeting note: Perth & Kinross Council records confirm that there is no railway crossing north of the cottages and that only occasional access is taken along a track through the garden of Faskally Cottage to access pedestrian gates across the railway. Landowner accepts this arrangement but route should not be promoted as it crosses the railway and goes through a private garden.</i> Network Rail are being consulted as part of the A9 Dualling Programme and have suggested they would like to reduce or remove level-crossings where possible.
	Will road restraint systems be provided alongside NMU routes, separating NMUs from the adjacent dual carriageway?	Provision of road restraint systems will be determined during detailed design. Road restraint systems will be provided if necessary following a suitable risk assessment in accordance with the DMRB.
	Will arrangements for collection of school children be considered?	Consultation has been undertaken with Perth & Kinross Council and bus companies to determine current and future usage. This will be continued during detailed design.
NMU Workshop June 2017 <u>Attendees:</u> British Horse Society CNPA Cycling UK Perth & Kinross Council Scotways	Access provisions along NCR7 at Foss Road Underbridge during construction were queried.	JUK advised that there may be some closures or diversions whilst the Foss Road Underbridge is being constructed. NCR7 travels along Foss Road and passes under Foss Road Underbridge to Pitlochry. As such, NCR7 may be diverted temporarily during construction. Further details of impacts on NCR7 are provided in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
	NMU access provisions for access to the Rob Roy Way were queried.	The existing at-grade crossing will be stopped up and NMUs diverted via a new underpass. The underpass will be a shared local access to Pitlochry Estates.

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
Sustrans	<p>NMU access provisions to Tay Forest Park were queried.</p>	<p>JUK explained that the A9 dualling is offline at Faskally Wood after the Clunie Underbridge. This offline section crosses the Highland Main Line railway with a new underpass constructed in the vicinity of Faskally Cottages. There is a local path that currently utilises an existing railway underpass and provides NMU access to Craigower and Tay Forest Park, which will be realigned and steps will be provided to carry the path across the railway. Provisions will be incorporated for cyclists.</p>
	<p>It was queried if the path at Pitlochry Boating Station would remain open</p>	<p>JUK confirmed that this will remain open although there may be some temporary closures and diversion during construction.</p>
<p>Accessibility Forum March 2017 <u>Attendees:</u> People Friendly Design Mobility and Access Community for Scotland</p>	<p>Rob Roy Way, which is a long distance walk between Drymen and Pitlochry, crossed that A9 at Pitlochry. As a result, a length of the route will be realigned, crossing the A9 via an underbridge. The gradient, which is an improvement to existing width and surface proposed appears suitable. Appropriate signage should be put in place to ensure users are aware of the route.</p>	<p>Mitigation item P04-AT9 in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers) proposes new signage to direct NMUs to the underpass.</p>
	<p>Access to the Enchanted Forest should be maintained, this is an important tourist site.</p>	<p>As reported in Appendix A9.1 (Impact Assessment for NMU Routes and Access to Outdoor Areas), No potential impacts on journey length are expected for NMU routes to Faskally Wood (site of the Enchanted Forest) during operation of the proposed scheme. Overall, Slight residual impacts on NMUs accessing Faskally Wood are expected due to residual impacts on amenity value for three of the paths leading to Faskally Wood however this impact is not considered to be significant.</p>
	<p>The proposals incorporate stairs on an NMU route that leads to the Tay Forest. While existing conditions on the route (e.g. steep gradients) may be barriers to movement, the design must ensure more barriers are not added. Consideration should be given to construction materials to mitigate as much as possible.</p>	<p>Whilst the provision of steps at Pitlochry North Junction may restrict use at this location, due to the topographical and engineering constraints NMU access options to Tay Forest from the A924 were limited.</p> <p>It should be noted that no significant impacts are expected for NMUs accessing Tay Forest via Core Path PLRY/4/Right of Way TP40 (Path 75 in Chapter 9: People and Communities – All Travellers).</p>

Table 5: Summary/Response to Comments Made at Public Exhibitions

Exhibition	Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
Public Exhibition November 2016	Scottish Badger Development Trust	Suggestion that wildlife reflectors should be installed.	Discussed with the Ecology team, there isn't sufficient evidence of their effectiveness, appropriate mitigation to protect mammals can found in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation) including mammal fencing to direct mammals to appropriate crossing points.
Public Exhibition November 2016	Pitlochry and Moulin Community Council	Concerns over visual impact from the East shores of Loch Faskally and request for installation of semi-mature planting.	Highlighted to the Landscape and Visual team, impacts from the East shores of Loch Faskally are included in the Landscape and Visual assessment (Chapters 13 Landscape and 14 Visual)
Public Exhibition November 2016 and Drop in Session March 2017	Member of the public, followed by emails from SWT and PKC biodiversity officer.	Concern over impacts of local large population of northern marsh orchids within the study area.	The ecology assessment considers impact on the northern marsh orchids and mitigation measures (translocation) are proposed to minimise impacts, for additional detail refer to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
Drop in Session, March 2017	Dalshian Chalets	Concerns how business will be affected by the proposed scheme.	Added to the list of businesses to be interviewed for the assessment in Chapter 8 (People and Communities - Community and Private Assets).
Drop in Session, March 2017	Member of the public	Concerns that planting mixes may not be suitable for bees.	Planting mixes proposed in the mitigation plans (Figure 13.5) include a diversity of native species including species rich grassland which will have variable flowering times and is bee friendly. In addition, as part of the Academy9 work bee hotels have been installed throughout the A9 dualling programme, including four locations with Pitlochry to Killiecrankie scheme extents.
Drop in Session, March 2017	Member of the public	Concerns over potential flood impact in Dalshian area.	Meetings held with landowners in vicinity of Dalshian and flood mitigation options investigated.