

Appendix A7.2: Summary of Consultation Responses

1 Introduction

- 1.1.2 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); and
 - The Highland Council (THC).
- 1.1.3 Further consultation has also been undertaken through the Environmental Forum and non-motorised user (NMU) Forum.
- 1.1.4 Table 1 below provides a summary of both statutory and non-statutory consultee comments in relation to the DMRB Stage 3 design and the response to this consultation. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the environmental issues that were discussed at ESG meetings held between March 2016 and May 2018 inclusive that are relevant to the proposed scheme; and Table 3 provides a summary of the issues raised at NMU Workshops in April 2016 and June 2017, and an NMU Forum held in May 2016.
- 1.1.5 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:
- BT;
 - Cycle Touring Club Scotland;
 - Deer Commission Scotland (part of SNH);
 - First Group;
 - National Farmers Union of Scotland;
 - National Trust for Scotland;
 - Paths for All;
 - Perth Museum Biological Records Centre;
 - The Highland and Islands Transport Partnership (HITRANS);
 - The Mountaineering Council of Scotland;
 - Rambling Scotland;
 - Scottish Government, Rural payments and Inspections Directorate;
 - Scottish Mink Initiative;
 - Scottish Outdoor Access Network;
 - Scottish Raptor; and
 - Visit Scotland.

2 Summary of Consultation

Table 1: Summary/response to consultee comments

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
Statutory Consultees		
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	<p>On 20 February 2017, HES was provided with a list of Scheduled Monuments and Category A Listed Buildings located outside the 200m study area, which were to be included in the assessment due to the potential for impacts on their settings. HES responded (1 March 2017) stating that it was content with the approach to assessment and with the list of cultural heritage assets. HES recommended seeking information and advice from PKC on unscheduled archaeology and the potential for as yet unknown archaeological remains within the study area if not already done so.</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>
	<p>In April 2017, a meeting was held with HES to discuss side road options at Guay farmhouse. Technical Note 004 – Guay Side Road Options (TN004) had been supplied to HES prior to the meeting and was used as the basis for discussions. At the meeting, constraints within the area and the design options considered were outlined to HES.</p> <p>HES stated that it was important that whichever side road option was progressed at Guay farmhouse, there was a strategy that ensured the future for the building was sustainable and it is seen as a long term, attractive and marketable property, thus ensuring in the long term that the asset is retained and maintained.</p> <p>TS requested clarification from HES on whether the listed status of the building would be retained or removed should Guay Side Road Option 2 be progressed. HES indicated that the listed status, in part, arises from the presence of the Wing. The listed status could only be determined after the works were identified and completed however added that it was likely the building would retain its listed status.</p>	<p>HES advised that if Guay Side Road Option 2 is progressed, evidence that other options have been considered and rejected will have to be provided. TS/Jacobs would also have to provide a clear strategy on the future use of the building. HES indicated that if Guay Side Road Option 1 is taken forward, HES would not need further information as long as there would be no direct impact on the building.</p>
	<p>A meeting with HES with held in April 2017 to discuss the Kindallachan Cairn. Technical Note 016 – Kindallachan Cairn Scheduled Monument (TN016) had been supplied to HES prior to the meeting and was used as the basis for discussions. At the meeting, constraints within the area and the design options considered were outlined to HES.</p> <p>HES stated that full excavation of the scheduled area prior to construction would be required. HES indicated that geophysical surveys subject to Schedule 42 consent would be acceptable but was not a requirement.</p> <p>HES outlined the process for gaining Scheduled Monument Consent and that notification to the Ministers would be required. Consent would only be granted once the proposed scheme was approved. In the meantime, an application for Scheduled Monument Consent could be drafted once the necessary information was available. In advance of the publication of the Draft Compulsory Purchase Orders, a 'Statement of Common Ground' between HES and TS could also be prepared to stipulate the areas of agreement reached in relation to the removal of the Kindallachan cairn.</p>	<p>Jacobs indicated that trial trenching of the adjacent area would also be proposed and that Jacobs would recommend geophysical surveys are undertaken prior to any excavations to inform TS of cost and programme implications.</p> <p>Geophysical surveys of the Kindallachan cairn and standing stone were carried out October 2017.</p>
	<p>Further to the meeting in April 2017, another meeting was held with HES in August 2017 to discuss the progress that had been made on the Guay side road option designs.</p> <p>HES suggested that separation between Guay Farmhouse and the A9 could be achieved by providing a solid fence in place of the anti-glare panelling.</p> <p>HES confirmed that their main concern is not the partial demolition of the Wing, but a strategy to ensure that the building is maintained throughout the construction to prevent any sort of deterioration that would avert a successful</p>	<p>This information has been used to inform the iterative design development and is discussed further in Chapter 4 (Iterative Design Development).</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>re-sale of Guay Farmhouse (as a residential building or otherwise). HES stated that although partial demolition of the Wing is not ideal they were not opposed to it as long as there is a strategy for short term protection and long term viability of the building.</p> <p>HES enquired on the anticipated duration for the construction period of the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig project. HES highlighted that for comfort they would require to review a short-term maintenance and protection plan that would be put in place during the construction period to help reduce the chances of deterioration to Guay Farmhouse during this time.</p> <p>Jacobs discussed potential remedial works and enquired if HES had guidance of potential remedial works to restore the Wing and types of materials. HES advised that the re-use of materials from the section of the Wing that requires demolishing would be preferred in the reconstruction of what would remain, as the special interest of Guay Farmhouse lies in the use of traditional building materials and details. HES also stated that the structural integrity of the roof is important to the buildings longevity, and as such, suggested that an additional survey is carried out to identify the existing condition of the roof of the Wing to identify if works are required as part of any remedial works.</p> <p>TS queried whether the mitigation provided would differ depending on whether the building remains listed or not, and if HES envisage Guay Farmhouse would retain its listed status after partial demolition of the Wing. HES advised that TS would have to preserve the cultural heritage value of the building regardless of its listed status.</p>	
	<p>The HES responses to their review of the draft ES were discussed at a meeting on 11 June 2018 which was jointly hosted with PKC and PKHT. During the meeting the HES responses on the draft ES Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage) and its supporting appendices and figures were discussed. Particular focus was given to the assessment of potential impacts on Kindallachan Cairn Scheduled Monument, Kindallachan Standing Stone Scheduled Monument and Guay Farmhouse Category B Listed Building and the need for and content of Scheduled Monument Consent applications and Listed Building Consent application respectively. Responses were provided to the comments raised and HES, PKC and PKHT provided further comment by emails on 21 June 2018 (PKHT) and 22 June 2018 (HES and PKC). These further comments informed further refinement of the cultural heritage assessment, and descriptions of alternatives considered and iterative design development chapters.</p>	<p>This informed content of Chapter 3 (Alternatives Considered), Chapter 4 (Iterative Design Development) and the assessment reported in Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage) and its supporting appendices and figures. It also supported the future submission of Scheduled Monument Consent and Listed Building Consent applications.</p>
<p>Perth & Kinross Council (PKC) (including Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (PKHT))</p>	<p>A list of Category B and Category C Listed Buildings that could be similarly affected was provided to PKC in a letter on 20 February 2017. PKC responded (27 March 2017) on behalf of PKHT, stating that they were content with the approach to the assessment and with the list of cultural heritage assets.</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>The consultation has been used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage).</p>
	<p>PKC attended meetings held with HES in April and August 2017 to discuss the Guay side road options and design development.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>A meeting on 18 January 2017 was held with PKC to discuss various aspects of the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig design. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an update on the proposed scheme; • flooding impacts and mitigation proposals; • ecology and landscape impacts; and • cultural heritage and side road design at Guay. <p>Technical Note 004 – Guay Side Road Options (TN004) had been supplied to PKC prior to the meeting and was</p>	<p>Jacobs undertook to continue to engage with PKC on flooding and cultural heritage impacts throughout the development of the proposed scheme.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>used as the basis for the discussions on cultural heritage and side road design at Guay.</p> <p>A meeting was held on 01 March 2017 with PKC where the following details were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKC enquired about the existing NMU route along the C502, and about the acceleration lane for vehicles exiting Rotmell junction. • PKC asked whether Dunkeld Sawmill traffic would be more likely to use the junction at Rotmell rather than go through Dunkeld, and if an asset division plan would be prepared for the works around Rotmell. • PKC enquired about the public reaction to the side road proposal connecting Dowally, Guay and Kindallachan, and about parking for walkers and other NMUs at the Loch Ordie Area. • PKC raised concerns about flooding to the north of Guay, and in the Sloggan Burn. • PKC queried the retention of bus stop provision at Kindallachan. If these were provided, PKC would need to consult with public transport as this may have an impact on the winter maintenance regime and classification of the road. • PKC queried the ownership of the proposed overbridge north of Kindallachan and whether it would have NMU provision, and asked about land take beside the A9, including slopes. • PKC advised that they have their own design standard, National Roads Development Guide, which should be used over DMRB for side road alignments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jacobs confirmed that the existing NMU route along the C502 would remain mostly unchanged and that the developing design is likely to accommodate NMU provision within the verge. In regards to the acceleration lane, the proposed junction layout will provide a merge taper in line with the DMRB standard, and the existing short diverge taper for southbound traffic exiting the A9 will also be improved. Any potential change in vehicle usage on the C502 would primarily be due to the restricted movement of the junction as the C502 road alignment is generally as per the existing route Jacobs confirmed the asset division plan is typically produced at the end of the job and will define the maintenance and ownership responsibilities of the roads, drainage, land and junction, following completion of the project. • Jacobs commented that the public feedback was mostly regarding the left in/left out junction(s), and that the condition and surfacing of the road has been raised in feedback. As part of the DMRB assessment, refinements and alterations are continuing to be made to the side roads. • Regarding parking, Jacobs informed that their intention was to provide a shared use facility between Dowally and Guay, and in the verge from Guy to Kindallachan, as well as parking at the church when it is not in use. • Jacobs confirmed they were aware of the flooding and that the design would be altered to reduce the flood impact, and that minor watercourses were under review and discussions were underway with residents. • Following PKC's query regarding the bus stop at Kindallachan, Jacobs arranged a meeting with the PKC public transport unit to discuss options. • Jacobs and TS confirmed that the overbridge and waterproofing would be owned by TS and the surfacing adopted by PKC. While there were no NMU provisions in the current proposal, Jacobs advised this could be reviewed during Stage 3. Earthwork slopes would also be reviewed during Stage 3 design development and on receipt of the results of the ground investigation works. • Jacobs acknowledged the use of PKC design standard but stated there were primarily for urban as opposed to rural roads. The proposed side roads were designed as a combination of the DMRB and National Roads Development Guide design standards. No agreement was reached but all agreed to reach agreement in principal before Orders were published.
	<p>At a meeting on 29 March 2017, PKC raised an issue regarding the C502 junction at Rotmell and the volume of local traffic from Blairgowrie and other nearby villages that use the route to avoid Dunkeld.</p>	<p>Jacobs confirmed that the intention is to create a new Grade Separated Junction (GSJ) at Dalguise that will allow traffic exiting at Rotmell to turn and head north on the A9.</p>
	<p>A meeting on 03 May 2017 was held with PKC to discuss public transport. PKC outlined the requirement for crossing points for children to be assessed from a safety perspective, and that use of buses would be preferable to taxis to get children to and from school.</p> <p>PKC indicated that it was feasible to run a public bus from Ballinluig to Dowally and Kindallachan provided that there was a turning circle at Dowally following the A9 dualling, such as the one available at Blackford. PKC</p>	<p>Jacobs indicated they have considered bus stop provisions located on the A9 for both local bus and school services.</p> <p>Jacobs presented a drawing highlighting the existing and potential bus stops and provided details on the three options under consideration to maintain the bus stops on the A9.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>envisage extending bus service 24. PKC commented that these options would appear to generate considerable costs, when there might be an alternative solution, i.e. extending bus service 24.</p> <p>At a meeting on 30 May 2017, PKC were informed of the proposed junction at Rotmell. PKC raised concerns that the traffic volumes would reduce considerably and in turn increase traffic travelling through Dunkeld. PKC queried whether the junction was still required if no vehicles would use the junction as access to the A9. PKC also commented that they had previously considered closing the junction due to landslips in 2003. PKC queried ownership of the proposed retaining walls and said they envisage these would be owned by the landowner. PKC queried if high friction surfacing would be used for pavement construction on the side road network and encouraged use of a different method. PKC agreed with Jacobs that the width of the proposed side road north of the Guay/Tulliemet road junction could be reduced to 5.5m due to the rural nature of the Dowally to Kindallachan side road, however this was to be confirmed. PKC stated they would review and inform Jacobs of their decision regarding speed limits on the side roads. PKC queried where the local road network would stop in relation to the Kindallachan North junction. The potential for flooding of the access track at Westhaugh of Tulliemet/Inch Farm was queried by PKC.</p>	<p>Jacobs queried if there were available passenger numbers within Kindallachan to assist in the design process and confirmed they would undertake further consultation with bus service providers.</p> <p>Jacobs acknowledged that according to traffic modelling information, traffic volumes would reduce at this junction, though this information was still to be finalised. Jacobs confirmed that the junction was still required due to the vehicles travelling to Blairgowrie from the northern extent of the scheme (approximately 450 AADT). Removal of this junction would result in a further increase of traffic travelling through Dunkeld. Jacobs advised that the asset plan would be prepared at a later date. Jacobs agreed to consider other surfacing methods as part of any further discussion on pavement composition. Jacobs explained that the current side road proposal at Dowally to Kindallachan have been designed for a 30mph speed limit due to their rural nature. It was confirmed by Jacobs that the local road network limits will be clarified as part of the asset division plan. Regarding Westhaugh of Tulliemet/Inch Farm, Jacobs explained that all side road and accesses have been designed with flood levels taken into consideration.</p>
	<p>Meeting with PKC on 15 September 2017 to discuss the development of the Guay side road options and local bus provision options. Jacobs informed PKC that provision for the local bus service has been incorporated within the design. PKC agreed that the local bus service proposals and the proposed carriageway width was acceptable.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>Meeting with PKC on 6 October 2017 to provide an update on the progress of the flood modelling and proposed mitigation for the proposed scheme. During the meeting PKC requested the details of the return period was identified for the December 2015 storm used to calibrate the model. PKC confirmed that they agree with the pragmatic approach to provision of mitigation presented at the meeting.</p> <p>Jacobs also provided an overview of the proposed drainage design at the meeting. PKC were informed that the floodplain impacts six of the nine drainage catchments within the scheme extents, and incorporating traditional SuDS features at these locations would have a negative impact on flood levels. Jacobs provided details on their approach to determine the most appropriate SuDS provision for each catchment as agreed with SEPA, a hierarchy of 3 options including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a bunded pond above the 30-year flood level; • an un-bunded pond that would be inundated by a 30-year flood but would provide water quality benefits to more frequent rainfall events; or • a combination of geocellular storage units with a Vortex Separator Chamber within the carriageway verge to attenuate and treat run-off where outfall levels, flood levels or groundwater levels preclude the other options. <p>PKC agreed that this pragmatic approach to SuDS provision was acceptable to minimise the impact on areas of floodplain.</p>	<p>Jacobs undertook to continue to engage with PKC on flooding throughout the development of the proposed scheme.</p>
	<p>Meeting with PKC and PKHT to discuss cultural heritage assets on 8 March 2018. PKHT sought clarification on the curatorial role for the project and Jacobs confirmed that there was no decision on this as yet. Guay Farmhouse was then discussed and an update on the development of the DMRB Stage 3 design was</p>	<p>This informed the assessment reported in Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage) and its supporting appendices and figures and the future submission of Listed Building Consent.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>provided, particularly in relation to the mainline and side road alignment in the vicinity of Guay Farmhouse. PKC reiterated that a clear case would need to be made in terms of the “tests” for demolition detailed in the Historic Environment Scotland (HES) <i>Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Demolition</i> guidance, and that the proposed works to the Wing of Guay Farmhouse are necessary to allow for the wider public benefit of the A9 development. JUK in turn emphasised some of the design limitations and design refinements that have been considered and have resulted in the current Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 3 design proposal, these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mainline alignment widening limited to the southbound carriageway due to the proximity of the Highland Main Line railway; • reducing volumetric loss from the River Tay floodplain; • design refinement of the Dowally to Kindallachan Side Road, particularly limiting the cross section to 5.5m because of use of the side road as a local bus route; and • maintaining separation between the proposed scheme and the property through use of retaining wall structures. <p>PKC emphasised that Listed Building Consent would be required and that a clear case setting out the benefits of the proposed development along with evidence that efforts have been made to reduce the need for intervention also included. The application should also clearly detail the works proposed and the repairs to the structure and fabric of the building. In addition, PKC would also need to see clear proposals for the re-use of material derived from the alteration works, and the long-term use and viability of the building providing for its continued active use. It was clarified that the works to the Wing of Guay Farmhouse would be considered an Alteration.</p> <p>PKC confirmed that they would consult with HES over any Listed Building Consent application and that if clear evidence was provided in the application that the “tests” for demolition had been met, it was likely that the application would be considered consentable.</p>	
	<p>The PKC responses to their review of the draft ES were discussed at a meeting on 30 May 2018 which was jointly hosted with SEPA. During the meeting the PKC responses on the draft ES Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) and its supporting appendices and figures were discussed. Full responses were provided to the comments raised and no remaining substantive issues were identified.</p>	<p>This informed the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) and its supporting appendices and figures.</p>
	<p>The PKC/PKHT responses to their review of the draft ES were discussed at a meeting on 11 June 2018 which was jointly hosted with HES. During the meeting the PKC/PKHT responses on the draft ES Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage) and its supporting appendices and figures were discussed. Particular focus was given to the assessment of potential impacts on Guay Farmhouse Category B Listed Building and the need for and content of Listed Building Consent. Full responses were provided to the comments raised and PKC and PKHT provided further comment by emails on 21 June 2018 (PKHT) and 22 June 2018 (PKC). These further comments informed further refinement of the cultural heritage assessment, and descriptions of alternatives considered and iterative design development chapters.</p>	<p>This informed the content of Chapter 3 (Alternatives Considered), Chapter 4 (Iterative Design Development) and the assessment reported in Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage) and its supporting appendices and figures. It also supported the future submission of Listed Building Consent.</p>
	<p>PKC confirmed by email on 11 June 2018 that it is the Council’s intention to utilise the proposed new side road to Kindallachan and Dowally for a local bus service and school transport provision (if entitled pupils reside in these settlements).</p> <p>The local bus service may not necessarily be named Service 24 but nonetheless PKC shall require to serve these locations with public transport. Therefore it will utilise the proposed new side road and turning circle.</p>	<p>This informed the assessment reported in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).</p>
PKHT	Following a consultation request to confirm assets to be considered in the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, PKHT did	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>not identify additional Listed Buildings.</p> <p>In response to a technical note on the side road options at Guay, PKHT indicated that Guay Side Road Option 1 would be the preferred option as Guay Farmhouse will not be directly impacted. However, Guay Farmhouse would be negatively impacted by both options and PKHT appreciated the outlined benefits associated with Guay Side Road Option 2.</p> <p>With regards to mitigation, PKHT advised that some level of recording would be required for both options but Guay Side Road Option 1 would be a basic record of the building in its setting where as Guay Side Road Option 2 would require comprehensive historic building record of the building.</p> <p>PKC later confirmed in an email dated 29/06/17 that they were content with a Level 2 Historic Building Survey (Historic England, 2016).</p>	<p>This informed the mitigation proposals within Chapter 15 (Cultural Heritage).</p>
<p>Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)</p>	<p>During a meeting on 14 December 2015, SEPA explained that drainage systems will be designed to provide two levels of treatment and reduce flows during a 1 in 100-year rainfall event (+20% climate change) to the equivalent greenfield runoff from a 1 in 2-year event. Filter drains and detention basins are generally the preferred method for achieving the two levels of treatment, however the constrained nature of the projects, which encompass challenging topography and the Highland Main Line railway, may make providing two levels of treatment, using these measures, unfeasible in some cases. In locations where detention basins will not be practical alternative methods will have to be considered. For example, this may include the consideration of vortex separator chambers to provide a level of treatment and geocellular storage to provide attenuation.</p> <p>Traffic levels are generally low and flow rates are typically high in the major watercourses. Jacobs are utilising the Highways Agency Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) system to help demonstrate that the outfalls from the proposed drainage infrastructure will not pose an unacceptable risk to the receiving watercourses.</p> <p>Detention basins are being designed to achieve a 24-hour retention time. If this retention time was reduced the detention basins could be made smaller to reduce the impact on the surrounding environment. SEPA to consider whether the 24-hour retention time could be reduced with focus made on designing the basins to achieve the greenfield flow rate.</p> <p>SEPA stated that they were unlikely to require a third level of treatment, with possible exceptions in areas where an increased risk of pollution (e.g. accident black spots) would be anticipated. However, as accident black spots should be removed as part of the dualling programme this is not considered to be an issue.</p> <p>SEPA suggested that input would be required from Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) as they may request a third level of treatment at some locations, potentially near Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or where there have been previous problems with oil spills.</p> <p>SEPA are currently considering the possibility of licences being required for the discharge to the water environment from construction stage SUDS. Consideration should therefore be given as to how construction stage SUDS, which will have to be designed and built to achieve the same standard of discharge as any permanent SUDS, can be incorporated into the layout of each scheme.</p> <p>SEPA to consider whether one level of treatment would be adequate for the existing carriageway in certain locations and whether they have any comments on outfalling below the 1 in 30-year flood level in constrained locations.</p> <p>SEPA also queried whether lay-bys could be considered for geocellular storage locations.</p> <p>SEPA are in discussions with Scottish and Southern Energy (SSE) regarding the possibility of increasing the baseline flow of the River Garry, particularly in summer.</p> <p>SEPA were asked to confirm whether the two cascades within the section have any ecological value, particularly in relation to fish spawning.</p> <p>Further email correspondence was received from SEPA on 26 April 2016 in response to a Technical Note on</p>	<p>Jacobs noted that HAWRAT does not assess salt within the runoff. The Jacobs Water Quality team is currently investigating ways to measure the potential impacts of the increased level of salt on the watercourses.</p> <p>Where detention basins cannot be provided due to level or spatial constraints it is proposed that dry swales are incorporated to provide a second level of treatment and attenuation.</p> <p>Jacobs to provide SEPA with access to drainage drawings.</p> <p>Jacobs issued SEPA with drainage technical notes, similar to that provided for Project 02, for Projects 03, 04, 05 and 06. Justification on alternative SuDS techniques to be provided within the notes.</p> <p>Jacobs explained that lay-bys are being considered and, where appropriate, may be utilised for the drainage network.</p> <p>Jacobs agreed to discuss the cascades with SNH.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>Drainage Treatment and Attenuation. SEPA noted that there were no outfalls shown for a couple of the detention basins, and that the Run G Detention basin appeared to be on the site of an existing pond – it is not acceptable to use part of the water environment as SUDS.</p>	
	<p>Following a request, SEPA provided the following data/information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flood risk information; • water quality monitoring data for watercourses within 10km 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 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. Outfall drainage was also discussed and it was confirmed that it did not affect freshwater pearl mussels.</p>	<p>Information/data provided by SEPA was incorporated into the EIA in relation to Chapter 10 (Geology, Soils, Contaminated Land and Groundwater) and Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).</p>
	<p>A meeting (28 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 A11.8 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>Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for Minor Watercourse Crossings – Jacobs outlined the purpose of the document and explained that it was developed from earlier culvert analysis and was an attempt to cover all possible eventualities along the route. SEPA explained that they preferred to see location specific information but in principle they had no specific issues with the document. Jacobs explained that each structure was assessed individually using the process outlined, with some structures screened out at each stage.</p> <p>SEPA explained that based on previous discussions, they envisage accepting a situation where culverts are enlarged (where necessary) with increased flow as long as there was no increase in flood risk to properties. This position was specifically on the River Garry because of its alignment and relationship in terms of time to peak with the minor watercourses. Application to other watercourses would be dependent on similar conditions.</p> <p>SEPA also explained that where there were no receptors upstream then they would prefer to see the following hierarchy applied for any loss of floodplain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compensatory storage; then 2. Risk-based assessment based on consequences. <p>However, SEPA acknowledged that it was undesirable and potentially a constraint to the proposed scheme where there was floodwater impounded by the road and that minor watercourse proposals may be influenced by this in some places.</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</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>It was further suggested that a cost-benefit approach would be undertaken to include consideration of the relative costs of culvert extension/enlargement, impacts from flooding and land purchase costs.</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>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>Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) and Appendix A11.3 (Flood Risk Assessment) detail the assessment and mitigation measures proposed.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>without recognition of the CAR licence process or requirements of the FRA and ES.</p> <p>SEPA confirmed that they are content with this approach and would expect to see the mitigation approach justified on a case-by-case basis with inclusion of impact on receptors.</p>	
	<p>A meeting was held on 9 September 2016 to discuss SEPA's feedback on the Flood Mitigation Summary Paper Rev08, SEPA noted that specific feedback to individual parties about flooding would only be possible following further design development and modelling. Nevertheless, the flood impact at key receptors was a key consideration for SEPA with particular concern regarding residential properties.</p> <p>SEPA acknowledges the limit of modelling accuracy, and that quoting changes of <10mm is subject to an error of a similar order. There were discussions around the negligible impacts criteria (+/- 10mm). This is not SEPA guidance, however it has been included as part of the A9 Design Guide (SEPA Flood Risk Guidance does not make reference to any requirements for water level changes between pre- and post-development model runs). SEPA also indicated that there is a lot of public scrutiny and the public would potentially not accept anything less than zero. This was noted by Jacobs to be an unrealistic expectation in modelling terms i.e. replicating the pre-scheme water levels to the nearest millimetre across the full modelling domain. SEPA indicated that it agreed with this in principle, i.e. that SEPA understands the complexities of hydraulic modelling and that to achieve no change (positive or negative) to water levels is not a realistic expectation of a hydraulic model of this nature.</p> <p>SEPA noted a decrease in flood level may also be a concern because a shallower depth may imply an increased velocity. With regard to velocity, SEPA's concern is primarily with regard to the impact of increased velocities on the railway line, with the possibility of increased scour risk. In the event that there is an increased risk of scour, it would expect to see a demonstration of appropriate mitigation to manage this scour risk. However, increased velocity impacting on the A9 and properties is also relevant.</p> <p>SEPA indicated they did not have specific concerns with River Tay and associated SAC and SSSI.</p> <p>Overall SEPA accept that the certainty over no increase in flood levels and scouring cannot be provided until DMRB Stage 3 level of assessment. However, they felt it was important to raise their concerns at this stage to ensure they are taken into account as the design progresses. Meeting Notes (Continued) Page 3 of 3 Jacobs U.K. Limited A9 Dualling Programme: Pass of Birnam to Glenn Garry SEPA also noted that the comments are taking into consideration that the paper considers potential mitigation measures at this stage, i.e. the measures are not fully developed. At the next stage, a discussion with SEPA would be appropriate on the specific mitigation measures that are proposed to be progressed.</p>	N/A
	<p>Jacobs met with SEPA on 29 June 2017 to discuss drainage treatment and attenuation proposals along the proposed scheme. Flood risk assessment and proposed mitigation was also discussed. Technical Note 'Drainage Treatment and Attenuation Within Floodplain Area' which was issued to SEPA on 5 June 2017 as the basis for discussion.</p> <p>With respect to drainage treatment and attenuation proposals, the merits of SuDS ponds (bundled and un-bundled) and geocellular storage units and Vortex Separator Chamber were discussed. it was proposed that SuDS proposals for the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig project should be considered in the order of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ponds bundled to the 3.33% AEP (30-year) fluvial flood level. • Un-bundled ponds or constructed wetlands. • Geocellular Storage with VSC <p>SEPA agreed and re-iterated that minimising flood impacts is the key issue.</p> <p>Jacobs tabled the latest revisions of the drawings detailing the impact of the scheme on peak water levels for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the 0.5% AEP (200-year) plus climate change event (unmitigated); • the 0.5% AEP (200-year) plus climate change event (mitigated); 	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the 0.5% AEP (200-year) event (mitigated); and the 3.33% AEP (30-year) event (mitigated). <p>Additional drawings were tabled highlighting the areas of proposed compensatory flood storage and key receptors, including areas for discussion.</p> <p>SEPA suggested that compensatory storage should be designed to protect properties from a more frequent event than the 0.5% AEP (200-year) event plus climate change design event. It was considered that this would be more likely to be acceptable to residents than preventing increases at a higher event but not more frequent events where properties are already inundated with flood water to depth. It was agreed that Jacobs would estimate the flooding threshold for key receptors and then convene a WebEx meeting to present the results and agree a revised design event for mitigation design. SEPA advised that for the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig project, mitigation should be targeted at this threshold event. SEPA advised their preference is for no increase at the threshold event and such increases at the 0.5% AEP (200-year) plus climate change event would not be a concern provided there is no increase in flood risk at the threshold event. This only applies to the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig project.</p> <p>Jacobs explained that the scheme as presented did not provide volume-for-volume mitigation for that lost as a result of the scheme. The scheme removes approximately 76,000m³ of floodplain for the 0.5% AEP (200-year) plus climate change event and currently provides approximately 59,000m³ as compensatory storage. SEPA indicated that they were interested more on the impact on conveyance and peak water levels than volume and if the impact on these two criteria could be addressed full volume mitigation would not be required if impracticable due to environmental or agricultural impacts. SEPA recognised that there were areas for livestock refuge during flood events and that they would prefer that they remain unaffected. SEPA requested a comparison of hydrographs at the downstream end of P3 to ascertain the impact of the scheme and mitigation design on conveyance. If it was found to have no impact additional compensatory storage would not be required by SEPA.</p> <p>SEPA advised that if the downstream hydrograph with the dualling scheme was the same as the baseline then volumetric floodplain loss is not a concern (as above). SEPA re-iterated that, same as for the current option, if the impact on conveyance and peak water levels could be addressed, full volume mitigation would not be required if impracticable.</p> <p>Jacobs queried the 600mm freeboard requirement, stating that in some limited areas (approximately 200m in total) only 450mm can be provided during the 0.5% AEP (200-year) plus climate change event, based on the current design, to achieve a standard vertical alignment on the mainline carriageway. SEPA indicated that they were content with a 450mm freeboard depth in this case as flood mechanisms in the area were well understood.</p>	
	<p>A subsequent meeting held on 13 July 2017, Jacobs provided an overview of the flood modelling work undertaken since the previous meeting on 29 June 2017.</p> <p>On review of the model outputs for a number of tested return periods at key receptors along the route, it was agreed by participants that the scheme starts to have wider flooding impacts at sensitive receptors (properties) in the 1 in 50 year return period flood event. On this basis, it was agreed with SEPA that any flood mitigation would be designed to mitigate the impact of the scheme upon flood risk at the 1 in 50 year return period. It was noted that this mitigation would likely provide minimal benefit to the 1 in 200 and 1 in 200 year + CC flood event.</p> <p>Jacobs confirmed that although compensatory flood storage for volumetric loss of the floodplain can be provided for the current Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 3 route during the 1 in 200 year + CC flood event, it has a significant impact on landowners along the A9 but with little benefit in terms of mitigating for peak water level. SEPA confirmed that from their perspective flood levels are the most critical figure however a review of the downstream residual flow should be undertaken. Jacobs confirmed that for the 1 in 200 year + CC flood event figures for the downstream peak flow increase for the current mitigated scheme design were shown to be approximately 1m³/s compared to a baseline peak of approximately 2540m³/s. It was agreed with SEPA that this was negligible.</p>	

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>Jacobs provided a summary of an alternative overbridge and junction design currently under assessment between Dowally and Guay. This option generally has the same level difference as the current option (1-2mm worse off in certain areas than the current DMRB Stage 3 route) however would result in an additional 25,000m³ loss from the floodplain. Although mitigation can be provided to compensate, there is a significant loss of land from surrounding landowners. SEPA confirmed that the additional volumetric loss of the floodplain is not a concern subject to confirmation that the downstream flow is not significantly affected.</p> <p>Jacobs proposed that the attenuation for the wetlands be reduced to a 1 in 30 year attenuation to minimise the encroachment within the floodplain. SEPA agreed that a reduction in attenuation volume from 200 year to 30 year would be acceptable provided that improved treatment (constructed wetland) was provided for more frequent return periods. SEPA also acknowledged that dilution resulting from a 30 year flood in the River Tay overtopping a constructed wetland would result in minimal adverse impact. SEPA requested that Jacobs justify each Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) selection (Pond/un-bunded wetland/geocellular storage) based on the constraints encountered at each outfall location, including levels, groundwater impacts on land use and flood plain encroachment. As a priority, SuDS solution should minimise the impact on the floodplain area where possible.</p>	
	<p>An overview meeting was held on 31 August 2017 of the flood mitigation work undertaken on the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig project and summarised the discussions with SEPA over the past few months (meetings held on 29 June 2018 and 31 July 2017).</p> <p>The flood modelling undertaken to date including the baseline, no mitigation and with mitigation scenarios over a range of return periods between 1 in a 20-year flood event and 1 in a 200-year flood event plus climate change allowance (20%). Environmental impacts on the mitigation and the outcome of more frequent return periods was also considered.</p> <p>Hydraulic modelling has also been carried out on further return periods to identify any impact to key receptors at these additional return periods. This modelling has shown that the impact at property is below 5mm in all the additional return periods modelled (20 year, 30 year, 60 year, 75 year, 100 year and 200 year) with the exception of the Haugh of Kilmorich (increase of between 7 and 10mm in the 60, 75, 100 and 200 year events) and Guay Farmhouse (increase of approximately 60mm in an unmitigated 200 year event).</p>	N/A
	<p>The Tay Crossing to Ballinluig flood model was issued to SEPA for their review on 14 September 2017. Comments were received on the model on 19 October 2017. Responses to the comments were prepared and issued to SEPA on 13 April 2018. At a meeting with SEPA on 30 May 2018, SEPA indicated that they had no further comments on the Flood Model.</p>	N/A
	<p>The SEPA responses to their review of the draft ES were discussed at a meeting on 30 May 2018 which was jointly hosted with PKC. During the meeting the SEPA responses on the draft FRA (Appendix A11.4 of the draft ES) were discussed. Full responses were provided to the comments raised and no remaining substantive issues were identified.</p>	This informed the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) and its supporting appendices and figures.
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)	<p>On 24 April 2017, SNH requested clarification over the species of bat present at Guay Farm. There was uncertainty over whether this is a confirmed maternity roost of whiskered bats. If confirmed, this would raise questions about whether a bat licence could be granted, and the only effective mitigation measure would be retention of the roost. Evidence is required to prove what type of bat species are present at Guay.</p>	<p>Nine dropping samples were collected from the Wing of Guay Farmhouse over three successive years. Jacobs sent samples of the bat droppings for DNA analysis and the results of the analysis identified brown long-eared bats, common pipistrelle and Natterer's bats within the Wing of Guay Farmhouse. Whiskered bats were not found to be present. Jacobs prepared a report summarising the DNA findings, submitted to SNH in October 2017.</p> <p>Jacobs have also prepared a bat species protection plan for Guay Farmhouse, outlining proposed mitigation measures, which was submitted to SNH in September 2017.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>Summary of conversation points covered between SNH and Jacobs regarding Fresh Water Pearl Mussels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEPA only consult with SNH where there may be a sensitive issue (e.g. mussels may/are present) with gravel abstraction and are seeking advice. • SNH advice is site specific and no set criteria or screening process followed. • SNH advise that SAC habitat is not lost but take into consideration habitat use e.g. if spawning habitat is present or if area is used by migratory fish. Noted that gravel is taken from exposed bar/banks and so really there should not be an effect. • SEPA have guidance in general binding rules that there should be no gravel abstraction 50m away from mussels (minimum distance). • SEPA follow their own guidance when allowing gravel to be abstracted and is on a case by case basis and generally SNH are not consulted. <p>Taken together SNH do not have any set criteria/screening process when providing advice on gravel abstractions and potential impacts, as each location is unique and advice is provided on a case by case basis.</p>	N/A
Scottish Water	<p>Meeting was held on 24 August 2016 where Scottish Water expressed concern that all 4 projects enter the construction phase at the same time, as it may not be possible for all diversions to take place simultaneously.</p> <p>Scottish Water identified two locations where their apparatus could be affected by the proposed scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guay and Kindallachan the existing water supply appears to cross the existing A9 for a short stretch. • Haugh of Kilmorich the existing water supply appears to cross the existing A9 for a short section and then cross back to the east of the existing carriageway. <p>Scottish water queried some of the pipework locations.</p> <p>General, project-wide issues that arose from the meeting include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preference that where Scottish Water assets cross the A9, these should be placed in a duct; • preference that supply is dualled where assets cross the carriageway; • replacement of any septic tanks that are removed; • access and availability for maintenance of private water supplies; • street furniture, shelters, gantries and street lighting to be designed to avoid interference with assets; • impacts on assets to be considered during assessment; • safe access for maintenance and repair to assets to be considered at design stage; and • adoption of a standardised numbering system for diversions. <p>In January 2017, following a request from Jacobs, Scottish Water provided information on their apparatus and preliminary details of the effects on these.</p>	This information has been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).
Marine Scotland (MS)	<p>MS stated that it is the responsibility of the Tay District Salmon Fisheries Board (TDSFB) to consult SNH and engage in the Appropriate Assessment process associated with the Habitats Directive when such an activity is likely to impinge upon an SAC.</p> <p>MS informed that they have issued licenses to the TDSFB to collect broodstock that could provide progeny to stock the upper Garry. MS also carry out an assessment that includes the potential impacts of both the removal of the broodstock and those associated with the stocking of the progeny. These assessments include consultation with SNH. In the case of the TDSFB application, SNH did not object to the collection of broodstock and did not identify a Likely Significant Effect (LSE) to the salmon qualifying interest of the SAC.</p>	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	MS provided copy of assessment as requested.	
Non-Statutory Consultees		
British Horse Society (BHS)	<p>During a meeting held on 7 November 2013, BHS welcomed their early involvement and input into the NMU consultations and hoped that their comments could feed into the overall design principles along the route of the proposed dualling.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>During a NMU workshop on 20 June 2017, BHS expressed a preference for road restraint systems to be provided where an NMU route is alongside the A9.</p>	<p>This information has been used to inform the assessment reported in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).</p> <p>During the NMU workshop on 20 June 2017, Jacobs confirmed that the assessment for road restraint provisions are undertaken in accordance with the DMRB and involves a risk assessment approach that considers a number of factors, including usage and topography, and this would be considered at Stage 3.</p>
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)	<p>BT were consulted in March 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. A response was not provided.</p> <p>During a meeting on 13 April 2017, discussions took place around the possibility of a temporary turning point just north of the Tay Crossing and that this could result in apparatus having to be moved twice. Discussions also took place around the possibility of using Geocellular storage tanks at the north of the section. BT would prefer their apparatus was not above/below this.</p>	Feedback from the C2/C3 process will inform the Constructability Review.
ByCycle	Concern with the Sustrans RR83 path alongside the A9 which is of great importance to NMUs. A steady stream of cyclists use it as a connecting link from Ballinluig to Dunkeld which is quicker than NCN 77 on the other side of the river. Do not regard the proposed replacement which sends cyclists up the hill via Tulliemet, as a reasonable alternative. It is necessary to reinstate the carriageway path along its length.	As part of the proposed scheme, provisions will be made for cyclists alongside the existing A9 or side roads, following the existing route.
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.	<p>No underpasses are proposed as part of the scheme.</p> <p>Where any new path, underpass or access point forms part of the proposed scheme, the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 were taken into account and potential barriers to disabled people such as gradient, verge width, radius of bends and surfacing were considered.</p>
EE 3	MBNL were consulted in March 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.	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.
Forestry Commission Scotland	Following a request, the Forestry Commission Scotland provided data on the Native Woodland Survey of Scotland. At a meeting on 4 February 2016, the Forestry Commission requested a strategic plan be produced for future access routes for timber haulage across the full scheme, and queried future access provision for significant woodland blocks.	<p>These data have been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA discussed in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).</p> <p>Regarding access routes, Jacobs responded that the options available would be considered at the next stage and subject to on-going discussions, then confirmed through the detailed design work.</p>
The Grayling	TGS were consulted to comment on fish species and their habitats in connection with the A9 dualling programme.	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
Society (TGS)	The organisation stated that the protection of grayling and grayling fishings should be considered in developing the proposed scheme and good design and constructional practice should be implemented.	
Living Streets Scotland	Living Streets Scotland showed concerns on the proposed scheme if it was to lead to any deterioration in safety and convenience for people on foot. However welcomed assurances that any impacts on pedestrians would be mitigated appropriately. Also attended the NMU forums held in May 2015 and May 2016.	N/A
National Grid	Following a C3 request to indicate the position and depth of National Grid's apparatus in accordance with the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991; National Grid responded stating that they do not own any assets in the area and that the company Jacobs will need to contact is Scotland Gas Networks.	Scottish Gas Networks was contacted by Jacobs.
Network Rail	Following a C3 request to indicate the position and depth of NR's apparatus in accordance with the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991; information was provided in response to Jacobs' enquiry for Network Rail's known underground assets based on the location details and map that Jacobs supplied.	N/A
	Meetings were held fortnightly from June 2017 onwards to update Network Rail in relation to interfaces with rail infrastructure as well as review any further queries that Network Rail may have about the design and construction of the proposed scheme.	These meetings with Network Rail have highlighted any queries/concerns Network Rail may have that Transport Scotland/Jacobs should fully consider. Design details regarding construction of specific structure relevant to Network Rail will be updated at the ongoing fortnightly meetings to ensure any issues and/or queries are addressed.
Perth Museum Biological Records Centre	Data received from the last 5 years on aquatic receptors and mammals within 500m of the existing A9.	N/A
Police Scotland	A meeting was held with 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. 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 Environmental Statement.	The impact assessment of the proposed scheme on NMU access is provided in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Tayside and Fife	RSPB emailed with concerns over the new route between Dowally and Ballinluig, questioning if TS and Jacobs would be undertaking a public consultation before choosing the preferred route.	RSPB were invited to a public exhibition.
	Following requests, RSPB provided data on breeding bird records within 2km in either direction of the existing A9. 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.	These data have been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA, Reference is made to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation). The assessment of the proposed scheme on designated sites of nature conservation interest is also provided in Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
Saving Scotland's Red Squirrels	SSRS were contacted by Jacobs for any records that they may have relevant to the proposed scheme. SSRS advised that all of their data was available on NBN.	N/A

A9 Dualling Programme: Tay Crossing to Ballinluig
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A7.2: Summary of Consultation Responses



Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
(SSRS)		
Scottish Ambulance Services (SAS)	A meeting was held with SAS and Jacobs on 28 April 2016, in order to gain input from the emergency services providers in relation to the proposed route options under development. 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.	N/A
Scottish Badgers	After receiving correspondence with details of the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig section, Scottish Badgers informed that the feeder road in the area of Haugh of Kilmorich coincides with three badger main setts and would lead to a complex relocation plan. Scottish Badgers subsequently asked if this was negotiable. During a site meeting with Scottish badgers (28 March 2017), a walkover survey was undertaken to determine the characteristics of the setts and discuss options for sett relocation. Scottish badgers raised concerns over survey timing as it may be moving past the optimal survey period come the end of April. Scottish Badgers stressed that replacement setts should be as close to the sett to be lost as possible.	Information was passed to the ecologist to inform on design refinement. An updated survey for mitigation discussion was subsequently provided. These data have been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA, Reference is made to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation). Jacobs confirmed their intention to start surveys as soon as possible. Jacobs explained that surveyors will be undertaking walkovers and bait marking simultaneously to increase efficiency. Jacobs and Scottish Badgers discussed the challenges of replacement sett design and successful uptake, including seeding and monitoring, and Scottish Badgers were content with this approach.
Scottish Fire and Rescue	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. Jacobs confirmed that details of new bridge structures will be available as part of the Stage 3 design process. Explanation was provided by Jacobs for the A9 Dualling lay-by strategy including standards and location of proposed lay-bys.
Scottish Gas Network (SGN)	SGN were consulted in March 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 Telecom responded to the request in May 2016 stating that they had no apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	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. At a meeting (June 2017) Scotways queried if the footpath would be designed as a cycleway. 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.	These data have been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA. Refer to Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers). Jacobs confirmed that discussions are still ongoing with Perth & Kinross Council, however noted that the topography in this location makes widening the path more challenging. Information provided has been taken into consideration in the NMU assessment as reported in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).

A9 Dualling Programme: Tay Crossing to Ballinluig
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A7.2: Summary of Consultation Responses

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
Scottish Southern Energy Scottish Hydro (SSE)	Following a C3 request to indicate the position and depth of NR's apparatus in accordance with the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, SSE indicated that their apparatus would not be impacted by the works. The only Transmission crossing within the vicinity is north of Ballinluig and already passes over the dualled section of the road.	N/A
SSE Transmission	Following a request for consultation, SSE provided information on habitat conditions and fish distribution in watercourses across the projects.	This data has been used to inform the DMRB Stage 3 EIA, see Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation)
SSE Power Distribution	Requested a copy of the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig Mainline Plan and Profiles, Code of Practice C3 and C3 Budget Estimate Pro-forma.	Jacobs supplied the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig Mainline Plan and Profiles, Code of Practice C3 and C3 Budget Estimate Pro-forma.
SSE Telecom	<p>During a meeting held in April 2017, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSE and Jacobs discussed the close proximity of the Highland Main Line Railway and A9 through the extent of Project 3. SSE specifically identified an area at Kindallachan where the A9 and railway were immediately adjacent. SSE noted that directional drilling may be an option but stated that they would not be able to confirm any diversions until C4 Notices are issued to SSE. SSE stated that they would prefer to avoid placing apparatus in a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) but if this is not possible arrangements, can be made to allow for work within SSSI's. SSE stated that they would require future access to all of their transformers. SSE suggested it would be useful for Jacobs to register for the interactive portal (SSEN.co.uk), which allows Jacobs access to some SSE Geographic Information System (GIS) data and to track the progress of any C3 and C4 Notices. SSE expressed a preference for Jacobs to register as one body as opposed to individual projects. Jacobs SSE indicated a preference to keep any overhead power line diversions out with the boundaries of Ministerial and Forestry Commission land for ease of maintenance. SSE also stated that the Forestry Commission are resistant to new overhead power lines being placed within their land. 	N/A
	SSE enquired how would be best to review the accesses for all but stage 2, to check they meet with SSE Gen requirements and to see if any bridges, underpasses etc. are capable of handling any equipment that SSE would need to take over them to access the various intakes.	Jacobs directed SSE to the TS website, where the information made available at the recent events could be viewed in detail, including the latest strip plans.
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. Further consultation will take place as part of the C4 process once the Stage 3 specimen design has been produced.	N/A
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.	N/A
Sustrans	Following a request, Sustrans provided data on important paths being used by cyclists in the study area, including	This data has been used to inform the assessment, see Chapter 9 (People

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	National and Regional Routes.	and Communities – All Travellers).
	At a NMU workshop on 26 June 2017, Sustrans & PKC suggested that the section of the Regional Cycle Network (RCN) Route 83, which runs from Rotmell to Dowally, be raised above the level of the A9 to segregate the route from the A9. Sustrans also queried if it was possible to raise the section of the RCN Route 83 north of Kindallachan above the level of the A9.	Jacobs indicated that the topography in the area is challenging however will undertake a review to confirm if this is possible. Jacobs advised that this was considered during the design development, however topography in this location and the presence of a retaining wall results in this not being feasible.
Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN)	<p>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, walking and cycling rather than a roads scheme only. TACTRAN's 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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 serves as safer alternative to cycling on the A9 and makes the provision of an additional route directly adjacent to the A9 appear unnecessary. Jacobs commented that 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.</p> <p>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).</p>
	TACTRAN stated that they would be grateful if Jacobs could amend the text in the feedback section of the report accordingly and were happy to have the relevant comments attributed to them.	N/A
Tayside Biodiversity Partnership	Following a request for consultation, Tayside Biodiversity Partnership provided data on watercourses and mammals within 500m of the existing A9.	These data have been used to inform the assessment, refer to Chapter 12 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
Tay District Salmon Fisheries Board (TDSFB)	During a meeting on 26 November 2015, TDSFB confirmed that electrofishing data could be made available but that there was not much within the A9 study area. They stated they do not have electrofishing data for Kindallachan Burn or Dowally Burn; however, there may be some electrofishing data for the Dowally Burn in relation to the hydro scheme on the burn, which would be held by Atholl Estates.	<p>Jacobs were informed by SNH that electrofishing surveys would not require to be undertaken for A9 Dualling project by Jacobs because electrofishing data was available through fisheries trusts/boards and Marine Scotland.</p> <p>Jacobs requested data on fish habitat, electro-fishing survey results, and stocking, by phone and by letter, requesting a response by 8 September 2017.</p>
Trafficmaster	Trafficmaster were consulted in March 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. Trafficmaster responded to the request in June 2016 stating that they had no apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	N/A
Virgin Media	Virgin Media were consulted in March 2016 as part of the New Roads and Street Works (Scotland) Act C2/C3 process requesting information on any assets that could be affected by the proposed scheme and a budget estimate of diversionary costs. Virgin Media responded to the request in May 2016 stating that they had no apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	N/A
	Jacobs issued a C3 request to ascertain the position and depth of Virgin Media's apparatus in accordance with the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. In addition, Jacobs requested preliminary details of the effects on Virgin Media apparatus, indicating on the enclosed plans Virgin Media's existing apparatus and the alterations proposed. Vodafone replied and stated that there appears to be two sites in the area, neither of which are not particularly close to the existing A9.	N/A

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	<p>- VF 32078 – Rotmell Farm, Strathtay, Nr. Dunkeld, Perthshire, Scotland, PH9 0NU</p> <p>- O2 3791 – Tayside Dowally, East Dowally Farm, Ballinluig, Perthshire, Scotland, PH9 0NR</p> <p>Vodafone also attached site location drawings.</p> <p>On 23 January 2017, Vodafone wrote to Jacobs and concluded that their apparatus would not be affected by the proposed work, and no strategic additions to their existing network were planned in the immediate future.</p>	

Table 2: Summary/response to environmental steering group comments

Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
ESG April 2016	<p>An update was given on the strategic work taking place across the programme, including opportunities for education in the local communities, innovation from graduates at the consultancies working on the projects, a sustainability strategy and a creative strategy.</p> <p>Jacobs assessing an additional offline for P03 following comments from the local community. A presentation on this was given during the meeting detailing the benefits and disadvantages.</p> <p>Methodologies for the landscape and visual assessment were discussed.</p> <p>Further topics of conversation included design of landform and the use of borrow pits.</p>
ESG June 2016	<p><u>Scoping</u></p> <p>An overview of the DMRB Stage 3 scoping report was presented to the ESG. No specific comments were received.</p> <p><u>Eastern Offline Option and Flooding</u></p> <p>Jacobs presented on the development of the eastern offline options and why it was introduced. Jacobs also gave an overview on the potential mitigation options for loss of existing floodplain storage in the online options for P03.</p> <p><u>Freshwater Pearl Mussels</u></p> <p>Jacobs gave an outline of the survey methodology for detecting Freshwater Pearl Mussels (FWPM) following the results on initial shallow water surveys.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The discussion included the provision of a justification for scenarios where less than two levels of SuDS treatment are proposed.</p> <p>Jacobs asserted that the offline option assessment was still ongoing and that the results would be shared with the ESG when finalised.</p> <p>Jacobs shared that they have put together a proposal to investigate the impacts of salt on existing aquatic invertebrates, that that survey results would be issued to SNH for comment.</p>
ESG September 2016	<p><u>Woodland Connectivity Discussion</u></p> <p>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.</p>

Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
	<p>CNPA queried whether compensatory planting needed to be within the project boundary The CNPA is in the process of developing a Tree and Woodland Strategy which would identify areas to improve woodland connectivity.</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>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 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.</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. Below is a summary of this response: HES noted that the character of individual assets and the erosion of character (impacts within Killiecrankie Battlefield and designated and undesignated features) along the route with respect to the historic environment be considered; CNPA requested that signage and lighting was added (cumulative impact of the introduction of new junction forms, structures/features) It was requested that cumulative impacts from culverted watercourses be added to the combined project effects. 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>Jacobs discussed the meetings proposed with consulting authorities, PKC and HES, to discuss the preferred route. Flood assessment work including compensatory storage design was ongoing and to be discussed further with SEPA, as well as details of SuDS. Meetings with landowners were also being arranged. Jacobs presented to the ESG on techniques for rock cutting and the appearance of the exposures following works.</p>
ESG March 2017	<p><u>Soil Nailing and Landscaping</u> Jacobs presented on proposed locations for soil nailing and advised on the associated landscape impacts. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a need for soil nailing in areas where shallow slopes were proposed, leading to adverse impacts on land take/other considerations; • looking at options for covering areas where soil nailing is required with vegetation to reduce the visual impact; • flexibility of the design/gradient of the soil nailed slopes, so they can be integrated with the landscape; • a need to steepen the slopes to avoid adverse impact on the Drummochter area; and • visual impacts for residents in the southern section as well as impacts on road users.
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 16 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 16 May that all of the projects fall under the current regulatory</p>

Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
	regime.
ESG May 2017	<p><u>Tree Species</u> 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 and 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	No discussions on any project-wide or P03 relevant issues, only updates on the draft Ess submitted for Pitlochry to Killiecrankie and Killiecrankie to Glen Garry.
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. Project update on P3 to state that Jacobs have reached an additional design fix and are working on options around Guay Farmhouse, flood risk and constructability.
ESG September 2017	No ESG held, instead a project update was submitted: Jacobs is progressing with the DMRB Stage 3 design development, particularly refinement of side road options (including an alternative overbridge location), flood mitigation and SuDS.
ESG October 2017	Jacobs provided an update on the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig Project. The final design fix is currently being assessed which includes design changes mentioned during the ESG September meeting. A mitigation workshop was held last week and a meeting with SEPA was held mid-September to discuss flood risk assessment.
ESG November 2017	Jacobs provided an update on the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig Project. A further design fix has been released to the team and continue their assessment. A community engagement event is scheduled tentatively for late November/early December 2017.
ESG December 2017	<p>No ESG held, instead a project update was submitted.</p> <p>A Community Engagement Event was held on 6 and 7 December 2017 to update community stakeholders on design development (main alignment, junctions, side roads and accesses), to consult on two overbridge options (Kindallachan North and Guay South) and to provide an update on flood risk management proposals (flood modelling work and compensatory flood storage).</p> <p>Assessment work on the DMRB Stage 3 design continues to progress and current programme targets a draft ES for consultation with ESG in early spring 2018 and publish the DMRB Stage 3 ES and draft Orders in the summer of 2018.</p>
ESG May 2018	Jacobs provided an update on the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig draft ES submitted for ESG review on 9 April 2018. The ESG were invited to provide feedback on the draft ES and specific comments relating to the assessment on the historic environment were provided by HES and PKC, particularly in relation to the potential impacts on Kindallachan Cairn, Kindallachan Standing Stone and Guay Farmhouse Grade B Listed Building.

Table 3: Summary/response to environmental forum comments

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments
Environmental Forum Meeting, February 2017	<p><u>Mammal Fencing</u></p> <p>Information was presented at the Forum, using P05 as an example, as it was the most advanced in design. The design of P05 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</p>

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments
Attendees: Transport Scotland Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) The Cairngorms National Park Authority (CNPA) RSPB Spey District Fishery Board; Scottish Badgers British Deer Society	watercourses and adjacent to Badger Setts. It was agreed that 'cranks' at the top of such fencing will not be required.
	<u>Badger Mitigation</u> Information was also presented on the approach to and assessment of Badger presence on the southern section projects (P02-P05). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haugh of Kilmorich baseline surveys were completed in January 2015; • 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 and • 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.
	<u>Deer Permeability</u> 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. <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. • 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".
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. See Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
	Are there any proposals to provide a parallel cycle route between the Tay Crossing and the C502?	The current proposals are to maintain existing NMU links that are more remote from the A9. It should be noted that there is not currently a parallel facility.
	How will connectivity be maintained between both sides of the A9?	A number of side road options are currently being investigated and will be developed further as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. It is possible that a structure across the A9 will be required to accommodate side roads and this would allow NMU movement across the A9. See Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
	There is a concern that the A9 dualling programme would encourage some traffic to utilise the old A9, which currently serves as an NMU route.	The concern is noted, however it is expected that the old A9 will only be used to access land and property and therefore any additional traffic flows are expected to be low. See Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
	What type of surfacing will be provided on new or diverted NMU routes?	Surfacing details have not been considered at this stage. This will be looked at during future stages of design taking into consideration relevant design standards and in consultation with NMU groups. See Chapter 9 (People and Communities – Effects on All Travellers).
	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.

Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
	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. See Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers).
	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.
	Issues with railway crossing points for NMUs was raised.	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.
<p>NMU Forums May 2015 and May 2016</p> <p><u>Attendees:</u> A9 Action Group Birnam Association of British Riding Schools British Horse Society ByCycle UK Cairngorms National Park Authority (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 (PKC) Perth and Kinross Countryside Trust (PKCT) Ramblers for Scotland Scotways Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) Scottish Outdoor Access Network SUSTRANS The Mountaineering Council of Scotland TACTRAN The Highland Council</p>	<p>A meeting was held in May 2016 with NMU Stakeholders, who 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>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>Why is the central reserve wider at various locations within the scheme?</p> <p>Specific to P03, it was requested that access to the craft centre car park be maintained as it is used by NMUs for parking to walk surrounding routes.</p>	<p>The iterative route design has taken into account where practicable the general comments from the NMU Forum.</p> <p>A new overbridge is included as part of the proposed scheme, further details are provided in Chapter 9 (People and Communities – All Travellers)</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> <p>Access to the craft centre car park will not be affected by the proposed scheme.</p>

**A9 Dualling Programme: Tay Crossing to Ballinluig
DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Statement
Appendix A7.2: Summary of Consultation Responses**



Workshop/Forum	Summary of Consultee Comments	Response
Transport Scotland (TS)		
NMU Workshop June 2017 <u>Attendees:</u> British Horse Society Cairngorms National Park Authority Cycling UK Mouchel Perth & Kinross Council Scotways SUSTRANS	Jacobs explained that Regional Cycle Network (RCN) Route 83, which currently runs from Rotmell to Dowally, will be relocated within a widened verge alongside the A9. Perth & Kinross Council and Sustrans suggested that this section of the cycle route be raised above the level of the A9 to segregate the NMU route from the A9.	Jacobs indicated that the topography in the area is challenging however will undertake a review to confirm if this is possible.
	It is proposed that the NMU route between Guay to Kindallachan will be a footpath located alongside the side road network. Scotways queried if the footpath would be designed as a cycleway.	Jacobs confirmed that discussions are still ongoing with PKC, however noted that the topography in this location makes widening the path more challenging.
	Is it possible to raise the section of the RCN Route 83 north of Kindallachan above the level of the A9?	This was considered during the design development, however topography in this location and the presences of a retaining wall means this is not feasible.

3 References

Transport Scotland (2016). Woodland Connectivity – Ancient Woodland Compensation Strategy. November 2016.