Appendix H. Comments and Responses

Dunkeld & Birnam Public Exhibition Feedback

Table H.1: Comments and Responses

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
1.	Following the exhibition at Birnam Institute on January 27th / 28th my wife and I have some concerns. The post and wire fence installed to mark your boundary is only 81cms from our boundary. We are concerned about that the affect major construction work will have on our property. We experienced considerable disturbance during the groundwork investigation. Three boreholes were driven along the line of our boundary causing the house to vibrate with every strike. One of your representatives explained that there was little that could be done to avoid this as the margins were so tight they needed every centimetre. We are also concerned about the affect this will have on our property.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. As detailed in previous correspondence, three boreholes were excavated within Scottish Minister's land in the locality of your property to determine existing ground conditions. The detailed Ground Investigation for this section of dualling was completed in February 2015, however further supplementary investigations may be required during future stages of design. The assessment currently being undertaken considers constructability and noise and vibration, in the context of identification of a Preferred Route Option. Further assessment will be undertaken as the design develops, which will consider construction vibration. Suitable noise and vibration mitigation measures will also be considered. Restrictions will be placed on construction activities to limit noise and vibration, which may include setting maximum permissible noise levels, limit on working hours and controlled movement of construction traffic. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
2.	To be included on entire A9 project: • Sufficient wildlife bridges (width of single carriageway minimum preferably wider). Grassed / planted road bridges which could also contain cycle / pedestrian paths and link National walking and cycle networks (see Poland example);	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. We note your comments. Many of these are quite specific so will be considered further as part of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 3 assessment. However, you may wish to note the

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	• Extended verges with broadcast of native trees, particularly pines, where rocky and mineral substrate suitable. Part of National Tree Project; • Wildlife corridors, native plant corridors: - To offset historic deforestation; - To assist carbon sequestration; and - To assist with uptake of precipitation (over 60% increase between tree landscape and deforested landscape). • Roads at base of gully / embankment where possible to reduce carry of traffic noise and reduce visual impact, including lights; and • Run off / on's of good length with no bus stops or lay-bys in vicinity and certainly not after countdown markers begin.	following at this time. A key environmental aim of the scheme is to maintain and enhance links between habitats to minimise fragmentation and barriers to species movement. As a result, wildlife crossings, which can be in the form of overbridges, underbridges, tunnels, culverts or viaducts, will be considered where a need is identified. Consideration will be given to the surrounding topography and crossings sited to integrate with the surrounding area, minimising the visual impact. The DMRB Stage 2 assessment includes an environmental assessment. The magnitude of environmental impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. This includes noise, visual input and light pollution during both construction and operation of the road. Detailed environmental mitigation, which may include compensatory woodland planting, will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). Land required to accommodate the scheme will be acquired by Compulsory Purchase under the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984. To avoid impact on adjacent physical and environmental constraints and land and property owners, the footprint will be minimised as much as possible, and restricted to only what is needed for the construction and safe operation of the trunk road. In some locations, verges will be extended to accommodate forward visibility to ensure driver safety, planting on such areas will be restricted. Where the assessment identifies the need for environmental mitigation alongside the proposed A9, appropriate land will be identified and acquired. The design of the A9 dual carriageway and associated junctions and lay-

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		bys is undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which provides standards, advice notes and other documents relating to the design of trunk roads. These standards stipulate parameters that should be followed to ensure safety. As a result, adequate separation between lay-bys and junctions will be provided to avoid the possibility of drivers confusing a junction or access with a lay-by entrance and to avoid the possibility of unexpected late manoeuvres. A Public Transport Strategy has been prepared for the A9 Dualling Programme that sets out principles to guide the future development and implementation of A9 dualling in relation to public transport. This document recommends that all existing bus stops on the A9 should be retained where it is safe to do so and where there is an identified need. Furthermore, it recommends that consideration should be given to enhancing bus accessibility to A9 towns and villages to enable a continuation of key services to communities. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
3.	Higher road to cross Dunkeld Junction will cause considerably more noise, moves to prevent this will cause eyesore. I opt for road lowering scheme.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. A noise and vibration assessment of the options is undertaken as part of this process. This assessment of road traffic noise has identified a number of potential impacts associated with the proposed route options. Potentially all three route options under consideration will result in adverse impacts at sensitive receptors, however the degree of impact varies

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		between the options. Option B, which places the road into a deep cutting at Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, results in the fewest major impacts. Options A, which raises the A9 has the most impact in terms of noise. The attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment, provides further details on the noise assessment undertaken. The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. DMRB Stage 3 includes preparation of an Environmental Statement, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works and identifies suitable mitigation. An example of an Environmental Statement can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
4.	Good display. Knowledgeable people to ask. Well thought through proposals.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
5.	Concerned about Option C - Lowering the A822 – as there is already an issue with an underground watercourse. Option B with the A9 kept at its lowest would appear to be most beneficial in terms of noise and because it allows for re-connection of the station with Birnam. Tennis club are exploring the possibility of getting flood lights. We hope that none of the options would adversely affect this.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The effect of the three route options on road drainage and the water environment is considered as part of this process. This assessment has not identified any significant issues in terms of hydrology and flood risk, fluvial geomorphology and water quality as a result of Option C. A summary of the noise and vibration assessment undertaken is provided in the attached Technical Note, B2140002/TN/011 (Revision 01): Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. At this stage it is not anticipated that any of the options under consideration would adversely affect the possibility of installing flood lights at the Tennis Club. However, we would welcome any further information you have about your plans so we can consider this further. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
6.	We prefer option A to others. I would keep out of flood zone of the Tay!	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The effects of the three route options on the water environment, which includes a flood risk assessment, are considered as part of this process. This assessment has identified potential impacts on the River Tay floodplain, particularly at the proposed Birnam Junction. Further design and assessment work is currently being undertaken to limit or avoid encroachment into the floodplain. The finalised designs will take account of the objective to avoid any increase in flood risk, consistent with Scottish planning policy. Your preference for Option A is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
7.	Option C works best! Consider using council tax 2016 for leaflet showing information on Transport Scotland website to view Perth to Inverness video of proposed finalised route to all affected parties - not just localised videos.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. As the A9 projects are still undergoing option selection at this time there is no overall Perth to Inverness 3-dimensional visualisation model available. The 3-dimentional visualisation models for the individual schemes are

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		available to view on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-dualling-perth-inverness). Your preference for Option C is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
8.	I am strongly in favour of the “Lowered Option” (Option B). The Category A listed station building must not be left in isolation as proposed in Options A and C. Its setting is important. Re-connecting the existing station building to Birnam Village via a ‘bridge’ over the A9 would be a fantastic improvement.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The effects of the three route options on cultural heritage sites are considered as part of this process. For Options A and C there is a large adverse impact on the setting of the building, while for Option B, there is a large beneficial impact. This will be considered in selecting a Preferred Route Option. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
9.	I will not be directly impacted by the junction options but I am very concerned about what provision is made for station users and ensuring there is no disincentive to use it, whether on foot, bike or by car. I am also concerned to ensure that, at the relevant stage, serious attention	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	is paid to how to landscape the ultimate engineering solutions to minimise what looks like going to be a serious impact on the local landscape. Please also consider improving provision for cyclists along this stretch of the A9, avoiding the need for long journeys too far off the A9 as this discourages cycle commuting. Thanks.	sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The potential impact on landscape and visual impacts is considered as part of this process. This will also be considered further as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). A key aim of the A9 Dualling Programme is to maintain existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes, improving where possible to remove barriers along and across the trunk road. This may be achieved by improving safety, providing improved connectivity between routes and making routes more attractive and comfortable to use. An NMU Access Strategy has been prepared to formalise Transport Scotland's position on NMU access arrangements and is available to view on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-non-motorised-user-nmu-access-strategy-9068). This document contains a number of objectives that will be considered throughout the design process. Options A and C propose station relocation to the north of Inchewan Burn. Vehicular access to the station will be from the A822 (Old Military Road), immediately west of the existing railway underbridge. The relocated station would include a replacement car park. A pedestrian footbridge, either incorporating lifts or ramps would be provided to allow access between platforms. NMU access would be maintained, as it is now, from Birnam Glen with a new structure across the Inchewan Burn. NMU access from the A822 will also be considered and enhanced if possible. Suitable footpaths would link to the platforms and station facilities. As a new facility, the relocated station would be designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues with

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		the current station, in particular the platforms that are lower than is required for current rolling stock. Option B incorporates a structure at existing ground level across the lowered A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station. This arrangement would allow station road to be extended across the structure providing direct access from the communities of Birnam and Dunkeld to the station. A replacement car park would be provided on the structure. It should be noted that Option B does not include any works to address the current accessibility issues with the platforms. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
10.	I prefer Options A and C to Option B. I don't like Birnam Glen being separated from Birnam, in Option B. Worry also about drainage from Birnam Hill. A and C are both good but I prefer A because of the height of the road. I cannot see a use for the old railway station. N.B. it was good to talk to knowledgeable people at an excellent presentation.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your comments in relation to drainage and the Category A Listed building at Dunkeld & Birnam Station are noted. Option B is lower in elevation than Options A and C and it is therefore more challenging to provide an effective drainage network. However, a preliminary drainage design has been undertaken to confirm that a technically feasible drainage solution exists for each option under consideration. This developing drainage design will be assessed in detail as part of the early work at the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 3 assessment. This will include a review of options to refine the position and type of treatment proposed, as well as further consultation with statutory consultees and liaison with any potentially affected landowners. Future use of the station building is being considered in relation to Options A and C.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		Your preference for Option A or C is noted. I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
11.	Very impressed with the exhibition, which clearly outlined the three current options. I really appreciated the time spent by Jacobs' staff and their obvious detailed knowledge. I would favour Option A. The road rising after the station which fits better with the landscape and reduced the need for concrete walls would seem to be a more pleasing solution. In terms of following the existing contours – more aesthetically pleasing. The last thing the gateway to the Highlands needs is a concrete corridor. Without vehicular access I cannot envisage how the old station building can be used – but realise that this is not your problem.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The effects of the three route options under consideration on landscape are considered as part of this process. This assessment considers Option A to have a lesser impact on landscape, due to the reduced retaining wall structures, particularly in comparison to Option B. Option A also avoids extensive earthworks on the A822 (Old Military Road) associated with Option C. This will be considered in selecting a Preferred Route Option. Future use of the station building is being considered in relation to Options A and C. Your preference for Option A is noted. I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
12.	We attended the A9 Dualling Public Exhibition in the Birnam Hotel last	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	evening which was very well attended. Not being drivers and using the train services from Dunkeld and Birnam Station our chief concern was the maintenance of pedestrian access to the proposed re-located station. I assume we will still be able to access the station by way of the Birnam Glen road with a footbridge over the Inchewan Burn. There is no such footbridge at present over the burn.	and for providing feedback. Options A and C propose station relocation to the north of Inchewan Burn. Vehicular access to the station will be from the A822 (Old Military Road), immediately west of the existing railway underbridge. The relocated station would include a replacement car park. A pedestrian footbridge, either incorporating lifts or ramps would be provided to allow access between platforms. NMU access would be maintained, as it is now, from Birnam Glen with a new structure across the Inchewan Burn. NMU access from the A822 will also be considered and enhanced if possible. Suitable footpaths would link to the platforms and station facilities. As a new facility, the relocated station would be designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues with the current station, in particular the platforms that are lower than is required for current rolling stock. Option B incorporates a structure at existing ground level across the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station. This arrangement would allow station road to be extended across the structure providing direct access from the communities of Birnam and Dunkeld to the station. A replacement car park would be provided on the structure. It should be noted that Option B does not include any works to address the current accessibility issues with the platforms. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
13.	We attended the exhibition in the Birnam on Wednesday 27/01/2016 and then we attended the Community Council meeting at the Birnam Hotel on Monday 08/02/2016 which we both thought was well presented and the proposals very clear, although it would have been better if each options had been explained and a strict 15 minutes for questions allowed.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016, the Community Council meeting on 8 February 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option C is noted.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	We strongly favour the Option C as we would like the road to be completed properly once and for all along with a viable railway station.	I am glad you found the exhibition and Community Council meeting informative and worthwhile. Your comments regarding the format of the Community Council meeting are noted and will be considered for future meetings. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
14.	Ref NMU's 1. Dalguise Junction – NCN 77. Many cyclists using the NCN 77 do not want to follow the route through the Hilton grounds as it is an off road route and very rough (rutted, wed, muddy) and therefore travel along the A9. Provisions to accommodate these cyclists need to be made along the new layout. This applies not only to long distance cyclist but also local cyclists. 2. As the cycle path past the station will no longer exist and cyclists will have to use the Perth Road, Birnam. This will involve them using the new layout. From experience these layouts are not cycle friendly, therefore a safe route needs to be considered. 3. Local Feature: Towards the end of the cycle path past the station south end, there is a culvert coming under the railway. I wish to point out that the cycle path at this point always floods with water coming through the culvert. 4. There is a walking route which comes along the river and up past the sewer field and out on to the Perth Road. No path exists at this point until Birnam Garage making it very dangerous for walkers as more traffic will be using the Perth Road. 5. There are many walking routes that access Birnam Glen used by locals and tourists also to the Hermitage and River walks. All these features should be considered and made accessible as they are today, not a second thought by the planners. They should be a priority as outdoor	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The impact on NMU routes is considered as part of this process. The effect of the three route options on the water environment, which includes a flood risk assessment, is also considered. As detailed in previous correspondence, a key aim of the A9 Dualling Programme is to maintain existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes, improving where possible to remove barriers along and across the trunk road. This may be achieved by improving safety, providing improved connectivity between routes and making routes more attractive and comfortable to use. An NMU Access Strategy has been prepared to formalise Transport Scotland's position on NMU access arrangements and is available on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-non-motorised-user-nmu-access-strategy-9068). This document contains a number of objectives that will be considered throughout the design process. Your concerns in relation to the potential diversion of National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 77 onto Perth Road are noted. As part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment an Accessibility Audit and Cycle Audit will be

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	activities are very important in this day and age.	undertaken on the design. A key objective of these audits is to ensure the road network is safe and more accessible for all road users. Any safety issues will be identified by this audit process and suitable mitigation measures considered in discussion with Perth & Kinross Council. Existing NMU routes that link the River Tay via Birnam Glen and The Hermitage will be maintained, albeit some diversionary works are likely. The condition of existing paths will be assessed during future design stages. Measures to improve safety and connectivity and make routes more attractive and comfortable to use will be considered if appropriate. Some of the existing routes on the east side of the River Tay are in poor condition. As these paths are outwith the scope of the A9 Dualling Programme it is unlikely works will be undertaken. However, this will be considered further during future stages of design. More detailed proposals for NMU infrastructure will be developed once a Preferred Route Option has been identified. We will consider your feedback further at that time. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
15.	I feel that considerations so far have very much focussed on importance of a motorist's good experience and saving a listed building rather than impact on people's lives. Other Constraints: • Bowl shape of surrounding hill amplifies all surrounding noise. We urgently need noise assessment for options before making a decision. • The A9 actually cuts through a village. I believe this is the only time this happens on the whole route therefore consideration should be given to alternative solutions;	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The aim of this assessment is to identify factors to be taken in to account in choosing alternative options and to identify the engineering, environmental and traffic and economic advantages, disadvantages and constraints associated with the route options. The environmental assessment includes consideration of impacts on landscape, visual, air

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	• Importance to balance size and prominence of road with beauty of village and river and its importance to tourism, industry and livelihoods. Current proposals appear disproportionately large. Personal Impact: All of the above and construction. However I am in favour of an upgrade of some sort especially at junctions having experienced total write off by tourist on wrong side of the road. The raised carriageway at northern junction will significantly increase the noise I already experience from across the narrow valley. I would like consideration of (believe it is essential to avoid destruction of village): • Scaled down 'standards' to take account of through village route and noise / pollution impact from landscape. • Speed reduction – mandatory to 'Birnam Pass' • Reduce south bound exit at Birnam to T junction. Would reduce impact on SSSI forestry area. This will be a more minimally used exit. Thank you for presentation however current options just do not feel acceptable for people living here which should be primary consideration.	quality and noise and vibration. This considers local communities, those who may be directly affected and the travelling public, as well as other factors. A summary of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment is provided in the attached Technical Note, B2140002/TN/011 (Revision 01): Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. DMRB Stage 3 includes preparation of an Environmental Statement, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works and identifies suitable mitigation. An example of an Environmental Statement can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). A9 dualling is being progressed through an on-line corridor, with off-line options having previously been discounted, primarily due to the surrounding topography and resultant environmental impact. The A9 will be a Category 7A all-purpose dual carriageway with a 70 miles per hour speed limit. As a result, there will be no gaps in the central reserve and no at-grade minor junctions. Only grade separated junctions will be provided on the route for safe access and egress to the A9. Isolated left-in left-out accesses may be provided in exceptional circumstances. To produce a high standard of road safety, the initial objective in the design process is to seek to achieve the Desirable Minimum Standards as set-out in the DMRB. This is normal practice when developing road designs. However, a flexible approach is set out in the relevant design standards contained within the DMRB. This permits use of reduced standards if it can be demonstrated that there are significant benefits, for

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		example, in reducing construction costs or environmental impacts. However, the use of reduced standards must demonstrate that safety is not significantly reduced and is subject to suitable justification and mitigation being provided. The objectives of the scheme, which are listed below, must also be considered. • To improve the operational performance of the A9 by: - Reducing journey times; and - Improving journey time reliability. • To improve safety for motorised and Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) by: - Reducing accident severity; and - Reducing driver stress. • To facilitate active travel within the corridor; and • To improve integration with Public Transport Facilities. A review has been undertaken for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project to determine the possible benefits of a reduced speed design. This review did not identify any significant benefits that would materially affect route choice. However, this will be further considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
16.	As someone who has recently invested in starting a new business in Birnam, I would like to give my thoughts on the dualling project and its	Thank you for your correspondence dated 15 April 2016 regarding the A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	implications for the village. There is, I think, a real danger that the commercial potential and the living environment of the village would be damaged further by an increased visual and acoustic presence of the A9, but at the same time an opportunity now to reconnect the railway station and make the village the proper thoroughfare both for people visiting Birnam and Dunkeld and for the local community using the railway it would have been before the A9 was built. If the A9 was sunk to allow Station Road to once again lead to the railway station, then more people would have reason to pass through the village than at present, there could be extra parking provided at the station end of the road which would help the congestion that sometime occurs when the Birnam Institute is busy, and people arriving at Dunkeld and Birnam station would have a much more pleasant first experience of the area than is the case when being faced by a busy road when you step off the train. Hopefully this might encourage more people to break their journey here, and help return the Victorian station to full use rather than see it decline into eventual disrepair. Equally those people in the village, both residents and visitors, would not feel so acutely the presence of the road running so close to the village, which would hopefully encourage people to linger longer rather than heading straight for Dunkeld, and make the village feel more connected to the scenic walks around Birnam Hill on the other side of the A9. With the road being widened and the speed limit increased, the looming presence of the road will only be heightened if the road is left at ground level or indeed raised at all, to the further detriment of the atmosphere in the village. I understand that there are cost implications, and that there are scenic implications in building the retaining walls if the road is sunk as well, but the cost to the village as a viable and sustainable community in the long	The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The aim of this assessment is to identify factors to be taken in to account in choosing alternative options and to identify the engineering, environmental and traffic and economic advantages, disadvantages and constraints associated with the route options. The environmental assessment includes consideration of impacts on landscape, visual, air quality and noise and vibration. This considers local communities, those who may be directly affected and the travelling public, as well as other factors. These factors will be considered in selecting a Preferred Route Option. It is recognised that tourism is an important feature of the A9 corridor and consultation is underway with Visit Scotland to identify potential benefits of dualling, which could include greater access to the many tourism and recreation sites along the route. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. Future use of the station building is being considered in relation to Options A and C. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	term should also be considered, and, as such, the concerns for the scenic views of drivers passing by Birnam seem less important than the perceived environment and atmosphere in the village for those drivers who wish to stop here and keep the economy of the area alive.	
17.	Please investigate new means of access for Birnam Glen. See attached sketch. Site meeting at some date.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Option B lowers the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station. As a result, Birnam Glen will be stopped-up at the location of its current underbridge, immediately north of the station. Access to properties on Birnam Glen to the west of the station would therefore be provided via a new access road from the A822 (Old Military Road) that would be to the west of the Highland Main Line railway. A new structure would be provided to cross the Inchewan Burn. The Inchewan Burn itself would be lowered as a result of Option B and will cross the A9 via a new culvert. We have considered your alternative access to properties on Birnam Glen. With Option B, the level of the A9 would be approximately 8 to 10 metres below the existing carriageway level, which is currently at a similar level to the Highland Main Line railway. Your proposals would require a structure with a span in excess of 65 metres to cross the Highland Main Line railway and the A9. To accommodate headroom clearance on the railway, the structure would be approximately 18 metres higher than the A9. Such a structure would be costly to construct and would have an adverse visual impact, particularly for adjacent residential properties on Stell Park Road. Furthermore, Birnam Glen is on a downward gradient as it approaches its junction with Perth Road. To provide a suitable tie-in, while avoiding impact to properties on Birnam Glen and the adjacent Fire Station, gradients in excess of those recommended by design standards would be required. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		additional information, wish to comment further or would like to arrange a site meeting please contact me.
18.	This may seem a minor detail in the overall plan but under Options A and C the present station building and platform will no longer be used. This may well lead to a decline in the structure (despite being a Category A listed building). I do hope every effort shall be used to find a new use for this fine building. Option B seems the most costly but would probably result in traffic noise being reduced for those living nearby in Birnam.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The effects of the three route options on cultural heritage sites are considered as part of this process. For Options A and C there is a large adverse impact on the setting of the building, while for Option B, there is a large beneficial impact. This will be considered in selecting a Preferred Route Option. Future use of the station building is being considered in relation to Options A and C. A summary of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment is provided in the attached Technical Note, B2140002/TN/011 (Revision 01): Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. This includes details on the noise and vibration impacts of the route options. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
19.	Have a concern about all the grade separated junctions causing problems for foreign tourists as sometimes-travelling in opposite direction to get to direction they would want to travel.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Clear and effective signing is essential to the safe operation of the road network. Traffic signs must be unambiguous and sited to provide road

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Good signage would be needed. Your video presentation of the 3 options had myself and another lady feel quite sea sick especially when encircling the grade separated junctions (I wear varifocals).	users with clear information and guidance at the correct time. To ensure a consistent and safe approach across the A9 Dualling Programme, a Traffic Sign Strategy has been prepared. The scheme will also be subject to a Road Safety Audit that will report on potential road safety issues and identify opportunities for improvements in safety for all road users. A key part of this audit will be the ability of drivers to understand the new road layout. Your comments in relation to the 3-dimensional visualisation model are noted and will be considered when planning for future public consultation events. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
20.	As a very near neighbour of the A9, my preferred option is either A or C. I am not in favour of Option B because of increased noise pollution and disruption during construction and increased traffic on Station Road after the project is completed (travelling to new station car park). Regardless of which option is chosen, my biggest concern regarding the new dual A9 is that traffic noise pollution mitigation measures are as comprehensive and thorough as possible, and integral to the project rather than an afterthought near the end of completion.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The aim of this assessment is to identify factors to be taken in to account in choosing alternative options and to identify the engineering, environmental and traffic and economic advantages, disadvantages and constraints associated with the route options. The environmental assessment includes consideration of impacts on noise and vibration. A summary of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment is provided in the attached Technical Note, B2140002/TN/011 (Revision 01): Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. This includes details on the noise and vibration impacts of the route options.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. DMRB Stage 3 includes preparation of an Environmental Statement, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works and identifies suitable mitigation, developed as part of the design, rather than being left until the road is completed. An example of an Environmental Statement can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). Your preference for Option A or C is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
21.	A and C Options are preferable. Staff at the event were very helpful. Thank you.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option A or C is noted. I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
22.	Extremely concerned that Options A and C both increase the severance of Birnam Village from the station. This was recognised as a mistake in the original A9 design and present plans merely compound it. Birnam already suffers economically compared to Dunkeld, fewer businesses, fewer tourists and poor parking.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Options A and C propose station relocation to the north of Inchewan Burn. Vehicular access to the station will be from the A822 (Old Military Road), immediately west of the existing railway underbridge. The relocated station

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Option B lowering the A9 whilst more technically challenging will enhance Birnam addressing these issues and provide long term sustainable benefits. I am also very concerned that the wishes of Network Rail to divest themselves of the responsibility for maintaining a beautiful listed building should influence the decision. We will be left with an unattractive --- station which will not be attractive to tourists when tourism is vital to Dunkeld and Birnam's economic success. The building will be left isolated and eventually be lost. It is essential for the station to remain an attractive welcoming local point and for Birnam to be both connected to it via Station road as well as attracting and increasing the flow of visitors through the village. Options A and C will kill Birnam economically.	would include a replacement car park. A pedestrian footbridge, either incorporating lifts or ramps would be provided to allow access between platforms. NMU access would be maintained from Birnam Glen with a new structure across the Inchewan Burn. Suitable footpaths would link to the platforms and station facilities. The relocated station would be designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues with the current station, which incorporates platforms that are lower than is required for current rolling stock. Option B incorporates a structure at existing ground level across the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station. This arrangement would allow station road to be extended across the structure providing direct access from the communities of Birnam and Dunkeld to the station. A replacement car park would be provided on the structure. It should be noted that Option B does not include any works to address the current accessibility issues with the platforms. In relation to Options A and C, we are considering whether access can be provided to the station building and whether there are options for future use. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
23.	The whole A9 Dualling project seems fantastically expensive (£3 billion?) for the sake of a 20 minute saving on the present journey time from Perth to Inverness. But if the Scottish Government is able to finance it then the improved safety and reliability of the route (even in event of roads works / accidents) will make it worthwhile.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. We have received a submission from Dunkeld & Birnam Community Council and are continuing to engage with them regarding their views and the project. Part of this includes considering derogations (Departures) from

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Of the three options for Birnam to Dalguise section (A, B and C) I think I prefer Option B which retains the existing station building with access and parking on the area over the lowered A9. It seems a pity to leave the old station isolated and probably unused and vandalised until it become a ruin but I can also see the advantages of Options A and C with parking and vehicular access as well as pedestrian access for NMUs. Should the whole project prove too expensive then I would suggest keeping the Birnam and Dunkeld section as at present with no dualling but roundabouts at Birnam and Dunkeld interchange and a strict 40 mph speed limit along this section which will only add approximately 5 minutes to the journey to Inverness.	design standards. Your comment regarding cost and your suggestion about retaining this section as single carriageway are noted. However, the Scottish Government has stated its commitment to upgrading the road to dual carriageway standard. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. In relation to Options A and C, we are considering whether access can be provided to the station building and whether there are options for future use. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
24.	I am sure you will be aware of the strength of concern and feeling that is developing in Dunkeld and Birnam about the potential adverse impact of the A9 proposals on this historic and environmentally sensitive community which is also such a magnet for visitors in their tens of thousands. The Community Council is currently preparing a formal response to yourselves and Transport Scotland on the subject. But the main concerns, which I certainly share, are that the current options do not give enough consideration to these communities as sites of special historical, environmental, touristic and residential interest. We are the only place along the route which is already actually divided by the A9 and the existing adverse effects are only likely to be greatly increased by the dualling to 7A standard with resulting take up of space currently featuring woodland, wildlife and important historical pathways, and greatly increased noise pollution on a permanent basis, not to mention the intense disruption to local residents and travellers alike during the construction phase of this particularly difficult and sensitive section of the route.	Thank you for your correspondence date 9 April 2016 regarding the A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing. To produce a high standard of road safety, the initial objective in the design process is to seek to achieve the Desirable Minimum Standards as set-out in the DMRB. This is normal practice when developing road designs. However, a flexible approach is set out in the relevant design standards contained within the DMRB. This permits use of reduced standards if it can be demonstrated that there are significant benefits, for example, in reducing construction costs or environmental impacts. However, the use of reduced standards must demonstrate that safety is not significantly reduced and is subject to suitable justification and mitigation being provided. The objectives of the scheme must also be considered. At this time, the designs shown at the public exhibition included some

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	People are not suggesting that no improvement to the A9 is necessary, but rather that the design options for this section should be substantially modified to take into account the special nature of this community and area, perhaps by derogating from the 7A standard of this section so that the results will be less intrusive and damaging. I would be glad to provide further detail on the above points if you would find that helpful.	areas of reduced standards. However, we are considering this further with Dunkeld & Birnam Community Council. A review has been undertaken for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project to determine the possible benefits of a reduced speed design. This review did not identify any significant benefits that would materially affect route choice. However, this will be further considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. We would welcome any further details you care to provide on the derogation of standards. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
25.	Preferred Option B & C. Noise and vibration issues main concern as we live in Stell Park.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. A noise and vibration assessment of the options is undertaken as part of this process. The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. DMRB Stage 3 includes preparation of an Environmental Statement, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works and identifies suitable mitigation. An example of an Environmental Statement can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement).

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		A summary of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment is provided in the attached Technical Note, B2140002/TN/011 (Revision 01): Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. This includes details on the noise and vibration impacts of the route options. Your preference for Option B or C is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
26.	Option A or C would be suitable. Option B – No. Will make a difference if height of Railway platform is changed.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option A or C, that incorporates a relocated station, designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues of the current station, is noted, as are your concerns regarding Option B. It should be noted that Option B does not include any works to address the current accessibility issues with the platforms. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
27.	Route C would be my preferred option. Route A would be my next choice. Definitely not Route B. Glad that Railway is being upgraded e.g. height of platform.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option A or C, that incorporates a relocated station, designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues of the current station, is noted, as are your concerns regarding Option B. It should be noted that Option B does not include any works to address the current accessibility issues with the platforms.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
28.	Send specific website name for scheme and any future details by email.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Information and updates on the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9 Dualling Programme can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-pass-birnam-tay-crossing). Your details have been added to the mailing list to receive newsletters and information about future public consultation events. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
29.	We looked at option A,B & C. A & C involved moving the station and of these two options, option A makes the most sense. Moving the station is a very good decision since option C involves very expensive work on the A822. The building of a new relocated station is inspired. This would give the community a new platform at a height to the trains which would satisfy an ageing community. It would also be more environmentally friendly than the building of large supporting walls. Option B should be disregarded totally.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option A that incorporates a relocated station, designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues of the current station, is noted. As are your concerns regarding Option B. I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
30.	I prefer and support Option A without a doubt. Well done on giving us back an accessible railway station - the existing one - which I use regularly is an nightmare. Also thanks for providing safer access at Birnam and Dunkeld -	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	we need both. Option B would create an environmental monstrosity in a beautiful area. A concrete car park in the sky.	Your preference for Option A that incorporates a relocated station, designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues of the current station, is noted. As are your concerns regarding Option B. I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
31.	A film presentation would be beneficial not everyone understands maps etc. Would like things explained.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your comments in relation to the material available to view at the public exhibition are noted and will be considered when planning for future public consultation events. If you require any additional information, wish to comment further or would like a meeting to discuss the scheme, please contact me.
32.	Option B would reconnect Birnam with the station which would be good for community. Living in Gladstone Terrace I would prefer the covered area to be extended to help with noise where I live. I am also concerned with the loop going so close to the Tay at the Perth end of Birnam. In response to the Public meeting, held by the Community Council, to present the A9 Dualling options, I would like to begin by saying that I could not hear everything said and would request a sound system for any further meetings. I would also like to thank David, the Community Council Representative chairing the meeting, for his tact and skill in difficult circumstances. The large turnout for the meeting showed the amount of local concern for	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016, the Community Council meeting on 8 February 2016 and for providing feedback. We note your comments about the Community Council meeting and your preference for Option B. In relation to noise assessments, a summary of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment is provided in the attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. To produce a high standard of road safety, the initial objective in the

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	this project. Having already attended the Public Exhibition at the Birnam Arts I had some grasp of the options available but the film, shown at the meeting, made things clearer for me. There is in fact very little choice available; all three junctions Birnam, Dunkeld, and Dalguise are basically the same in all three options. The option suggested by someone at the meeting where the big loop, to the river, is left out made perfect sense lessening the environmental impact considerably. The Dunkeld Junction involves a very large bridge over the Braan and there were no details of the impact this would have on the rivers and the footpaths and the amount of trees and habitat lost. Again at the Dalguise Junction more information is needed on how this would impact the riverside habitat. Options 1 and 3 involve moving the station from its present location and leaving the listed station building in an inaccessible no man's land. This seems absurd as does moving the building. The only option with merit is therefore option 2 which would at least reconnect Birnam with its historic station via the Station Road. Unfortunately there was no noise or vibration impact assessment available, which I suspect would be considerable as the overpass does not go far enough to shield most of the local housing. It is the natural environment that gives this area its beauty and attracts the visitors that bring much needed income. Damage this by removing habitat and increasing noise and vibration and you risk permanent damage to this community. There seems to be a real case for reducing the high standards that the roads department are proposing for this small section, where the impact on the local community would be unprecedented. While at the A9 Dualling Presentation in the Birnam Arts in Centre, one of Jacob's representatives asked me if I had been aware of the test drilling that they had been carrying out. I replied that I could feel the vibrations of passing trains and indeed the noise and vibration of their drilling had woke me up at night and disturbed me during the day. He informed me that the drill to be used in construction was 4 times as big as that used for testing, and that most of the work would be at night and at weekends. This is	design process is to seek to achieve the Desirable Minimum Standards as set-out in the DMRB. This is normal practice when developing road designs. However, a flexible approach is set out in the relevant design standards contained within the DMRB. This permits use of reduced standards if it can be demonstrated that there are significant benefits, for example, in reducing construction costs or environmental impacts. However, the use of reduced standards must demonstrate that safety is not significantly reduced and is subject to suitable justification and mitigation being provided. The objectives of the scheme must also be considered. At this time, the designs shown at the public exhibition included some areas of reduced standards. However, we are considering this further as design work progresses. Two-way traffic flows will be maintained on the A9 during construction as far as possible. This will be difficult within a complex and sensitive corridor. An initial assessment of constructability has been undertaken on this basis for the route options under consideration as part of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment. It is likely that speed limit restrictions and reduced lane widths will be utilised. Further consideration of traffic management will be undertaken at DMRB Stage 3. Appropriate operational and construction noise and vibration measures will also be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. Limitations may be placed on construction activities to limit noise and vibration, which may include setting maximum permissible noise levels. It should be noted that the retaining walls required north of Dunkeld & Birnam Station will be unusual, complex and time consuming to construct and will incur greater costs. Furthermore, as a result of the retained heights, the walls will be at the limit of what is technically feasible. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	indeed a frightening prospect and highlights the need for close cooperation between the construction company and the local community with an agreed schedule for drilling that would allow for some peaceful nights. Please remember that it is the young, the old and the sick who are likely to endure the worst of the disturbances. I trust that the feedback from the local community will be listened to and that there will be some answers before any decisions are made.	
33.	Current Route Option. Of the three Option C - New option would appear to be the best.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option C is noted. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
34.	Any of A or C. Each option gives local access to trains due to alterations to platform levels.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option A or C, that incorporates a relocated station, designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues of the current station, is noted. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
35.	1 - NCN cycle route. New signage needed including signage to station. 2 - Parking at station essential, whichever option is chosen. 3 - Glad to see full access options into Birnam retained.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Where existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes are affected suitable diversions will be proposed in consultation with relevant NMU groups.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	4 - Also glad to see full provision for access to Murthly Castle (also used by cyclists for community). 5 - Note. If the path leading to the railway underpass and on to Birnam Hill core paths is to be rerouted from the Birnam junction, please note that a burn comes off the hill at the underpass. No drainage has ever been provided and currently it floods the cycle path. It would also flood a rerouted path. Please phone me if you need a grid reference.	Opportunities to enhance existing provisions, which may include additional signage, will be considered where appropriate to support the scheme objectives. The importance of maintaining links to local towns, villages and communities for local residents and tourists is recognised and will be maintained where possible. The importance of suitable access to Murthly Castle for NMUs is recognised and will be provided. One of the scheme objectives established for the A9 Dualling Programme is to improve integration with Public Transport facilities. As a result, the options under consideration have sought to replace the station car park, which will be affected by the dualling. Your comments in relation to flooding issues at the existing railway underpass are noted and will be considered as the design develops. To confirm the location we would appreciate if you could provide the grid reference. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
36.	Option B: Opening up of Station Road – Considerable impact on property. Existing wind damage on property. Option A/C – • Additional distance to station; • Mobility issues; • Buses have been cut – public transport issues; • Is it necessary to move the station as well as the carpark?	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your comments in relation to Options A and C are noted, as is your opposition to Option B. Options A and C propose station relocation to the north of Inchewan Burn. Vehicular access to the station will be from the A822 (Old Military Road), immediately west of the existing railway underbridge. The relocated station would include a replacement car park. A pedestrian footbridge, either incorporating lifts or ramps would be provided to allow access between platforms. Non-Motorised User (NMU) access would be maintained, as it is now, from Birnam Glen with a new structure across the Inchewan Burn.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	• Mobility drivers getting more than mobility impaired pedestrians. Very against Option B – would fight against this option. Opportunity to build another bridge.	NMU access from the A822 will also be considered and enhanced if possible. Suitable footpaths would link to the platforms and station facilities. As a new facility, the relocated station would be designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues with the current station, in particular the platforms that are lower than is required for current rolling stock. Proposals for the station will be developed further as part of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 3 assessment. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
37.	Will all the people that visit Birnam / Dunkeld today come when there is a dual carriageway? If there was to be a change of government could all this be stopped?	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The A9 Dualling Programme is designed to deliver economic growth through improvements to road safety and journey times as well as better links to pedestrian, cycling and public transport facilities. As a result, the programme has broad cross party support and there is no suggestion that a change in government would stop the programme. It is also recognised that tourism is an important feature of the A9 corridor and consultation is underway with Visit Scotland to identify potential benefits of dualling, which could include greater access to the many tourism and recreation sites along the route. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.
38.	The Exhibition and materials provided are helpful and informative, the information on the website is very accessible. It is recognised that there is	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	no easy solution. In terms of comments, it would be helpful to have the following information to help make a more informed decision. • What are the present and projected traffic flows for each of the proposed junctions? I am particularly interested in the flows for the Birnam and Dalguise junctions. • In terms of the options for the Birnam junction, the junction on the riverside will have a huge impact on the historic landscape and the riverside path at that point. What height will the proposed embankment at this point be above the footpath? • In terms of the two options that move the station, what is the proposed future use of the only Grade A listed building in Birnam? • The proposals for the new station do not seem to have platforms long enough to service the sleeper that the present station does. We do not want to lose the sleeper service because the new station is not adequate. • Are Railtrack happy with the loss of their sidings at the station? If they are retained, how will road vehicles access them? • How is proposed to deal with pollution issues from the old Ladywell Quarry? • The proposed bridge(s) over the Braan, what is the total width of these. At the moment it covers two carriageways, the future proposals including the slip roads covers eight carriageways? What mitigation steps will be taken to protect the River Braan and the existing walkways, which are also used by cyclists?	In relation to the specific requests in your feedback, please note the following: 1. Current and anticipated future traffic data is included in the Preliminary Engineering Services (PES) Report for the dualling of the A9 between Perth and Inverness. Link to PES Report: (www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-design-manual-roads-bridges-dmrb-stage-1-report-5595). See Chapter 6, Table 6.2.1 and Appendix P. 2. The proposed embankment on the southbound loop at Birnam Junction in the current design is approximately 18 metres high. 3. In relation to Options A and C, we are considering whether access can be provided to the station building and whether there are options for future use. 4. The relocated station will be designed in accordance with Network Rail standards and guidance. Platforms will be designed to accommodate relevant rolling stock, as directed by Network Rail. 5. We are consulting with Network Rail who are aware of the impact on the sidings. Suitable vehicular access will be considered as part of any relocation of the sidings. 6. We are in consultation with Perth & Kinross Council and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) to identify any mitigation measures necessary for Ladywell Landfill Site. There are fairly standard approaches to dealing with potentially contaminated materials during construction. The specific approach would be developed at the next stages of design and mitigation measures will be set out in an Environmental Statement.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	• Have there been any discussions with City Link about their Glasgow and Edinburgh-Inverness coach services. The area has recently seen major reductions in services from 10 to 3 per day. The road proposals must not result in reductions of train and coach services. • I have major concerns about the Birnam junction as shown as it introduces a major urban type feature into an area of outstanding natural beauty, an historic landscape and potentially a very damaging impact of the River Tay, a river of high European significance. • There are two alternatives to this proposed junction that would result in reduced capital costs and reduce impact on the landscape. The reduction in costs could then be used to offset the undoubtedly higher costs of cut and cover at the station shown in Option B • Reduce the junction to just provide access from Birnam southbound onto the A9 and northbound from the A9 to Birnam • Remove the access to the A9 altogether and just provide a direct access from Birnam to Bankfoot. I do not think the traffic flows justify three major grade separated junctions in such a short distance. I look forward to hearing your response to these points. In the meantime my strong preference is for option B that restores the link between Birnam and the Station, provides more parking at the station and could reduce the amount of traffic noise for the local community.	7. It is likely that the River Braan crossing will comprise of three individual structures. The first structure will be approximately 15 metres wide and will carry the northbound merge slip road, the second will be approximately 34 metres wide and will carry the A9 dual carriageway and the third will be approximately 15 metres and will carry the southbound diverge slip road. The River Braan forms part of the River Tay Special Area of Conservation and measures will be taken to mitigate potential environmental impacts during construction and operation. Existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes will be maintained, albeit some realignments of the routes may be necessary. The landscape impacts of the proposed River Braan crossing are considered in the environmental assessment. 8. A Public Transport Strategy has been prepared for the A9 Dualling Programme that sets out principles to guide the future development and implementation of A9 dualling in relation to public transport. This document recommends that all existing bus stops on the A9 should be retained where it is safe to do so and where there is an identified need. Furthermore, it recommends that consideration should be given to enhancing bus accessibility to A9 towns and villages to enable a continuation of key services to communities. Consultation with bus companies is planned as part of ongoing design work. 9. Various junction layouts have been considered at Birnam. This assessment has concluded that closure of the northbound merge and southbound diverge slip roads would increase traffic on Perth Road by up to approximately 1,100 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), 2041, Do-Something Model). It should be noted that an option to remove access to the A9 altogether at Birnam Junction was considered and displayed to the public in January/February 2012.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		Feedback following the exhibition suggested that the public favoured a junction that provided access to, and egress from, the proposed A9 dual carriageway. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.
39.	Good display. It would be good if you could use the 3D Visual presentation for all options being considered at the forthcoming meeting (public) with the Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council on 08/02/2016. Would suggest you include all residents within the Community Council area in future for all communication. Also inform Community Council at earliest possible time of these events on dunkeldcommunitycouncil@pkc.gov.uk.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your comments in relation to future public consultation events are noted. Engagement with directly affected communities is a key part of the project development and this will continue during future stages of design assessment. As I am sure you are aware, dialogue with Dunkeld & Birnam Community Council is ongoing. The 3-dimensional visualisations used at the public exhibition were also used at the Community Council meeting on February and are also available to view on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-pass-birnam-tay-crossing). I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
40.	I would like to make the point that I wish to promote plan B as the option for dualling at Birnam. It is important that the railway station remain as is with a new access from Station Road thus linking the station to the village. I am sure disabled access to the station could be improved. I would like to be kept informed of further meetings planned regarding this issue.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. No works are planned to the station building or platforms as part of this option. However, access to the station would take account of the needs of disabled users. Your details have been added to the mailing list to receive newsletters and information about future public consultation events. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.
41.	I have previously taken the opportunity to visit one of the community engagement drop in sessions in Birnam but did not receive notice of the most recent session. Could you add my e-mail to circulation lists for these, please? I have reviewed the A, B and C alternatives published on the site and continue to see plan B as the best of these. The current A9 split the heart of the Victorian village by putting the A9, with minimal landscaping, between the village and its station. Plan B helps to rectify this by re-joining the two and reducing sound impact on the village as a whole. With appropriate visual and noise reducing berm / fencing along the north side of the remaining open sections, this could repair some of the considerable damage done by the original design. The challenges / costs of this alternative are noted but it seems the one alternative that has a positive for the village. I was interested to see that your plans settled on a two junction design rather than leave the Bankfoot road without a junction to the A9 or limited access, such as south access only from Birnam and North only	Thank you for attending the public exhibitions in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. As are your concerns regarding Options A and C. We make note of your comments regarding retaining this section as a single carriageway. However, the Scottish Government has stated its commitment to upgrading the road to dual carriageway standard. We also note your comments about environmental mitigation. For whichever option is taken forward, more detailed environmental assessments will be undertaken and mitigation measures developed. This will be set out in an Environmental Statement. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	from Bankfoot. It seems overkill and visually intrusive for the tiny traffic volume. I continue to be of the view that the majority of the stated aims of the project would be better achieved by leaving this very constrained section as single carriageway but improving junctions to enhance safety. A simpler version of the South junction would be possible with single carriageway and the awful impact of the north Dunkeld and Dalguise junctions could be reduced. This was managed in Bankfoot with a much smaller impact. A few miles of single in the context of 110miles of A9 to Inverness seems bearable. Plans A and C with a station outside the village seem to achieve a poor outcome for a lot of money. I look forward to your further updates.	(www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). Various junction layouts have been considered at Birnam. This assessment has concluded that closure of the northbound merge and southbound diverge slip roads would increase traffic on Perth Road by up to approximately 1,100 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), 2041, Do-Something Model). It should be noted that an option to remove access to the A9 altogether at Birnam Junction was considered and displayed to the public in January/February 2012. Feedback following the exhibition suggested that the public favoured a junction that provided access to, and egress from, the proposed A9 dual carriageway. Your details have been added to the mailing list to receive newsletters and information about future public consultation events. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.
42.	I have the following comments on the current A9 dualling proposals in the Birnam area. I live in Birnam, adjacent to the road, and am a regular user of both the A9 and the railway station. 1. The proposed junction at Birnam with the B867/ Perth Road is unsatisfactory for all versions. It takes too much land, has an excessive effect on the landscape and will perform worse for road users, being too complicated. A layout more similar to that provided elsewhere, involving the use of simple slip roads and T junctions, would be better. I attach a suggested plan which should meet the requirements. I have provided an outline diagram, and have also superimposed this onto your plan. The A9 would for a relatively short distance move slightly closer to the railway but without impinging onto its infrastructure; a short retaining	Thank you for attending the public exhibitions in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. In relation to the specific requests in your feedback, please note the following: 1. Thank you for providing a suggested alternative layout at Birnam Junction. Such a layout has previously been considered. Provision of southbound merge and diverge slip roads that meet the requirements of appropriate design standards have a number of impacts. The southbound diverge slip road would encroach close to residential properties on Perth Road. To limit encroachment retained earthwork solutions or retaining walls would be required. A similar solution would be required to avoid encroachment towards the River Tay, which is a

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	wall may be needed dependent on the effect on the NMU route. It would also require a marginally longer bridge over the B867. 2. In the general area of Birnam / Dunkeld, your scheme proposals A and C are unacceptable. They will increase noise and other pollution, and cause the road to be an even greater intrusion into the local environment than it currently is. One of the principles behind the scheme should surely be to reduce noise and intrusion rather than allow for an increase in what are currently quite high levels. It is quite apparent that both schemes are very poor in this respect. Whilst scheme C is marginally better than A, there is really no great difference between them. A couple of your people at the recent exhibition in Birnam were keen to present scheme C as some kind of compromise between the “extremes” of schemes A and B. In no way can this be the case, as it demonstrably does not perform satisfactorily in terms of noise and visual intrusion. On the other hand, scheme B is acceptable, since it goes a long way to restoring proper access to the station, and reducing the level of noise and visual intrusion in the Birnam village. It will also be substantially better in improving pollution levels from the high levels of diesel emissions (i.e. particulates) coming from HGVs. At the Dunkeld junction, also, scheme B is to be preferred, as both A and C position the road too high, higher than now, again increasing the noise and intrusion, and reducing the visual amenity in the two historic villages. 3. Your proposals for schemes A and C envisage replacing the current station with a newly constructed one to the northwest. This is quite unnecessary for what you are trying to achieve. I don’t disagree with moving the car park and vehicular access, but not to the extent of building a new station and doing away with the existing one. The same effect can be had by extending the double track and both platforms slightly to the northwest, the platforms then being carried over the Birnam Glen road, just sufficient to allow access to the new car park and access. Pedestrian and	Special Area of Conservation (SAC) as a result of the southbound merge slip road. Construction in such close proximity to the river channel will introduce an increased risk of environmental impacts. 2. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment, which is currently ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, considers noise and vibration and air quality impacts. The attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment, provides further details on the assessment undertaken. The assessment of road traffic noise has identified a number of potential impacts associated with the proposed route options. Potentially all three route options under consideration will result in major and moderate adverse impacts at sensitive receptors, however this varies between the options. Option B, which places the road into a deep cutting to the immediate north of Dunkeld & Birnam Station results in the fewest major adverse impacts. Option A, which raises the A9 has the most impact in terms of noise. This will be considered in selecting a Preferred Route Option. Further assessment will be undertaken as the design develops, which will consider construction vibration. Suitable noise and vibration mitigation measures will also be considered. Limitations may be placed on construction activities to limit noise and vibration, which may include setting maximum permissible noise levels, limit on working hours and controlled movement of construction traffic. 3. Your comments on station relocation are noted. We are aware of the impacts on the Category A Listed station building and further design work will be undertaken as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. 4. We are aware of the Stirling example you refer to. However, rather than relying on comparisons to other projects where the circumstances

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	disabled access could continue to be provided via the glen road. Your proposals would isolate the existing station building (of particular historic interest and significance) and remove it from its correct setting – an operational station building. The proposals would also remove the existing platform canopy from use, and no doubt just substitute a "bus-stop" type of facility, little or no use in providing protection from the elements. Equally no doubt that this would satisfy the legal minimum, to the detriment of most users! You should not be claiming the provision of a compliant station as one of the "benefits" of the scheme; this is excessive and likely to be unduly expensive. The current station falls below a satisfactory minimum standard for height - one attained at virtually all (if not all) stations on the Highland line, but it does so because of Transport Scotland's abysmal failure to fund the necessary work. It is not difficult to do, there are numerous examples elsewhere, and Network Rail would do the work if funded. Indeed, any significant alteration to the station, short of removal to a new site, would drive the provision of fully-standard height platforms, including my suggestion for a limited extension of the platforms. 4. Your people describe Scheme B as being excessively difficult and expensive to build, yet others can build such where there are environmental gains to be had. I don't see the Swiss or the Dutch putting environmental protection and pollution prevention at the bottom of the list of desirable features, and neither should Scotland. There are in fact plenty of examples where this is done acceptably. I referred one of your staff to Stirling, where a dual-carriageway road had been driven under the station forecourt some years ago, quite analogous to your scheme B. It can therefore be done, and there is an acceptable and practical solution which was adopted only 50 miles away. It was evident at the local meeting held in Birnam that there will be substantial opposition to any scheme which does not give considerable	are not exactly the same, we have considered this location specifically through developing and assessing Option B. A key part of this assessment is to consider constructability. Jacobs' assessment has highlighted a number of construction complexities with Option B. Walls of up to 8.6 metres in height will be necessary on the west side and 13.3 metres on the east side. To avoid ground anchors, which would extend beneath private property and the Highland Main Line railway, unusual and complex solutions will be necessary. These will be timely to construct and at the limit of what is technically feasible within such a constrained corridor. The added complexity will also increase costs and associated risks. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. As are your concerns regarding Options A and C. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	weight to minimising the effects of noise and pollution, and I for one would object at any Public Inquiry were this not done. I suggest therefore that it will be in everyone's interests to minimise such objections, so just get on and develop such a scheme, which gives the village back its proper environment. For the record, Scheme B is the only one I support.	
43.	I attended the recent consultation days held at the Birnam Institute and wish to make the following comments: 1. This exercise should be taken as a once in a lifetime opportunity to re-connect the station with the village. The legacy of the 1970s A9 widening has been a mistake we've had to live with for forty years. The separation of the station from the village by the physical barrier of the A9 removes the sense of having an integrated public transport link to all the cities in Scotland on our doorstep, being easily available and belonging to the community. 2. The relocation of the station under Proposals 'A' and 'C' and the engineering that goes with it is a huge expense and totally unnecessary. Furthermore, it worsens the sense of separation between the village and the railway by placing it in a more distant and hidden position from now with an exaggerated and circuitous route for drivers. 3. Option 'B' would allow easy pedestrian and vehicular access to the station from the centre of the village. Its visibility and connectivity with the village will encourage local use. It will also provide a public transport hub with local bus services using a re-connected Station Road to inter-connect with trains, such integration being one of the Scottish Government's objectives. 4. The same visibility and connectivity will benefit short and long stay tourism. Tourism is vital to this area, sustaining many parts of the local	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. We note your preference for Option B and your comments regarding the cost of relocating the station for Options A and C. Cost will be considered as part of the assessment of the options. As will constructability, which suggests disruption and duration of construction will be greater for Option B compared to Option A and C. Your acceptance of this disruption is noted. We also note your comments about accessibility to the station for Option B. This is recognised in the assessment work we are undertaking. Future use of the station building is being considered in relation to Options A and C. Option B proposes a new access road to properties on Birnam Glen to the west of Dunkeld & Birnam Station. The current access issues are recognised and will be discussed with Perth & Kinross Council. We have undertaken an assessment of traffic noise and set out information in the attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment, which may be of interest. In your feedback you suggest Option B has been discounted by Transport Scotland and Jacobs. I can confirm that Option B has undergone the same level of assessment as other options and no decision regarding a

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	economy. I have run a holiday lettings business for nine years and know from customer feedback the feeling of illogicality of having a station but no quick and easy access to the village. 5. The Birnam Institute in Station Road is a genuine community hub and hosts many conferences, seminars and other functions. Option 'B' offers a conspicuous connectivity with the station, something that will only encourage the amount of delegates choosing to travel by rail to functions there. It presents the opportunity for level access from station to conference whereas the proposed alternative location will create a need for persons with mobility restrictions to book taxis from Perth, an option which is not only environmentally unfriendly but also much less inclusive and welcoming for people with mobility restrictions. 6. The dropping of the road level under Option 'B' will mean traffic noise levels will be reduced compared to the other two 'at grade' options. 7. Re-connecting Station Road to the station will vastly improve the chances of bringing the 'A' listed station buildings back into use. 8. If Road Options 'A' or 'C' are chosen, our Grade A listed station building will have little chance of being leased, will become run-down, abandoned, attract anti-social behaviour and graffiti. Visitors from the south will view this abandoned building which will present an area in need of regeneration. 9. Eliminating the step-up from the platform level to train level at the station can be achieved by raising the platform level or lowering the track bed. As use of the station buildings is no longer linked the function of the station, the former could easily be achieved without being constrained by the new platform level being different to that within the station building.	Preferred Route Option has been made at this time. Consultation feedback is incorporated into the assessment where relevant and considered in the decision making process alongside the engineering, environmental and traffic and economic assessment. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	10. As a resident of Birnam Glen the new access road offered by Option 'B' would allow fellow residents and myself to receive a full refuse and gritting service as well as provide access for fire engines which are presently unable to fit under the 9 foot railway bridge. 11. Although I live very close to where the works will take place, I have no hesitation in supporting Option 'B' even though the engineering is more challenging and for their duration I will be subject to a longer period of works, disruption and night-time working. This is a small price to pay for getting the decision right and one I am quite happy to put up with. I have concerns from the recent and previous consultation exhibitions that Option 'B' is considered the nuisance option that has had to be included to placate local community feelings but has already been discounted by the professionals for whom it is more demanding. I hope you can confirm this is not the case by informing me that the feedback you receive from this consultation exercise will be the primary factor in determining which Option you recommend.	
44.	With regard to the properties at: Telford Gardens and King Duncan's Place, we were always led to believe that the bank and trees were there to screen us from the A9. They were planted by the Scottish Office for that reason to cut down noise and air pollution. When the houses first went on the market it was stated that the houses would be screened from the A9 by a bank and trees. That includes the houses at Stell Park Road which went on the market roughly 3 years ago. We were told that the new carriageway would be on the South side of the existing road, away from us, which is fine, but now you intend to put a slip road between the existing A9 and our houses which is absolutely ridiculous. By what I can make out, the retaining wall will be just 6.3m	Thank you for attending the public exhibitions in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. In the vicinity of your property, carriageway widening to accommodate the dual carriageway is proposed to the west, towards the Highland Main Line railway. However, to provide a grade separated junction to meet relevant

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	from my house which is bound to create more noise and air pollution as well as having a huge impact on the value of the property. Another concern, is that during construction, especially with everything being so close, how will this affect our house foundations? By past experience I would say not very well. As well as all the above, plans to move the Railway Station means it will be closer to us, therefore we will also incur more noise from trains and station traffic. With regard to the road layout options: A: Visual impact and increased noise / air pollution due to height of road. B: Construction is likely to be a nightmare for us. C: Seems favourite – with road level much the same.	and current design standards, while taking account of local constraints, a slip road is required on the east side of the dual carriageway to facilitate southbound merging traffic. The slip road is approximately 15 metres from your property, albeit earthworks will likely extend to the edge of your property boundary. The attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment, provides further details on the assessment undertaken. This assessment includes consideration of noise and vibration, air quality and constructability. These factors will be taken into account when selecting a Preferred Route Option. The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. DMRB Stage 3 includes preparation of an Environmental Statement, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works and identifies suitable mitigation. At this stage, appropriate operational and construction noise mitigation measures will be considered. Limitations may be placed on construction activities to limit noise and vibration, which may include setting maximum permissible noise levels, limit on working hours and controlled movement of construction traffic. An example of an Environmental Statement can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). Your preference for Option C is noted. As are your concerns regarding Options A and B. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
45.	The update sheets, recent exhibitions and public meeting on 28/01/2016 have been helpful and to an extent informative. They have however, left us with as many questions as there were definitive answers – see Community Council News in The Bridge, March 2016. I would like from the above to make the following points: • Recent articles and information produced by Jacobs UK Ltd and Transport Scotland seem to be influencing a steer away from Option B despite it being the preferred choice of way with most local Birnam residents. • At the public meeting, a Transport Scotland representative stated that the cost differential between Options A, B and C was not as significant as first thought however this would appear to contradict Jacobs UK Ltd statement – see The Bridge March 2016 – Option B "This results in increased…. Cost …. Of construction. " • At the public meeting a professional engineer in the audience questioned the required extent / length of high walling in option which I'm sure was agreed could be less than stated in some publicity so far. • In a recent article in the Heartland magazine March 2016, Jacobs UK Ltd is quoted as 'warning' that scenic views by car driving (presumably flashing passed – the raison d'etre for the dualling of the A9!) would be compromised although quote " the local populations would have a better one". • Victorian Birnam – a unique if whimsical architectural gem – owes its existence to the station. If moved, albeit resulting in a publicity coup for those involved see Heartland Magazine March 2016, would miss the point completely of this Grade A listed building for which suggestion have already been put forward for future use. The station is central to the heart	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016, the Community Council meeting on 8 February 2016 and for providing feedback. In relation to the specific requests in your feedback, please note the following: 1. Transport Scotland and Jacobs are not seeking to influence a steer away from Option B or any other option. The intention of recent public consultation is to ensure the public is aware of the particular construction complexity associated with Option B. The retaining walls necessary north of Dunkeld & Birnam Station will be unusual, complex and time consuming to construct. Furthermore, they will be at the limit of what is technically feasible. 2. At the time of the public Community Council meeting cost estimates for the route options had yet to be completed. However, since February further work has been undertaken to understand the costs associated with the options. Based on current estimates it is anticipated that the cost of Option B is likely to be approximately 30% higher than Option A with Option C approximately 7% higher than Option A. This is largely due to the increased complexity of the retaining structures required north of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and associated risks. 3. Retaining walls are required to the immediate north of Dunkeld & Birnam Station to avoid earthwork slopes impacting residential properties to the east and the Highland Main Line railway to the west. 4. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment, currently ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section, assesses the visual impact of the options on receptors alongside the proposed dual carriageway and the view from the road for road users as part of the environmental assessment. This is

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	of Birnam and if reunited with the village would restore its historical integrity – a Victorian gem at the gateway to the Highlands. The above points are an indication of my preference for the adoptions of Option B, despite and recognition of the not inconsiderable challenge faced, and one which along with many other local residents I will promote absolutely. I look forward to hearing from you, and the other parties involved, in response to these views.	considered in identification of a Preferred Route Option. 5. The effect of the three route options on cultural heritage has been considered as part of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment. For Options A and C there is a large adverse impact on the setting of the building, while for Option B, there is a large beneficial impact. This will be considered in selecting a Preferred Route Option. Future use of the station building is being considered in relation to Options A and C. We would be pleased to hear from you if you have suggestions for the future use of the station building. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.
46.	Current Route Options I would favour Option A. I am concerned however, about the fate of the Category A listed station building. Although not in use at present it has been used in the past as, I believe, for band practice. Leaving the building with no vehicle access will exclude man, if not all, possible future uses. Unused the building with undoubtedly deteriorate, and also the isolation could leave it open to vandalism. Tay Crossing Structure I would favour Option 2. Given the bridge is viewed from below by walkers and cyclists on the riverside tracks, and by anglers, a more aesthetically attractive design is	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option A, and for the River Tay structure that incorporates angled supports, is noted. In relation to Options A and C, we are considering whether access can be provided to the station building and whether there are options for future use. We would be pleased to hear from you if you have suggestions for the future use of the station building. Existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes that link the River Tay via Birnam Glen and The Hermitage will be maintained, albeit some diversionary works are likely. The condition of existing paths will be assessed during future design stages. Measures to improve safety and

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	preferable, and I think the angled supports fulfil that requirement. A9 Between Dalguise and Dunkeld Junctions (B898 / A923 & A822) My concern for this section of the A9 in regards to cycle path NCN 77, which I understand will remain extant as a link between the B898 and Dunkeld, is ideal as a recreational route. If going to Birnam, however, this route from the B898, through the Hilton and Dunkeld to Perth Road is over 3 miles of which 1.5 miles are on a track that can be slippery near the river with mud / ice and under the trees with leaves. Not being surfaces cyclists use, road bikes with skinny tyres generally do not use this route. In the interests of promoting active travel (the aim I believe, is for 10% of everyday journeys to be made by bike by 2020) and links to communities I believe that a cycle path needs to be incorporated with the A9 between the B898 and A923 / A822 junctions, reducing the distance to about 2 miles and about 4 miles from the main settlement of Dalguise for this section: i.e. 1.5 miles shorted than NCN77, and all on a surfaced route. Dalguise is also within the catchment area of the Royal School of Dunkeld in Little Dunkeld, which takes children up to the age of 12. The school is very keen to promote cycling for the pupils road and regular cycle training sessions, running a cycle club and also holding an annual Big Pedal when pupils are encourages to cycle to school. At present any children living along the B898 are rather excluded from the cycling activities unless their parents drive them and their bikes to school. I do believe that in addition to NCN 77 there needs to be a safe, well surfaced cycle path adjacent to the A9 between the B898 and A923 / A822 junctions to encourage / facilitate active travel and link the community of Dalguise to Birnam and Dunkeld. Better to incorporate a cycle path now rather than prior to construct it in a few years' time. This is only my personal opinion based upon cycling in the area, and	connectivity and make routes more attractive and comfortable to use will be considered if appropriate. Some of the existing routes on the east side of the River Tay are in poor condition. As these paths are outwith the scope of the A9 Dualling Programme it is unlikely works will be undertaken. However, this will be considered further during future stages of design. More detailed proposals for NMU infrastructure will be developed once a Preferred Route Option has been identified. We will consider your feedback further at that time. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	observation of other cyclists. Even when on an organised ride using NCN 77 I saw some participants turn onto the A9 from the B898 to go to Birnam, rather than negotiate the track section (they were on road bikes with skinny tyres) through the Hilton.	
47.	Literally, an over-engineered waste of space. This is neither needed not wanted by the affected community here beyond the 2 groups of party political supporters who have failed to communicate with their respective MSPs. Far from being progressive and good for the economy, what we are offered is the retro brutality of the mid-20th century wreaking havoc on historic places that are wholly dependent on tourism. Tourists do not ask for this. The only merit I can find in any schemes is that of 'sinking' the road covering it to connect the station to Birnam again. It is more important to get this right than fuss about timing for something we are stuck with forever. Where are Options D and E? Option D – low impact barriers along the middle of the existing carriageway with upgraded junctions with lights etc. Option E – Civilised societies of Europe would not think twice about undergrounding throughout the Pass of Birnam. It is a politically driven, backward looking mind-set which prevents it. There is time enough to secure funding for such a heroic project. Our local economy needs it and deserves it.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your comments regarding the scheme are noted. However, the Scottish Government has stated its commitment to upgrading the road to dual carriageway standard. Based on typical assumptions for a twin bore tunnel, construction duration and costs are significantly higher than an on-line upgrade. However, this is dependent on a range of factors, including geometry, length of tunnel, ventilation requirements, geology, construction methods and environmental considerations. Operational and maintenance requirements are also more onerous for tunnels, incurring further costs. Suitable drainage, which is likely to involve pumping stations, lighting and ventilation is required to ensure safe and efficient operation of tunnels. Furthermore, as fires in tunnels can be particularly hazardous because of the potential concentration of fumes and poisonous gases, high temperatures and heat radiation and the difficulties that can be experienced by fire fighters working in an enclosed space, tunnels must be designed for fire protection. Ventilation systems must also be designed to aid escape in the event of a fire. Fires that involve heavy goods vehicles, particularly those carrying flammable liquids, such as whisky, can be especially hazardous. To accommodate ventilation shafts, emergency exits and provide access for construction, surface works would be necessary, which may have an impact on the environment. Assuming a tunnel would be constructed to the

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		west of the current A9, this will impact previously undisturbed areas of the River Tay (Dunkeld) National Scenic Area and Ancient Woodland. Surface works would also be necessary to provide connection to the communities of Dunkeld and Birnam, taking consideration of physical constraints, including the Highland Main Line railway. It should be noted that previous assessment considered the use of tunnels within the A9 corridor. Two areas in particular were identified as most suitable, the Drumochter Pass and Slochd. Both options we ruled out for the following reasons: • Tunnelling would entail a significant length of twin bore tunnel to be constructed; • Significant engineering works required at the on-line tie-in points, causing disruption; • Tunnel management, maintenance requirements and potential restrictions on usage for particular vehicles are likely to offset the benefits of improved winter resilience; and • Environmental impacts on designated sites at tunnel entrance points. To implement low impact barriers along the centre of the existing carriageway, widening would be necessary to provide the appropriate barrier set-back and working width. While not as excessive as the widening required for a dual carriageway, there may be impacts on adjacent constraints. Gaps would be required in the barrier to accommodate right-turn manoeuvres, which is recognised as a safety issue with the existing carriageway. Alternatively, junctions could be amended to allow left-in left-out movements only, however this would result in increased journey times and would need provision of suitable junctions to accommodate turning vehicles at various points along the

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		route. It is intended that the proposed route corridor shall not be illuminated with street lighting to limit environmental impacts, including visual impacts. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.
48.	We attended the exhibition in the Birnam Institute on 28th January and the Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council Meeting on 8th February. It was clear to us that there was insufficient information provided on construction costs, technical data and environmental and local economic impact for local residents to make properly considered responses to the 3 Options presented. It has always been pointed out by the engineering consultants and Transport Scotland that the “Pass of Birnam” is the most technically difficult stretch of the whole A9 Dualling project between Perth and Inverness. There is, therefore, a case for treating this one mile stretch of road (between Birnam turnoff and the Dunkeld turn off) differently and at the same time saving huge construction costs and disruption. Sadly it is unlikely that any alternative to the 3 Options will be considered because the Scottish Government and all political parties are apparently committed to dualling the whole of the A9 and to “no roundabouts” regardless of costs and disruption. The following is not an argument for “no change” to “The Pass of Birnam” but a suggestion of turning a negative into a positive. The very title “The pass of Birnam” lends itself to promoting this section by signage on the north carriageway as a “Welcome to the Scottish Highlands – you are now entering an area of scenic beauty etc.” and traffic would be encouraged and in fact compelled (by average speed cameras which are apparently working well to improve safety on current stretches of the A9) to drive more slowly along this stretch. There is indeed a need to address the access at junctions at either end, station access and to introduce noise	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016, the Community Council meeting on 8 February 2016 and for providing feedback. We note your preference for Option C and your comments regarding the flooding impacts and construction disruption for Option B. The effects of the three route options on the water environment, which includes a flood risk assessment, are considered as part of the ongoing assessment. The finalised designs will take account of the objective to avoid any increase in flood risk, consistent with Scottish planning policy. Constructability, which suggests disruption and duration of construction will be greater for Option B compared to Options A and C, is also considered. Your comment regarding implementation of a reduced speed limit through this section of the A9, policed by average speed cameras is noted. However, the Scottish Government has stated its commitment to upgrading the road to dual carriageway standard. A left-in left-out junction has previously been considered for access to Dunkeld & Birnam Station, however, due to adjacent constraints, a safe layout cannot be provided. Furthermore, there is insufficient space to provide a replacement car parking facility which does not address two of the scheme objectives established for the A9 Dualling Programme, to facilitate active travel within the corridor and to improve integration with Public Transport facilities. To address these issues, station relocation has

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	reduction measures. Regarding the station, the left-in / left-out principle as mooted in all 3 Options for The Hermitage junction could apply to station access. Sadly, as a cynic of public consultation, we do not expect the above paragraph to be given any consideration or to elicit any response so we will revert to the issue of choosing one of the 3 Options albeit without sufficient detailed information on many aspects. We appreciate that Option B will be the choice of many residents as it will re-integrate the station with the village. Given the location of our property our main concerns with Option B are firstly the potential for flooding with the lowering of Inchewan Burn which is a spate burn and which has reached higher levels this winter than we have seen in the last 24 years; secondly the noise, vibration, disruption and inconvenience of the construction phase which we have been informed will be a period of 18 months to two years which either we have to decide to live through or we have to decide to sell up and which may in fact impact on the value of our property. Our choice is Option C which we feel is an improvement in terms of construction on the earlier presented Option A.	been considered for Options A and C. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.
49.	Please accept this letter as our feedback following the recent public exhibition at the Birnam Arts Centre. Following careful examination of the three options outlined we feel that we are not in a position to provide an informed response at this point. Specifically, Jacobs and Transport Scotland ask for views about any local features or constraints that are important to consider and how the junction options may affect our household and community. We feel that the current approach is a very 'one size fits all' one and does not take account for the unique corridor and topography of the area. This is the only stretch of the A9 that cuts through and in places overhangs a vibrant, residential community. We are also very proud of our place in railway history and wish for our railway station and service to be enhanced not jeopardised or	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment, which is currently ongoing, includes an environmental assessment. This assessment considers the impact on many of the items you have raised in your correspondence, including noise and vibration, air quality, visual, landscape, ecology and nature conservation, cultural heritage, road drainage and the water environment, community and private assets and effects on all travellers. The attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment, provides further details on the DMRB Stage 2 assessment undertaken.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	moved. We would like to make some general points and note that without the information listed below it is impossible to form any judgement about the true human, economic and geographical impact. Assessment of: 1. Noise impact and mitigation. 2. Projected air quality and pollution and mitigation. 3. Visual impact. The character of the whole area will be irreversibly altered. What is still to some extent a rural environment will be urbanised. 4. Environmental impact e.g. on ancient woodland and water environments including flooding. 5. Impacts on biodiversity, including key species like pine martin, red squirrel, otter. 6. Impact on housing stock and market. 7. Impact of vibration during and after any construction period. 8. Impact on core path network. 9. Impact on cycle routes. 10. Impact of health of local population and how this ties into national objectives. 11. Impact on cultural heritage.	The magnitude of environmental impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. Detailed environmental mitigation will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). We make note of your comments regarding further options for the A9, which suggests retaining this section as a single carriageway. However, the Scottish Government has stated its commitment to upgrading the road to dual carriageway standard. The project is designed to deliver economic growth through improvements to road safety and journey times as well as better links to pedestrian, cycling and public transport facilities. Dualling the A9 will also provide greater access to the many tourism and recreation sites along the route. The design of the A9 Dualling Programme has been undertaken in consultation with numerous stakeholders, including Network Rail, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and Dunkeld & Birnam Community Council. This will continue as the scheme develops. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any further information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	12. Impact on historical environment. 13. Impact on public transport services including assurances about maintaining and ongoing enhancement of current provision. 14. Carbon footprint of project. 15. Economic impact on local businesses. 16. Impact on tourism. 17. Impact on local school. 18. Impact on local medical services. In our opinion it would be timely for decision-makers to pause and reflect on the points of information above and really consider the legacy they are creating both for us, our community, Perthshire and Scotland. There may be other options that haven't been considered in partnership with other stakeholders that cost less and still meet national safety and economic development objectives e.g. improved lighting, signage, speed monitoring. Any improvements to the A9 would need to take account of the above and provide demonstrable benefits to each individual household and to the community in order to justify this amount of change and cost. We are not prepared to be 'sacrificed' and look to you to provide a sympathetic and responsible response. We have forwarded our comments and feedback to the Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council, A9 Working Group. We look forward to receiving your response.	

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
50.	Non -Motorised Users Requirements on the Pass of Birnam to Jubilee Bridge. Planned rationalisation of the NMU facilities in this area will prove detrimental to public access (walkers, runners, cyclists, horse riders, daily use by local house owners, etc., sports competitors, users of public transport both by train and bus) to a network of paths. The proposed method of assessment relies on a misconstruct which assumes that if there are two paths between points A and B then one can be removed, ignoring the fact that usual usage and the principal attraction relies on both paths being used to make a circuit. (e.g. If paths 1 and 2 connect with points A and B then removing either 1 or 2 is not acceptable because the usual use would involve both 1 and 2.) Maintaining the current path structure - Reasons in Support. The Dunkeld and Birnam area is famed for its pedestrian cycling, fishing and wildlife habitat facilities and the easy public access to them. They form a basic attraction in the area used widely by local people individually and operating in groups and by visitors so forming a vital role in the local tourist industry. Equally well they can be regarded as a platform for a healthy life style. See government accent on walking and cycling for health. They also provide access for sports such as running, mountain biking and orienteering. Sporting events involving paths in the area include the Birnam Hill, Race, the Inver Night 5K, the Dunkeld M. Bike Enduro, and Scottish Endure Series access for Downhill Mountain Biking Championships, Hermitage Birnam Hill and Ladywell Orienteering. ByCycle's Summer Series. The area forms a major part of the R. Tay National Scenic Area centred on Dunkeld and including the Pass of Birnam and the proposed road as far as	Thank you for your correspondence regarding the A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. The impact on NMU routes is considered as part of this process. A key aim of the A9 Dualling Programme is to maintain existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes, improving where possible to remove barriers along and across the trunk road. This may be achieved by improving safety, providing improved connectivity between routes and making routes more attractive and comfortable to use. An NMU Access Strategy has been prepared to formalise Transport Scotland's position on NMU access arrangements and is available on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-non-motorised-user-nmu-access-strategy-9068). This document contains a number of objectives that will be considered throughout the design process. Your concerns in relation to NMU routes are noted. Existing routes in the vicinity of Dunkeld and Birnam will be maintained, albeit some diversionary works are likely. Measures to improve safety and connectivity and make routes more attractive and comfortable to use will also be considered if appropriate. More detailed proposals for NMU infrastructure will be developed once a Preferred Route Option has been identified. We will consider your feedback at that time. It should be noted that as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment an Accessibility Audit and Cycle Audit will be undertaken on the design. A key objective of these audits is to ensure the road network is safe and more accessible for all road users. Any safety issues will be identified by this

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Rotmel Farm. Introduction Walking/Cycling - Most of the paths used in and around B&D are allocated P&K core path status. As such they are supposedly protected with a stated intention by the developing companies to maintain their presence. (The current plan for the Luncarty to Birnam Pass road respects the paths that exist e.g. an over road bridge at the Gelly Crossing which is designed also as an animal crossing.) They are on the development maps as they currently exist but notably there are a number of areas where the planned road is labelled “proximity to NMU”. In many cases such are not just crossings but involve stretches of the NMU pathway. These points are due for assessment under the Jacobs Assessment Strategy. The strategy involves- 1. Preferred by Jacobs- Combining with an adjacent core path. 2. New path or route to be provided. They may fulfil their preservation requirement by relocating them e.g. the Cycle way from Birnam Station to Bankfoot road end might be removed and reassigned through the village to join at the new Bankfoot Rd roundabout. 3. There are other paths which are not in the core path network. These will be assessed to see if an alternative connection can be adopted. If not an alternative path may be provided or the path may be closed. Details of paths involved Core Paths: 1. The National Cycle Network No 77 - Currently runs close to and parallel to the railway station to Bankfoot road. Major problems will	audit process and suitable mitigation measures considered in discussion with Perth & Kinross Council. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	exist at the station and onwards. Planned development (see above) close current path and use Perth Rd to Bankfoot Rd junction NO 040410 with the latter adequately structured to separate out motorised traffic on the Birnam roundabout. 2. Core path from Perth Rd to Birnam Hill area - NO040411 currently requires crossing the A9. An underpass linking with the one that currently goes under the railway would provide for walkers, cyclists and animal migration. An overbridge would be of less use to cyclists, infirm walkers and wildlife. The possibility is that they will detour it via the Birnam roundabout. Will that cycle/ walk/ animal crossing be adequately structured into the road way? One suggestion is that to avoid the roundabout an underpass could serve the purposes above and take the NCN 77 onto Bankfoot road without using the Birnam roundabout. 3. The Station Underpass - on the Birnam Glen road NO031417 - Options A and C appear to keep the underpass road and therefore NMU access to the Glen. Option B sees the road lowered and motorised traffic taken round by Amulree road. There is as yet no mention of an over bridge taking in both the roadway and railway and it may be that NMUs would have to go via the station. Any bridge reduces access by cyclists, wildlife, buggy pushers, and infirm walkers, especially those who may live in houses in Birnam hill road. 4. The Braan crossing underbridge NO024422. This is another feature which Jacobs has said will be maintained. What is not clear at present is the route the path will take after going under the roads. Will the present wooden bridge be replaced and will the Fiddlers Path link turning to the right back under the road in the present system be included? The Inver branch currently links with businesses in Inver, including the caravan site. 5. The Hermitage Path - NO014424. This is a major feature of the local	

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	path system as far as tourists and locals are concerned. The meeting at the Birnam Hotel revealed that the plan is to have the left in left out Hermitage road link moving even closer to the river than it does at present. It is questionable how this change in road alignment could leave room for the current foot/ cycle path leading to and going through the junction. 6. The proposed roadway runs very close to the Tay walk (west side) NO003422. Is this popular Tayside Circuit path going to survive? 7. The Jubilee Bridge Crossing NO 004438. The bridge has footpaths on both sides. There are also underpasses on both sides of the Tay. This little network connects to a. the Hilton Hotel woods with the Craigvinean woods; b. both sides of the Tay Circuit walk/ cycle way; and c. importantly the NCN 77 long distance cycle way from Pitlochry to Dundee (coming via Dalguise). It is essential that both the underpasses and the bridge crossing paths are kept. Non-Core Paths: 1. NO048398 Currently, people can cross the A9 to move from the Bankfoot Road area into Murthly estate and connect with the Core Path Network there. People (and wildlife) should be able to do this (more safely) by the proposed Murthly Estate underpass. 2. There is a well-trodden non CPN path runs from the Newtyle Fisherman's Hut NO042411 to join with the Murthly estate roads at around NO056394. Can it be preserved given the extent of road building planned in the FH area?	

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	3. There is a rock exposure at the current Birnam junction where there is also a small footpath leading cyclists and pedestrians to an A9 crossing point. The rock exposure is regularly used by educational groups (geology?). 4. There is a non CPN path running from the Hermitage entrance across the A9 through a walker's gate and across a couple of styles to the Niel Gow Oak. I think this is used by the Niel Gow Walk visitors (see Niel Gow Festival). I use it regularly as do others. Can we get a bridge crossing here? 5. Currently there is access (motorised or otherwise) to the Craigvinean Woods at NO 003428 affording an extra access point to this popular biking area. Since it is also a FC and radio mast access point, will this be maintained? Possibly a Left-in Left-out junction? 6. Bus transport link - Will the bus stops in lay-bys on the A9 at Inver survive? Notably, these stops are usable by adults, including Inver holiday makers and by school children returning home late from Aberfeldy e.g. after school clubs. Any south lane bus stop would require a bridge crossing to the village access path.	
51.	Possibly the biggest concern for local people is that of noise. Already the noise of the A9 is a concern for local people, whether in Stell Park or on the far side of the Tay. Noise travels and reverberates around the valley. Whatever solution is found, it should reflect the need to minimise the impact of noise on the local population and upon its reliance on tourism. If tourists no longer choose to visit Dunkeld and Birnam because of the noise of the A9, much of the local economy will be put at risk. Although this may not be an option, I would ask that serious consideration be given to restricting speed along this corridor whether or not it becomes a dual carriageway – possibly to 50 mph. Of the options laid out by the	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out the current standards and good practice relating to trunk roads. Stage 2 of this process is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9, which considers various route options within the on-line corridor. A noise and vibration assessment of the options is undertaken as part of this process. This assessment of road traffic noise has identified a number of potential impacts associated with the proposed route options.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	developers, dropping the level of the A9 and sitting a car park for the station above the carriageway presents as the least intrusive option (long-term) and the one with greatest potential to minimise noise.	Potentially all three route options under consideration will result in major and moderate adverse impacts at sensitive receptors, however this varies between the options. Option B, which places the road into a deep cutting at Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, results in the fewest major impacts. Options A, which raises the A9 has the most impact in terms of noise. The attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment, provides further details on the noise assessment undertaken. The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. DMRB Stage 3 includes preparation of an Environmental Statement, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works and identifies suitable mitigation. An example of an Environmental Statement can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). A9 dualling is being progressed through an on-line corridor, with off-line options having previously been discounted, primarily due to the surrounding topography and resultant environmental impact. The A9 will be a Category 7A all-purpose dual carriageway with a 70 miles per hour speed limit. As a result, there will be no gaps in the central reserve and no at-grade minor junctions. Only grade separated junctions will be provided on the route for safe access and egress to the A9. Isolated left-in left-out accesses may be provided in exceptional circumstances. To produce a high standard of road safety, the initial objective in the design process is to seek to achieve the Desirable Minimum Standards as set-out in the DMRB. This is normal practice when developing road

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		designs. However, a flexible approach is set out in the relevant design standards contained within the DMRB. This permits use of reduced standards if it can be demonstrated that there are significant benefits, for example, in reducing construction costs or environmental impacts. However, the use of reduced standards must demonstrate that safety is not significantly reduced and is subject to suitable justification and mitigation being provided. The objectives of the scheme, which are listed below, must also be considered. • To improve the operational performance of the A9 by: - Reducing journey times; and - Improving journey time reliability. • To improve safety for motorised and Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) by: - Reducing accident severity; and - Reducing driver stress. • To facilitate active travel within the corridor; and • To improve integration with Public Transport Facilities. A review has been undertaken for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project to determine the possible benefits of a reduced speed design. This review did not identify any significant benefits that would materially affect route choice. However, this will be further considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. It is recognised that tourism is an important feature of the A9 corridor and consultation is underway with Visit Scotland to identify potential benefits of dualling, which could include greater access to the many tourism and

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		recreation sites along the route. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
52.	As a landowner I wish to express my concerns on the loss of fields to the viability of the farm. The farm total land is 44ha the size of the two fields is approx. 5.5ha which equates to a loss of a 13.5ha of farm land. These fields are in a seven year potato rotation. The loss will mean the potato merchant who rents the potato land will no longer be interested in any land from the farm in the future. While I appreciate you no having any other options I wish to make you aware of the catastrophic affect this proposal has on the future of this farm.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The impact on your farm is noted as discussed at the meeting on 16th May 2016. The conclusion of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment, which is currently ongoing, is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is taken forward as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. A particular requirement at this stage is an assessment of the significant environmental effects of the project, which includes an assessment of impacts on agricultural businesses. This is published by means of an Environmental Statement. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). The design will be refined as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment and access provision to adjacent land will be considered. A key part of the process is further discussions with directly affected landowners. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
53.	First if all, we are against this section of road from Birnam to Dunkeld being dualled at all. The requirements of a dual carriageway width along that section cannot possibly be met without massive disruption during the construction phase and, thereafter, permanent unacceptable noise and pollution in far too close proximity to neighbouring properties – particularly for the residents of Stell Park. Our own property, in Little Dunkeld will also be adversely affected by the re-configuration of road levels at the A822 / A9 Dunkeld Junction. If, however, it is decided to proceed with this section of dualling, we would definitely prefer to have 'Option C – new option', as being the least damaging road layout in relation to the properties in Little Dunkeld affected by the A822 / A9 Junction. We would like to be kept informed relative to any future considerations / proposals which may emerge in the future. Continuing uncertainty relative to the final agreed design is most undesirable and should be finalised as soon as possible, as property values can be adversely affected.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. We note your comments regarding retaining this section as a single carriageway. However, the Scottish Government has stated its commitment to upgrading the road to dual carriageway standard. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment includes an environmental assessment. The magnitude of environmental impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. This includes noise, impacts during both construction and operating of the road. The attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment, provides further details on the assessment undertaken. Detailed environmental mitigation will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). Your preference for Option C is noted. We are aiming to announce a Preferred Route Option in 2016 to end the uncertainty for local residents. Information and updates on the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9 Dualling Programme can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-pass-birnam-tay-crossing). Your details have been added to the mailing list to receive newsletters and information about future public consultation events.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
54.	We have serious concerns over noise impact on our business. We generate a large income for the local area and are concerned that noise from the road will impact on the tranquillity of our property. Since our business is on an elevated position overlooking the A9, we have concerns of a visual aspect as well. We are a leisure business with over 300 visitors every weekend.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment includes an environmental assessment. The magnitude of environmental impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. This includes noise, visual input and light pollution during both construction and operating of the road. A summary of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment is provided in the attached Technical Note, B2140002/TN/011 (Revision 01): Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment. Detailed environmental mitigation, which may include compensatory woodland planting, will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). It is recognised that tourism is an important feature of the A9 corridor and consultation is underway with Visit Scotland to identify potential benefits of dualling, which could include greater access to the many tourism and recreation sites along the route. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
55.	Further to your display in the Birnam Institute I would once again like to	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	draw your attention to the location of my premises as I am concerned about the impact the works will have on my business. I have not been sufficiently reassured that the construction of the new road will not impact negatively on my business. My concerns include the noise of the works and the vibrations caused by the nature of the work and plant involved. I feel that the nature of the works could impact on my business and may make it impossible to keep the business on the site. I am also worried of increased noise levels of the dual road after construction.	and for providing feedback. We make note of your comments regarding the specific impacts on your veterinary practice as a result of the works. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment currently being undertaken considers constructability and noise and vibration, which is considered in identification of a Preferred Route Option. Jacobs' assessment has highlighted a number of construction complexities with Option B, which suggests disruption and duration of construction will be greater compared to Options A and C. The Preferred Route Option will be further developed during the DMRB Stage 3 assessment and an Environmental Statement prepared, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works. At this stage, construction vibration and suitable noise and vibration mitigation measures will be considered. Limitations will be placed on construction activities to limit noise and vibration, which may include setting maximum permissible noise levels, limit on working hours and controlled movement of construction traffic. An example of an Environmental Statement can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
56.	These comments are made from the perspective of a keen walker and cyclist in the main, but also from the perspective of a frequent traveller by train on the Highland Line and elsewhere, plus driving up the A9 frequently.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. In response to the specific points raised in your feedback, please note the following:

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	I am not a local resident, but represent ScotWays on the NMU Forum. My comments are made from south to north. Birnam Junction to Dunkeld Station The loss of the off-road section of cycle route NCR 7 is unfortunate, but understandable given the lack of space between the railway and the houses in Birnam/ Dunkeld. However locating the route through Birnam poses problems due to the traffic and parked cars; the road itself is quite narrow. However if the Birnam Junction was deleted completely, the only through traffic would be to and from Bankfoot, assuming an underpass was provided to accommodate the B867. This would provide a better environment for cyclists and for local people, and very few people would be inconvenienced, as the Dunkeld Junction is little over a mile to the north. If there was some opposition, a possible solution, while still reducing traffic through Birnam, would be to allow access to the A9 from Birnam only in a southerly direction. The removal or simplification of the Birnam Junction would give a cost saving, and avoid impinging on the designed landscape of Murthly Castle. Stopping up the B867 completely at the meeting point with the A9 would be unacceptable since a crossing of some sort is required to access the paths network on Birnam Hill. Dunkeld Station Moving the station slightly to the north is a welcome and innovative approach to the problem, and one which neatly resolves the pinch point at the station, while allowing Network Rail to improve a sub-standard station The problems of a very low platform are not resolved by a few sets of	<u>Birnam Junction to Dunkeld Station</u> Various junction layouts have been considered at Birnam. This assessment has concluded that restricting movements at the junction or closing it altogether will increase traffic on Perth Road considerably. For example, closing the northbound merge and southbound diverge slip roads would increase traffic on Perth Road by up to approximately 1,100 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), 2041, Do-Something Model). It should be noted that an option to remove access to the A9 altogether at Birnam Junction was considered and displayed to the public in January/February 2012. Feedback following the exhibition suggested that the public favoured a junction that provided access to, and egress from, the proposed A9 dual carriageway. As discussed at the Non-Motorised User (NMU) Forum on 27 May 2016, an Accessibility Audit and Cycle Audit will be undertaken on the design as part of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 3 assessment. A key objective of these audits is to ensure the road network is safer and more accessible for all road users. Any safety issues will be identified by this audit process and suitable mitigation measures considered in discussion with Perth & Kinross Council. <u>Dunkeld Station</u> Options A and C propose station relocation to the north of Inchewan Burn. Vehicular access to the station will be from the A822 (Old Military Road), immediately west of the existing railway underbridge. The relocated station would include a replacement car park. A pedestrian footbridge, either incorporating lifts or ramps would be provided to allow access between platforms. NMU access would be maintained, as it is now, from Birnam Glen with a new structure across the Inchewan Burn. NMU access from the A822 will also be considered and enhanced if possible. Suitable footpaths would link to the platforms and station facilities. As a new facility,

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	mobile steps, because at present the train service uses four different types of coaching stock, each with the doors in different places- ensuring that the steps are always in the wrong place. This makes it difficult for agile people, let alone those with heavy luggage or children. For those with any disability it is impossible. A step-free platform to train is inherently much safer, and allows faster boarding to and alighting from trains, thus speeding up the service by reducing stop time. The plans can be tweaked to permit entry at grade to both down and up platforms. If there are concerns regarding noise transmission from a slightly elevated A9, as in Option C, I note that in France and Germany the authorities use walls of glass bricks in sensitive areas to reduce noise transmission, while ensuring that those on the road can still enjoy the passing scenery. I note that access to the paths network on Birnam Hill by Birnam Glen and the Inchewan Burn will be preserved and even improved; for that many thanks. I have concerns regarding the paths network at the confluence of the Braan and the Tay, but these will not be fully addressed till Stage 3.	the relocated station would be designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues with the current station, in particular the platforms that are lower than is required for current rolling stock. Existing NMU routes at the confluence of the River Braan and River Tay will be maintained, albeit some realignments of the routes may be necessary. This will be considered further as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. Your comments in relation to suitable mitigation from noise impacts are noted and will be considered as the design develops. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
57.	I attended the February meeting in Birnam. Thank you for a high quality presentation and for the openness with which you addressed us. My conclusions so far are : --The application of standards and exceptions - Dunkeld/Birnam is the only village on the Perth Inverness stretch through which the A9 actually passes. Whilst the objective is an uninterrupted high class 70 mph dual carriageway, in this unique stretch where the A9 passes through a conurbation, for the safety of drivers and villagers, and the protection of the environment, it would be entirely reasonable that exceptions to standards be sought. This could alleviate some of design issues	Thank you for attending the Community Council meeting on 8 February 2016 and for providing feedback. A9 dualling is being progressed through an on-line corridor, with off-line options having previously been discounted, primarily due to the surrounding topography and resultant environmental impact. The A9 will be a Category 7A all-purpose dual carriageway with a 70 miles per hour speed limit. As a result, there will be no gaps in the central reserve and no at-grade minor junctions. Only grade separated junctions will be provided on the route for safe access and egress to the A9. Isolated left-in left-out accesses may be provided in exceptional circumstances.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response

	considerably. In case it remains complex, I don't think that that a speed restriction to 60 mph over this section would meet with any public opposition, and this would certainly allow for a neater cheaper, safer design.
	
	--Tourism and Heritage - Dunkeld is a village of significant heritage importance for Scotland, and the number of international tourists visiting bears this out. International and national tourism is a very important component of the local economy. Key tourist sites are the cathedral, the river walks, The Bridge across the Tay, and the centre of Birnam. The A9 can and should be constructed in such a way that the visual and noise impact on these sites is minimal. The station needs retained, as it itself is part of the heritage.
	
	--Connectivity of the villages - It would be highly valuable if the existing station were reconnected to Birnam village - from this perspective Option B (concrete platform over the A9), whilst maybe complex to construct is highly attractive, giving a sense of completeness back to Birnam. It would allow the station and environs to be utilised much better than at present. The idea to build a new station should be rejected. This would leave the old station as a sad but protected relic, and only remind us every day of the failure to plan a good solution.
	
	--Noise and vibration as a Primary Criteria
	
	Obviously the A9 runs close to the villages and houses, and there's no real way of avoiding that. Noise in operation (not construction) is critical because it will almost certainly be the primary long term measure by which it will be judged whether the A9 dominates Dunkeld to its long term detriment, or whether the A9 and Dunkeld have been successfully planned to their mutual benefit. I simply recommend that Noise in operation is made a Primary engineering design and Decision Criteria. I voiced this in the Hall in Birnam, and received a lot of support. I don't think noise in construction is an important decision criteria, though obviously it needs
		To produce a high standard of road safety, the initial objective in the design process is to seek to achieve the Desirable Minimum Standards as set-out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). This is normal practice when developing road designs. However, a flexible approach is set out in the relevant design standards contained within the DMRB. This permits use of reduced standards if it can be demonstrated that there are significant benefits, for example, in reducing construction costs or environmental impacts. However, the use of reduced standards must demonstrate that safety is not significantly reduced and is subject to suitable justification and mitigation being provided. The objectives of the scheme, which are listed below, must also be considered.
		
		• To improve the operational performance of the A9 by:
		  - Reducing journey times; and
		  - Improving journey time reliability.
		• To improve safety for motorised and Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) by:
		  - Reducing accident severity; and
		  - Reducing driver stress.
		• To facilitate active travel within the corridor; and
		• To improve integration with Public Transport Facilities.
		
		A review has been undertaken for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project to determine the possible benefits of a reduced speed design. This review did not identify any significant benefits that would materially affect route choice. However, this will be further considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	minimised. Construction may last two years, but the operation will last 40 years plus. I have two additional suggestions. --Simplify by shifting the carriageway at Dunkeld junction For Option B, where the A822 passes over the A9 at the Dunkeld junction, if you shift the carriage ways, say 50 metres to the west, the A822 can pop out under the railway, over the A9 and you've got a lot more room on the Dunkeld side of the A9 for slip roads and slope down to the grade of Dunkeld. This also takes the A9 further from the houses on Stell Park, and closer to the railway. I believe this means you don't need to build such high walls. I presume that you plan to remove the road maintenance yard at the foot of the A822, since this is not going to be needed anyway. --Cycle paths In all options what would be really a big benefit would be to get a high quality cycle track between the Dalguise junction and the Dunkeld junction. The cycling circuit Dunkeld A822 towards Amulree, over the hill to Aberfeldy, past Grandtully, Dalguise and back to Dunkeld is very popular but has lacked this critical link for many years.	It is recognised that tourism is an important feature of the A9 corridor and consultation is underway with Visit Scotland to identify potential benefits of dualling, which could include greater access to the many tourism and recreation sites along the route. Your comments in relation to station relocation for Options A and C and reconnection of Station Road with Dunkeld & Birnam Station for Option B are noted. The DMRB Stage 2 assessment is ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9. A noise and vibration assessment of the options is undertaken as part of this process. This assessment of road traffic noise has identified a number of potential impacts associated with the proposed route options. Potentially all three route options under consideration will result in major and moderate adverse impacts at sensitive receptors, however this varies between the options. Option B, which places the road into a deep cutting at Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, results in the fewest major impacts. Options A, which raises the A9 has the most impact in terms of noise. The attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment, provides further details on the noise assessment undertaken. The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. DMRB Stage 3 includes preparation of an Environmental Statement, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works and identifies suitable mitigation. An example of an Environmental Statement can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		birnam#Environmental Statement). Thank you for providing a suggested alternative layout at Dunkeld Junction. A number of similar layouts have previously been considered in an attempt to facilitate greater space to accommodate the proposed A9 dual carriageway and grade separated junction and move the works further from residential properties to the east. This has involved working with Network Rail to identify opportunities to move the Highland Main Line railway. However, none of the alternatives considered were deemed to be significantly better than the current options, although this will be considered further as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. Existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes that link Dalguise and Dunkeld will be maintained, albeit some diversionary works are likely. The condition of existing paths will be assessed during future design stages. Measures to improve safety and connectivity and make routes more attractive and comfortable to use will be considered if appropriate. More detailed proposals for NMU infrastructure will be developed once a Preferred Route Option has been identified. We will consider your feedback further at that time. I am glad you found the Community Council meeting informative and worthwhile. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
58.	General Comment The Public Exhibition, held at the Birnam Arts Centre on 27/28 January 2016, was very comprehensive and professionally presented and the opportunity to attend was much appreciated. Although the video fly over of Options A, B and C was impressive, it would have benefitted from a voice over commentary or at least some labels to identify what option you were looking at particularly when there was a 180 degree turn around for no	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Your preference for Option A, that incorporates a relocated station, designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues of the current station, and the River Tay structure that incorporates angled supports, is noted. As are your comments in relation to the proposed junction layouts and your

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	apparent reason! Fortunately one of the project presentation team was available to provide us with expert comment. Options A, B and C The development of previous route options is welcomed, particularly the relocation of Birnam and Dunkeld Station (to provide compliant platforms and resolve previous accessibility issues) as are grade separated junctions and left-in/left-out junction at The Hermitage plus the greater integration of transport. Option B is our least preferred option being visually unattractive, necessitates building close to the station coupled with the greater noise and vibration during construction and the possibility of work overnight. Of the similar Options A and C, A is preferred as it is visually more attractive and better fits the topography. Option C is less liked because of the need for significant earthworks for the A822 and A923 and the new railway underbridge. Category A listed station building – we are tempted to say “so what?” What function has it fulfilled in recent years other than being “pretty to look at”. Tay Crossing Structure As we have little knowledge of the life expectancy or the cost of bridges, we are uncertain whether it would be better to either retain the existing bridge plus build a new bridge or to demolish the existing bridge and construct a new bridge to carry both carriageways. Of the three options presented, we find Option 2 the most visually attractive. Please acknowledge receipt of this email in due course.	concerns regarding Option B. Please note, future use of the station building is being considered in relation to Options A and C. I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. Your comments on the 3-dimensional visualisations are noted and will be considered for future events. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
59.	We have been instructed to act on behalf of the National Trust for Scotland	Thank you for your correspondence dated 18 February 2016 regarding the

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	to respond to the latest round of consultation in relation to the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of the A9 Dualling project. Further to the exhibition held on 28th January 2016 by Transport Scotland, we write to convey the Trust's concerns and comments to the latest option proposals. Although three options have been presented, the areas of concern to the Trust are the same for all three options and therefore the following comments relate to all three of the proposals put forward by Transport Scotland. One of the main objectives of NTS is caring for the countryside which is delivered through countryside management. Countryside management seeks to conserve and enhance natural and cultural features in the countryside for the enjoyment and appreciation of visitors and residents. Not only does it include delivery of practical habitat, species and cultural site management but also the provision of visitor facilities and support services, access provision mainly through footpath management, environmental education and interpretation. Therefore the promotion and maintenance of all core paths, cycle paths and other accesses is key to the Trust. Having studied the proposals set out by Transport Scotland and Jacobs at the exhibition, It is clear that the footbridge which is situated to the west of the existing A9 and which provides foot and cycle access over the River Braan will require to be relocated as a result of the project. We wish to discuss with Transport Scotland possible re-routing of the bridge. It is understood that The Hermitage entrance is to become a left in, left tout access. We also understand the latest proposals so not include any upgrade or improvement to the existing junction at The Hermitage. We have serious concerns about the safety of this and the impact this will have on the Hermitage site. It is understood that the Forestry Commission's access to the north of The	A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment includes an environmental assessment. The magnitude of environmental impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. Detailed environmental mitigation will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. A key aim of the A9 Dualling Programme is to maintain existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes, improving where possible to remove barriers along and across the trunk road. This may be achieved by improving safety, providing improved connectivity between routes and making routes more attractive and comfortable to use. An NMU Access Strategy has been prepared to formalise Transport Scotland's position on NMU access arrangements and is available to view on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-non-motorised-user-nmu-access-strategy-9068). This document contains a number of objectives that will be considered throughout the design process. Existing NMU routes in the vicinity of the River Braan will be maintained, albeit some realignment of the routes may be necessary. This will be considered further as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. We would be happy to discuss this with you at that time. A9 dualling is being progressed through an on-line corridor, with off-line options having previously been discounted, primarily due to the surrounding topography and resultant environmental impact. The A9 will be a Category 7A all-purpose dual carriageway with a 70 miles per hour speed limit. As a result, there will be no gaps in the central reserve and no at-grade minor junctions. Only grade separated junctions will be provided on the route for safe access and egress to the A9. Isolated left-in left-out

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Hermitage site will be closed as a result of the A9 dualling project. The Forestry Commission have members of the public accessing the area for recreational purposed and also require access for HGV lorries and heavy pant, for felling and management of the woodland. If the access to the north of The Hermitage is closed, they will require to use The Hermitage entrance to take access, putting more pressure on the existing junction. We do not feel that the existing junction is adequate for the increase visitors and addition of timber lorries and plant. At present, visitors come from the north and south but under the current dualling proposals, visitors to the site will not be able to make a right turn. Therefore all visitors will be coming from the south putting even greater pressure on the junction. In 2015, the Trust counted on the onside meters, 175,000 visitors. Although we do not know how many of these were cars, buses etc., or whether they have travelled from the north or the south, we do know that all traffic going forwards under the proposals will be coming from the south. Therefore, taking the above into account we do not believe the exit slipway leading the public off the carriageway into The Hermitage site is adequate and has health and safety implications. We are currently taking advice on this from a traffic planning consultant and reserve our right to comment further on this in due course. However, we would urged Transport Scotland to re-consider the safety of this junction taking into account the use it will inevitable endure going forward. It is important that access to The Hermitage is maintained to a high standard and is safe to encourage visitors and in turn meet the Trust's objectives. This more important than ever, given that the right turn into The Hermitage will cease to exist under the latest proposals. We look forward to hearing from you in due course.	accesses may be provided in exceptional circumstances. To maintain access to The Hermitage, which is recognised as an important tourist destination, a left-in left-out junction is proposed on the northbound carriageway. Dunkeld Junction and Dalguise Junction would facilitate turning traffic to provide access to the site. This junction has been designed in accordance with relevant design standards, taking into account expected traffic volumes. The proposed layout incorporates a 110 metre diverging length with a 130 metre merging length, which is considered safer than the existing arrangement, which includes only an 80 metre diverging length and no merging taper. Access to land adjacent to the A9 that will have their direct access removed as part of the scheme will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information, wish to comment further or would like a meeting to discuss the issues raised further, please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
60.	Thank you for an interesting and informative exhibition at the Birnam Institute at the end of last month and, as requested, please find below my feedback and concerns re the proposed plans: Firstly, I would like to reiterate my point, previously made, that I do not feel that it is really necessary to dual the A9 south of Pitlochry, particularly given the recent findings that the average speed cameras seem to have had a very beneficial effect - proving that it is drivers rather than the road which seem to be at fault in any accidents. There is also such limited space as the road passes Birnam - any attempt to dual the road will have a seriously detrimental effect on the village. It strikes me that the Scottish Government, having undertaken to dual the whole A9, is determined to plough ahead without due regard to logistical and environmental constraints such as those posed here. I do accept that alterations to the Dunkeld junction are necessary, though I question whether any alteration is really required at the Birnam end (in my 20+ years here I am not aware that there have been any accidents there and it is generally relatively easy to get on and off the A9 at that point). I do worry that, whichever option is chosen, we are going to end up with a mass of concrete and overpasses such as are on the A90 between Perth and Dundee, to the detriment of a very scenic route through the 'Gateway to the Highlands'. I am however pleased to see that there has been a rethink and that access to and from the A9 from the Birnam end of Perth Road is to be retained, though I have concerns about how the proposed alterations will affect the walk along the river and up from the Newtyle Beat fishing hut - a popular walk with locals and visitors alike. From what I could understand from the proposed plans the revised junction would take an unnecessarily large swathe out of a peaceful and tree-lined walk. As I have mentioned, I question the necessity.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. We make note of your comments regarding retaining this section as a single carriageway. However, the Scottish Government has stated its commitment to upgrading the road to dual carriageway standard. A9 dualling is being progressed through an on-line corridor and will be a Category 7A all-purpose dual carriageway with a 70 miles per hour speed limit. As a result, there will be no gaps in the central reserve and only grade separated junctions are provided on the route for safe access and egress to the A9. Isolated left-in left-out accesses may be provided in exceptional circumstances. The current proposals include grade separated junctions at Birnam, Dunkeld and Dalguise. Assessment has suggested that removal of the junction at Birnam would increase traffic significantly on Perth Road. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment, which is currently ongoing for this section, includes an environmental assessment. The magnitude of environmental impacts of the proposed A9 and associated junctions, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. Detailed environmental mitigation will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. Where existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes are affected suitable diversions will be proposed in consultation with relevant NMU groups. Opportunities to enhance existing provisions will be considered where appropriate to support the scheme objectives. The importance of maintaining links to local towns, villages and communities for local residents and tourists is recognised and will be maintained where possible. The importance of suitable access to Dunkeld & Birnam Station for NMUs

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	I am also concerned that we will retain easy and safe pedestrian access to the station. With regard to the Dunkeld junction, I would only ask that any alteration is done sensitively and in keeping with the surroundings, and with the least disruption possible to all. I hope you will take all our concerns properly into account and that we are not to be presented with a 'fait accompli' which is neither welcome nor appropriate.	is recognised and will be provided. Indeed, this was a key in considering station relocation for Options A and C. I am glad you found the exhibition informative and worthwhile. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
61.	I hope that you have retained my earlier more comprehensive comments regarding dualling proposals which all still stand. If they have been lost, please let me know and I will source a copy. We are now faced with 3 proposals, all of which have similar costs. Option B connects the village, retains a beautiful Victorian station, encourages use of the station building, facilitates access to the Institute for day trippers and conference attenders alike, and provides a sense of place and direction for visitors. The other 2 options create abandoned Victorian buildings which encourages antisocial behaviour and divides a village. It would in no way enhance the amenity for either visitors or residents to create a modern halt and abandon the station. The mood of every person that I have spoken to wants option B. The separation of the railway from the village should never have taken place when the bypass was built. You have the opportunity to correct it and I hope you will do so.	Thank you for attending the public exhibition in Birnam in January 2016 and for providing feedback. Previous consultation undertaken prior to Jacobs' involvement in the project has been provided to us. We are therefore aware of your previous comments. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. As are your concerns regarding Options A and C. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
62.	Whilst I can see why people feel that the A9 is a dangerous road, I do not agree that it should have a blanket policy of dualling along its entire length. From what I have seen of the A9 Dualling project to date, there seems to	Thank you for your correspondence dated 6 March 2016 regarding the A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	be an assumption that this is the right approach along the whole length. There have been no alternatives discussed or arguments for and against presented to the public. Dualling seems to have been a knee jerk reaction to the public perception that all the accidents are caused by confusion between single and dual sections of road. I would be interested to know whether the accidents that have happened along the A9 are actually due to this, or, particularly round Dunkeld, more to do with a staggered junction into Dunkeld, and difficult junctions at the station and Birnam turn offs Objectives I would argue that your basic objectives are too simplistic, and considering that Transport Scotland is a Government Department, there is scant little holistic thinking, or regard for other outcomes other than the transport. A robust scheme challenges its own perceptions during the whole design process, to avoid falling into the trap of making assumptions. • As mentioned above, there should be something showing what accidents there were, where, and why they happened. The blanket assumption that the A9 is dangerous because people get confused between single carriage and dual carriageways and therefore the whole thing must be dualled is far too simplistic. Accidents happen for many reasons, and may be mainly because, for example at the Dunkeld junction, that it is a staggered junction. • There is no objective to protect the environment, the ancient woodlands, the River Tay SAC, or the River Tay National Scenic Area. • There is no objective to help alleviate some of the road problems by looking at alternative methods of transport, namely upgrading the railway line, which is archaic by modern standards. • There is no objective to ensure the road scheme doesn't affect tourism or the economics of the area. Any major works to this area are going to affect	The Scottish Government has stated its commitment to upgrading the road to dual carriageway standard. This commitment followed an examination of a range of transport solutions for the corridor, which are presented in the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR), 2008. This report can be viewed on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/strategic-transport-projects-review). Current and anticipated future traffic data is included in the Preliminary Engineering Services (PES) Report for the dualling of the A9 between Perth and Inverness. This report also provides an analysis of accident trends (Section 2.5.2) and identifies the location of slight, serious and fatal accidents (Appendix O). The PES Report can be viewed on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-design-manual-roads-bridges-dmrb-stage-1-report-5595). Objectives are set to provide a means of measuring the performance of the final infrastructure. They are not a mechanism for restating existing legislation or good practice for which adherence is mandatory. Example areas of the latter would be health and safety and environmental treatment. That is why these areas are not restated as objectives but they are of great importance. Details on the impact of the speed cameras that were implemented on the A9 in October 2014 is available on the Transport Scotland web-site (http://www.transport.gov.scot/news/performance-data-a9-and-average-speed-cameras-published). It is recognised that the A9 passes through areas which are outstanding in wildlife and landscape terms and conservation of these sites is important, particularly as it is a major asset to the tourist industry. As a result, in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been carried out for the A9 Dualling Programme. The SEA was developed

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	tourism in two ways: - By reducing the attractiveness of the area by this spread of urbanisation. This is after all a NATIONAL Scenic Area, and is one of the major reasons people come to Scotland. - By increasing the speed that people pass through this area, they are less likely to stop. The dither time of shall we stop here or not is reduced, and the junctions proposed whether they are in a cutting or on a flyover promote carrying on at speed. This will lead to less people stopping at Dunkeld and Birnam, affecting the viability of already struggling businesses. Your objectives are all roads based, and are not a balanced view of the complexity of this area particularly. If your basic objectives are flawed, I would question whether you will have the right approach to any options proposed. Constraints: From the very title, the listed constraints are obviously seen as a problem. There doesn't seem to be any suggestion that they will be improved, rather that they will be destroyed in some way. This appears to be a damage limitation exercise. • Properties: Certainly in at least one option, half of Inver is being destroyed. Although I am sure that individual property owners may be financially compensated in some way, if they agree to compulsory purchase soon enough, you are blighting all the other houses in this attractive little village too. Niel Gower cottage is one of those to be demolished. This has local historical significance, yet is not even mentioned. • Dunkeld and Birnam Station: at least there is an attempt to try to keep	in consultation with environmental stakeholders and has identified the key environmental and landscape issues along the route and has assessed the potential impacts associated with the dualling programme. The SEA Report can be viewed on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-strategic-environmental-assessment-2541). The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment, which is currently ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section, also includes an environmental assessment. The magnitude of environmental impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. This includes landscape, noise and vibration, visual, cultural heritage, ecology and nature conservation and air quality. Detailed environmental mitigation, which may include compensatory woodland planting, will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). An Environmental Steering Group (ESG) has also been created for the A9 Dualling Programme and involves representatives from Scottish Natural Heritage, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA), Historic Environment Scotland, Cairngorms National Park Authority and Perth & Kinross Council. This group meets monthly to discuss the scheme, ensuring the environment is fully considered in the design process. For the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section of A9 dualling, considerable consultation has been undertaken with Network Rail to ascertain their aspirations for the Highland Main Line railway and to determine any benefits from a collaborative approach. This had led to consideration and assessment of a number of options. However, Network Rail has suggested they are able to meet their long-term goals to achieve

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	this Category A listed building in two of the options (I think?), albeit somewhat clumsily, and with no regard to the setting of an historic building. The third has labelled it rather vaguely to be 'relocated'. Does this mean the actual building, or will it be replaced with some glass box? • River Tay Special Area of Conservation: I am sure that these SACs are about habitat, and habitat links. By putting in any type of cutting, you are in effect cutting off all habitat links along this road corridor. • Highland Main Line Railway: That a major transport link such as the Perth to Inverness railway line should be allowed to stay as a single track with its severe limitations on services, while four lanes of road are proposed at considerable expense, is backward thinking, not taking seriously climate change issues, and harmful for the development of Scotland. In any other European city, the two would be considered at least in tandem, so that one compliments the other. I also suspect there is very little regard for pedestrians or cyclists in this scheme. You seem to be cutting off Kings Seat from Birnam, or at least making it a less than pleasant experience going from one to the other. • River Tay National Scenic Area: This is as it says of NATIONAL importance. But this seems to be of no consequence whatsoever as every proposal suggests that the character of the area will be severely compromised. Of particular importance is the fact that this is seen as the 'Gateway to the Highlands' and is the 'picturesque cathedral town of Dunkeld'. Why do you have so little regard for the character of this area? • River Tay crossing: This is the one part of the scheme that I think probably does merit some work. • Birnam Glen and Inchewan Burn, and ancient woodland: Again, these are seen as constraints, but every plan shows that all the ancient woodlands along this road will be irrecoverably damaged. Thus appears to be the march of 'progress', to destroy all things even when they have	faster journey times between Inverness and the Central Belt without any infrastructure works in the vicinity of Dunkeld and Birnam. Furthermore, the costs associated with moving the railway further from the A9 are not considered to provide significant benefits to the A9 Dualling Programme. It is recognised that tourism is an important feature of the A9 corridor and consultation is underway with Visit Scotland to identify potential benefits of dualling, which could include greater, and safer, access to the many tourism and recreation sites along the route. In the vicinity of Dunkeld and Birnam, the A9 passes through a constrained corridor and every effort will be made to limit impact on both physical and environmental constraints. The three options under consideration impact on two residential properties and one commercial property. Auchlou, which is located to the east of the A9 at Inver has already been acquired by Scottish Ministers and a yard at the junction with the A822 (Old Military Road), which includes a residential dwelling, will also be affected. No further property is currently required to accommodate the scheme. Your comments in relation to drainage and the Category A Listed building at Dunkeld & Birnam Station are noted. A key aim of the A9 Dualling Programme is to maintain existing Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes, improving where possible to remove barriers along and across the trunk road. This may be achieved by improving safety, providing improved connectivity between routes and making routes more attractive and comfortable to use. An NMU Access Strategy has been prepared to formalise Transport Scotland's position on NMU access arrangements and is available to view on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-non-motorised-user-nmu-access-strategy-9068). This document contains a number of objectives that will be considered throughout the design process.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	been identified as being of significance. Consultation so far: There is an assumption that people will understand the drawings as they stand, whereas most people cannot read the subtleties of the lines on the map. Although I read plans every day in my job, I myself struggled to see which were cuttings and which were embankments, and where. I expect most people did not pick up details such as the hill with the memorial on it being sliced in two. There should be a series of perspectives displayed showing the effects from major viewpoints. Where were they? I think that before any money is spent on dualling this section, you should be absolutely certain, and prove that that is the specific answer at this locality. I would also like to see what difference the average speed cameras and 50mph for hgv's has made to the accident rate, and where this has made a difference. In other words, is all this work really necessary, or are the interim measures solving the underlying problems? I am disappointed that the 3 options shown are all similar, and following the same assumptions, rather than challenging those assumptions to look for the best scheme. I implore that you have a fourth option trialling a simpler solution, of looking at each of the junctions, without dualling this section. The two junctions at Birnam and Inver could be roundabouts, and the Station car park could be relocated off the minor road, as you have shown in your options. I do not feel you have justified your approach until you have proved that alternative options are not better. Here is a simple SWOT analysis comparing this approach. A9 Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing Dualling Options 1, 2 and 3	The findings of your SWOT analysis are noted, as are your comments in relation to the material available to view at the public exhibition. This will be considered when planning for future public consultation events. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information, wish to comment further or would like a meeting to discuss the scheme, please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Strengths • Would complete A9 dualling option • Would save maybe two minutes journey time in this section • Would satisfy those that think it's all about people having serious accidents because they get confused about whether they are on a dual carriageway or not. Weaknesses • Would seriously affect an important NSA, which is what draws people to this area, thus damaging tourism. • Would destroy half of Inver included listed buildings such as Niel Gowers cottage • Would destroy Grade A listed railway station building • Would destroy a number of ancient woodlands and cut in two important habitat links, creating a huge barrier to wildlife • Would take away half of monument hill (don't know its name) • Would cost A FORTUNE • People would bypass Dunkeld in a cutting at high speed, and would be a lot less likely to stop. Opportunities • Perth and Inverness may benefit from people arriving marginally faster.	

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Threats • Dunkeld will suffer economically, due to less people stopping, and unattractive road blighting area • Perthshire will suffer economically as it will be a less attractive place to visit as the reason people visit has been compromised • Alternative greener modes of transport such as train, cycling and walking will all suffer • The environment will suffer enormously • The money will start to run out, and it will be a cheap, ugly concrete solution Alternative Option of not dualling, and just looking at the junctions Strengths • Costs a fraction of the existing three options • Will probably solve all the serious accident issues • Will mean that no properties need to be compulsorily purchased and destroyed, saving the character of the village of Inver • Dunkeld and Birnam Station building can remain intact, and junction improvements could concentrate on relocating the entrance to the other side of the railway line, as per other options, reducing accidents at this spot. • Will not be detrimental to the River Tay SAC, helping to protect wildlife	

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	• Will not be detrimental to the River Tay NSA, helping tourism to thrive in this area. • River Tay crossing could still be dualled, if this is seen as a black spot. • Will mean that there is no need to take away ancient woodland or half of Inver • Can spend more on greener transport options, such as rail, cycle and pedestrian routes Weaknesses • May increase the minor shunt accidents at roundabouts. • May increase journey time by say, two minutes. Opportunities • Putting in roundabouts at Dunkeld and Birnam junctions will slow people down where you want them to slow down, i.e. at a point when they make a decision as to whether to stop. • Money could potentially be diverted into improving the Perth to Inverness railway line • Money could be used to make a good job of the rest of the road, so that the junctions do not end up being cheaply done concrete monstrosities like at the Ballinluig junction. • Money could be used on really good cycle and walking routes further improving tourism, and sustainable green transport links, helping to reduce climate change, fulfilling a holistic number of Scottish Govt. policies.	

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Threats • May not get European funding (?) if it is not dualled? I would like to suggest that in the meantime, the simple option of sorting the junctions is trialled for a couple of years, whilst other dualling work on the A9 is undertaken, to see if it reduces the serious accident rate. This will then give better statistics as to whether the junction improvements have reduced the accident rate, if this is really what the problem is.	
63.	I have recently had the opportunity to view the most recent options for the A9 dualling programme along the Birnam Pass to Tay Crossing section and have a number of issues that I wish to offer to the dualling team for your further consideration. Options A & C – Elevated A9 proposal Both these options present the same issued of concern. In both scenarios the A9 carriageway will pass through this narrow corridor at a relatively high level. This presents the likelihood of significant noise pollution affecting the adjacent residential areas and the wider community due to the elevated nature of the noise source. Mitigation measures via noise attenuation measures such as acoustic screening devices such as screens and landscaping options would involve creating a zone of high screening along the side of the carriageway. This in turn has two detrimental effects: Firstly, the visual impact on this highly attractive environment. I do not believe this aspect has been considered in the presentation and once it is introduced into the visuals it would provide a significantly different representation of the likely built condition. Secondly, a large portion of Birnam is affected by over-shadowing by Birnam Hill during the winter months. The impact of introducing an	Thank you for your correspondence dated 5 March 2016 regarding the A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing. Your preference for Option B, which involves lowering the A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station and to the immediate north, is noted. As are your concerns regarding Options A and C. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment includes an environmental assessment. The magnitude of environmental impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate are considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. This includes noise and visual input during both construction and operating of the road. Detailed environmental mitigation, which may include erection of acoustic barriers, will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. An example of an Environmental Statement, which forms part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, can be found on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-luncarty-pass-birnam#Environmental Statement). Your comments in relation to the visual impact of suitable acoustic barriers are noted. Options A and C propose station relocation to the north of Inchewan Burn

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	elevated carriageway along this section will potentially add to this over-shadowing. This detrimental effect would be further exacerbated by the addition of acoustic screening to the sides of the carriageway (my earlier point refers). Option C – New Railway Station This proposal relocated the station at a more distant location from the main community and as such encourages the use of cars to access the railway. This is contrary to the ambition of reducing vehicle use in favour of public transport (which is an issue in that it is presently limited in this area). It is my considered view that a new station should be integrated within the community as far as possible. The safety and security aspects of such a remote facility are a concern. Facilities such as this which are satellites and not part of an active public environment are unfortunately prone to abuse and vandalism. Option B – Retention and Integration of the Existing Station I believe that your visual representations of this option are somewhat misleading and present a rather stark and uninviting deck connection between the village and the station. This deck connection can be designed in such a manner to provide a landscaped and pedestrian friendly connection that can blend into the wider landscape. The acoustic benefits to the community of enclosing the high volume traffic through this narrow section would also be considerable. Similarly the engineering “challenges” associated with this option suggested, as major issues of concern are far from insurmountable. In the context of the scale of the overall A9 dualling programme I believe that an investment in a high quality engineered solution for the relatively short but challenging section at Birnam would be well worth the investment in the long term.	to address accessibility issues in its current position and address one of the scheme objectives, to improve integration with Public Transport facilities. Vehicular access to the station will be from the A822 (Old Military Road), immediately west of the existing railway underbridge. The relocated station would include a replacement car park. A pedestrian footbridge, either incorporating lifts or ramps would be provided to allow access between platforms. NMU access would be maintained, as it is now, from Birnam Glen with a new structure across the Inchewan Burn. Non-Motorised User (NMU) access from the A822 will also be considered and enhanced if possible. Suitable footpaths would link to the platforms and station facilities. As a new facility, the relocated station would be designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of the issues with the current station, in particular the platforms that are lower than is required for current rolling stock. Option B incorporates a structure at existing ground level across the lowered A9 in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station. This arrangement would allow station road to be extended across the structure providing direct access from the communities of Birnam and Dunkeld to the station. A replacement car park would be provided on the structure. It should be noted that Option B does not include any works to address the current accessibility issues with the platforms. Your comments in relation to the 3-dimensional visualisation of Option B are noted and will be considered for future consultation events. Should this option be taken forward consideration will be given to structural form and landscape mitigation to soften the visual impact. It should be noted that Option B requires retaining walls north of Dunkeld & Birnam Station. These walls will be unusual, complex and time consuming to construct and will incur additional costs. Furthermore, as a result of the retained heights, the walls will be at the limit of what is technically feasible. The nature and size of these retaining wall structures limit the mitigation that can be employed to soften their appearance within the landscape.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Re-connecting the iconic station back within the urban fabric of Birnam will have long term benefits for the village and will encourage improved railway usage (in conjunction with improved railway strategies which require to be also considered as part of the bigger picture). The alternative A and C options reinforce the A9 as a barrier between the railway and he community. These elevated options also present environmental issues which should not be underestimated when final decisions are determined. Having carefully considered the options presented I am personally strongly in favour of Option B.	I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
64.	As we are one of the property's which is closest to railway station, well we are probably the closest we are very concerned what lies ahead for us in near future. As I am nearing 60 years of age and my family are all up and away from house we were thinking it's getting near time to down size the house this was going to be my nest egg for our retirement years unfortunately we won't be able to sell our house, or we won't have much chance of selling it at its proper value now or in future until road is complete. As it stands at moment we don't even know what's going to happen or plans you have for around station area, also when the dualling does go ahead and the building of new A9 what sort of noise and dust pollution and vibration are we going to be subjected to also contractors trying to get access up station road for period of construction. We also have heard that properties that lie close to new A9 could be devalued by £30,000. As you see our future is going to be full of uncertainty for the next 9 years, or even more quite a sentence to have hanging round your neck isn't it. Look forward to hearing something back from you about our concerns or even somebody that might come to speak to us.	Thank you for your correspondence dated 13 March 2016 regarding the A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing. We take note of your comments and are aware that the uncertainty surrounding the project proposals are causing local residents some concern. As a result, we are keen to progress the scheme and announce a Preferred Route Option in 2016, subject to concluding consultation with relevant stakeholders, including Dunkeld & Birnam Community Council. Please note that consultation, particularly with those directly affected by the scheme, will continue as the Preferred Route Option is developed and refined in the next stage of assessment. The assessment currently being undertaken considers constructability and noise and vibration, which are considered in identification of a Preferred Route Option. Further assessment will be undertaken as the design develops. Suitable noise and vibration mitigation measures will also be considered. Limitations will be placed on construction activities to limit noise and vibration, which may include setting maximum permissible noise levels, limit on working hours and controlled movement of construction

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
		traffic. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information, wish to comment further or would like a meeting to discuss the scheme, please contact me.
65.	We write in relation to the latest exhibition carried out at the Birnam Institute in Birnam regarding the A9 Dualling Programme-Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing Project. My wife and I were out of the country on annual leave whilst the latest exhibition was carried out and we weren't aware of the latest proposals until a neighbour made us aware last weekend. We've now had the opportunity to review the latest proposed options, cgi's and videos but require further information and detail on the schemes before responding with a preferred option noting a response is required by 18th March 2016. We've called you today at your offices in Glasgow and left a message on your voicemail for a call back to discuss the detail of the latest options in more detail and would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience. We look forward to hearing from you.	Thank you for your correspondence dated 18 March 2016 regarding the A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing. We would be happy to meet with you to discuss the current options in more detail and will be in contact in the near future to identifying a suitable date.
66.	May I make a representation regarding the A9 dualling at the pass of Birnam. I am concerned that during the construction of the dualling at the pass of Birnam the houses along King Duncan's Place may be structurally damaged owing to the close proximity of the works. I think option C would be preferable as it would retain the road at a similar	Thank you for your correspondence dated 7 April 2016 regarding the A9 dualling proposals between the Pass of Birnam and Tay Crossing. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment, which is currently ongoing for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section, includes an environmental assessment, which includes consideration of noise and visual impacts. The attached Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01: Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment provides further

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	height, and be less intrusive. Option A, raising the height of the road would be visually unacceptable and unnecessary. Option B where the road would be greatly lowered would create a hollow which would be liable to flooding, and Would constitute the greatest risk to my property regarding subsidence. I am concerned about noise pollution and the visual impact. Can you clarify what measures will be taken to address these issues and the effect on my property.	details on the assessment undertaken. The magnitude of environmental impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. Detailed environmental mitigation, which may include noise barriers and landscape planting, will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment of the Preferred Route Option. At this stage further assessment will also be undertaken on construction vibration. During construction it is likely that limitations will be placed on activities to limit noise and vibration, which may include setting maximum permissible noise levels, limit on working hours and controlled movement of construction traffic. Suitable property structure condition surveys would also be undertaken to ensure adjacent properties were not adversely affected by the works. I hope the information above answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.
67	We were unable to attend the Public Exhibition at Birnam Institute on 27-28 January 2016, however, we did attend a Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council Meeting on 8 February which included a very informative presentation by Transport Scotland and Jacobs. We now welcome this opportunity to raise our concerns formally in writing as part of the public consultation exercise. The proposals continue to cause us great concern especially with the resultant quality of lifestyle this upgrading of the A9 will bring about, both during the construction phase also increased traffic noise, vibration and pollution levels on completion. Our major concerns are the impact caused by dualling the A9 in such close proximity to our home, specifically:-	Thank you for your correspondence dated 22 February 2016 regarding the A9 dualling proposals for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section. The assessment and preparation of road schemes in the UK is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which sets out current standards and good practice relating to Trunk Road works. For the development of road schemes the DMRB sets out a three stage assessment process. A DMRB Stage 2 assessment is currently being undertaken on the three current route options, which were detailed at the recent Public Exhibition and Community Council meeting and shown on the Transport Scotland web-site (www.transport.gov.scot/project/a9-pass-birnam-tay-crossing). The aim of the assessment is to identify factors to be taken in to account in choosing alternative options and to identify the engineering, environmental and traffic and economic advantages, disadvantages and constraints associated with the route options. The conclusion of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment process is identification of a

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	1. Option A. • Increased height of the road north of the railway station, to reduce the height of retaining walls on both sides of the carriageway will result in increased traffic noise and undoubtedly adverse visual impact from our property. Vibration and pollution from traffic will also increase, and is of great concern. • The southbound joining slip road will be adjacent to our property and on an incline rising up to the dual carriageway. This will result in increased noise and pollution as vehicles, particularly HGVs, accelerate uphill. • Earthwork cuttings are required, bringing the road closer to our property, with retaining walls to improve ground and substrate instability. The likelihood of landslides, both at the construction stage and in the future should be considered, especially with the increased climatological rainfall of recent times. • Loss of existing natural flora and fauna; deer, squirrels, pheasants and other birds all frequent the area between our garden and the existing A9. It will take several years to re-establish, if at all. • Relocating the railway station to an area beside the Ladywell landfill site, in particular the drainage run-off, could present construction problems. 2. Option B. • Lowering the A9 in the locality of the existing railway station will improve vehicle accessibility to the station. • Resultant huge retaining walls will require ground anchors projecting beneath our property, will likely undermine foundations and cause ground instability. • At the construction stage, *extensive* piling of corrugated steel to be impacted into the ground known to contain large boulders. The resultant vibrations could well cause structural damage to our property. • High retaining walls will have an adverse visual impact on this beautifully scenic area for those entering The Highlands of Scotland.	Preferred Route Option, which is further developed during DMRB Stage 3 assessment. DMRB Stage 3 includes preparation of an Environmental Statement, which aims to protect the environment by considering the likely significant effects of the works and identifies suitable mitigation. DMRB Stage 3 typically concludes by publication of draft orders, which start the statutory process to gain authorisation for the construction of the project and the formal objection period. Following the Community Council meeting on 8 February 2016, a Technical Note, summarising key elements of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment undertaken to date has been produced. This note focusses on constructability, noise and vibration, drainage, landscape, visual, air quality and views from the road and thus provides information on many of the concerns you have raised. A copy of this note is attached for your information. As you note in your correspondence, the current station has a number of issues that restrict use by elderly and disabled users. The station platforms are lower than is required for current rolling stock and wooden steps are mounted on the platform to align with the train for access/egress. The platforms are also linked by a pedestrian footbridge, which is unsuitable for disabled users. Furthermore, the current station is accessed by Non-motorised Users (NMUs) from Birnam Glen via a set of steps and does therefore not provide suitable access for cyclists or those with sensory, cognitive or physical impairments. Options A and C are at-grade in the vicinity of Dunkeld & Birnam Station with widening applied to the west, impacting on the station car park and encroaching closer to the Category A Listed station building. There is insufficient space to provide a safe, compliant left-in left-out junction to the station in its current position. To further integrate public transport facilities within the scheme, and enhance accessibility for Options A and C, it is proposed to relocate

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	3. Option C. • Earthwork cuttings are required, bringing the road closer to our property, with retaining walls to improve ground and substrate instability. The likelihood of landslides, both at the construction stage and in the future should be considered, especially with increased climatological rainfall of recent times. • The southbound slip road will be adjacent to our property and on an incline rising up to the dual carriageway. This will result in increased noise and pollution as vehicles, particularly HGVs, accelerate uphill. • Loss of existing natural flora and fauna; deer, squirrels, pheasants and other birds all frequent the area between our garden and existing A9. It will take several years to re-establish, if at all. • Stopping of the A822 at the Railway Bridge, after extensive works and public money already spent recently to widen this bridge. • Relocating the railway station to an area beside the Ladywell landfill site, in particular the drainage run-off area could present construction problems. • As the proposed level of A9 is similar to existing, this option would possibly have least impact for residents of King Duncans Place. Our other concerns directly as residents of the Dunkeld and Birnam Community are specifically:- 4. Railway Station access. • Relocation of the railway station will be an expensive use of public money. • A pedestrian walkway (as existing with the underpass) is not an alternative to vehicular access at the station, especially for the elderly and infirm, also tourists arriving with baggage. In wintry weather (frequent in this locality), walking along the underpass is not a good option either, even for able bodied people. • Alternatively, the existing station platforms could be upgraded by raising to a suitable level. • We suggest then using Birnam Glen Road leading from Perth	Dunkeld & Birnam Station immediately north of Inchewan Burn. This relocation, to an area of agricultural land, allows the provision of new platforms and associated station infrastructure. Access to the station is from the A822 (Old Military Road), immediately west of the current railway underbridge. A bus stop and turning facility is incorporated, allowing integration with other forms of public transport as well as a vehicle drop-off point and approximately 50 parking spaces and disabled spaces. A pedestrian overbridge, either incorporating lifts or ramps is provided to allow access between platforms. NMU access will be maintained from Birnam Glen with a new structure across the Inchewan Burn. Suitable footpaths will link to the platforms and station facilities. The relocated station will be designed to comply with current relevant accessibility and disability legislation, addressing many of these issues. It should be noted that station relocation may or may not retain the existing listed station building and further discussions are required with Historic Environment Scotland, Perth & Kinross Council and Network Rail, who own the building. It should be noted that other options to provide access to the station in its current position have been considered and the proposal to relocate the station for Options A and C was deemed the most suitable to address accessibility issues. Option B retains the station in its current position. The structure proposed over the lowered A9 allows Station Road to be extended providing direct access from the communities of Birnam and Dunkeld. A replacement car park and bus turning provision is provided on the structure over the lowered A9. No works to the station platforms are proposed with Option B. A detailed Ground Investigation (GI) was undertaken between June 2014 and February 2015 to improve knowledge of the ground conditions along the route corridor. The GI consisted of 300 boreholes and 200 trail pits and identified granular material, comprising predominantly of sands and

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	Road and a tight turn into a proposed car park adjacent to south platform. This currently private road would then become fully 'adopted' to permit public access. • Given that most trains (both north and southbound) use the north platform (adjacent to the station building), a new car park adjacent to the south platform would require usage of a footbridge. • Alternatively, we suggest car parking in Birnam Industrial Estate, and to construct a foot bridge with lifts to the north platform across both carriageways of the A9, and continuation to south platform also? 5. <u>Widening of A9 passing Birnam.</u> • Widening of the existing carriageway between the Birnam junction and the Railway Station will require extensive embankment infill which will encroach on properties immediately below on Perth Road. This has the potential for increased ground instability and likelihood of landslides, both during construction, and in the future. 6. <u>General (during construction).</u> • Damage to foundations and structure of house caused by earthworks and compaction vibrations whilst pile driving corrugated steel retaining walls. • Earthwork cutting gradient will be steeper than existing. Retaining wall structures are required, but instead of proposed single walls, could these be of a lesser height to create terracing? This would create a less significant visual urban feel, and also provide areas for planting when (in time) flora and fauna may re-establish. • Close proximity to residential properties, with an undoubtedly increased probability for damage by pile driving in an area known to contain large boulders. • Increased noise, dust and air pollution levels with resultant health issues. This will have an impact on our quality of life, especially through retirement. • Increased volume of diverted traffic through Birnam, passing primary school and access to GP Surgery. Resultant road safety	gravels. Many of the boreholes include systems to monitor groundwater. The results recorded to date suggest the ground water level will generally be below the level of Option B. While further assessment will be undertaken as the design develops, there is no suggestion that the area is susceptible to landslides. Transport Scotland has an aspiration to maintain two-way traffic flows on the A9 during construction. As a result, traffic flows on Perth Road during construction are not anticipated to increase. It should be noted however that temporary closures of the A9 may be required for some works, for example to lift structures into position. Every effort will be taken to ensure this is done outwith peak traffic periods. I hope the information above and the attached Technical Note answers your queries. If you require any additional information or wish to comment further please contact me.

Reference	Comment	Jacobs Response
	concerns. 7. <u>General (on completion of construction).</u> • Damage to foundations and structure of house caused by faster traffic flow. Vibrations are already felt when HGVs, or a freight trains passes. • Increased traffic noise due faster traffic flow. • Increased pollution from traffic exhaust, and dust. Health issues for those living close by the road. • A decrease in property value resulting from close proximity of dual carriageway, with resultant noise and pollution. • This will have an impact on our quality of life, especially throughout retirement. 8. <u>Alternatives.</u> We are all very much aware of the Scottish Government's intention to dual the entire length of the A9 between Perth and Inverness by 2025. Living beside the A9, we are also conscious of the improved safety measures already being taken to manage traffic flow at speed. Average speed cameras have already improved road safety on this road. By retaining the existing Railway Station and upgrading the platforms with car parking at Birnam Industrial Estate, there is scope that the route of A9 would be broadly similar to existing with a lesser impact on residential properties also. A series of lesser height retaining walls between the railway station and Dunkeld junction would create terracing and permit intermediate planting. Once mature, this would soften the otherwise urban look in an area of outstanding scenic beauty. We look forward to providing continued feedback to inform on the best use of public resources as part of the consultation process.	

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
A. General Points		
A1	Transport Scotland amend the note of the Community meeting with our specific comments, to ensure a true record, and provide an adequate technical note in response to the issues set out at the community meeting on 8th February, which have been further expanded below.	Meeting notes following the Community Council meeting were issued on 26th February 2016 and Transport Scotland deem them to be a reasonable reflection of the meeting. No specific comments were received from the Community Council or A9 Dualling Working Group at that time. Comments were made in the 21st April 2016 submission from Dunkeld & Birnam Community Council and that is considered a record of Community Council feedback on the meeting. Responses to the recommendations made are provided in this table.
A2	Transport Scotland to confirm that senior authorities in Transport Scotland and the relevant parties in the Scottish Government will be kept appraised of the ongoing discussions with the local community in this area.	This is confirmed.
A3	Transport Scotland should undertake a wider evaluation of other alternatives across both sections of the route to mitigate the issues faced in a more sustainable way. This exercise must be undertaken, in partnership with the community to ensure the process does harness local knowledge of issues and potential mitigation.	In 2011 the Cabinet Secretary announced full dualling of the A9 between Perth and Inverness by 2025. In response, in September 2012, Transport Scotland commissioned a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and a Preliminary Engineering Services (PES) study for the dualling of the A9 between Perth and Inverness. The SEA and PES studies considered on-line and off-line corridors and recommended that off-line corridors were significantly less advantageous than the on-line corridors and should not be taken forward for further consideration. Following a period of consultation, this was announced by the Scottish Government's Minister for Transport and the Islands in March 2014. Public and stakeholder consultation has been undertaken throughout the

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
		project development process to identify ideas and options that should be considered. On Project 2 Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing, Option 7 was developed following direct involvement from the Community Council. This option is included in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment as Option B. Other alternatives are being considered for Project 3 Tay Crossing to Ballinluig. Link to PES Report: www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-design-manual-roads-bridges-dmrb-stage-1-report-5595 Link to SEA Report: www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-strategic-environmental-assessment-2541
A4	Transport Scotland should provide outline details to the community on the proposed alternative route between Rotmell and Ballinluig. This would allow for community input to this option before significant resource is invested into the design. Transport Scotland should also outline the detailed process and timeline for assessing this alternative route option.	The design and assessment work for the eastern offline option is ongoing and once this has been completed a decision will be taken on whether this option will be taken forward for further consideration. If this is the case then the most appropriate form of consulting on this option will also be considered at that stage.
A5	To inform the community on the impact of the current proposals for junction design, we would ask Transport Scotland to provide more detailed information on the expected impact on the surrounding community of each proposed junction design with respect to (i) local community, (ii) visual impact including lines of sight, (iii) environmental and wildlife	To address the concerns raised a copy of the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. Understanding of impacts on the local community has been augmented by consultation.
A6	Transport Scotland to provide the relevant traffic data, and pedigree of such data, used to justify the decisions for each	Traffic data is included in the PES Report.

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
	junction.	Link to PES Report: www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-design-manual-roads-bridges-dmrb-stage-1-report-5595
A7	Transport Scotland to outline plans for traffic management in the area during the construction phase of the project.	Transport Scotland has an aspiration to maintain two-way traffic flows on the A9 during construction. An initial assessment of constructability has been undertaken on this basis for the route options under consideration as part of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment. It is likely that speed limit restrictions and reduced lane widths will be utilised. Further consideration of traffic management will be undertaken at DMRB Stage 3.
A8	Transport Scotland should set out the principles by which it takes decisions on trade-offs between considerations to reach decisions in these circumstances, providing clarity on the process, and the role of the community in this process.	The Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project, which was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016, shows how individual impacts are assessed. The magnitude of impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. Community and other stakeholder input informs the assessment.
B. Derogation of Standards		
B1	Transport Scotland should engage with the community on detailed possibilities of a derogation of standards and provide an assessment on how this will mitigate the Project impact on this section.	To produce a high standard of road safety, the initial objective in the design process is to seek to achieve the Desirable Minimum Standards as set-out in the DMRB. This is normal practice when developing road designs. However, a flexible approach is set out in the relevant design standards contained within the DMRB. This permits use of reduced standards if it can be demonstrated that there are significant benefits, for

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
		example, in reducing construction costs or environmental impacts. However, the use of reduced standards must demonstrate that safety is not significantly reduced and is subject to suitable justification and mitigation being provided. The objectives of the scheme must also be considered.
B2	Specifically, Transport Scotland should provide a detail assessment on reduced speed limits and derogation at the junctions and how this has been considered to date.	A review has been undertaken for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project to determine the possible benefits of a reduced Design Speed design. A Design Speed of 100kph (reduced from 120kph) has been considered. This review did not identify any significant benefits that would materially affect route choice. However, this will be further considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment.
B3	Transport Scotland should set out the approval process for agreeing derogation of standards.	See B1.
C. Noise		
C1	Transport Scotland should provide maps showing the complete study area and all sensitive receptors, noise difference contour plots, details of how noise has been calculated, details of traffic projections, and details of data limitations and assumptions used in the noise modelling and assessment process.	Full details of the noise and vibration assessment undertaken are included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. Following the meeting of 8th February 2016, further assessment to determine the likely impacts on receptors with a suitable acoustic barrier/fence in place alongside the proposed A9 dual carriageway adjacent to Stell Park Road, Telford Gardens and King Duncan's Place has been undertaken. The results of this assessment were reported in Technical Note

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
		B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01, 'Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment', provided to the A9 Working Group on 18th March 2016.
C2	Transport Scotland to arrange a meeting with the local community as soon as practicable to address issues in relation to noise.	A meeting has been arranged for 29th June 2016 to discuss community concerns. The A9 Dualling Working Group to confirm what issues remain to be addressed.
C3	Transport Scotland to provide information on criteria for selecting the location of noise receptors.	The criteria for selecting the location of noise receptors are detailed in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
C4	Transport Scotland should provide the completed DMRB Stage 2 assessment. The community should be given time to comment on this prior to the Autumn decision and announcement on the Preferred Route Option.	The Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
C5	Transport Scotland to provide a specific assessment of the noise impacts of the proposed junction design at Birnam, Dunkeld and Dalguise during the operational and construction phases.	Full details of the noise and vibration assessment undertaken are included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
C6	Transport Scotland to provide an assessment of noise mitigation measures with the possible benefits they may have.	The noise and vibration assessment undertaken and detailed in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters does not consider specific noise mitigation measures as is standard at DMRB Stage 2. A noise mitigation

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
		strategy will be developed at DMRB Stage 3 and suitable noise mitigation measures recommended as necessary. Following the meeting of 8th February 2016, further assessment to determine the likely impacts on receptors with a suitable acoustic barrier/fence in place alongside the proposed A9 dual carriageway adjacent to Stell Park Road, Telford Gardens and King Duncan's Place has been undertaken. The results of this assessment were reported in Technical Note B2140002/TN/011 Revision 01, 'Summary of DMRB Stage 2 Assessment', provided to the A9 Working Group on 18th March 2016.
C7	Transport Scotland to provide clarification on how, and at what stage mitigation measures will be consulted on with local communities.	As is standard practice, environmental mitigation is considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. A consultation plan is outlined in the covering letter.
D. Human Health & Air Quality		
D1	Transport Scotland to confirm whether potential health impacts were raised as strategic environmental issues for the communities alongside the A9 Dualling project, and if so how these were considered and addressed.	Human health is considered in the SEA. In consultation with the relevant SEA Consultation Authorities, detailed consideration of noise and air quality was scoped out and therefore the SEA does not specifically assess air quality or noise at the strategic level, but recognises these as important issues requiring more detailed assessments at the local level i.e. it is relevant for the project level DMRB Stage 2 and 3 assessments. In terms of Population and Human Health the SEA considers accident data and access issues. Link to SEA Report: www.transport.gov.scot/report/a9-dualling-strategic-environmental-assessment-2541

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
D2	Transport Scotland to provide a copy of the minutes from all meetings of the Environmental Steering Group is requested.	Meeting notes to be provided.
D3	Transport Scotland to provide information on air quality assessments, the comparison of options, the projections of air quality at the junctions, the impact of predicted traffic growth on air quality; assessment of these effects on sensitive receptors at the local level is requested; and how these assessments were undertaken.	Full details of the air quality assessment undertaken are included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
D4	Transport Scotland are requested to provide the assessment that concludes there will be benefits to air quality; the evidence this conclusion is based on; calculations that demonstrate that emissions will be reduced over the long term, with projected traffic growth of at least between 10-15%.	The SEA is a strategic level assessment that balances changes in vehicle technology against projected traffic growth. It does not relate to any specific local section or route option. The information has now been developed to be more meaningful at a local level and is incorporated in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
D5	Transport Scotland to set out the evidence for claiming that the effects have been assessed to be temporary; what detailed consideration there has been of this section of the A9 Dualling on air quality; and what mitigation is proposed to reduce the impacts of air pollution in this section of the A9.	Full details of the air quality assessment undertaken are included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. Appropriate operational and construction noise mitigation measures will be considered as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment.

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
D6	Transport Scotland is requested to provide an assessment of the potential future impacts on health to the local community, especially those residents within 200m of the road (which includes elderly, unwell, housebound, young children). For example, for a housebound person or a household with a young family, living a short distance from the dualled road, what will be the impact on wellbeing of vibration during construction and longer term with increased traffic.	Full details of the assessment undertaken are included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
D7	Transport Scotland to provide information on the impact of access routes for emergency vehicles and additional time added for patients to Perth/Dundee particularly for those losing direct access to the A9.	Consultation has been undertaken with the Scottish Ambulance Service, Police Scotland and the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service. No significant concerns have been noted in relation to the route and side road options currently under consideration. Consultation will continue as the design develops and once detailed construction methods, which include traffic management arrangements, are known.
D8	Could Transport Scotland explain why NHS Scotland was not invited to be a Consultation Authority.	The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 defines the consultation bodies. NHS Scotland is not included.
D9	Transport Scotland should provide the proposals for the mitigation and compensation for their loss/change is important for the community to consider in relation to the options proposed. Has the impact on human health been assessed in relation to these closures/disruptions?	The impact on human health is considered in relation to effects on air quality and noise receptors and on non-motorised users (NMUs). The assessment undertaken is included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. Impacts on NMU routes are also considered in the report.

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
E. Flooding Risk and Water Environment		
E1	Transport Scotland to advise whether assessments of flooding have taken into account recent high impact events and projected flood risk, to inform design plans in this section. In particular to advise on the impact of dualling on the existing flood plain and detail on design options being considered for the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig section In addition, to advise what decisions this has led to in terms of design and expected mitigation.	The flood assessment is included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. We confirm that we have taken notice of the recent flood events.
E2	Transport Scotland to provide a Flood Risk Assessment and Catchment Management Plan for the Tay and Tummel catchment areas.	The flood assessment is included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
E3	Transport Scotland to provide detailed advice on what consideration has been given to flood risk during the construction phase.	The flood assessment is included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
E4	Transport Scotland to demonstrate what assessments and through a presentation to the community demonstrate that there will be no changes to flood risk and no impact to water quality.	The flood and water quality assessments are included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
E5	Transport Scotland is asked to commit to a thorough assessment of local flooding risk, including thorough consultation with local	The flood assessment is included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
	stakeholders, prior to the selection of preferred options.	Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. Flood risk assessment will be further developed as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment in consultation with relevant stakeholders.
E6	Transport Scotland should demonstrate how WEWS Act principles have been applied to all the crossings proposed in this section, and undertake consultation with local stakeholders and experts, to consider whether there are practicable alternatives to engineering proposed	Information about watercourse crossing is included in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
F. Ecology and Environment		
F1	Transport Scotland to advise how the proposed options address the issues and recommendations raised in the Strategic Environmental Assessment and the defined project objectives? Transport Scotland to work with statutory consultees to provide the community with a technical assessment on the points set out above.	The options developed consider the SEA recommendations and have been developed from the strategic level to the project level as part of the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
F2	Transport Scotland to advise on environmental impact of each junction.	The Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
F3	Transport Scotland to determine and justify how the proposed options address the issues and recommendations raised in the Strategic Environmental Assessment and the defined project objectives.	See F1.
F4	Transport Scotland to advise on the potential mitigation and compensation measures to address the key environmental impacts.	The Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016 outlines possible mitigation methods, but which specific methods will be most appropriate will be identified as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment.
G. Public Transport		
G1	Transport Scotland to provide details on their consultation with Network Rail on the feasibility of relocating the station in options A and C.	Meeting notes to be provided.
G2	For each option, Transport Scotland to advise on the consultation undertaken with Network Rail regarding alterations to the station to make it compliant with disability access legislation and elderly passenger needs.	Meeting notes to be provided.
G3	Transport Scotland to set out examples of similar application of the proposed design option B at the Station, to assist the community in considering the benefits and impacts of such a	The Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
	design	May 2016. Examples of similar application of the proposed design Option B have not been identified.
G4	Transport Scotland to advise whether the new platforms meet all the requirements of the Train Operating Companies that the new trains, including the sleeper due from Autumn 2017, will be able to stop and pick up passengers.	The relocated station included in Option A and C will be developed in consultation with Network Rail to comply with relevant current legislation and guidance. Option B does not include amendments to the current station layout. Therefore, the current level of provision, that includes platforms that are too low for modern rolling stock, will remain, subject to any upgrading works proposed by Network Rail.
G5	What consultation has Transport Scotland had with the Highland Main Line Community Rail Partnership regarding their shared objectives of improving community access to public transport in the context of A9 dualling Options?	No consultation has taken place between the TS project team and the Highland Main Line Community Rail Partnership.
G6	Transport Scotland to advise if they have considered the potential for sustainable and alternative forms of transport to be supported at Dunkeld and Birnam station, including electric car charging points, bike hire, integrated bus services.	There are currently no plans for enhancements such as electric car charging points at this station.
G7	Transport Scotland to advise on consultation undertaken or proposed with the community and local business representatives about possible future use of the station buildings under each option.	Consultation is ongoing with Network Rail who own the station building, Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and Perth and Kinross Council.

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
G8	Transport Scotland to provide details on the consultation with Perth and Kinross Council as regards maintenance and lighting of the new, longer footpath access to the new platforms.	Details will be developed as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment, in consultation with Perth & Kinross Council.
G9	Transport Scotland to undertake an environmental impact assessment on the loss of ancient and semi-natural woodland and quarry pollution risks associated with options A and C.	The impact on Ancient Woodland is detailed in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. Potential impacts on the Ladywell Landfill site are also detailed in the draft report.
G10	Transport Scotland to advise on the details of consultation with Network Rail and Historic Scotland regarding the future use and maintenance of the present station building.	Meeting notes to be provided.
H. Non-Motorised Users		
H1	Transport Scotland are asked to commit that the core path network (including linking paths and particular in relation to the Tay Crossing) will be maintained.	Where existing NMU routes are affected suitable diversions will be proposed, in consultation with relevant NMU groups. Opportunities to enhance existing provisions will be considered where appropriate to support the scheme objectives. The importance of maintaining links to local towns, villages and communities for local residents and tourists is recognised and will be maintained where possible.
H2	Transport Scotland to provide a full detailed assessment of the impacts of A9 dualling plans for road and junction design on the core path network and impact on NMUs.	The impact on NMU routes is detailed in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
		2016.
H3	Transport Scotland to commit to full community engagement on the detailed impact and any proposals for re-alignment, with specific avoidance of paths of historic nature.	A consultation plan is outlined in the covering letter.
I. Cultural and Historical Issues		
I1	The SEA states that more detailed local level Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments will be required through later design stages. A local level assessment should be undertaken at this stage for Dunkeld, Birnam and Inver, given the recognised scenic and historic value of the area.	The potential impact on landscape and visual impacts is detailed in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. This will be considered further as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment.
I2	An impact assessment be undertaken by Transport Scotland, Historic Scotland, National Trust for Scotland and Forestry Commission Scotland involving representatives of the Community Council on the impact of A9 dualling and junction design on the historic and listed buildings in the area and mitigations to avoid minor, moderate and major adverse impacts at a local level.	The potential impact on cultural heritage assets, including listed buildings is detailed in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. As part of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment, the A9 Environmental Steering Group (ESG), which includes Perth & Kinross Council, SEPA, HES and SNH are invited to review the developing Environmental Assessment Chapters. It should be noted that key stakeholders inform the assessment process but the impact assessment is undertaken by Transport Scotland as the scheme Promoter.
I3	Transport Scotland consider further options that could improve the historic, cultural and environmental attractions of the area – e.g.	As far as possible attempts will be made to understand and mitigate impacts and facilitate opportunities. It should be noted that the station

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
	developing the Option B plans for the Station to provide a hub for transport, social and cultural activity supporting tourism and the local economy.	building is owned by Network Rail and is therefore their responsibility.
I4	Transport Scotland share assessments undertaken to date by Historic Scotland on the impact of the A9 Dualling in this section on Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments.	The potential impact on cultural heritage assets, including listed buildings is detailed in the Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters that was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
I5	Transport Scotland reviews, with input from Historic Scotland, the list of Listed Buildings assessed within the 2014 SEA and publish an updated SEA with the full list.	The draft assessment work undertaken at this stage of the process develops the strategic work from the SEA. An update of the SEA is not considered necessary.
J. Next Steps		
J1	Transport Scotland to provide the supplementary information requested in this submission and commit to a process of examining further more creative options, with community engagement as outlined above.	With regard to supplementary information, please refer to our responses above. Engagement with directly affected communities is a key part if the project development and we have considered further options when requested throughout the design process. Indeed, following consultation with Perth & Kinross Council and Dunkeld & Birnam Community Council in February 2013, Option B was developed for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project. This option has been included in the DMRB Stage 2 assessment. We are also examining alternatives requested for the Tay Crossing to Ballinluig project. Transport Scotland consider the options consideration phase to be nearing

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
		completion and note that the Community Council has not suggested any further alternative options for consideration.
J2	Transport Scotland to confirm the Community Council can provide a formal response on route and junction option proposals, once it has received and had reasonable time and opportunity to consider this supplementary information and engage the wider community.	The Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. The current anticipated timescales for the next stages of scheme development are outlined in the letter issued to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016.
J3	Given the above recommendations, Transport Scotland to provide an updated view and timetable on the forward process towards reaching a final Preferred Route Option decision.	See J2.
J4	Transport Scotland to provide information on how the Preferred Route Option Decision will be taken, by whom and on the basis of what evaluation and decision/scoring criteria.	The Draft DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Addendum Report, Part 3: Environmental Assessment Chapters for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project was provided to the A9 Dualling Working Group on 31st May 2016. This shows how individual impacts are assessed. The magnitude of impacts, relative significance and ability to mitigate is considered in selecting the Preferred Route Option. No scoring system is used. The design team provide an initial recommendation, which is referred to investment decision makers at a senior level within Transport Scotland for approval. Ministers are then informed of the decision and justification before a Preferred Route Option is announced.
J5	Transport Scotland to provide information on how feedback from	Consultation feedback is incorporated into the assessment where relevant

Comments and Responses from Dunkeld and Birnam Community Council		
Recommendation Reference	**Community Council Recommendation**	**Transport Scotland / Jacobs Response**
	the community on the final Preferred Route Option decision will be addressed.	and considered in the decision making process. Responses to feedback are also provided. Where such feedback is given at an exhibition, a report summarising the feedback so that it is anonymous and responses are prepared it is published on the Transport Scotland web-site.