

# **Appendix A7.1: Summary of Scoping and Consultation Responses**

## **1.1 Introduction**

- 1.1.1 This appendix contains a summary of the key environmental input provided by statutory and non-statutory consultees throughout the consultation and scoping process described in Chapter 7 (Consultation and Scoping).
- 1.1.2 Table A7.1-1 provides a summary of the relevant statutory consultee comments on the EIA Scoping Report and the appropriate responses and/or actions taken in relation to the comments. Table A7.1-2 provides a summary of DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Steering Group (ESG) meetings. Table A7.1-3 provides a summary of individual meetings with statutory consultees and Table A7.1-4 provides a summary of key meetings with non-statutory consultees.

**Table A7.1-1: Summary of Consultation Responses – EIA Scoping Responses**

Consultee	Topic for Consultation	Summary of Key Consultee Comments Influencing the EIA	Response to Comment/Key Actions Taken in Relation to EIA and/or Design
NatureScot	General	<p>Thank you for your consultation requesting comments on the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed dualling of the A9 section Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing.</p> <p>The scoping report is comprehensive, NatureScot agrees with the scope and level of detail proposed for this Environmental Report and we are content with the topics scoped in and out.</p>	<p>Acknowledged and comments received in March 2024 at the conclusion of DMRB Stage 2 on the Preferred Route Option 3, Option ST2D are also noted and have been considered during the DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Impact Assessment. These related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Landscape General comments; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SuDS;</li> <li>○ Woodland and mitigation planting;</li> <li>○ Content of LVIA;</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Birnam and Murthly Junctions;</li> <li>▪ Dunkeld Junction; and</li> <li>▪ River Tay (Dunkeld) NSA assessment.</li> </ul>
	Biodiversity Enhancement	<p>The Fourth National Planning Framework (NPF4) sets out a new requirement for developments to deliver positive effects for biodiversity, primarily under Policy 3. We recommend the requirements of NPF4 are therefore adopted as part of any future application. For further details please see the following draft guidance <a href="#">here</a>. Please also visit our webpage <a href="#">Planning and development: Enhancing biodiversity</a>.</p>	<p>An Ecological Impact Assessment has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in Chapter 12: Biodiversity. The approach to delivering positive effects for biodiversity as required under Policy 3 of NPF4 is provided in Section 12.7 of the chapter and in further detail in the accompanying Appendix A12.8 Positive Effects for Biodiversity and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p> <p>In line with NPF4, the approach to positive effects for biodiversity seeks to achieve the standard position of ‘no net loss’ by identifying impacts and associated effects on all biodiversity resources (habitats and species) within the zone of influence from the proposed scheme. Design changes and mitigation have been applied to avoid or reduce effects to a non-residual state or compensation measures have been applied where a non-residual state cannot be achieved.</p> <p>The enhancement measures for positive effects for biodiversity associated with the proposed scheme focus on items highlighted through the policies in NPF4 and the NatureScot guidance such as restoring degraded habitats, measures to increase populations of priority species and strengthening existing nature networks. The enhancement measures also target priority species and habitats within the zone of influence such as those highlighted in the Tayside Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP). This approach seeks to achieve nature conservation outcomes that demonstrably exceed existing obligations (i.e. to be additional to other activities that would occur anyway). The approach also uses the metric adopted in England and Wales for achieving Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Whilst not mandatory in Scotland, BNG is a requirement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) in England and by Section 6 of the 2016 Environment (Wales) Act to ensure that habitats are left in a measurably better state than before development takes place.</p>
Historic Environment Scotland	General	<p>We welcome that cultural heritage has been scoped into the assessment and are content to agree with the methodological approach outlined in the scoping report and its basis on the updated DMRB guidance.</p>	Acknowledged.
	Baseline Data	<p>We are satisfied that the baseline data used for the DMRB Stage 2 Assessment of the now preferred route option (ST2D) remains valid. We would look to the</p>	Acknowledged.

		<p>DMRB Stage 3 Assessment to build on this assessment, taking into account our previous views issued on presented findings at earlier stages.</p> <p>The assessment should be supported by visualisations, particularly in reference to the key issue of the potential impacts on the site and setting of Dunkeld and Birnam Station and Footbridge (HB 11139) as well as the Inventory Designed Landscapes of The Hermitage (GDL 363) and Murthly Castle (GDL 292). In relation to the latter, you will be aware that we have previously commented on the Murthly Castle GDL desk-based assessment and consider it a robust baseline and appraisal to inform the assessment.</p>	<p>Visualisations are provided in Chapter 11: Visual Figures 11.8-11.14.</p>
	Mitigation - Iterative Design Development	<p>The commitment to the continuation of an iterative design process throughout DMRB3 to further refine potential mitigation for identified impacts including proposals for the Dunkeld Railway Station is welcomed.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust (PKHT)	General Comments	<p>Many thanks for the EIA Scoping Report in advance of the proposed Environmental Impact Assessment for the P2 Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing section as part of DMRB Stage 3. As outlined in the report PKHT can confirm to have been previously consulted on this part of scheme in 2021. We note the inclusion of a cultural heritage chapter and PKHT has confidence that the heritage assets will be fully considered during the EIA process. The proposed assessment includes an update of current baseline studies and this will be valuable given some time passed. Further walkover surveys of the area and a comprehensive study of Murthly Castle and Garden designed Landscape is welcomed by PKHT. We are also happy to be further consulted regarding the fieldwork programme and potential mitigation measures.</p> <p>Regarding the specific impacts on the approved route on Birnam Station, given the widening of the road, we are interested to see what mitigation measures are proposed for the protection of the historic building group from increased air pollution and the potential subsequent stone degradation.</p> <p>Other than our comments above we are broadly happy with the approach and look forward to further discussions regarding the archaeology programme and appropriate mitigation in due course.</p>	<p>The cultural heritage assessment is provided in Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage of this EIA Report.</p> <p>As discussed in Appendix A9.2, site inspections and a walkover survey were undertaken to identify cultural heritage resources not identified from desk-based sources, and to inform the assessment of value (sensitivity) of these and previously identified cultural heritage resources (undertaken 07 June 2022 and 17 – 21 June 2024).</p> <p>A detailed description of the history and baseline of Murthly Castle Garden and Designed Landscape is provided in Appendix A9.3: Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment of Murthly Castle Garden and Designed Landscape.</p> <p>It is considered unlikely that changes in air quality would result in significant adverse effects on the historic fabric of Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station and associated assets from widening the existing A9 as part of the proposed scheme.</p>
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	General	<p>Thank you for consulting SEPA for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping opinion in relation to the above project on 23 April 2024. We have considered the Scoping Report for DMRB Stage 3 EIA (Revision P04 dated 23 April 2024) and can confirm we are generally satisfied with the proposed scope of the assessment in relation to issues in our remit.</p> <p>Generally, we are satisfied with the proposed approach to the assessment for all other matters and have no specific concerns with the mitigation identified at this stage. However, as noted in Section 5.1.19 of the report, we expect mitigation to be developed further as the assessment progresses where there is an opportunity for design changes to avoid or reduce environmental impacts</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Mitigation has been developed further to embed mitigation in the design of the proposed scheme as part of the iterative design process. Embedded mitigation is discussed in Chapter 5: Iterative Design Development.</p> <p>There has been further engagement with the ESG including NatureScot regarding NPF4 Policy 3 and positive effects for biodiversity for the proposed scheme.</p>

		<p>and effects. Our detailed comments and recommendations on the scope of the EIA is included in Appendix 1 below.</p> <p>We acknowledge the proposed scope of the biodiversity assessment and the reference to the requirements of NPF4 Policy 3. As planned, we recommend further engagement with NatureScot regarding the proposed assessment on this issue.</p>	
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	Disruption to Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE)	<p>We understand an assessment of GWDTE is proposed to be scoped out of further assessment as these are not present along the proposed scheme. We have no concerns with this approach however recommend the information supporting that conclusion be provided either before or with the EIAR. If through further survey work GWDTE were found, then we would expect an assessment to be included in the EIA.</p>	<p>Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems are discussed in Chapter 13: Geology, Soils, Groundwater and Land Contamination. In line with DMRB LA 113 and as agreed with SEPA, the study area for the consideration of Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE) extended 100m from the existing A9 carriageway with the option to extend this boundary should the dewatering impact assessment require it.</p> <p>No groundwater dependant terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTE) were identified in proximity to the proposed scheme.</p>
	Fish ecology	<p>(SEPA Letter Appendix 1) We note the various mitigation measures identified in Appendix C to protect fish. Please note that aspects of the design relating to fish ecology will be considered at the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR) stage. However, it would be good practice to improve fish passage where possible.</p>	Acknowledged.
	Invasive non-native species (INNS)	<p>(SEPA Letter Appendix 1) We welcome the commitment to a biosecurity strategy to implement appropriate treatment of INNS. It is more beneficial to presume INNS are present at sites as in the main these are not always easily identified or visible, particularly aquatic species. Our website has further information and guidance in relation to INNS.</p>	Acknowledged.
	Groundwater	<p>(SEPA Letter Appendix 1)</p> <p>We acknowledge construction and operational impacts on groundwater are to be assessed. The superficial geology where the scheme is taking place is classed as alluvium with the associated aquifer of high productivity. Any excavation is likely to require dewatering of likely large volumes of groundwater which will be permanent if passive drainage is applied (e.g. road cuttings). We acknowledge the EIA is to include a detailed assessment of dewatering effects in proposed areas of cuttings.</p> <p>A study area of 850m from the footprint of the proposed scheme is planned based on the minimum study area applied for groundwater abstractions under CAR. The cited 850m radius applies for groundwater abstractions (including dewatering) of less than 500m<sup>3</sup>/d. Given the high productivity of the sand and gravel alluvium in the construction area and the planned underbridges and underpasses it is likely that a large volume of dewatering may be required, possibly in excess of 500m<sup>3</sup>/d. We therefore recommend the study area around large excavations is increased to 1.2km corresponding to the radius required for abstractions greater than 500m<sup>3</sup>/d.</p>	<p>The assessment of dewatering effects in proposed areas of cuttings is provided in Chapter 13: Geology, Soils, Groundwater and Land Contamination, Section 13.5 (under Groundwater Flow) and in Appendix A13.3 Surface Water Indirect Dewatering Assessment.</p> <p>Impacts and effects on groundwater abstractions within 1.2 km of the CPO boundary have been assessed. Typically, the minimum study area to be applied for groundwater abstraction licensing is 850 m under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended) (Scottish Government, 2011) and based on “Regulatory Method (WAT-RM-11) Abstraction from Groundwater V6” (SEPA, 2017-A). However, following consultation with SEPA regarding the Scoping Report for DMRB Stage 3 EIA (Transport Scotland 2024), it was agreed, given the high productivity of the superficial aquifer in the construction areas along the River Tay and the possibility of a large volume of dewatering being required (possibly in excess of 500m<sup>3</sup>/d), the study area would be expanded to 1.2 km for abstractions. Reference is made to Chapter 13: Geology, Soils, Groundwater and Land Contamination.</p>

		Groundwater abstractions and other groundwater receptors should be identified and risk assessed within the 1.2km radius from the dewatering areas. We note the further work is to include consultation with landowners and potential surveys to identify and mitigate private water supplies potentially at risk. We have guidance on assessing the impacts of development on groundwater abstractions in this guidance note which should be followed for the assessment.	
	Material Assets and Waste	<p>(SEPA Letter Appendix 1)</p> <p>We have no concerns with the proposed scope of the assessment on material assets and waste at this stage. We welcome the commitment to producing a site waste management plan (SMC-M1) and to apply the principles of the 'Waste Hierarchy' to minimise waste generation (SMC-M3). We recommend that this assessment also consider the management of diseased trees in the study area.</p> <p>It is indicated peat is proposed to be scoped out as it is not present along the proposed scheme. We have no concerns with this approach however we recommend the information supporting that conclusion be provided either before or with the EIAR.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The Schedule of Environmental Commitments as set out in Chapter 22 includes mitigation items SMC-M1 and SMC-M3.</p> <p>The use and consumption of material assets and the production and disposal of waste are also subject to a complex framework of legislative and policy instruments at the national, local and applicant level, including SEPA Guidance on Disposal of trees and plants infected with specific plant diseases, 2013.</p> <p>The Schedule of Environmental Commitments also includes mitigation item SMC-M2, which requires the appointed Contractor to comply with all relevant waste legislation concerning waste handling, storage, transport, and disposal. Additionally, this requires the appointed Contractor to consult with SEPA for advice on waste practice, licenses, and exemptions where appropriate.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 14: Material Assets, there are no peat resources either within or within 250m of the proposed scheme boundary. Given their absence, effects on peat resources as a mineral resource have been scoped out of the EIA. Additional details on peat as a soil resource, (rather than a mineral resource), can be found in Chapter 13 (Geology, Soils, Groundwater and Land Contamination).</p>
	Flood risk	<p>(SEPA Letter Appendix 1)</p> <p>We support assessing the construction and operational impacts on flood risk. We acknowledge this is to be supported by a Stage 3 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to assess the 0.5%AEP (200-year) plus an allowance for climate change design flood event, based on the Climate change allowances for FRA in land use planning guidance, and this will inform the design of culverts or compensatory storage areas.</p> <p>We acknowledge the mitigation identified to reduce the risk of flooding impacts on the construction works. We support the preparation of the Flood Risk Plan and that plant and materials will be stored in areas outside the functional floodplain (SMC-W2). We note live information will be taken from the Met Office and SEPA Floodline and recommend signing up to SEPA flood warning services. We welcome chemical, fuel and oil storage will be undertaken in a site compound on ground at a low risk of flooding (SMC-W8). We also welcome that consideration will given to temporary protection (e.g. demountable flood barriers) to sensitive receptors at flood risk.</p>	<p>The DMRB Stage 3 FRA is discussed in Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment and reported in further detail in Appendix A19.2 Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Acknowledged. Mitigation items relating to the risk of flooding impacts during construction of the proposed scheme, including SMC-W2 and SMC-W8, are provided in Chapter 22: Schedule of Environmental Commitments and discussed in Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment.</p>
	Hydromorphology	<p>(SEPA Letter Appendix 1)</p> <p>We have no specific concerns about the scope of the assessment in relation to hydromorphology. However, there appears to be a lack of recognition of the</p>	Reference is made to Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment.



		<p>possible effects of climate change in relation to this issue. We recommend the design of river engineering measures also account for the effects of climate change (e.g. more frequent high flows and the impacts that will have on sediment transport processes and channel morphology).</p> <p>It is noted that mitigation measure SMC-W5 includes a requirement that 'works will be supervised by a suitably qualified geomorphologist'. We welcome this approach and would support this also being applied to other river engineering mitigation particularly that identified for river crossings (SMC-W15).</p>	Acknowledged.
	Sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS)	<p>(SEPA Letter Appendix 1)</p> <p>NPF4 Policy 22c requires that development proposals manage all rain and surface water through SUDS. We acknowledge that a minimum of two levels of SUDS is intended to be included for all mainline outfalls in agreement with SEPA and that the detailed design is to adhere to the SUDS manual (C753) and CAR (SMC-W17).</p> <p>LA 113 Road drainage and the water environment states 'in Scotland lining of drainage systems is not usually required' however consideration may need to be given to protective measures (like impermeable lining) in some areas to address the risks associated with elevated levels of contaminants.</p> <p>We acknowledge and welcome that new SUDS outfalls will be designed to treat and attenuate the peak flow from the drainage system during a 0.5% AEP (200-year) rainfall event, plus a 39% allowance for climate change and that any drains damaged by construction works will be re-instated to ensure flooding is not exacerbated.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Mitigation item SMC-W17 is included in the Schedule of Environmental Commitments provided in Chapter 22. SMC-W17 includes the commitment that SuDS retention ponds will be designed with an impermeable liner to maintain a body of standing water and provide treatment volume.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p>
	Construction environmental management	<p>(SEPA Letter Appendix 1)</p> <p>The EIA should identify all aspects of site work that might impact on the environment, potential pollution risks associated with the proposals and identify the principles of preventative measures and mitigation. A draft Schedule of Mitigation should be produced covering all the environmental sensitivities, pollution prevention and mitigation measures identified to avoid or minimise environmental effects including reference to best practice pollution prevention and construction techniques and regulatory requirements. Please refer to the Guidance for Pollution Prevention (GPPs) and our water run-off from construction sites webpage for more information.</p>	<p>The EIA has included an assessment of the effects of construction site activities on the environment. Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the EIA Report presents the pollution risks identified, an assessment of their effects as well as measures to prevent and/or mitigate significant effects.</p> <p>Chapter 22: Schedule of Environmental Commitments of the EIA Report documents the pollution prevention and mitigation measures identified to avoid or minimise significant environmental effects, also providing reference to best practice pollution prevention and construction techniques and regulatory requirements.</p>

**Table A7.1-2: Summary/response to Environmental Steering Group comments**

Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
ESG May 2024	<p>Discussion regarding Positive Effects of Biodiversity (PEB), including confirmation that work is underway with SRUC and NatureScot who are developing a metric using the English DEFRA tool which will include connectivity. Jacobs are looking into developing a similar approach for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing project. NatureScot noted that it needs to be clear what is compensation and what is enhancement. It was added that the existing biodiversity on the site to be used for BNG/PEB also needs to be considered. Transport Scotland/Jacobs are considering the restoration and improvement of existing habitats.</p> <p>Jacobs provided an update on Standard Mitigation Commitments and the intention to provide updated commitments in the draft EIAR which all ESG members in attendance confirmed they would be willing to review. NatureScot was keen that the consult and comply aspect is considered.</p> <p>There was further discussion in relation to Dunkeld &amp; Birnam station, with PKC noting it is of particular interest and has been raised with the PKC heritage team. HES commented they would provide feedback on design principles for Dunkeld and Birnam Station.</p>
ESG June 2024	<p>No ESG held, instead a project update was submitted: Jacobs is progressing with the DMRB Stage 3 design development, particularly ecology surveys and geophysical surveys for heritage (magnetometer and ground penetrating radar) as well as progressing with development of a methodology for assessing Positive Effects for Biodiversity (PEB).</p>
ESG September 2024	<p>Jacobs presented on the design of works at Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station, including potential impacts, possible mitigation and conceptual visualisations of the aesthetic design of the replacement car park, pedestrian underpass and lift/stairs access arrangements. There was wide-ranging discussion afterwards with key points made by ESG members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The ESG requested a further meeting to discuss further development of the design concepts including overall architectural style, materials, and the degree to which these reflect/complement the listed station building and the Conservation Area.</li> <li>▪ Separation of the lift/stairs structure from the listed station building was positive in terms of setting and provided opportunity for developing relationships between existing and new structures.</li> <li>▪ Encouragement was given to explore opportunities for direct vehicle access to the listed station building beyond the intermittent vehicle access provided via the Network Rail Maintenance Access to support the sustainable longevity of the listed station building.</li> <li>▪ Visualisations and photo-montages would be necessary to support the assessments in the EIAR and the scope and location of these would need to be agreed with HES and PKHT.</li> <li>▪ The potential impacts of traffic pollutants on the listed station building should be considered.</li> </ul> <p>A presentation was also given by Jacobs on Positive Effects for Biodiversity (PEB), including National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) requirements; assessment approach; potential PEB habitat and species initiatives; community benefits; and using Biodiversity Net Gain to support the overall assessment of PEB.</p> <p>There was a wide-ranging discussion following the presentation with key points made by ESG members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is unlikely that Scottish specific guidance on PEB will be available before publication of the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing EIAR.</li> <li>▪ Commendable progress has been made on the assessment approach in the meantime and there is a great opportunity for Transport Scotland to set a benchmark.</li> <li>▪ The assessment reported in the EIAR should clearly differentiate biodiversity losses, mitigation and enhancements (positive effects for biodiversity).</li> <li>▪ As biodiversity must be demonstrably better than before intervention in terms of compliance with NPF4, habitat scale initiatives may be better able to demonstrate positive effects than species related initiatives.</li> <li>▪ Habitat management agreements beyond the proposed scheme may be useful and necessary to demonstrate positive effects for biodiversity.</li> <li>▪ Transport Scotland should consider opportunities for proposed scheme related positive effects for biodiversity across the A9 Dualling projects.</li> </ul>



Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
	<p>A post-meeting email (dated 25 September 2024) was also provided by Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust which included notes on the visibility/connection of the signal box; planting proposals near the station; the potential for green transport links/bike infrastructure; the importance of retaining some vehicle space adjacent to the station building; and the usefulness of preparing viewpoints and visualisations of the proposed scheme in relation to the station as part of the EIA.</p>
ESG November 2024	<p>The meeting was convened following an action from the ESG September 2024 meeting where HES/PKC/PKHT/NatureScot asked for a follow up meeting to discuss the design development for Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station. To progress the action, it was arranged that additional interested parties be invited to attend (Transport Scotland (Rail) and Network Rail) and that the meeting should include a site walkover to ensure the surrounds and context of Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station are understood.</p> <p>To support the meeting, an invitation was also extended to Nicoll Russell Studios to report how architectural heritage had informed the developing design and present a series of visualisations of Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station and its surrounds to explain the developing design proposals.</p> <p>Network Rail provided an update of the improvement works at the station, including the raising of sections of Platform 1 and Platform 2 to allow step free access from trains; step free access between Platform 1 and Platform 2 with the existing path to be upgraded to provide compliant access from the existing car park to Birnam Glen and provision of a new compliant path from Birnam Glen to Platform 2; as well as safety improvements (segregation) of cycle path (NCN77) and core path (DNK/142) from existing sidings. An update was also provided on the proposed property improvements of Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station building to meet statutory obligations for protection of the Category A Listed Building, essential maintenance works and additional improvements.</p> <p>Preliminary feedback of the developing design proposals included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A need for the design to reflect both Network Rail and Scotrail requirements, such as winterisation, and design measures reflecting the station would be unmanned.</li> <li>▪ The existing station is accepted as being disconnected from Birnam and it is acknowledged that the developing design proposals do provide a much greater level of connection between the station and Birnam and this is welcomed.</li> <li>▪ Future design development should consider a canopy entrance to the underpass that does not incorporate a gable; and consideration of a more modern utilitarian rather than decorative design approach, including for the platform level buildings, that uses less glass but uses it functionally with the design, potentially incorporating more timber and reflecting historic railway architecture.</li> </ul> <p>Further feedback on practical matters included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Glazing can be reflective and so impactful on setting as well as requiring specific maintenance.</li> <li>▪ Door access on the platform level buildings should be manually operated.</li> <li>▪ Scale of wall behind the canopy in the replacement car park is considered appropriate and a blonde sandstone type finish is preferred.</li> <li>▪ Network Rail and Station signage was considered necessary and appropriate.</li> <li>▪ Salt splash from road salting and its potential impacts on the station building and the car park wall should be considered.</li> <li>▪ Vehicle access for any future use of the station building via the Network Rail Maintenance Access should only be considered occasional, e.g. for maintenance and deliveries, and would need to be by agreement with Network Rail.</li> <li>▪ Vehicle access to the station building from Birnam Glen road is constrained by the level difference.</li> <li>▪ The community have put forward 10-12 suggestions to Network Rail for the future use of the station building, including a Mens Shed.</li> <li>▪ Future responsibility for the replacement car park and its maintenance needs to be considered.</li> </ul>
ESG March 2025	<p>Jacobs outlined the approach and process of the review by the ESG of the Draft DMRB Stage 3 Environmental Impact Assessment Report. The purpose of the review is to identify significant omissions or errors and to raise any key concerns with regards to residual effects. The review period would commence on 18 March 2025 and finish on 22 April 2025. Meetings were offered</p>

Environmental Steering Group (ESG) Meetings	Summary of Consultee Comments/Discussion
	<p>with ESG members during this period to discuss the EIAR documentation and the assessment noting that HES, PKHT and PKC had intimated a meeting in week commencing 31 March 2025 would be helpful.</p> <p>Design development of the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing was presented with key areas of focus being on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Murthly Estate Access Track – SuDS location and cross section of access track, bioth to reduce potential for impacts on Murthly Estate Garden and Designed Landscape.</li> <li>▪ Birnam Junction – lowering of the mainline to reduce potential for impacts on nearby properties and to facilitate WCH provision from Perth Road and along the B867.</li> <li>▪ Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station Car Park – confirming extension of the Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Pedestrian Underpass to Platform 1 and Platform 2 and to optimise car park design.</li> <li>▪ Dunkeld Roundabout – raising of the mainline to prevent inundation during 0.5% AEP plus 53% climate change, inclusion of flood relief culverts between ch4400 and ch4500 and addition of Flood Compensatory Storage area.</li> <li>▪ Dalguise Junction – optimising the mainline and side road designs and levels to allow gravity fed road drainage solution (rather than previous pumped solution).</li> <li>▪ River Tay Crossing – cross section of River Tay Bridge optimised to facilitate provision for WCH with improved segregation when compared to the existing provision on the River Tay Crossing (Jubilee Bridge) with links to paths provided on the north and south of the River Tay.</li> </ul> <p>The meeting next focussed in more detail on the design proposals affecting the Murthly Castle Garden and Designed Landscape, including further details on the SuDS pond design/location, the alignment of the Murthly Estate Access Track and the aesthetic design of Murthly Estate Bridge.</p> <p>The meeting next focussed in more detail on the design proposals for Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station, with visualisations, sketches and photo-realistic images presented and Nicoll Russell Studios also in attendance. The materials presented showed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The layout of the car park and the indicative planting.</li> <li>▪ A revised canopy design above the entrance to the pedestrian underpass.</li> <li>▪ The relative level of the car park to Station Road and the houses and gardens on Birnam Terrace that back on to the car park.</li> <li>▪ The positioning, orientation, scale and outline design of the platform level buildings that house the stairs and lifts and their positions relative to the Network Rail platform improvement works.</li> </ul> <p>Positive feedback on the design development was received.</p> <p>The meeting finished with a presentation on Biodiversity and Natural Capital. The Biodiversity session provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ an update on essential mitigation proposals (including off-site mitigation)</li> <li>▪ implications for biodiversity units quantified in the Biodiversity Net Gain metric; and</li> <li>▪ positive effects for biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p>The Natural Capital session provided an outline of the Natural Capital approach proposed and that a Natural Capital Assessment would be undertaken for the proposed scheme.</p>

**Table A7.1-3: Summary of Consultation Responses: Summary/response to individual meetings with statutory consultees**

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback/Discussion
Perth & Kinross Council NMU and Accessibility Forum	<p>Meeting on 23 April 2024 with the NMU and Accessibility Forum. An update was provided on the status of the project, the announcement of the Preferred Route and that the DMRB Stage 3 process had commenced with draft Orders and the Environmental Impact Assessment report due to be published in Spring 2025. The discussions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ That an Equality Impact Assessment would be prepared.</li> <li>▪ That design would be cognisant of Cycling by Design, Routes for All and Inclusive Mobility.</li> <li>▪ The need for clear terminology when describing paths.</li> <li>▪ That improving the segregation on the NCN77 across the River Tay was a design challenge.</li> <li>▪ Crossfall and slope of paths was being considered.</li> <li>▪ Design proposals linking Birnam, Dunkeld, Inver, The Hermitage and the Tay crossing were all discussed as well as access to Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station.</li> <li>▪ The legal arrangements for core paths affected by the draft CPO and Road Orders.</li> <li>▪ Frequency of further meetings (as required).</li> </ul> <p>Meeting on 14 February 2025 with Perth Access Forum. An update was provided on the status of the project, the timeline for the publication of the Draft Orders and EIAR and the design development. The discussions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dunkeld Junction at-grade roundabout.</li> <li>▪ Lighting of junctions.</li> <li>▪ WCH path arrangements between Birnam Junction, Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station and Birnam Glen.</li> <li>▪ WCH routes crossing the River Braan linking Birnam, Dunkeld and Inver</li> <li>▪ WCH arrangements linking Dalguise Junction and new provision on the River Tay Bridge.</li> </ul>
Perth & Kinross Council	<p>Meeting on 27 March 2024 to discuss the preferred route and design development for the Pass of Birnam to Tay Crossing scheme and understand the impacts on various departments within Perth &amp; Kinross Council and any concerns they have. Discussions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in traffic flow coming off at Dunkeld and heading through Birnam and whether it would be a significant increase (estimated as an additional 400 vehicles per day on Perth Road subject to review);</li> <li>▪ Birnam junction as the community preferred choice;</li> <li>▪ Cyclists access into Birnam from Bankfoot (confirmed that the proposed realigned Perth Road can be used to pass under the A9 carriageway);</li> <li>▪ Confirmation that no issues had been raised with the preferred route design on bus services.</li> <li>▪ Improving accessibility to the railway station including access to Platform 2 (noted that the existing overpass could be used subject to ongoing review for alternative options).</li> </ul> <p>Further points discussed included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Timing of proposed changes in the area of the industrial estate.</li> <li>▪ Affected footpaths, including access to Birnam Glen, which is subject to height restriction (noted that maintaining access provision during construction will be considered as part of the next stage of the design).</li> <li>▪ School bus access from the Rotmell farm area (noted that the design accommodated all vehicle movements).</li> <li>▪ Plans for traffic signals at the proposed Dunkeld Roundabout (noted that traffic modelling undertaken for the DMRB Stage 2 assessment indicated they are not required).</li> </ul>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback/Discussion
	Meeting on 24 April 2024 to discuss Ladywell Landfill Site, including its layout and use (noted that the Working Plan for the site is unchanged since 2015).
Perth & Kinross Council Access Forum	<p>Meeting on 14 February 2025 with Perth Access Forum. The discussions during the meeting included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Update on the proposed scheme and the A9 Dualling Delivery Plan.</li> <li>▪ Access arrangements at Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Station and provision of facilities for cyclists.</li> <li>▪ Provision for WCH at Birnam Junction, including WCH from Perth Road and extending on the B867.</li> <li>▪ WCH provision linking Birnam, Dunkeld and Inver with particular focus on the crossing of the River Braan.</li> <li>▪ WCH provision to cross the River Tay utilising Dalguise Junction and the River Tay Bridge.</li> <li>▪ Positive feedback as received.</li> </ul>
SEPA	<p>Meeting on 30 April 2024 to discuss the main issues surrounding the hydrology and hydromorphology associated with the proposed scheme; culvert length of watercourse WC13; waste materials; private water supplies; and groundwater considerations. Discussions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Predicted flood risk with the proposed scheme in place in the absence of mitigation and the implications of adopting the +53% climate change uplift and how this has guided mitigation.</li> <li>▪ The number of culverts required.</li> <li>▪ Results of the hydraulic modelling and investigations undertaken, including those with regard to compensatory storage and environmental constraints.</li> <li>▪ Details of the drainage network and the proposed components of the design and the minimum level of treatment considered for SuDS, and any further requirements for road drainage.</li> <li>▪ CAR licencing and the process of attaining acceptance for the design of water crossings.</li> <li>▪ Private water abstractions.</li> <li>▪ Detailed discussion on watercourse crossings, including constraints associated with road alignment, excavations and culverting.</li> </ul>
SEPA	<p>Meeting on 21 January 2025 to discuss the proposed scheme in relation to hydrology, flood risk, drainage design and watercourse crossings. The discussions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An explanation of the hydrology model which includes the River Tay, River Braan and Inchewan Burn and which is run for the 30yr, 200yr and 200yrCC return period events.</li> <li>▪ An update on flood relief culverts and further design development of the highway alignment and drainage system.</li> <li>▪ Exploration of compensatory floodplain storage and constraints in potential locations; design network details at key locations; and the constraints associated with watercourse crossing WC13 in the Dalguise Junction area.</li> </ul> <p>SEPA provided post meeting notes (03 February 2025) on detailed technical aspects regarding the River Tay, River Braan and small ungauged watercourses; as well as further information and comment on watercourse WF13.</p>

**Table A7.1-4: Summary of Consultation Responses: Summary/response to individual meetings with local community interests**

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback/Discussion
Forestry and Land Scotland (FLS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ February 2024: meeting to discuss potential impacts on FLS operations including that associated with the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) basin at Inver and implications around the closure of the 'White Gates' access to Craigvinean Forest (harvesting, access to the active quarry, the overnight chargeable public car park). Noted that an alternative access would be considered.</li> <li>▪ June 2024: FLS provided septic tank information for the Inver Complex.</li> <li>▪ January 2025: Further discussions on the access at White Gates and The Hermitage - FLS proposed to create new access points at Douglas Fir Woods (as a primary access point) and Dalmarnock (as a secondary point) as well as associated links and forest road improvements required to create a new and resilient haulage network. Issues were noted and discussed.</li> <li>▪ February 2025: Discussions on achieving Positive Effects for Biodiversity (PEB)/Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for the proposed scheme and the potential to use FLS land. Noted that voluntary purchase may be required and that native woodland improvements at felled timber locations could be achieved.</li> <li>▪ February 2025: Meeting to discuss management proposals and the implications of the proposed scheme for FLS managed land to the north and east of the Highland Main Line railway and existing A9 between Inver and the River Tay Crossing.</li> <li>▪ April 2025: Meeting to discuss land-take requirements and appropriation.</li> </ul>
National Trust for Scotland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ March 2024: Meeting to discuss potential impacts on National Trust for Scotland (NTS) land and which included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NTS to be included in discussions regarding non-motorised user (NMU) access towards Inver and The Hermitage which is a NTS facility.</li> <li>○ NTS noted the design must consider the timber lorry access to Craigvinean Hill as well as car parking for visitors to The Hermitage; and also timber traffic via 'White Gates' and associated safety concerns. Discussion on whether NTS could be involved in the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for the construction phase before the end of the design process and publication of draft orders but no commitment made at this stage.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ December 2024: meeting to discuss design development and potential interactions with NTS land holdings including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The design of The Hermitage left-in left-out junction and its interaction with The Hermitage car park, forestry access and provision for WCH.</li> <li>○ Signage requirements for The Hermitage.</li> <li>○ Access to The Hermitage during construction and potential disruption to activities.</li> <li>○ Potential for Forestry Land Scotland timber extraction using The Hermitage Junction.</li> <li>○ Information on The Hermitage as a visitor attraction was collated.</li> <li>○ Potential impacts on other NTS land holdings around the River Braan (Riverside Land) including potential impacts on WCH users of existing riverside paths.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ March 2025: follow up to the December 2024 to further discuss design development topics. Land-take from Open Space on Riverside Land noted.</li> </ul>
A9 Community Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ November 2024: Meeting with the A9 Community Groups to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update on design development, including refinements to the A9 mainline and junctions; requirements for WCHs and developments at Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Railway station.</li> <li>○ Provide feedback on the consultation events held in January 2024 (Transport Scotland/Jacobs led event) and March 2024 (Community Group led event) and discuss the forthcoming Community Engagement Event planned for August 2024 (Transport Scotland/Jacobs led event).</li> <li>○ Discuss Dunkeld &amp; Birnam Railway Station Community and Network Rail Accessibility Improvements.</li> <li>○ Consult with landowners/stakeholders to inform design development.</li> <li>○ Provide an outline of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report to the Community Group.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Consultee	Summary of Consultee Feedback/Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Discuss current issues affecting the A9 including accident frequencies and road closures; that the “Preferred Route” was not the Community Preferred Route; the extra traffic that will use Perth Road, Birnam; and the proposed SUDS in the station car park area (noted that a covered storage solution and a swale at the entrance to the car park was likely).</li> <li>○ Discuss current proposals at the railway station and underpass access to Platform 1 and potentially Platform 2.</li> <li>○ Explain the role of the Environmental Steering Group, its members and functions and the changes incorporated regarding walking, wheeling, cycling and horse riding routes and changes to routes for those taking access to or driving to The Hermitage, the Dalguise junction and the SUDS pond and fishing areas on the bank of the River Tay; that the new Tay Crossing structure would form the southbound carriageway and a range of possible solutions were currently being considered for WWCH facilities.</li> <li>○ Explain that liaison was continuing with the local authority and the bus companies regarding bus stop usage and practical solutions for public transport options.</li> <li>○ Discuss the potential loss of the industrial units and possible loss of jobs.</li> <li>○ Discuss concerns about the 70mph speed limit on the approach to the roundabout (noted that appropriate design, signage and lighting would be in place, which would be subject to Road Safety Audit).</li> </ul> <p>It was also proposed that Transport Scotland and Jacobs attend and inform the next meeting of the Birnam to Ballinluig A9 Community Group in November 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ December 2024: meeting with the A9 Community Group to update them on the proposed scheme, which included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A request to view the DMRB Stage 2 report (noted that access to the report and the Consultation Report was offered in Birnam Arts, with provision for the former in the adjacent Public Library).</li> <li>○ It was noted that feedback to the January exhibition was provided with responses in the August Event Consultation Report.</li> <li>○ It was also noted that the Community Preferred Option for the roundabout was one of the closest votes in the process and that the local community had feared the roundabout may not have passed the scrutiny of the DMRB assessment.</li> <li>○ The A9 Community Group survey indicated concerns around the access to the station and it not being a positive solution and some local worries about the re-routing of the Inchewan Burn (noted that the preferred route design did not interfere with the burn).</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ March 2025: meeting with the A9 Community Group to update them on the proposed scheme, which included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A9 Delivery Plan and timeline for the publication of the Draft Orders and EIAR</li> <li>○ Update on design development</li> <li>○ The A9 Community Group queried the design in and around the Birnam Junction. It was agreed that there would be a site visit with a representative of the A9 Community Group to the area around the Birnam Junction to discuss matters relating to the junction design and biodiversity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>