A83 Rest and Be Thankful

LTS EIAR VOLUME 4, APPENDIX 6.1 - SUMMARY OF SCOPING CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Transport Scotland

A83AAB-AWJ-EAC-LTS_GEN-RP-LE-000246

A6-1. Summary of Scoping Consultation Responses

A6-1.1. Introduction

A6-1.1.1. This appendix contains a summary of the key environmental input provided by the A83 Environmental Steering Group (ESG) through the consultation process described in Chapter 6: Consultation and Scoping.

A6-1.1.2. Tables A6-1.1 to A6-1.6 provide a summary of the A83 ESG comments on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report in relation to the Proposed Scheme and the responses to this consultation.

Table A6-1.1 Summary of Environment Consultee Feedback – Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)

Summary of Feedback	Response
Thank you for consulting SEPA for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping opinion in relation to the above development on 27 November 2023. We would welcome engagement with the applicant at an early stage to discuss any of the issues raised in this letter and would especially welcome further pre-application engagement once initial peat probing, habitat survey and hydromorphological work has been completed.	Noted.
National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) has recently been published. The guidance referenced in this response is being reviewed and updated to reflect the new policies. It will still provide useful and relevant information but some parts may be updated further in the future.	Noted.
To avoid delay and potential objection the EIA submission must contain a scaled plan of sensitivities, for example peat, GWDTE, proximity to watercourses, overlain with proposed development. This is necessary to ensure the EIA process has informed the layout of the development to firstly avoid, and then reduce then mitigate significant impacts on the environment. We consider that the issues covered in Appendix 1 below must be addressed to our satisfaction in the EIA process. This provides details on our information requirements and the form in which they must be submitted.	Noted, information relating to peat and GWDTE can be found in Chapter 12: Geology, Soils and Groundwater, and information relating to the Water Environment in Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment.
We have also provided site specific comments in the following section which provides pre- application advice and can help focus the scope of the assessment.	Noted.
1. Site specific comments	n/a
Hydromorphology	n/a
We have engaged with Atkins' hydromorphologists as the proposals have developed and are broadly content with the proposed scope of the assessments in relation to hydromorphology. We would offer the following advice which should be taken into consideration and incorporated into the EIA Report.	Noted.
The 1:25,000 mapping shows 16 watercourse crossings, however close examination of the aerial photography suggests that there could more. These are not shown on the OS Master Map detailed river network so will need to be field assessed to understand if new crossings will be required or existing crossings upgraded during the works.	The number of crossings is based on an analysis of LiDAR, a field and hydrology assessment and the engineering constraints on the number of structures. AWJV note that watercourse alignments evolve in time. Please see Volume 3, Figure 19.2 The Proposed Scheme and Watercourses for the watercourses assessed,

Summary of Feedback	Response
In order to determine potential effects on hydromorphology, a full process-based geomorphological assessment (fluvial audit) should be undertaken for the full length of each stream (where it's safe to do so), with particular attention being paid to the geomorphological forms and processes in the reach in which each crossing is to be located. The aim of each assessment would be to understand how the flows of water (energy) and sediment during the operational phase are likely to interact with the channel morphology that exists at that point, such that the design can be geomorphologically aligned to allow the free movement of sediment as far as possible, channel adjustment (where this wouldn't compromise the crossings), and maximise energy dissipation. Designs that do this will help to ensure that the amount of maintenance required over the long term is kept to a minimum.	Examination and assessment of Digital Terrain Model (DTM) data and aerial imagery in combination with empirical data has helped understand the dominant fluvial geomorphological processes and behaviours. The watercourse summaries in the baseline (Volume 4, Appendix 19.3 Road Drainage and the Water Environment Baseline) presents this information and has informed the design. There are, however, complex hillslope processes operating at this site (e.g. landslides including debris flows) which has also determined the design. Field survey has been limited to access immediately upstream and downstream of the Old Military Road (OMR) and immediately downstream of the A83 due to the very steep terrain.
In terms of assessment methodology (section 17.7) we are pleased that a combination of desk-based and field-based techniques are going to be used. As noted above, the identification of the water courses that require assessment shouldn't rely solely on those shown on the 1:25,000 mapping but should be finalised after a field survey has been undertaken. Even very small watercourses have the potential to cause the scheme problems if crossings are not adequately designed or drainage not otherwise properly accounted for. The proposed use of DTMs is good. Consideration could be given to collecting new LiDAR data and generating additional DEMs, which can then be differenced with existing DEMs to gain insights into channel morphological behaviour following higher flows. This would complement the proposed use of time lapse cameras to better understand hydromorphological processes. The proposal to collect sedimentological and hydrometric data is good. The proposal to use the data collected to help improve scheme resilience and minimise damage to water courses is also good. Consideration should be given to synthesising all the data collection described in the report and the additional data collection described in paragraphs 17.5.2 and 17.7.2 here into a conceptual model of (a) how each water course is functioning currently, and (b) and how it is likely to function once the scheme is built. This will then provide pointers on how designs may need to be adjusted and on what monitoring, further data collection, or adaptive management may be required once the scheme is built.	High resolution DTM data (received February 2024) has been used in the assessment although a repeat survey for comparison of hillside changes has not yet been analysed. Due to EIA timescales and prioritising other Ground Investigation works, collection of hydrometric data and camera visuals were not commissioned. At this stage, these data are not believed to be a limiting factor to our assessment or consenting. Available historic data including old maps, aerial imagery, photographs and reports have been reviewed to improve understanding of past events and hydro-geomorphological and geotechnical behaviours. Where feasible, in-channel sediment size data have been collected; Conceptual models have not been developed for this EIA given the degree of existing modification and ongoing maintenance (not well documented) and the appreciation that this is a dynamic hillside with varying surface water flow pathways prone to debris flows and landslips. A thorough description of baseline (Volume 4, Appendix 19.3 Road Drainage and the Water Environment Baseline) and potential hydromorphological impacts of the Proposed Scheme (Volume 4, Appendix 19.4 Hydromorphology Assessment) has been presented. Managing the flow and sediment processes to be resilient to climate change and in the most sustainable way has been the principal aim.
Impacts on GWDTE and existing groundwater abstractions	n/a

Summary of Feedback	Response
We note that NVC survey has been carried out and that wetlands, including Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE), have been identified. Please refer to our detailed requirements in Appendix 1 relating to GWDTE. For further information on assessments please refer to LUPS- GU31, in particular sections 2.10 to 2.14.	NVC mapping is provided in Volume 3, Figure 11.4b Terrestrial Habitats (National Vegetation Classification) and potential GWDTE have been identified based on SEPA Guidance and from field survey observation in Volume 4, Appendix 11.4: Designated Sites and Terrestrial Habitat Report. These are discussed in Chapter 12: Geology, Soils and Groundwater, with low groundwater dependency, based on site characteristics.
Based on the information provided at this stage it seems unlikely that any development will take place within 250 m of a groundwater dependent private water supplies; if this is the case it would be helpful if the EIA Report provides evidence to confirm this.	The only private water supply (PWS) in the Study Area is for High Glen Croe property, which is confirmed by landowner as a stream-fed supply. This PWS is detailed in Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment.
Impacts on peat	n/a
In this case, where parts of the site are identified as being on peat, we agree with the scoping report and expect the application to be supported by a comprehensive site-specific Peat Management Plan. Further information on our requirements is set out in Appendix 1.	Comments addressed below, refer to comments against Appendix 1.3 - Disturbance and re-use of excavated peat and other carbon rich soils.' Site specific information relating to peat is included in Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan.
Flood risk	n/a
We note that a detailed flood risk assessment will be undertaken. In relation to the assessment of flood risk, we reiterate our previous advice. If culverts are to be installed beneath the road shelter, then the correct design approach must be undertaken in line with DMRB standards (as was explained to SEPA in a meeting held on 3 May 2023 between SEPA and Atkins-WSP Joint Venture). It was also confirmed that 200-yr + CC design flows would be used, which we are satisfied with. For completeness, we advise that it would be the rainfall uplifts that are most appropriate to add to their fluvial flows give how small the catchments/ watercourses are on the mountain side. The latest rainfall climate change uplift for Argyll & Bute is 46%.	The design standard for culverts, the acceptance of the 200+CC design flows and the use of the rainfall uplifts (46% for Argyll and Bute) for climate change have been noted and applied within Volume 4, Appendix 19.6 Flood Risk Assessment, summarised in Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment.
2. Regulatory advice for the applicant	n/a

Summary of Feedback	Response
Details of regulatory requirements and good practice advice, for example in relation to private drainage, can be found on the regulations section of our website. We would direct the applicant to our water and waste permitting teams (water.permitting@sepa.org.uk and waste.permitting@sepa.org.uk) for further discussion on regulatory matters.	Initial engagement has occurred with SEPA Regulatory personnel in order to establish requirements and appropriate level of detail expected for items such as CAR Licences and water quality treatment on drainage networks (taking account of betterment over the existing A83 and challenging topographical conditions). Such dialogue shall continue as the process progresses in order to seek to streamline inputs and reduce regulatory timeframes for the benefit of all parties.
Appendix 1: Detailed scoping requirements	n/a
This appendix sets out our minimum information requirements and we would welcome receipt and discussion around these prior to formal submission to avoid delays. There may be opportunities to scope out some of the issues below depending on the site. Evidence must be provided in the submission to support why an issue is not relevant for this site to avoid delay and potential objection. If there is a significant length of time between scoping and application submission the developer should check whether our advice has changed.	Noted.
3. Site layout	n/a
All maps must be based on an adequate scale with which to assess the information. This could range from OS 1: 10,000 to a more detailed scale in more sensitive locations. Each of the maps below must detail all proposed upgraded, temporary and permanent infrastructure. This includes all tracks, excavations, buildings, borrow pits, pipelines, cabling, site compounds, laydown areas, storage areas and any other built elements. Existing built infrastructure must be re-used or upgraded where possible. The layout should be designed to minimise the extent of new works on previously undisturbed ground.	Noted, figures and drawings relating to the Proposed Scheme design and associated environmental information / data can be found in Volume 3: Figures, of this EIA Report. Every effort has been made in the development of the Proposed Scheme design to minimise the extent of new works on previously undisturbed land, information on the development of the Proposed Scheme design can be found in Chapter 4: The Proposed Scheme.
4. Engineering activities which may have adverse effects on the water environment	n/a

Summary of Feedback	Response
The site layout should be designed to minimise watercourse crossings and avoid other direct impacts on water features. The submission must include a map showing: a) All proposed temporary or permanent infrastructure overlain with all lochs and watercourses. b) A minimum buffer of 50m around each loch or watercourse. If this minimum buffer cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of the location, dimensions of the loch or watercourse and drawings of what is proposed in terms of engineering works. Measures should be put in place to protect any downstream sensitive receptors.	Watercourse crossings exist along both the A83 and Old Military Road corridors. No new crossings are proposed, including for the Croe Water. Locations of watercourses, with identification codes, are shown on Volume 3, Figure 19.2: Water Feature References and on Volume 3, Figure 19.3: The Proposed Scheme and Watercourses. The Proposed Scheme involves upgrading existing crossings where applicable to meet DMRB requirements and to address requirements of the Debris Flow Shelter structure. The Old Military Road crossings shall be upgraded where there is an established requirement, such as increased resilience to flooding, whilst aiming to provide a proportionate approach for this temporary solution. Details of each watercourse crossing's current condition and proposed structure are included in Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment and Volume 4, Appendix 19.4 Hydromorphology Assessment. Formal drainage outfalls for the highway network have been identified in Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, with assessment details in relation to routine runoff and accidental spillage provided in Volume 4, Appendix 19.5 Water Quality Assessment. Mitigation measures are detailed in Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment and Volume 4, Appendices 19.4 Hydromorphology Assessment and 19.5 Water Quality Assessment.
Further advice and our best practice guidance are available within the water engineering section of our website. Guidance on the design of water crossings can be found in our Construction of River Crossings Good Practice Guide.	Noted. SEPA, CIRIA, DMRB and other good practice publications for water engineering have been reviewed and applied in the design process for the Proposed Scheme.
1.14 Refer to our Flood Risk Standing Advice for advice on flood risk. Crossings must be designed to accommodate the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability flows (with an appropriate allowance for climate change), or information provided to justify smaller structures. If it is considered the development could result in an increased risk of flooding to a nearby receptor then a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must be submitted. Our Technical flood risk guidance for stakeholders outlines the information we require to be submitted in an FRA. Please also refer to Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) Flood Risk Standing Advice for Engineering, Discharge and Impoundment Activities.	Crossings are designed to the 0.5%AEP+allowance for CC. If any structures will not meet this requirement justification will be provided. Volume 4, Appendix 19.6 Flood Risk Assessment references SEPA's Technical flood risk guidance for stakeholders doc. The CAR process will be followed as appropriate.

Summary of Feedback	Response
5. Disturbance and re-use of excavated peat and other carbon rich soils	n/a
Where proposals are on peatland or carbon rich soils the following should be submitted to address the requirements of NPF4 Policy 5: a) layout plans showing all permanent and temporary infrastructure, with extent of excavation required, which clearly demonstrates how the mitigation hierarchy outlined in NPF4 has been applied. These plans should be overlaid on: i. peat depth survey (showing peat probe locations, colour coded using distinct colours for each depth category and annotated at a usable scale) ii. peat depth survey showing interpolated peat depths iii. peatland condition mapping iv. National Vegetation Classification survey (NVC) habitat mapping. b) an outline Peat Management Plan (PMP). c) an outline Habitat Management Plan (HMP) Detailed advice a) Development design in line with the mitigation hierarchy	Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan outlines how the Proposed Scheme aligns with the NPF4 Policy 5. Detailed Ground Investigation (GI) is yet to commence on the LTS and as such, detailed GI information is yet to be obtained for the Proposed Scheme but we have based our assessment on available information from available data sets and emerging GI findings where available. Peat probing was undertaken in June 2024 south of Loch Restil for an area marked for a discontinued swale, therefore this PMP does not present probing data. The Outline Peat Management Plan will be revised when all GI and necessary probing. It will be the responsibility of the Appointed Contractor to develop a detailed design for the Proposed Scheme and a revision to the Peat Management Plan to reflect the updated design and associated Ground Investigation information. Point (iv) is covered by the National Vegetation Classification survey (NVC) habitat mapping (Volume 3, Figure 11.4b Terrestrial Habitats (National Vegetation Classification). Point (c) is covered by Volume 4, Appendix 11.15 Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan).
In order to protect peatland and limit carbon emissions from carbon rich soils, the submission should demonstrate that proposals: • Avoid peatland in near natural condition, as this has the lowest greenhouse gas emissions of all peatland condition categories; • Minimise the total area and volume of peat disturbance. Clearly demonstrate how the infrastructure layout design has targeted areas where carbon rich soils are absent or the shallowest peat reasonably practicable. Avoid peat > 1m depth; • Minimise impact on local hydrology; and • Include adequate peat probing information to inform the site layout and demonstrate that the above has been achieved. As a minimum this should follow the requirements of the Peatland Survey – Guidance on Developments on Peatland (2017).	Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan has followed the approach for assessment as outlined in the comments from SEPA. The design of the Proposed Scheme has been developed to avoid impacts to areas of peatland where possible, such as the removal of a swale in the SSSI to avoid impacts to peat with the drainage networks in this area now outfalling to Loch Restil.

Summary of Feedback	Response
The Peatland Condition Assessment photographic guide lists the criteria for each condition category and illustrates how to identify each condition category. This should be used to identify peatland in near natural condition and can be helpful in identifying areas where peatland restoration could be carried out.	Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan Sections 4.6 and 4.8 outline a peat condition assessment which has been based upon historical data available online and, where available (such as along the line of the OMR improvements), emerging GI information. The Appointed Contractor's Peat Management Plan will include further GI and peat probing data to show condition.
In line with the requirements of Policy 5d of NPF4, the development proposal should include plans to restore and/or enhance the site into a functioning peatland system capable of achieving carbon sequestration. b) The outline PMP should also include: • Information on peatland condition. • Information demonstrating avoidance and minimisation of peat disturbance. • Excavation volumes of acrotelmic, catotelmic and amorphous peat. These should include a contingency factor to consider variables such as bulking and uncertainties in the estimation of peat volumes. • Proposals for temporary storage and handling. • Reuse volumes in different elements of site reinstatement and restoration.	See the above comments on NPF4 Policy 5 and peat condition. Excavation volumes are included in Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan, Section 4.8. Proposals for temporary storage will be outlined by the Appointed Contractor in their Materials Management Plan (MMP) as outlined in Section 4.10 of Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan). Proposals for reuse will be outlined by the Appointed Contractor in their MMP (outlined in Section 4.10 of Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan).
Handling and temporary storage of peat should be minimised. Catotelmic peat should be kept wet, covered by vegetated turves and re-used in its final location immediately after excavation. It is not suitable for use in verge reinstatement, re-profiling/ landscaping, spreading, mixing with mineral soils or use in bunds.	Text added in Section 4.10 of Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan to highlight this.
Disposal of peat is not acceptable. It should be clearly demonstrated that all peat disturbed by the development can be used in site reinstatement (making good areas which have been disturbed by the development) or peatland restoration (using disturbed peat for habitat restoration or improvement works in areas not directly impacted by the development, which may need to include locations outwith the development boundary).	Text added in Section 4.10 of Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan to reflect this point.

Summary of Feedback	Response
The faces of cut batters, especially in peat over 1m, should be sealed to reduce water loss of the surrounding peat habitats, which will lead to indirect loss of habitat and release of greenhouse gases. This may be achieved by compression of the peat to create an impermeable subsurface barrier, or where slope angle is sufficiently low, by revegetation of the cut surface. c) The outline HMP should include: • Proposals for reuse of disturbed peat in habitat restoration, if relevant. • Details of restoration to compensate for the area of peatland habitat directly and indirectly impacted by the development. • Outline proposals for peatland enhancement in other areas of the site. • Monitoring proposals.	Text added for point c to show these points are covered by the Volume 4, Appendix 11.5 Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan.
To support the principle of peat reuse in restoration the applicant should demonstrate that they have identified locations where the addition of excavated peat will enhance the wider site into a functional peatland system capable of achieving carbon sequestration. The following information is required: • Location plan of the proposed peatland re-use restoration area(s), clearly showing the size of individual areas and the total area to be restored. • Photographs, aerial imagery, or surveys to demonstrate that the area identified is appropriate for peat re-use and can support carbon sequestration. This should include consideration of an appropriate hydrological setting and baseline peatland condition.	Text added to Section 4.11 of Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan to show these points are considered.
In addition, if any proposed re-use restoration areas are outwith the ownership of the applicant, information should be provided to demonstrate agreement in principle with the landowner, including agreed timescales for commencement of the works, and proposed management measures to ensure the restored areas can be safeguarded in perpetuity as a peatland.	Text added to Section 4.11 of Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan to outline this point.
NatureScot's technical compendium of peatland restoration techniques provides a useful overview of the procedural and technical requirements for peatland restoration.	A reference to this guidance has been added to the text in Section 4.11 of Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan.
6. Disruption to GWDTE and existing groundwater abstractions	n/a

Summary of Feedback	Response
Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE) are protected under the Water Framework Directive. Excavations and other construction works can disrupt groundwater flow and impact on GWDTE and existing groundwater abstractions. The layout and design of the development must avoid impacts on such areas. A National Vegetation Classification survey which includes the following information should be submitted: a) A map demonstrating all GWDTE and existing groundwater abstractions are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m and proposed groundwater abstractions. The survey needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it. b) If the minimum buffers cannot be achieved, a detailed site specific qualitative and/or quantitative risk assessment will be required. Please refer to Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstractions and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems for further advice and the minimum information we require to be submitted.	NVC mapping is provided in Volume 3, Figure 11.4b Terrestrial Habitats (National Vegetation Classification) and methodology is provided in Volume 4, Appendix 11.4: Designated Sites and Terrestrial Habitat Report. Potential GWDTE have been identified based on SEPA Guidance and from field survey observation, discussed and assessed in Chapter 12 Geology, Soils and Groundwater, with low groundwater dependency based on site characteristics. The assessment has also taken account of proposed activities (including excavation depths) and existing barriers to groundwater flow in the Study Area. Volume 3, Figure 12.7 Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems provides selected GWDTE information. There are no groundwater abstractions in the Study Area, with the High Glen Croe property's private water supply confirmed as a surface water source.
7. Borrow pits	n/a
If borrow pits are required, the following information should also be submitted for each borrow pit: a) A map showing the location, size, depths and dimensions. b) A map showing any stocks of rock, overburden, soils and temporary and permanent infrastructure including tracks, buildings, oil storage, pipes and drainage, overlain with all lochs and watercourses to a distance of 250m. You need to demonstrate that a site specific proportionate buffer can be achieved. On this map, a site-specific buffer must be drawn around each loch or watercourse proportionate to the depth of excavations and at least 10m from access tracks. c) Sections and plans detailing how restoration will be progressed including the phasing, profiles, depths and types of material to be used.	Noted. No borrow pits planned, excavation of the Debris Flow Shelter (DFS) will generate material and require management.
8. Pollution prevention and environmental management	n/a

Summary of Feedback	Response
A schedule of mitigation supported by the above site specific maps and plans must be submitted. These must include reference to best practice pollution prevention and construction techniques (for example, limiting the maximum area to be stripped of soils at any one time) and regulatory requirements. They should set out the daily responsibilities of Ecological Clerk of Works, how site inspections will be recorded and acted upon and proposals for a planning monitoring enforcement officer. Please refer to the Guidance for Pollution Prevention (GPPs) and our water run-off from construction sites webpage for more information.	Chapter 21 Schedule of Mitigation sets out the mitigation commitments in relation to the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme. The assessments presented in the EIA Report (Chapters 7 – 19) are supported by figures (Volume 3) and technical assessments (Volume 4). The daily responsibilities of any Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW), and other members of the Contractors Site Staff will be detailed within the Contractor's Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
9. Waste	n/a
The submission needs to state that there will be no discarding of materials that are likely to be classified as waste as any such proposals would be unacceptable under waste management licensing. Further guidance on this may be found in the document Is it waste - Understanding the definition of waste,	Noted. Waste management will adhere to the Waste Hierarchy and legal requirements. This has been committed to through mitigation measures set out in Chapter 13 Material Assets and Waste.

Table A6-1.2 Summary of Environment Consultee Feedback – Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

Summary of Feedback	Response
Land Requirements	n/a
For clarity, we recommend that the Scoping report clarifies whether the EIA will consider the land requirements for delivering any off-site biodiversity enhancement measures and if not, how this will be addressed.	The locations for biodiversity enhancement measures are included as part of the Proposed Scheme and as such have been assessed within the EIA. Specific details on the sites are detailed in Chapter 4 The Proposed Scheme and Volume 4, Appendix 4.1 Biodiversity Net Gain / Natural Capital Assessment.
Legislative and Planning Context	n/a
Although highlighted elsewhere in the Scoping report, we recommend that the requirements of NPF4 Policy 3: Biodiversity are specifically highlighted in this section. Policy 3 has a critical role in ensuring that developments secure positive effects for biodiversity.	The requirements of NPF4 Policy 3 are outlined in Chapter 11 Biodiversity and Volume 4, Appendix 11.2 Biodiversity Legislation, Policy and Guidance. Specific details on securing positive effects for biodiversity are set out in Volume 4, Appendix 4.1 Biodiversity Net Gain / Natural Capital Assessment.
Air Quality	n/a
We welcome the decision to scope in the assessment of potential impacts on the notified interests of Beinn an Lochain SSSI from dust and vehicle emissions during construction.	Noted, further information on the assessment of impacts to the Beinn an Lochain SSSI can be found in Chapter 7 Air Quality and Chapter 11 Biodiversity.

Summary of Feedback	Response
Landscape	n/a
We support the approach outlined in this chapter including the commitment to undertake a revised ZTV to inform the assessment and selection of viewpoints. We also welcome the identification of the need to specifically assess the impact of introducing lighting to a previously unlit area as result of the lighting of the flow shelter.	Volume 3, Figure 10.2 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) has been prepared to inform the Proposed Scheme design and assessment. The introduction of lighting has been addressed in Chapter 10 Visual Effects. Where lighting might impact on the Special Qualities of the LLTNP, this is included in Chapter 9 Landscape, Table 9.1.
Visual Effects	n/a
As with the Landscape chapter, we support the approach outlined in this chapter including the commitment to undertake a revised ZTV to inform the assessment and selection of viewpoints. We also welcome the identification of the need to specifically assess the impact of introducing lighting to a previously unlit area as result of the lighting of the flow shelter.	Volume 3, Figure 10.2 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) has been prepared to inform the Proposed Scheme design and assessment. Where the introduction of lighting may impact on visual receptors is addressed in Chapter 10 Visual Effects, Table 10-1.
Biodiversity	n/a
We support the approach outlined in this chapter including the likely sensitive receptors and potential effects identified as well as the proposed assessment methodology and approach to mitigation. We are content with the decision for beaver, great crested newt, Scottish wildcat and water vole to be scoped out of the assessment but for this decision to be kept under review if any signs of these species are identified during other survey work.	Noted, following the Scoping Report the EIA Report provides a summary of baseline conditions and details surrounding the scoped out species are outlined in Chapter 11: Biodiversity.
Geology, Soils and Groundwater	n/a
The assessment methodology for peat should also address the NatureScot guidance on Advising on peatland, carbon rich soils and priority peatland habitats in development management (https://www.nature.scot/doc/advising-peatland-carbon-rich-soils-and-priority-peatland-habitats-development-management) as well as the guidance identified in the Scoping report. In particular, the recommendation that restoration to achieve offsetting (i.e. compensation rather than biodiversity enhancement) would be in the order of 1:10 (lost:restored), i.e. 1ha loss of peatland should result in measures to restore 10ha of peatland and that to achieve enhancement, an additional 10% of the baseline assessment of the extent of priority peatland habitat would be required.	Volume 4, Appendix 12.6 Outline Peat Management Plan has been developed to reflected the noted Guidance and recommendations made by Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Authority.
Material Assets and waste	n/a

Summary of Feedback	Response
In addition to the approach outlined in this chapter, we recommend that opportunities for the re-use of excavated rock from the project for other consented projects in the area are explored. This would reduce the need for new or expanded borrow pits elsewhere within/adjacent to the National Park along with the associated landscape and biodiversity impacts.	The reuse of excavated arisings are considered in Chapter 13 Material Assets and Waste. No borrow pits are required, as excavation of the Debris Flow Shelter (DFS) will generate material.
Road Drainage and the Water Environment	n/a
This chapter of the Scoping report highlights that it may not be possible to mitigate all potential the impacts on the water environment locally. As a result, opportunities for off-site enhancement of the Croe and Kinglas waterbodies are to be explored. We recommend that opportunities to improve the current classification of these watercourses and other enhancements are explored with SEPA and other relevant stakeholders such as the Argyll Fisheries Trust and Loch Lomond Fisheries Trust.	Opportunities for off-site enhancement within the wider catchment of the Croe Water on FLS sites have been sought (Residual Effects, Chapter 19: Road Drainage and the Water Environment) parallel to opportunities for BNG. Consultation was also carried out with SEPA and Argyll Fisheries Trust; though not with Loch Lomond Fisheries Trust due to the distance from the Proposed Scheme.
Appendix A. Natural Capital and Biodiversity Net Gain	n/a
We welcome the confirmation that the EIA will be informed by a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment and a Natural Capital assessment.	Noted, detail in relation to this is presented in Volume 4, Appendix 4.1 Biodiversity Net Gain / Natural Capital Assessment.
As a Scottish Biodiversity metric is still under developed, we support the decision to use the Defra Biodiversity metric in the meantime. However, based on recent challenges with the application of the Defra metric to other development proposal within the National Park, we recommend that a sense-check of the results is undertaken to ensure that they reflect the local context. This sense-check should take into account of the findings of the recent Scottish Government report: Measuring biodiversity: researches into approaches (https://www.gov.scot/publications/research-approaches-measuring-biodiversity-scotland/documents/). The EIA should follow the approach detailed in the Scottish Government Biodiversity: draft planning guidance (https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-government-draft-planning-guidance-biodiversity/) and demonstrate how criteria i to v detailed in NPF4 Policy 3 will be met by the enhancement scheme. We recommend that the enhancement scheme should contribute towards the objectives of the National Park Authority Future Nature Route Map (https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Future-Nature-route-map-final.pdf), particularly improving the condition and extent of the three key habitat networks within the National Park - woodland, peatland and water. We are keen to continue to work in partnership with you and others to identify appropriate enhancement opportunities that can be delivered by the project.	We have reviewed the LLTNP Future Nature Routemap as part of the scoping process for enhancement opportunities, as well as other relevant plans such as the National Park Partnership Plan and Trees and Woodland Strategy. The priorities of such plans will be considered in the development of the enhancement sites which are considerations detailed in Chapter 4: The Proposed Scheme and Volume 4, Appendix 4.1 Biodiversity Net Gain / Natural Capital Assessment. We are aware of the recent Scottish Government report 'Measuring biodiversity: research into approaches' and have taken this into consideration. Our team are experienced in applying the Defra metric in a Scottish context and will be taking into account local considerations and its applicability in a Scottish context in its use. Our reporting includes details of any adaptations made to the Metric and/or highlight where Scottish considerations come into play. Volume 4, Appendix 4.1 Biodiversity Net Gain / Natural Capital Assessment provides more detail on the reasoning behind the methodology used in the study.

Summary of Feedback	Response
Overall, we are generally content with the approach outlined the draft Scoping report and we hope that you find the above comments helpful in refining your approach.	Noted

Table A6-1.3 Summary of Environment Consultee Feedback – Nature Scot

Summary of Feedback	Response
NatureScot do not intent to provide any additional comments to those provided previously.	A presentation outlining the Biodiversity Stage 3 EIA Scope was provided on the 29 September 2023 to Nature Scot, followed by the submission of the EIA Scoping report. NatureScot advised verbally during this presentation, that notable bryophytes were located within the water catchment of the area, and may be found on the upper wooded sections of Croe Water. This information was factored into the assessment. Further engagement was completed on the 27 August 2024, to outline the scope completed for all ecology surveys, with a focus on bryophytes and bats. Nature Scot also suggested mitigation that could be explored for the SSSI. Noted, no reference to any specific section of the EIA Report required.

Table A6-1.4 Summary of Environment Consultee Feedback – Historic Environment Scotland

Summary of Feedback	Response
Thank you for sending on the draft EIA Scoping report for our consideration. We note the methodology and scope of the assessment for cultural heritage as set out in Chapter 6 of the scoping report and we can confirm that we are content to agree with the approach to be taken. We also welcome the recognition within the report (Appendix.4) of the relationship between the Biodiversity Net Gain and Natural Capital Assessments and the need to consider the historic environment in areas such as cultural service provision or offset interactions.	Noted, no reference to any specific section of the EIA Report required.

Table A6-1.5 Summary of Environment Consultee Feedback – Scottish Forestry

Summary of Feedback	Response
Thank you for forwarding on the EIA scoping report. The chosen route will have a fairly limited impact on woodland, however, it is important that potential woodland removal and impact on all types of woodland are clearly indicted within the document.	Noted.
Scottish Forestry (SF) would advise that the UK Forestry Standard -4th Edition – 2017 (UKFS, https://forestry.gov.scot/sustainable-forestry/ukfs-scotland) would apply to any operations relating to woodland management. A new (5th) edition of the UK Forestry Standard (UKFS, https://forestry.gov.scot/publications/1522-the-uk-forestry-standard-the-governments-approach-to-sustainable-forestry-5th-edition/viewdocument/1522), has now been published and it will be applied after 1st October 2024.	The UK Forestry Standard 4th Edition and The UK Forestry Standard 5th Edition has been referred to in Chapter 9: Landscape and Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Landscape Legislation, Policy and Guidance.
We also advise that the Scottish Governments Control of Woodland Policy 2009 (CoWRP, https://forestry.gov.scot/support-regulations/control-of-woodland-removal) applies.	The Control of Woodland Policy 2009 has been referred to in Chapter 9: Landscape and Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Landscape Legislation, Policy and Guidance.
We note that neither of these documents are referred to within the EIA Scoping response and we would expect to see them listed with the other relevant documents perhaps in section 4.5.	Noted, as referenced above these documents have now been included within the relevant sections of the EIA Report.
I look forward to seeing the potential BNG projects and particularly those relating to increasing native broadleaf cover and riparian woodland improvements, which have been mentioned previously at ESG meetings.	Noted, detail in relation to this is presented in Volume 4, Appendix 4.1 Biodiversity Net Gain / Natural Capital Assessment.
I mentioned ACT (https://www.act-now.org.uk/) at a previous meeting when we were discussing BNG and compensatory planting. I believe they also worked with the 3 villages community regarding the area of land you highlighted in Arrochar at the very end of the loch near Succoth.	Following review of locations for providing biodiversity enhancements, this was not taken forward. Four locations were selected due to the close proximity to the Proposed Scheme.

Table A6-1.6 Summary of Consultee Feedback – Argyll & Bute Council

Summary of Feedback	Response
Argyll and Bute Council will not be providing comments at this stage of the process, as we work closely with the LL&TNP we would concur with comments made by them.	Noted, no reference to any specific section of the EIA Report required.