

Soldiers of Killiecrankie
C/O The Coach House
Druimuan
Killiecrankie
PH16 5LG

Colin Bell
DPEA
by email to colin.bell@gov.scot
cc:- Transport Scotland A9dualling@transport.gov.scot

DPEA refs: CPO-340-4, ROD-340-7, ROD-340-6, EPW-340-2

14th August 2019

Dear Mr Bell

OUTLINE STATEMENT

On behalf of **Soldiers of Killiecrankie (Transport Scotland Ref B214005/ELM/DJR/79/001)** in relation to **Acquisition of Land (Authorisation Procedure) (Scotland) Act 1947, Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, A9 Dualling – Killiecrankie to Glen Garry.**

I refer to your Relevant Notice of 4 July 2019.

I write to confirm that we wish to maintain our objection and intend participating in the inquiry that is to be held concerning the A9 Dualling, Killiecrankie to Glen Garry. The issues that concern Soldiers of Killiecrankie relate to the section across Killiecrankie Battlefield.

Soldiers of Killiecrankie are not opposed to the upgrading of the A9. We accept it has to follow the line of the existing A9 through the battlefield. However we continue to object to the statement that the line of the new carriageway across the battlefield, has equal impact on the battlefield, whether it is north bound or south bound carriageway.

We wish to give evidence at the inquiry.

Please find below an outline of the issues that Soldiers of Killiecrankie wish to cover. This should be read in conjunction with our previous submissions to Transport Scotland.

1. We do not accept Transport Scotland's DMRB Stage 2 Assessment that "that overall the level of impact on the battlefield would be similar whichever online option were to be taken forward."
 - We do not believe Transport Scotland properly evaluated all the mitigating factors and came to a conclusion in haste without all the relevant facts.
 - We are disappointed by how little protection the Inventory of Scottish Historic Battlefields has provided our battlefield. This is its first real

test to protect a Scottish Battlefield, we see conflicts between Inventory of Scottish Historic Battlefields legislation and the DMRB standard for designing dual carriageways. We ask the Reporter to look at how this legislation has worked and that the reporter provides recommendations for strengthening the Inventory of Scottish Historic Battlefields. The HES web site says *'What is the Inventory of Historic Battlefields? Learn about our role in designating and preserving Scotland's nationally important battlefields.'*

- In particular we question how a decision on the best route through the battlefield can be made when all the archaeological work had not been conducted. The archaeological work was concluded in the summer of 2018, the chosen route was announced to the public in March 2016.
 - We reiterate our amazement that there has been no attempt to interpret the archaeological results with regard to the story of the battle and the choice of route through the battlefield.
2. The stepped ground in front of McKays Regiment. We have read and reread Transport Scotland response to our concerns about this area of the battlefield (Item 5 of their letter to us dated 18th February 2019). We do not understand what they are saying other than to give us a spurious response which includes other topics all in the same reply. We continue to believe that the retention of this part of the battlefield is absolutely crucial for interpretation of the battlefield for current and future generations.
 3. We are pleased to see the relocating of the SuDS feature from Field F9, but do not agree that the proposed planting of woodland in this area. This woodland and all other woodland planted on the battlefield will have a detrimental effect on the topography of the battlefield now and for future generations. This is another example of conflict between the Inventory of Scottish Historic Battlefields and how one of major battlefields is protected with the DMRB standard for dual carriageways.
 4. In addition to this we will demonstrate the importance of maintaining key features of the battlefield so future generations can see first-hand key features. We have been able to demonstrate there is an appetite for this knowledge:-
 - Over the last 6 years Battle fo Killiecrankie events some 8,000 visitors have been attracted to Killiecrankie Battlefield.
 - School educational programs – we will give you examples of this and the impact on local school children's knowledge of their history.
 - We have been working with the private land owner (Urrard Estates) to make the battle field accessible in a responsible way to the public. With the success of Jacobite period dramas such as Outlander we are seeing more interest in being able to walk the battlefield.
 - Securing investment to enhance the public's knowledge and experience of walking the battlefield. We will provide examples of this and future possibilities. The Killiecrankie Battlefilid is on one of Scotland main tourist

trunk roads, the importance of preserving battlefield features for future generations, is absolutely critical.

5. We do not accept Transport Scotland's arguments for the imposition of laybys on the battlefield. The original laybys were installed some 40 years ago. We believe placing laybys on Killiecrankie battlefield are not in keeping with current battlefield preservation. This is another example of conflict between the Inventory of Scottish Historic Battlefields and how one of major battlefields is protected with the DMRB standard for dual carriageways.
6. The inadequacies of the consultation process. Transport Scotland advise us that they have complied with 'Engaging With Communities' booklet which sets out how engagement will take place. We will bring examples of how the consultation process in practice led to miss understandings in the local community and with Soldiers of Killiecrankie. We do this so the Reporter can make recommendations to the Scottish Ministers on ways to strengthen this for the future.

On behalf of Soldiers of Killiecrankie
James Rattray, Chairman
T:- 01796 473335