

**Delayed Office Opening  
for Employee Training**

*This office will be closed from  
8.45am - 11.00am on the first  
Thursday of each month.*

Hazel MacKinnon  
20 Spoutwells Road  
Scone, Perthshire.  
PH2 6RW

**The Environment Service**  
*Nick Brian: Interim Head of Planning*

Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street, PERTH PH1 5GD  
Tel 01738 475000

Contact Beatrice Nichol  
Direct Dial (01738) 4775287  
Email:  
[www.pkc.gov.uk](http://www.pkc.gov.uk)  
Ref: 707355

Date 18 September 2016

Dear Ms MacKinnon

I am writing in response to your letter regarding the recent village survey undertaken by Scone & District Community Council. We welcome the fact that your **MAIN** concern is with the **TIMING** of the development in relation to the CTLR, rather than the development itself. Nonetheless, this is not entirely reflected in some of the statements that you have made regarding the proposal. Whilst the Council acknowledge the value of community surveys as a mechanism to gain valuable local information, the form that they take and the questions that are posed can determine the statistical outcomes that are presented. In this case, it is unclear as to the actual number of responses that the questionnaire received and where those that did respond lived.

It is also important to stress that it would be inappropriate for the Council to undertake a questionnaire on the principle of Scone North housing site. This is an allocated site within the Local Development Plan; it has already been subject to the full consultation process and scrutiny through the Local Development Plan Examination. An independent Reporter, appointed by the Scottish Ministers, considered the representation from the Community Council and residents opposing the Scone North allocation. The reporter also considered representation opposing the Council's embargo on development until such time as the CTLR was a committed project. The Reporter's recommendations were:

**"31. The purpose of the CTLR is to address problems of traffic congestion and associated air quality problems within Perth. Its stated purpose is not to improve traffic levels in Scone or to discourage large goods vehicles from travelling through that settlement.**

**32. It has been concluded under Issue 25b that an initial phase of 100 houses could take place on site H29 in Scone in advance of the CTLR due to the relatively good public transport availability and the need for Scone to develop, given its status as a principal settlement in TAYplan." (page 439 of the LDP Examination Report)**

The adoption of the LDP was approved unanimously by full Council in 2014. The principle of this development is therefore not under question and the current public consultation by the developer is about the detailed design of the proposal. The developer has every legal right to now seek permission to develop this site and has undertaken the PAN consultation events that are required for this size of development.

### **Question 1 & 2:**

The Scone North Housing Allocation will be developed in tandem with the construction of the Cross Tay Link Road. The building rate on this site is likely to be far slower than appears to be envisaged. It is unlikely that the first 100 units will be built by the time the CTRLR is completed. As such, it will not contribute significantly to pollution levels at Bridgend. The quote from a previous Council letter was part of a response to the enquiry that was made regarding the number of deaths that pollution could contribute to. The full response continued on to state:

“The issue of whether death is caused by fine particulate air pollution in Perth and Kinross is discussed in the Public Health England’s report ‘Estimating local mortality burdens associated with particulate air pollution’. The briefing note on this report, issued by Health Protection Scotland, describes the rationale behind the metrics used to calculate the burden of mortality associated with PM 2.5 particulates and accepts that **“Air pollution is likely to contribute a small amount to the deaths of a larger number of exposed individuals, rather than being solely responsible for the number of deaths equivalent to the calculated figure of attributable deaths”**. This report contains a number of reminders of the need to recognise the extent of the uncertainty in the estimated morbidity statistics.

It should be noted that the statistics on pollution related deaths related to PM 2.5. The predominant source of PM 2.5 is from transitional pollution, not the air quality of local traffic in Bridgend. Due to the complex nature of these studies, it would be beneficial for further advice and information to be sourced through the Health Protection team at NHS Tayside to gain an overview of health protection concerns in relation to air quality issues.”

As stated in the original letter, due to the complex nature of these studies, it would be beneficial for further advice and information to be sourced through the Health Protection team at NHS Tayside to gain an overview of health protection concerns in relation to air quality issues.

As stated in the previous letter, the Council are committed to reducing air pollution within Perth and are running a considerable number of initiatives with this aim in mind. It is therefore incorrect to suggest that the Council are intending to increase pollution at Bridgend. These initiatives, combined with the Cross Tay Link Road, aim to reduce pollution within Perth. “Cleaner Air for Scotland” was published in November 2015 by the Scottish Government and it is likely that the Placemaking aims of this document will assist in developing further initiatives through the Local Development Plan in terms of air quality.

### **Question 3:**

The questionnaire provided in 2007 was part of an earlier Local Plan process which was then superseded by the planning modernization process. This required Local

Authorities to produce a Local Development Plan for the Council area that responded to the Strategic Development Plan (TAYplan) policies and strategies. The questionnaire was not part of a statutory process. The statutory consultation undertaken for the Local Development Plan (which was eventually adopted in 2014) was undertaken twice and received limited response from the local community. Nonetheless, the Council acknowledges that there was opposition to the site but it was less than had been in 2007. The Local Development Plan was then taken to the Scottish Government Examination process before being adopted unanimously by the full Council. This unanimous vote included the Scone North site with the changes determined by the Scottish Government Reporter.

The Council stands by the statement that “opposition appeared to have reduced”. When the Proposed Plan was published, it was advertised as required by statute. We neighbour notified all residents; we held 2 public drop-in sessions in the Perth Area attended by? It is fair to say that the two sites which attracted the two most interest included Scone North. Officers attending the drop-in event discussed the Scone North site with a range of individuals, many of which were opposed to the proposal. There were, however, also supporters of further housing development at this location. The proposal also attracted considerable press coverage. Taking all this into account, the number of representations against this proposal was significantly less that might have been expected from past experience.

**Question 4:**

There appears to still be confusion over the terms “Greenfield” and “Brownfield”. Greenfield is land that has never been developed upon, brownfield land is land which has had previous development on it. The site has never been defined as brownfield, it is defined as a housing development site. The report that you reference was a Landscape Capacity Study undertaken by SNH. This is a report that assists in identifying areas for development. It is combined with a wide range of other background reports that feed into the decisions regarding site allocations in the Local Development Plan.

The surrounding woodland is primarily commercial forestry but some of it is designated as ancient woodland. Ancient woodland is not necessarily referring to the existing trees but to the continuance of woodland in the area since 1750 when the first maps to cover the whole country were produced. There is no evidence of the woodland being the original Caledonian Forest; the origins of this term come from the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD Roman historian, Pliny the Elder, and there is no locational information as to the extent of the forest other than that it was north of the Clyde and west of the Tay.

The developer will be required to identify and protect the existing trees within the site wherever is practically possible. Initial pre-application discussions indicate that it is the developer’s intention to retain the majority of the mature trees within the site and enhance access to the surrounding woodland. There will be some loss of trees for access reasons but these will be mitigated with replanting. Any works such as this will be highlighted through the Environmental Impact Assessment that the developer is required to undertake as part of the planning application. The Council are happy to receive any further information that the local community have regarding the site if it is appropriate to the planning application.

**Question 5:**

The CTRL is a committed project and is timetabled to begin in 2019-20. The planning application for this site has not yet been submitted and it has not received planning permission. It is therefore very unlikely, that any building will be programmed to take place until later in 2017. The first one hundred units allowed before the CTRL is in place are unlikely to have been completed by the time of the CTRL's completion.

There appears to be some confusion over the cost and funding of the CTRL. We would emphasise that at this stage in the design process the costings provided are estimates which include a degree of optimism bias in line with Transport Scotland guidance. The higher cost referred to of £180M related not to the CTRL but to the full Perth transport future project. This includes a range of measures including active travel, public transport, approach roads, city centre enhancements and park and ride sites. The CTRL project is in 3 phases as noted below:

- Phase 1 – A9 / A85 junction and Bertha Park link (Approximately £35M) contract let
- Phase 2 A9 to A94 including the new Tay crossing (Approximately £115M)
- Phase 3 Link through Berta Park (Cost to be determined)

The road will be funded through a mixture of prudential borrowing by the Council and forms one of the projects being promoted through the City Deal bid which is being taken forward. The Council has adopted supplementary Guidance in relation to developer contributions which applies to new developments within the approximate Perth and Perth part of the Dundee Housing Market Area. When developing the contributions guidance it was identified that 61% of future traffic growth is associated with new development, as such new developments are required to contribute towards 61% of the total estimated costs of the CTRL. The Guidance can be found here [www.pkc.gov.uk/developercontributions](http://www.pkc.gov.uk/developercontributions)

All developments within the area as outlined under appendix 3 of the Developer Contributions Guidance will contribute, this includes all residential developments and other non-residential developments based on the increase in floor area. The Guidance provides exceptions such as new employment uses and proposals within the Perth City Centre will have the contribution requirement considered on an individual basis. Paragraphs 6.16 and 6.17 of the Guidance set out the contribution levels required from new developments. To date over £300,000 has been received by the Council with further significant contributions committed through Section 75 Legal Agreements payable as developments proceed.

Based on a 700 unit development (As per H29) the contribution due would be approximately £2.174m. Payment of this contribution would be secured through a S.75 Legal Agreement with the payments being phased as the development is built. This would be determined through negotiation with the individual developer.

**Question 6:**

SEPA's Flood maps class groundwater flooding for the Scone area as 'low likelihood'. As stated in the previous letter we sent to you, the planning application has not yet been received and therefore, the approach taken by the developer to issues surrounding drainage has yet to be finalised. A Drainage and Flood Risk Assessment is

required for the site and initial discussions indicate that surface water drainage from the site would be attenuated in SUDS and discharged to the East of Scone (which discharges to the Cramock Burn). The discharge rate will be limited to the existing greenfield runoff rate for the site and as such will not increase flood risk. It is unlikely that any surface water drainage will be connected to the Barrel Drain. Indeed, the proposal has the potential to reduce the flows to the Barrel Burn. Foul water is a matter for Scottish Water to assess and they are fully involved in the Development Plan process. All discussions to date with Scottish Water indicate that the drainage is unlikely to be an issue; however, any detailed queries on this should be directed to them.

I hope this answers your questions and clarifies the previous information provided by the Council.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bea Nichol', with a small heart symbol above the 'i'.

Bea Nichol  
Planning Officer: Development Plans Team