

Scone & District Community Council – Minutes of the Meeting 19th May 2016

| Points Raised by the Community Council | Responses from A & J Stephen Ltd | Corrections required by A & J Stephen Ltd (AJS) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1) The CC expressed disappointment at short notice of 7 days given to the community regarding the second public event, it might have been better public relations to have given longer notice.</p> <p>The CC requested if A & J Stephen would consider a further public event giving more information</p> | <p>Agreed, could have given a longer time scale but this was the statutory length of time required, nothing sinister.</p> <p>This was refused as opinion was that they had already complied with all that was required. The offer was made to the CC that assistance would be provided to the committee if they had any queries regarding the reports that are produced.</p> | <p>*Please note that we would like the following corrections/additions made to your text*</p> <p><u>Add</u> PKC confirmed that the nature of the consultation proposed by AJS was acceptable and recommended a follow-up event if the first was well attended. It was however always AJS' intention to hold two events, in common with other AJS public pre-application consultations in Perth & Kinross.</p> |
| <p>2) Why was the meeting and correspondence with the CC not mentioned on the boards at the public event? The CC is a statutory consultee and A & J should recognise that SDCC would be the conduit by which they would communicate with the community in future. The CC also stated that they would be facilitating the understanding of the community in respect of planning and procedure involved.</p> | <p>This was not considered, not even thought about.</p> | <p><u>Add</u> It was noted by AJS that if they had mentioned the meeting and correspondence with SDCC, this may have caused problems for the SDCC with the introduction of the alternative west entrance at the second public meeting. The public event is designed to reach further than Community Council Members and AJS welcome comments from both the SDCC and other third parties with an interest in the proposal.</p> |
| <p>3) Information given on boards not concise with not enough detail for a proper consultative response, a few changes after 6 months, 1) school position, 2) housing moved, 3) access road amended, with the last board about the "village green entrance" perhaps designed to show the development in a good light.</p> | <p>This shows a misunderstanding of the term consultation, the main purpose of the event was to inform the community, technical detail to follow at planning stage when there will be the opportunity to comment on more details. The purpose of the consultation is to influence our thinking on the development. A solution for the access corner at Stormont Road would be part of a separate planning application</p> | |
| <p>4) We have concerns about the drainage effect on the rest of the village. No information given regarding levels of terrain, no cross section through the site, no information on drainage. What effect on the Barrel Drain? More information might help community to gain</p> | <p>The public community does not require this level of technical detail at this stage. Geology reports are being prepared for site which consists of boulder clay and scree sandstone forming an aquifer. The drainage is going west through a new 4.5 metre deep sewer, will not</p> | <p><u>Correction Required</u> The surface water drainage associated with all developed areas is being discharged to the west and the Cramock Burn and will not affect the Barrel Drain. A very small section of the sewer will be installed at a depth of 4.5m.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>confidence in the project</p> <p>5) The village green access entrance on Stormont Road is taking more of the Green Belt. Concerns were with housing on opposite side of road, will this lead to more extensive development. With only one exit initially, what is the ratio of houses and traffic? There is no information regarding the western end of the development.</p> | <p>affect Barrel Drain. This would be part of a separate planning application and does not mean adding more houses just repositioning.</p> <p>PKC will only allow so many houses per exit, a traffic impact assessment is being prepared by an independent consultant.</p> | |
| <p>6) Does the design of the CTRLR take into account the huge difference in topographical levels?</p> | <p>Housing design will be adjusted according to the route of the CTRLR. Build rate would be approx. 20 houses per annum but if the economic climate permitted, build rate would increase.</p> | |
| <p>7) What is happening regarding information about pollution and air quality? More housing means more pollution.</p> <p>There should have been more information regarding impact on wildlife and the forest environment.</p> | <p>Air quality report will show the impact of air pollution from the CTRLR, the local environment and vehicles in the wider area. There is an acceptance of marginal increase in air pollution, more cars means pollution will last longer. Environmental Impact assessments have been requested and will be part of the final planning application.</p> | <p><u>Correction Required</u></p> <p>There is an acceptance by local and central government that any development may lead to a marginal increase in air pollution. The alternative is to have no development. Whilst there will be an increase in the number of cars and queue lengths at certain junctions, this may not necessarily increase the level of pollution. It may extend the period of time that pollution is present.</p> |
| <p>8) Need for more housing?</p> | <p>LDP and Scottish government outlined the need for more housing. Scone is a Tier 1 settlement as outlined in the Tayplan.</p> | |
| <p>9) What were the main concerns expressed at the second consultation?</p> | <p>Transport/traffic, flooding and drainage and education facility.</p> | |
| <p>10) What is the possible timescale of the planning procedure?</p> | <p>3-6 months but might be longer. The planning application would be recommended for acceptance by the Head of Development planning, could be refused by Development Control Committee but granted on appeal by the Scottish Government with PKC liable for costs.</p> | <p><u>Correction Required</u></p> <p>The planning application is likely to be recommended for approval because it is supported by the adopted local development plan. There is an acceptance by the head of development planning that the application could be refused by the Development Control Committee but granted on appeal by the Scottish Government with PKC liable for costs, as happened recently at Almond Valley.</p> |

