



Minutes of the meeting held on 19th May in RDMI at 7.30pm between the Committee and the builders, A&J Stephen regarding the public information event held on Tuesday 3rd May for the PAN H29 North Scone Housing Development.

Scone and District Community Council members were: Chair : Vanessa Shand

Treasurer : David Dykes

Secretary : Hazel Mackinnon

Planning : Donald McKerracher

Data Protection : Bill Paterson

Apologies : Clive Price

A & J Stephen were represented by : John Stephen Managing Director of builders A & J Stephen

Bruce Strachan, Director of A & J Stephen

Apologies : Ewan Maclean Emac Planning

Welcome: V. Shand

Points raised by the Community Council.

Responses from A & J Stephen (amendments in Green)

<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. AJS noted that PKC had confirmed that the presentation had complied with their basic requirements. AJS held second event as is their normal practice</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>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>AJS considered that any mention of meeting or correspondence with SDCC may have caused problem for SDCC.</p> <p>Event was to get response from all parties including SDCC</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.</p> <p>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 confidence in the project</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 designed to discharge to the west, through a new sewer 4.5 metre deep in places. As a result this will not affect the Barrel Drain.</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.</p> <p>With only one exit initially, what is the ratio of houses and traffic?</p> <p>There is no information regarding the western end of the development.</p>	<p>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 CTRL take into account the huge difference in topographical levels?</p>	<p>Housing design will be adjusted according to the route of the CTRL. 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 CTRL, the local environment and vehicles in the wider area. There is an apparent acceptance, by local and central government, that any development may lead to a marginal increase in air pollution and the only alternative is no development. An increase in vehicles means pollution levels may not necessarily increase but will last longer. Environmental Impact assessments have been requested and will be part of the final planning application.</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 is likely to be recommended for acceptance by the Head of Development planning, as it should comply with the LDP. It could be refused by Development Control Committee but granted on appeal by the Scottish Government with PKC liable for costs, as had happened recently at Almond Valley.</p>