

## Questions handed to Perth & Kinross Council along with Questionnaire results:

1. Councils have been shown to put development ahead of the health of the area (see BBC Scotland report <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-37213786>). Only a few houses will increase the illegal levels of NOX. Who will be liable in law for causing ill-health when increased levels can be prevented by waiting until the Bridge is built before starting the Development?
2. In the Planning Dept. letters to constituents they quote a Public Health England report "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". We assume this to mean that air pollution will contribute to deaths of already ill persons, rather than cause new deaths. We are sure the Council does not want to contribute to pollution which kills sick people? Please clarify.
3. Why did the Council via the Planning Dept. use this comparison as evidence that 'opposition had lessened' in the Village of Scone? Planning said there were 920 responses to the original questionnaire in 2007 of which 73% were opposed (wrong it was 80% with 10% don't know, 10% in favour). The Planning Dept. comments that there were 39 written objections to the Proposed Plan stage. The quote is: 'Clearly, this demonstrates that less opposition was made to the proposed plan than at the questionnaire stage. 73% of 920 is 671 negative responses. 39 negative responses at proposed plan is therefore a considerable reduction.' This statement allowed the Reporter to grant permission for the development without the CTRL. The villagers, who mistakenly thought the Council's questionnaire was the way to voice their opinions, are very concerned at this misinterpretation. Please explain why this comparison was used and its validity.
4. A 2001 joint report by SNH and PKC said further development in this area was inappropriate. In the draft LDP in 2004 this area was Greenfield, in the 2015 LDP this became brownfield. Rare fauna eg pine martins/red squirrels/bats etc and flora eg old Caledonian forest are about to be destroyed. (The same red squirrels that the Scottish Government gave a grant of £18k to Lord Mansfield). Why did the Council change its mind from 2001? Please comment on the fact that without this development the 2028 government target will be met yet the Council are allowing this development before the CTRL is built.
5. Our MAIN issue is with the Development's TIMING relating to the CTRL. Please give a detailed explanation of source of funding for the road to the Bridge from Scone, where this funding assumes Developer contribution please indicate which Developers and amount to be received from each. Please explain how a single Developer for H29 can afford to contribute what must be many millions, as we believe regulations apply that Developer money must be spent near to the development (see Lord Carloway's judgement in Aberdeen)?
6. Flooding and sewage. SEPA rates Scone as being of moderate risk of ground water flooding. The Council recommendation is that no build takes place where the risk is moderate. (Scottish Planning Policy 7: Planning and Flooding, this policy advocates that any new developments should not materially increase the probability of flooding elsewhere). Do the Council plan to change this ruling?