

Representations

Representation from:-	Name		
	Address		
	Email	Phone	

Green Belt

Representation 1A Greenbelt Policy

The current LDP 1 contains definitive controls over activities, which would be permitted within the Green Belt. Recently the current policy was breached by Officials recommending approval of activities within the Greenbelt not compliant with the current Policy.

I **object** to the breach of any Policy and such a breach should not be covered up and policies fully complied with.

Representation 1B Greenbelt North Boundary

I wish to express my **support** for the actions taken to restore the Green Belt northern boundary, between the River Tay and the A94 Road, to its original line as shown in LDP 1 as it reaffirms the intention to provide long term confidence to the public.

Representation 1C Greenbelt in area for housing, additional to H29

I wish to express my **support** for the actions taken to omit the area of additional housing attached to H29, which was promoted in the MIR. The area should be omitted since it is NOT required for additional housing, breaches the Green Belt and is outside the Settlement Boundary

Representation 1D Greenbelt restoration to southwest of H29

I wish to express my concern that the area to the rear of Harper Way, Scone, has currently been removed from the Green Belt, in a clear Breach of Green Belt Policy. I strongly **object** to the revised Green Belt boundary being revised at this location, in an attempt to cover up a Policy Breach, which was promoted by Officials recommending approval for H29. The access to H29, at this point, was added to the Proposed LDP1 following the MIR stage and as such must have been deemed adequate for access at that time. During the LDP 1 process the H29 site was promoted as having a main access from the A94 and this access was provided only as an additional access. The area of this access to H29, as shown in LDP 1, would be sufficient for an access but the developer proposed to include housing on either side, presumably to maximise the site profitability. The current Green Belt Policy does not include “developer needs” as a justification for Green Belt development and the Proposed LDP 2 should **reinstate the green belt** to remove the effect of the Policy Breach.

Representation 1E Greenbelt boundary change east of A94

I wish to express my **support** for the movement of the greenbelt boundary, east of the A94, which indicates an improved settlement boundary and restricts the potential for further development in this location

Representation 2 –

Except for the proposed re-alignment of the settlement boundary, in the southwest of the H29 development, I wish to **support** the proposed settlement boundary for Scone, as shown on page 34 of Appendix G. In addition I wish to **support** the deletion of the proposed housing developments at H29 southwest and also at Picstonhill as both proposals are unnecessary, within the designated greenbelt and lie outwith the current settlement boundary.

I would however **strongly object** to the proposed re-alignment of the settlement boundary, in the southwest of the H29 development as this is only a means of covering up a deliberate breach of current LDP Policy.

Settlement Statements

Representation 3 Developer Requirements for H29 Scone

The current LDP 1 contains a requirement in respect of the recognised potential for flooding on and in the vicinity of the site, in addition to the other environmental concerns.

The proposed LDP 2 however, whilst including requirements for most other environmental concerns does not include any reference to flooding.

A masterplan for this site has been submitted however this has failed to fully address the concerns in flooding as it was based purely on a desktop study and no detailed site investigation or hydrological analysis carried out.

I wish to **object** to the amendments made to the developer requirements for the above site and request that such a developer requirement regarding flooding is re-inserted, until such time as the entire site is fully investigated, an analysis carried out and a risk assessment with satisfactory solutions provided.

Representation 4 Housing site Embargo

In recognition of the traffic and pollution problems within the Bridgend and Atholl Street area, the current LDP contains an embargo on developments at Balbeggie, Burrelton, Perth Airport and Scone.

However the proposed LDP 2 however contains proposals for other development sites along the A93 and A94 corridors, which will feed into the Bridgend area from sites at Alyth, Blairgowrie, Coupar Angus, Meigle and Glebe School Scone. These amount to a housing capacity ranging from 1,477 and 2,294.

I **object** to these sites having unrestricted development potential and request that an embargo is put into place on these settlement sites.

I note that the proposed developments at H3 Gannochy Road and MU336 at Murray Royal Hospital, include comments regarding Bridgend pollution.

I **support** the intent of these comments and trust that these will be developed into a full policy.

Cross Tay Link Road

Representation 5-

The existing LDP shows a corridor provision regarding the CTRL, however since then the actual line of the road has been defined and agreed by Council, along with the location of junction construction as part of the approved CTRL and also further design work is underway at present, with the intention that construction will take place during the period of LDP 2.

However the Proposed LDP 2 makes virtually no mention of the CTRL, does not have a separate section relating to the CTRL and indicates junctions (i.e. Highfield Junction) which do NOT form part of the approved CTRL.

I **object** to the relative omission of the CTRL from the Proposed LDP 2 and request that a section is inserted into the Plan, which contains details and also includes the correct junction information.

Representation 6

In section 6.4.6 of the Addendum to the Environmental Report it makes the comment regarding Scone that “There are no existing air quality issues in Scone and no indication that additional development will result in air quality objectives being breached although would increase traffic problems at Bridgend if developed in advance of the Cross Tay Link Road” and as a result there appears to be no plan for Air Quality Assessments (AQAs) to be carried out. The statement is misleading since it does not recognise the recent permission granted for houses before CTRLR built, the cumulative effect of multiple sites shown in the settlement documents) and the cumulative effect of other potential opportunity developments.

I **object** to the lack of concern in the Proposed LDP 2, regarding air quality and its consequent health effects. As a result I request that detailed AQA’s are deemed essential for all developments, especially in respect of cumulative effects, and an embargo is placed on further house building along the A93/A94 corridors until CTRLR built.

Policy 4 – Perth City Transport & Active Travel

Representation 7 City wide design principles

Some information given in the Interactive Storymap CANNOT be found in the information provided by the downloadable documents issued for consultation, and this creates difficulties.

However I would make a comment regarding Figure 5, in the Interactive Storymap, entitled “City wide design principles”.

I **object** most strongly to the “Cross Tay Link Road junction improvements” shown between the A93 and A94 junctions.

I **object** because No junctions are provided in this vicinity on the approved CTRLR plans, hence there is nothing to “improve” and also any access at these points would lead directly into Green belt land.

I request that these plans amended to recognise that NO accesses are shown for these locations and also to recognise that the Green Belt exists adjacent to the CTRLR at these locations, with its obvious limitations on development.

Policy 57 – Digital Connectivity

Representation 8

The Policy makes reference to the Digital Economy Act 2017 and details requirements for new developments and new digital infrastructure installations. However the Policy gives very little guidance or requirement details for upgrading of existing digital provision.

At present within Scone village download speeds of 25Mbps are normal, whereas within Scone District some locations, despite being with 4 miles of Perth Centre, are experiencing download speed levels of only 2Mbps and a similar problem is common throughout rural Perthshire.

I **object** to the casual acceptance in the policy that only new developments require consideration and request that consideration must be given to increasing the scope of Policy 57 to reflect the existing position and outline plans accordingly.