

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Landowners, Tenants and Residents

A summary of comments received from landowners, tenants and residents on the decision to review the route of the CTLR between the A93 and A94.

Landowner and Tenant Comments	
1	Neither route impacts me. Not my place to comment.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving the CTLR further north will make it less attractive to users from Scone. • The new route will be longer, costing more. • The Scone North development is being designed in accordance with policy and guidance to accommodate the CTLR passing through it, there is no need to move it. • Moving the CTLR further north creates the opportunity for the future expansion of Scone North (potential to infill the gap between Scone North and the CTLR). • The Community Council have had adequate time to raise the objections to the route of the CTLR currently being considered, and have not done so. A proper process has been followed by planners and engineers therefore there is no need to revisit this.
3	Do not have an objection to the northern route however would like to understand the consequential delays associated with changing to this route.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very unfortunate that this is happening so late in the process. • My client is already making plans based on the current proposed route and changes to this will be disruptive to these plans. • We hope that all the good work so far in agreeing the current proposal with the team delivering the CTLR does not go to waste. • Highly qualified staff within and out with the Council has decided that this route best serves the needs of the project so why, after so much resource and cost, is this now being called into question? • My client does not see the merits in the alternative route and, should the northern route be progressed, and his land is still required, my client will be seeking advice with the view to objecting to the CPO.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am surprised and suspicious that this is simply a delaying tactic. I cannot see that there will be major differences in air quality or road safety between either route. • I am suspicious that this alternative route creates more planning gain for landowners and developers to the north of Scone – creating more long term air quality issues. • One of the main drivers behind the CTLR is improving the environment in Perth. The longer we wait on the CTLR the worse this issue becomes. • Delaying this project will be at major cost. • Although as a landowner I am unaffected, I feel realigning the road at this stage of the consultation process will only delay a project that has unanimous agreement in its need for completion.
6	No concerns regarding the alternative realignment route to the North of Scone.

7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surprised at this being considered at such a late stage. • Preference for existing route. • Concerned about the northern route being less attractive to road users in Scone, meaning it will have less of a positive impact on traffic and air quality in Scone and Bridgend. • Concerns over the location of the A94 roundabout on the northern alignment and its proximity to the airport and the long sweeping bend there (poorer visibility). • One concern is traffic pollution however this will be addressed through the move to electric vehicles. • The northern route appears to destroy more woodland. • Moving the CTRL further north may encourage further development in the future. • Concern over the increased cost and abortive cost associated with the completed consultations and investigations. • The northern route will dissect two more of my fields.
8	Does not impact me as a landowner.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hugely in favour of CTRL and the sooner it happens the better. • Wish that the Council's decisions reflects the wishes of those most directly affected.
10	No comments on the alternative alignment but concerned about the delay as we have a number of projects that cannot commence until the CTRL is committed.

Local Resident Comments Received

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The claims regarding environmental pollution around the local area are not supported by any evidence and are simply based on subjective assertions. • The claims regarding traffic levels generated by the CTRL are not supported by the SWECO traffic growth analysis which only predicts a 20% increase through to 2035 – There is certainly not an economic justification for the £135million cost of the CTRL, however it does provide significant reduction in traffic congestion throughout central Perth area. • The growth in electric vehicles throughout this period will by definition create a significant reduction in both traffic noise and air pollution levels • The alteration in routing of the CTRL proposed by the SDCC as necessary by the H29 housing development plans is simply being pursued by some notable local residents in the North of Scone - with no basis in highways engineering and design practice – but simply to move it further from these local interests • This “back of envelope” approach by members of the SDCC was notable in that there was no consultation with those householders directly affected by such a change in routing. • The simplistic attempt to gauge public opinion, through a poll held outside local shops asking passers-by was neither representative of the local population of 4500 residents and the areas they reside in relative to the proposed developments, with the questions based on the subjective views of the pollsters. • At a meeting of the SDCC on the 25th of Feb 2019, SDCC representatives showed a distinct lack of knowledge of the detailed plans for both the H29 and CTRL proposals; making unfounded claims about traffic and pollution issues regarding the routing of the CTRL through the final stage of the H29 development. The detailed road design includes significant embankments and high fencing separating the CTRL from proposed housing along with speed restrictions along
---	--

	<p>this section approaching the A94.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence was provided in justification of these arguments • In contrast, the PKC and SWECO representatives have held a number of meetings with those homeowners and residents directly affected by the CTRLR routing as it approaches the A94 and have agreed on a series of design mitigation measures giving these householders assurances that the impact will be minimised. • In order that planning of these housing developments are based on realistic assessments of local need in the decades to come, this would be better achieved by adopting a phased approach to planning approvals with the final eastern stage of H29 not being scheduled till 2035 – 2040. • Such an approach during that interval would ensure that any development reflects economic, demographic and technology changes in the interim period. • The current Tayplan Development Strategy, based on 2014 estimates, has significantly reduced projected population levels through to 2035. The impact of Brexit will likely reduce the anticipated levels of migration, which form the basis of these population projections. • The local economy is directly influenced by the various businesses operating out of Perth Airport, these being the largest source of employment in the larger Scone area. Principal of these is the ACS Flying Training Organisation, which manages operations of the Airport and has invested significant sums in establishing a fast growing flight training organisation at the airport, for both private and commercial pilot training. • Much of this training utilises the clear areas around the airport for the practice of abnormal situations and as a result any encroachment on these areas to the east and west of the airport will increase risk to both operations and any property therein. • Such levels of increased risk will likely impact on demand for housing in these areas. • Similarly, repositioning the CTRLR in closer proximity to the airport would create an increased level of risk to traffic on that road, since it will be immediately west of the main runways. • In conclusion, the concerns raised by the SDCC are not representative of the wider community, are subjective and are not evidence based.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDCC neither consulted nor took our views into consideration when submitting its proposals • SDCC has apparently recently completed a community poll encouraging residents to consider the repositioning of the road further away from Scone, which poll allegedly received 250 (approx.) signatures. We were only made aware of this poll after the fact, which appears to have been completed over the period of the Christmas holidays, from one of the local shops. The manner in which this poll has been completed is frankly irresponsible, relying on footfall into one shop (which notably isn't even on the main street), and immediate residents who happened to see it. It also does not appear that the implications of the proposal were fully explained at the time of signing, which may be considerable, and in fact may cause even greater negative impact on Scone. • We are obviously concerned that the alternative route proposed for the road would be nearer to our property, and appear to run over a large area of woodland, which may affect popular walking and cycling routes, as well as impacting wildlife. • We are also surprised that this proposal appears to have been made without regard to the significant objections that have posed by the local Scone community to the 700 plus housing development planned at Scone North. The SDCC appears to have failed to take into consideration that this alternative proposed

	<p>routing may in fact, have the unintended consequence of create more development land for housing (as the compulsory purchase of the land over which the road would run over would potentially then make it unviable for farming, and thus vulnerable to the likelihood of being sold for housing development). We are concerned that this potential for further development may lead to further noise pollution, traffic safety issues, and additional pressure on our already strained village community and resources (e.g. school, doctors' surgery etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is also questionable if the new proposals have taken into account the positioning of Perth airport, and the safety considerations that apply regarding this. We were surprised to hear at the last SDCC meeting that the airport had not been consulted on this proposed re-routing. • Whilst we did not support the original CTRLR proposals, we had come to terms with the inevitability of this project, given assurances that were provided to us by the CTRLR team regarding positioning re landscaping, SUDs and screening, in order to mitigate the impact on our development. In short, we are surprised and disappointed by the views presented by SDCC, and at the apparently serious consideration to which these are now being given. We wish to make clear that this proposal is not representative of our views and that we are deeply concerned by this situation.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand that you have received representations from the Scone & District Community Council (SDCC) concerning a suggested re-routing of the proposed CTRLR to a more northerly termination with the A94. The SDCC representations appear to be based on the perceived need to move the new road further away from Highfield Road and the proposed H29 housing development by A & J Stephen. • We would wish to strongly object to this proposed re-routing of the CTRLR in view of the environmental impact (noise and pollution) to this immediate area which we would also imagine would be of concern to the residents of Newmains housing development close by. Prior to our purchase our property we did make enquiries concerning the routing of the proposed CTRLR and received assurances that the road would terminate at its eastern junction close the existing Park and Ride roundabout at the north end of Scone. Environmentally the proposed new route would also be very close to the boundary of Muirward Woods and therefore create unnecessary disturbance to wildlife and to walkers using these woods for recreational purposes. • I also understand from discussion with an aviation expert that the proposed northerly route may also encounter safety problems in view of its proximity to the airport and the need to preserve adequate emergency landing areas close to the airport which, as you may already know, is used for pilot training. • In view of the above I would strongly recommend acceptance of the original proposed route for the CTRLR which has received full impact assessment and incorporates design mitigation measures such as embankments and fencing to minimise any possible effects on local residents. • I should add that at no time have we been approached by any member of the SDCC to hear our concerns about the proposed re-routing of the CTRLR. This is surprising in view of the considerable effect it would have on us and our near neighbours.