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1 Introduction

1.1 Background


This strategy document emerged from the realisation that Perth's transport network is increasingly suffering from congestion at peak times and that if left unchecked, this could act as a major barrier to the future development of Perth with the existing network only able to support 35% of future development proposals. Furthermore, additional congestion and wider impacts in terms of access and air quality would be to the detriment of residents and visitors.

As a consequence, a major study was undertaken in accordance with the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG), to determine what measures should be taken to ensure that Perth continues to thrive as a modern, vibrant city. This work culminated in the publication of a major report entitled Perth Traffic and Transport Issues Transport Appraisal.

Shaping Perth’s Transport Future in turn presented the options from the Transport Appraisal in a strategy paper for Stakeholder and Public Consultation.

The strategy is centred on an integrated approach, as illustrated in Figure 1.1, to “provide a transport system in and around Perth that will support sustainable economic growth, protect and improve the environment and improve social inclusion and accessibility”. The proposals include the provision of a new crossing over the River Tay (Cross Tay Link Road – CTLR) and a package of City Enhancements to lock-in the benefits of the CTLR in removing traffic from Perth city centre and improve the walking, cycling and public transport networks supported by demand management and local road network improvements.

Figure 1.1: Shaping Perth’s Transport Future - an integrated approach
Consultation on the proposals took place from 8 October 2010 to 11 February 2011. As part of the development of Shaping Perth’s Transport Future a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was also undertaken.

Consultation on the Environmental Report took place over the same period. Further information on the SEA and reports for the different stages of the assessment process can be found at www.pkc.gov.uk/transportplanning.

A summary of the process to date and intended future stages is shown in Figure 1.2.

Figure 1.2: Shaping Perth’s Transport Future – Process

1.2 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Statement is to report on the consultation undertaken on Shaping Perth’s Transport Future. The report sets out the various consultation activities undertaken, outcomes of the consultation and also identifies the next steps.

1.3 REPORT STRUCTURE

Following this introductory chapter, the report is structured as follows:

- **Chapter Two** describes the approach to the Consultation.
- **Chapter Three** reports on the responses to the Consultation Questionnaire.
- **Chapter Four** reports on the key comments and issues raised in the Written Submissions received.
- **Chapter Five** reports on the discussions at the Stakeholder Workshop.
• **Chapter Six** provides a summary of the Key Issues and outlines the Next Steps.
2 Consultation Methodology

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the approach to the consultation which included the following:

- Public Exhibitions; and
- Stakeholder Workshop.

As part of the development of the proposed Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR), one to one meetings were also undertaken with a number of organisations to:

- Identify any potential constraints with statutory stakeholders to the delivery of any of the proposals;
- Identify possible challenges or barriers to delivery and work together to mitigate these risks at an early stage; and
- Ensure that proposals are designed and developed in a way that maximises the likelihood of them gaining the support required to ensure they can be delivered smoothly and without any unnecessary delay at a later date.

As part of the development of the proposals, one to one meetings were also undertaken with a number of organisations:

- **Trunk Roads Authority**: the Perth Traffic and Transport Issues Transport Appraisal required consultation with Transport Scotland on the principle of the CTLR as two of the corridor options include a junction with the A9 trunk road.

- **Strategic Environmental Assessment Consultation Authorities**: as part of the SEA process, consultation with the Consultation Authorities (Historic Scotland; SEPA and SNH) is a statutory requirement. While not a statutory SEA consultee, Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust and Perth & Kinross Council’s Environment Service were also involved in meetings/workshops arranged as part of the SEA process.

- **Key Landowners**: initial discussions were undertaken with key landowners on the emerging CTLR corridor options.

2.2 Public Exhibitions

As part of the consultation on the PKC Main Issues Report, public exhibitions took place throughout Perth & Kinross between October and December 2010. Information specific to the transport proposals set out in Shaping Perth’s Transport Future was displayed at a number of the public exhibitions, including:

- Kinnoull – 11 October.
- Coupar Angus – 12 October.
- Scone – 13 October.
- Stanley – 14 October.
• Almondbank – 21 October.
• Perth – 23 October.
• Perth – 11 November.
• Blairgowrie – 18 November.
• Luncarty – 9 December.

The public exhibitions were attended by PKC Transport Planning Officers and also Halcrow project team members.

With regard to the transport proposals, the public exhibitions sought to provide the general public with the opportunity to gather information on the proposals as well as share their views. Specifically, the exhibitions provided the public with:

• An understanding of the problems and constraints experienced by the transport network at present and potential options to improve the network in the future;
• An opportunity to comment on proposals for the future transport network in the context of Perth and its immediate surroundings; and
• An understanding of the next steps and timescales for reporting.

2.3 Stakeholder Workshop

As part of the consultation process, a workshop was arranged with key stakeholders. The workshop took place on 25 January 2011 in Perth with the objectives to:

• Share information on the proposals set out in Shaping Perth’s Transport Future;
• Provide the opportunity for different stakeholders to come together to discuss the proposals and share their views; and
• Gather direct input to the consultation on Shaping Perth’s Transport Future.

The outcomes of the workshop included the following:

• Stakeholders consider they have had an opportunity to have their say and are confident their comments will be considered; and
• PKC have further understanding of the points of agreement / consensus and also points where differing views remain across different stakeholder groups to help provide an informed view of the key issues which require particular focus and effort to resolve going forward.

Chapter Five outlines the key issues raised and discussed at the workshop.

2.4 Feedback

Feedback and comments on the transport proposals were invited by the following mechanisms:

• Shaping Perth’s Transport Future Consultation Questionnaire (available online and in hard copy); and
• Written submissions to PKC.
In addition, representations on the Main Issues Report (MIR) submitted to PKC Local Development Planning team which included specific comments on the CTLR and/or City Enhancements were passed to the Transport Planning team for inclusion as part of the transport consultation analysis.

All Consultation Questionnaires and written submissions received by PKC electronically or in hard copy were passed to Halcrow for processing and analysis.
3 Questionnaire Responses

3.1 Introduction
As noted in Chapter Two, a Consultation Questionnaire was developed to gather specific feedback from members of the public and stakeholders on the proposals. The questionnaire included nine questions in total and a copy is enclosed in Appendix A for reference.

The questionnaire was available for completion online throughout the duration of the consultation period. It was also available to download from the PKC website for completion via e-mail or postal return. In addition, copies of the questionnaire were also available at the public exhibitions and Stakeholder Workshop for completion in person or return by post/e-mail. All questionnaires received by e-mail and post were processed online to provide one standalone database for all returned questionnaire.

3.2 Responses
A total of 176 questionnaires were returned. This included full and partially completed questionnaires where some questions had been unanswered or left blank.

The submissions received can be grouped as follows:

- Members of the public.
- Government/Public Bodies.
- Developers/Landowners.
- Unknown.

Figure 2.1 shows the geographic coverage of respondees based on postcode data provided by respondents. This does not account for multiple responses with the same postcode and therefore the red dots on the map do not illustrate the total number of responses received by postcode but instead provide a general overview of the geographic spread of respondees.

The following sections discuss the responses on a question by question basis under the following headings\(^1\):

- Cross Tay Link Road;
- City Enhancements; and
- Other Issues.

\(^1\) The total number of respondees ("count") does not add up to 176 for all questions due to some questions being unanswered or left blank on some questionnaires.
Figure 2.1: Consultation Questionnaire - Geographic coverage of respondents

Responses received from locations not shown include Blairgowrie, Crieff and Meigle.

---

2 Responses received from locations not shown include Blairgowrie, Crieff and Meigle.
3.3 **Cross Tay Link Road**

1. **Do consultees agree with the principle of the CTLR?**

Of the respondees who answered this question, a majority (60% - 103 respondees) stated they either agreed or strongly agreed with the principle of the CTLR while 29% (52 respondees) stated they disagreed/strongly disagreed with the principle of the CTLR.

Figure 3.1 provides a more detailed breakdown of the responses received.

![Figure 3.1: Principle of the Cross Tay Link Road](image)

Table 3.1 presents a sample of some of the comments received in support of/against the principle of the CTLR (with the number of similar comments also shown).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As someone who has no choice but to negotiate traffic through Perth at peak times, I have long recognised the need for a river crossing north of Scone.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Tay crossing to the north of Perth would result in much more long-distance traffic between Stirling and Aberdeen using the A94 rather than the A90 dual carriageway….Settlements such as Balbeggie, Burrelton/Woodside, Coupar Angus and Meigle have no or only partial bypasses. Any CTLR would mean these settlements suffering much higher levels of traffic…</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would prefer the same money to go into public transport infrastructure or alternatives to reduce cars, lorries etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth already has a bypass far superior to many cities, and the scale and cost of a new CTLR seems disproportionate to the problem of short-term local traffic congestion.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of building a new road such as this in an extreme financial crisis is unacceptable.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.1: CTLR Principle – additional comments*
2. Are there other issues/constraints which need to be considered?

A total of 161 respondees answered this question. 95 respondees stated there were other issues to consider, 36 had no opinion and 30 stated there were no other considerations.

A sample of comments received (along with the number of similar comments shown) are summarised in the Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t feel the impact of a new CTLR on rural communities has been</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered enough or weighted accordingly in examining the impact of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the various options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are exceptional environmental and historical sites.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would move traffic back onto the Meigle – Coupar Angus road.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Additional Constraints / Issues – Key Comments

3. Out of the different corridors presented for the CTLR which is your preferred corridor?

Figure 3.2 shows respondee preference for the different CTLR corridors presented. As illustrated, there was strong support for Corridor C with 71% of those respondees who answered this question (120 out of 170) identifying Corridor C as their preferred choice.

A map showing the different CTLR corridors consulted on is included in Appendix B for reference.

![Figure 3.2: Preferred Cross Tay Link Road Corridor](image)

Of those in favour of Corridor C, a number of recurring reasons were identified, including the reduced impact on communities (in particular Redgorton) compared to Corridor E and also the need for the proposed Greenbelt boundary set out in the MIR to include the land between Berthapark and Redgorton/Luncarty as per the boundaries prepared for the Draft Local Plan in 2004.
Specific comments received include:

“It is (Corridor C) cheaper, avoids demolishing peoples’ homes in Redgorton, it is more direct, it will remove greater pollution, it will bring greater benefits to Scone Palace and the racecourse and will be cheaper to maintain and result in fewer accidents.”

“Retains Greenbelt area between the outer limits of Perth northwards, still allowing plenty of room for housing development in Bertha Park area and still maintains the rural community identity of Luncarty and Redgorton.”

“It (Corridor C) does not devastate rural communities as Corridor E does to Redgorton and it is not so far north out of Perth that people still opt to go through Perth rather than use the longer link road. It also provides the rational option of extending the link road to join up with the A9 before Broxden and A90 to Dundee in the future.”

For those respondees who did not favour Corridor C, particular concerns were raised with regards to environmental impacts, especially concerning the Scone Palace Design Garden Landscape.

Comments include:

“Corridor C whilst removing traffic from the main area of congestion, the proposed route is a corridor that passes in extremely close proximity to a significant Perthshire cultural, historic and tourist venue (Scone Palace) where tourists attend in considerable numbers to views and walk around the attractive and peaceful grounds which form part of a much larger designation of designed landscape.”

“Of the routes proposed Corridor E is considered to be the most suitable, not simply because it is further north of Scone Palace but on environmental and economic grounds. Whilst each corridor will have environmental negatives, Corridor E does not pass through a Designed Landscape, passes further afield of Scheduled Monuments, disturbs less Ancient Woodland…”

Few comments were expressed in relation to Corridor G with the focus primarily on Corridors C and E. This may be because the lesser benefits of Corridor G are more widely recognised and also the focus of community concern particularly with regard to the impact of Corridor E on Redgorton against the environmental consideration in relation to Corridor C.

### 3.4 City Enhancements

**5. Do consultees agree with the principle of the City Enhancements Package?**

The City Enhancements is a key part of the proposals set out in Shaping Perth’s Transport Future. The questionnaire included a number of questions specific to the package to understand the level of support for the principle of the City Enhancements package i.e. to maximise the opportunities from the CTLR and removal of through traffic from the city centre to improve the cycling, walking and public transport networks.

A total of 160 respondees answered the above question with a majority (36%) stating they agreed with the principle of the City Enhancements while a further 15% were in strong agreement. 21% of respondents disagreed/strongly disagreed with the City
Enhancements. The remaining 28% were somewhat indifferent and neither agreed or disagreed with the principle of the City Enhancements as illustrated in Figure 3.3.

![Figure 3.3: Principle of the City Enhancements](image)

6. Out of the different levels of interventions presented for the City Enhancements what package should be the one which is taken forward?

At this stage, high level concepts have been developed for the City Enhancements package based on three levels of change – minor, moderate and major. The majority of respondents (42%) supported moderate change. Figure 3.4 provides a more detailed breakdown of the responses received.

The different level of City Enhancements change consulted on is included in Appendix B for reference.

![Figure 3.4: City Enhancements - Preferred Level of Change](image)

A selection of comments provided, in relation to the different levels of change for the City Enhancements package, is presented in Table 3.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of change</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>“The problems which the proposals seek to address are in my opinion minor and do not require major change. Subtle improvements to what is in place already are all that is needed.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Moderate       | “Major change simply doesn’t seem viable given the present financial climate of stringent government cut-backs. Moderate change will also allow gradual progression and continual assessment that any new package is achieving its aims.”
   “Moderate interventions suggestions appear to me to have the best ideas from my interpretation.”
   “Minor change would not do enough. Major change could be too radical and some would be unnecessary if the CTLR project went ahead.” | “I don’t believe big changes are needed, and are of limited benefit.”
   “One way systems and reducing parking spaces are ludicrous ideas, motorists are the ones who spend the most amount of money not cyclist and pedestrians, you must be able to “pop into town” conveniently or the town will continue to degrade in a business sense.” |
| Major          | “If we are going to change anything, let’s aim for the ultimate package instead of tinkering around the edges.”
   “A major change is required to sort out years of neglect in solving transport issues around Perth. A CTLR will free up road space for pedestrians and cyclists.” | “Cars should be part of the transport future.”
   “Before any packages should be taken forward all existing services in the city should be corrected/improved i.e. bus services enhanced, traffic light sequences improved etc.”
   “Taking away the character of Perth and further reducing the ease of approach for passing trade so likely to further destroy the town shopping centre.” |
| General        | “Before any packages should be taken forward all existing services in the city should be corrected/improved i.e. bus services enhanced, traffic light sequences improved etc.” | “Taking away the character of Perth and further reducing the ease of approach for passing trade so likely to further destroy the town shopping centre.” |

Table 3.3: City Enhancements – Comments

3.5 **Other Comments**

From some of the responses received, a number of additional points were raised. Recurring themes included:

- The consultation process;
- Linkages between the MIR and Shaping Perth’s Transport Future; and
- Additional transport considerations.

These points are discussed in more detail below.

3.5.1 **Consultation Process**

In respect of the consultation process, concern was expressed by a number of respondents regarding the lack of consultation with those communities most likely to be impacted by the CTLR. It was felt that more consultation and engagement should
have been undertaken by PKC with the local communities (Redgorton in particular) in view of the potential impact of proposals.

The following comment captures the strength of feeling raised by respondees:

“There is substantial hostility to the CTLR project which is aggravated by lack of full consultation with all interested bodies and the local community. Considering this project would impact on voters’ lives, communication has been very poor.”

### 3.5.2 Main Issues Report

Concern was also expressed in responses regarding the relationship between Shaping Perth’s Transport Future and the PKC Local Development Plan Main Issues Report.

Recurring points raised concerned the following:

- The CTLR is not identified as a main issue in the Main Issues Report, despite it representing a significant infrastructure project; and
- The preferred CTLR corridor reported in the Main Issues report is not the only option or indeed the preferred corridor as reported in the Perth Traffic and Transport Issues Transport Appraisal;

### 3.5.3 Transport

In the responses received a number of issues were raised in respect of additional transport factors which should be considered. Examples of the points raised include:

- There is no mention of rail in Shaping Perth’s Transport Future and the potential to re-open former stations on the mainline. This is viewed by some to represent a missed opportunity, particularly when there are proposals to increase the size of many surrounding settlements such as Stanley, Blackford, Luncarty, Bridge of Earn etc;
- Enforcement of parking and loading restrictions needs to be stronger in Perth; and
- New infrastructure and measures need to be supported by programmes and interventions which seek to change travel behaviour and attitudes.

### 3.6 Socio-Economic Profile

As part of the questionnaire, it was possible to obtain information on the socio-economic profile of respondees including the following characteristics:

- Gender.
- Age.
- Employment.
- Disability.

#### 3.6.1 Gender

Of those who answered this question (151 respondees), 60% were male and 40% female.
3.6.2 Age

A breakdown of the age of respondees is shown in Figure 3.5. As can be seen, the largest proportion of respondees (48%) were aged 46 – 65 years. The smallest proportion of respondees were aged under 16.

![Figure 3.5: Respondee Profile - Age](image)

3.6.3 Employment

A breakdown of the employment status of respondees which answered this question (136 respondees) is presented in Figure 3.6. As can be seen, the largest proportion of respondees (60%) stated they were in employment and just over 30% stated they were retired.

![Figure 3.6: Respondee Profile - Employment](image)

3.6.4 Disability

Nearly all respondees who answered this question stated they did not suffer from a physical and/or mental disability as illustrated in Figure 3.7.
3.7 SUMMARY

A total of 176 questionnaires were returned as part of the consultation. The majority of the responses were received from members of the public. Key findings emerging from the responses include:

- The majority of respondees were in favour of the principle of the CTLR;
- Issues viewed to require further consideration concern community impacts, the re-routing of traffic and environmental considerations;
- The preferred CTLR proposal is Corridor C;
- The majority of respondees agreed to the principle of the City Enhancements package; and
- The majority of the respondees supported the promotion of moderate change by the City Enhancements package.
4 Written Submissions

4.1 Introduction

Written submissions, including both letters and e-mails, were also received as part of the consultation. In total 93 submissions were received by PKC. This included representations to the Local Development Plan team on the Main Issues Report which included points specifically concerning the CTLR and/or City Enhancements.

The submissions received can be grouped as follows:

- Community.
- Government/Public bodies/Representative Organisations.
- Developers/Landowners.
- Active Travel Organisations.

In addition to the letters and e-mails received, a Save Redgorton and Luncarty Residents Petition Against the CTLR Corridor E Route Proposed by PKC was also submitted. A total of 367 signatories were recorded on the documentation received.

The key issues raised are summarised in the following sections and highlight recurring themes raised by respondents on particular issues concerning the proposals set out in the strategy.

4.2 Community

A total of 69 submissions were received from residents across a number of communities in the Perth & Kinross area. A summary of the communities represented is provided below, with the numbers in brackets referring to the number of responses from each location:

- Luncarty (21);
- Redgorton (15);
- Scone (8);
- Stormontfield (8);
- Other3 (7); and
- Unknown4 (10).

Responses were also received from Scone & District Community Council, Stanley & District Community Council and Stormontfield Proprietors’ Association.

Responses from residents included challenges to the principle of the CTLR. The principle was challenged by a number of different communities, but in particular by residents of Scone. Mixed views were also expressed by residents of Stormontfield. Comments received in respect of the requirement for the CTLR include:

3 “Other” accounted for by - Perth x 3, Pitlochry x 1, Stanley x 1, Meigle x 1 and West Kinfauns x 1.

4 As not all submissions received were accompanied with address details, it was not possible to attribute all responses to a specific community.
“…the favoured indicative proposal is not best choice compared to other possibilities because…it is disproportionate in scale, cost and irreversible environmental impact compared to the stated aims for the bridge line and apparently unexamined alternatives…It threatens the health, safety and well-being of those settlements directly affected…” (Scone resident)

“…the proposed link road going north of Scone will do nothing to alleviate this problem as the majority of this traffic is travelling into Perth, not round it.”

“…the issue of the Cross Tay Bridge which appears to be taken as read should be revisited. New roads mean increased traffic…Communities further north-east of Scone would be adversely impacted by increased traffic…” (Perth resident)

“Paragraph 4.5.13 of the MIR confirms that transport is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, accounting for more than 25% of all CO2 emissions. Therefore until such time as all other sustainable transport options and solutions have been fully and properly exhausted it is considered that the case for the need for the CTLR still needs to be proven.” (Luncarty and Redgorton residents)

Recurring points raised by respondents in the most directly affected communities of Redgorton and Luncarty made note of the fact Corridor C emerged as the preferred option from the Perth Traffic and Transport Issues Transport Appraisal. The following points were highlighted in responses received with regard to the benefits of Corridor C:

- It is much cheaper;
- Would result in lower maintenance costs;
- Is much more direct;
- Would provide the greatest relief in removing traffic travelling through the centre of Perth;
- Is the most favourable in terms of reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions, improving local air quality and reducing noise;
- Has economic benefits that significantly outweigh the costs; and
- Provides significantly improved access to Scone Palace and Perth Racecourse.

Furthermore, specific concern was also expressed at the apparent greater emphasis being placed on protecting a Designed Landscape over the protection and safeguarding of the homes and well-being of residents in existing settlements. Linked to this, concern was also expressed at insufficient consideration afforded to the potential impact on people or the impact caused by the possible demolition of their homes.

In terms of community impacts, concerns were also raised in a number of responses regarding the impact of the CTLR on settlements located along the A94 – “We are particularly concerned that a relief road and bridge would simply encourage a lot more traffic, particularly heavy traffic, to come north up the A94 instead of taking the far more suitable A90 via Dundee.” (Scone resident)

Responses received by individuals highlighted a number of points with regard to the design of the proposed CTLR, including:
• The appropriateness of the design to ensure existing congestion problems are not simply transferred elsewhere;
• The proposed single carriageway design is appropriate to the proposed traffic volume and appropriate mitigation measures are introduced; and
• Concern regarding the need to ensure the safety of users is maintained, particularly in relation to the requirement for users of Stormontfield Road to cross the CTLR.

Concerns were also raised on a number of matters concerning the consistency between Shaping Perth’s Transport Future and the Main Issues Report. Recurring points raised were:

• The “preferred corridor” presented in the MIR (Corridor E) is not the only option for the CTLR and furthermore Corridor C or an amended version seem to be the preferred option;
• The CTLR is not listed as a Key Issue in the MIR, but it is arguably the biggest single infrastructure project in a generation;
• The CTLR is counter to some of the objectives of the MIR, including reduction of emissions, increasing the proportion of short trips by more sustainable modes and protecting and enhancing landscape quality and biodiversity particularly in the Redgorton/Luncarty area;
• The impact of the CTLR on the housing strategy (in regard to the potential direct impact on proposed sites at Luncarty, Scone and Berthapark); and
• Deletion of the Greenbelt from Berthapark to Redgorton / Luncarty (proposed boundary as per Draft 2004 Local Plan).

A number of the responses were also critical of the consultation process and, in particular, the lack of prior consultation undertaken with communities which would be directly affected by the CTLR proposals (Corridor E in particular).

4.3 **Government/Statutory Bodies and Representative Bodies**

Responses from organisations included six from Government/Public bodies and three from representative bodies.

From an environmental perspective, responses from public bodies raised concerns about the landscape impacts of the CTLR, in particular the impact of Corridor C on the Scone Palace Garden and Designed Landscape. In addition to comments on the Environmental Report, the SEA Consultation Authorities also submitted comments specific to the actual strategy document Shaping Perth’s Transport Future.

Agreement to the preferred route options for the CTLR identified in the Environmental Report (Corridor E or an amendment of Corridor C) to minimise the impact on the Garden and Design Landscape was highlighted. While it was acknowledged all three Corridors would have significant negative effects on the historic environment it was noted Corridor E would be the least significant and offers the greatest possibility for mitigation with Corridor C the least preferred “…on account of the significant effect that a road in this location would have on Scone Palace designed landscape for which there would be no available mitigation.” The proximity of Corridor E to Battleby Design Landscape was also noted.
Other environmental issues raised concerned the ancient woodland, habitat fragmentation along the proposed Corridors, impacts on protected species and requirement for appropriate consideration of mitigation measures to minimise such impacts.

With regard to Corridor C, concerns were also raised in relation to the junction spacing on the trunk road network. This is set within the wider context of the STPR Project 16 – A9 upgrade from Dunblane to Inverness which includes the potential for grade-separation at Inveralmond roundabout. As a result, there is concern the proposed junction north of Inveralmond would not comply with standards based on the indicative Corridor presented for consultation.

Representation from the local business community highlighted support for the principle of the CTLR and City Enhancements. In terms of the CTLR, Corridors C and E were identified as appropriate for further consideration but should not be used as the premise to support further out-of-town development. With regard to the City Enhancement, major change was supported although alterations to parking provision and access arrangements should not be to the detriment of city centre retailing and business operations.

4.4 DEVELOPERS/LANDOWNERS

A total of six responses were received either directly from developers/land owners or from agents acting on their behalf.

A recurring concern raised by developers was the proposed mechanism to fund the transport proposals via developer contributions. Specific points raised included:

- The financial deliverability of sites which are particularly dependent on the CTLR, such as Scone, Berthapark and Luncarty;
- The principle of Planning Circular 1/2010 – Planning Agreements (Scottish Government, 2010) which does not support the use of developer contributions from future developments to resolve existing problems; and
- The requirement that planning agreements must relate to the development being proposed as per Circular 1/2010. In this context, there are concerns PKC may impose developer contribution policies on development sites that do not require the CTLR and do not contribute to the problems identified which have led to the requirement for the CTLR. This was identified as a particular concern for the Corridors which extend to the west of the A9 to serve Berthapark as it was not considered appropriate to deliver this section of the corridor through anything other than the developments at Berthapark, Almondbank and Almond Valley itself.

As well as the above concerns, two developers noted their support for Corridor E, subject to the route being adjusted accordingly to lessen the impact on the communities of Redgorton and Luncarty.

4.5 ACTIVE TRAVEL ORGANISATIONS

Responses received from organisations engaged in the promotion of Active Travel included ByCycle, Cycle Touring Club and Paths for All.

All three organisations were of the opinion greater prominence should be afforded to active travel and noted concerns regarding the appropriateness of promoting new
road infrastructure within the wider context of concerns regarding the environment, health and national targets to promote mode shift. Two of the organisations (ByCycle and the Cycle Touring Club) specifically stated they did not support the principle of the CTLR.

In terms of the City Enhancements proposals, feedback suggested that the approach going forward should be more radical and centred on reducing private car use, making better use of the existing network, further investing in public transport and implementing actions to change behaviour and attitudes. Expenditure on such measures was considered to represent better value and complement wider policy agendas in terms of active travel. Furthermore, it was felt investment on new road infrastructure would distort future expenditure programmes in the future.

4.6 **Summary**

Over 90 written submissions were received from organisations and members of the public to the consultation on Shaping Perth’s Transport Future. This included responses received by the Local Development Plan team to the MIR consultation that included comments of specific reference to the CTLR and/or City Enhancements.

Members of the public accounted for the largest proportion of written submissions received (74%) with the remaining 26% accounted for by public sector bodies, the businesses community, local developers/landowners and transport groups.

The comments provided in the responses primarily focused on the CTLR, with only a small number of respondents expressing a view on the City Enhancements. This in turn reflects the majority of responses being received from local communities where there is particular concern regarding CTLR Corridor E. The strength of feeling concerning Corridor E is further underlined by the receipt of a petition with 367 signatories against this proposed Corridor.

Table 4.1 provides examples of the type of comments received and the number of similar comments included in responses.
Table 4.1: Written Submissions Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I am broadly in agreement with the proposals which “include a new crossing over the River Tay (CTLR) as well as a package of measures to further develop the cycling, walking and public transport measures supported by traffic demand management measures.””</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I am not convinced that the majority of traffic through the centre of town is on the way elsewhere but going into town. These users will be even less likely to use the new route.”</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The proposed link road going north of Scone will do nothing to alleviate this problem (congestion at Bridgend) as the majority of this traffic is travelling into Perth, not round it.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The money would be better spent on measures to improve active travel and green transport options within the area, on taking freight from road to rail and discouraging or even preventing big lorries using the route through Bridgend unless they originate in the area.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Paragraph 4.5.13 of the MIR confirms that transport is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, accounting for more than 25% of all CO2 emissions. Therefore until such time as all other sustainable transport options and solutions have been fully and properly exhausted it is considered that the case for the need for the CTLR still needs to be proven.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I believe that the CTLR poses potential significant threats to biodiversity and the fragmentation of habitats along the length of the route (particularly adjacent to the River Tay).”</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I wholeheartedly support the approach to the proposed which is to protect and enhance the landscape qualities of Perth &amp; Kinross.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Even if the CTLR proceeds there is no reasoned justification for not continuing the green belt from the northern edge of Bertha Park up to Redgorton/Luncarty as was proposed in 2004…Map 1 should be redrawn to include the land between Berthapark and Redgorton/Luncarty within the Greenbelt.”</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross Tay Link Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Proposed route E as shown in Figure 19 of the MIR is not the only option or even the preferred corridor of search for the CTLR…..based on the technical work undertaken and presented…CTLR Corridor C to the north of Perth racecourse clearly emerges as the preferred route. Option C (apart from its perceived impacts on Scone Palace Gardens &amp; Designed Landscape), clearly has many more benefits than Option E.”</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“One the face of it….there appears to be greater emphasis on protecting a designed landscape rather than protecting and safeguarding the homes and well-being of residents in existing settlements.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…no mention of potential impact on people or the impact caused by the demolition of their homes.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The proposed preferred route is too long and should be at least of dual carriageway if not motorway construction.”</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “It is essential that the safety of the current and future users of the Stormontfield Road is safeguarded and that their safety is not endangered by the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTLR proposals.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We are concerned that a relief road and bridge would simply encourage a lot more traffic, particularly heavy traffic, to come up the A94 instead of taking the far more suitable A90 via Dundee. Thus, although a bridge may reduce traffic between the top of Scone and Perth, it would lead to an intolerable increase in the A94 corridor between Scone and Forfar.”</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Key Issue 18, Q19 (MIR) – I agree that reducing the need to travel and ensuring good access to public transport and other sustainable modes, should be a fundamental component of the local development plan policy.”</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So we have a transport plan that provides definite proposals for increased road capacity but very little detail of the lock-in benefits to the city centre.”</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Whilst the options for the CTLR are very clear, it remains pretty unclear what improvements will be instigated for active travel.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It should also be recognised that the provision of this new road network would not encourage sustainable modes of transport, rather it will do the exact opposite.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The focus is on major road infrastructure with active travel, particularly walking and cycling, given less viability and credence.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Issues Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The MIR raises 21 key issues and asks 53 questions. The CTLR is not actually listed as a Key Issue in the MIR.”</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Map 8 in the MIR shows a site for 200 houses on the south side of Luncarty. However, there is no reference to the proposed CTLR on the map or any indicative route as shown in Figure 19.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Timescales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is considered that a blanket application of such obligations without giving due consideration to the underlying financial viability of a project is fraught with difficulty and potentially counter-productive…It is considered that innovative, proactive and pragmatic approach should be developed in relation to developer contributions having regard to the “wider” picture.”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…agrees that developer contributions can be used in accordance with the provision of Circular 1/2010 but is concerned that developments within the Perth Core Area…may be required to make significant contributions to transport infrastructure that is not required and will be of little benefit.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The CTLR seems unlikely to get built give the public finances and the problems with the housing markets which may last for many years…”</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Developer contributions must be front end loaded in order that the benefits to the community are received at the commencement of the development, not at some unspecified point in the future.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“One of the core principles of planning is to engage with ALL interests as early and as fully as possible (Scottish Planning Policy)…My concern is no prior consultation or engagement took place with any residents in Redgorton or Luncarty given the impact created by the CTLR…”</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “I submit for consideration an objection to the proposed road bridge north of Scone until full consultation has taken place with the affected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>communities in accordance with Scottish Government decree. “</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Stakeholder Workshop

5.1 Introduction
As noted in Chapter Two, the consultation included a Stakeholder Workshop which took place in January 2011.

Invited stakeholders included:

- **Community Councils/Representatives:** all active community councils within Perth Core and surrounding settlements within proximity to CTLR, including Bridgend, Ganochy & Kinnoull, North Inch & Muirton, Scone & District Community Council, Stanley & District, Methven, Earn, West Carse, Blairgowrie & Rattray and Coupar Angus, Ardler and Bendoc. Resident representatives also invited from Luncarty and Redgorton.

- **Transport bodies / operators /groups:** Transport Scotland, TACTRAN, Network Rail, Stagecoach, First, Megabus, ByCycle, Freight Transport Association and Road Haulage Association.

- **Business:** Perthshire Chamber of Commerce, Scottish Enterprise Tayside, Perth City Centre Management Ltd, Perth City Centre Action Group, Visit Scotland, Scone Palace and Perth Racecourse.

- **Environment:** Historic Scotland, Scottish Natural Heritage, Scottish Environmental Protection Agency, Forestry Commission and Perth and Kinross Civic Trust.

A list of attendees is provided in Appendix C.

The workshop was intended to provide a forum to bring different stakeholder groups together to discuss the transport proposals. Following an opening presentation attendees formed four groups to discuss the CTLR and City Enhancements in more detail over two sessions. At the outset it was noted there was the assumption attendees were present to represent their organisation/group/local community and views expressed at the workshop were recorded and registered accordingly.

The questions posed in the consultation questionnaire, discussed previously in Chapter Three, provided the structure and basis for discussions during the break-out sessions.

A summary of the key points raised during the Workshop with respect to the transport proposals are discussed in the following sections.

5.2 Break-out Session 1: CTLR – Key Points
The first break-out session focussed on the CTLR and different Corridor options proposed for consideration.

1. **Do stakeholders agree with the principle of providing a new Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR) to remove non-local traffic from travelling through Perth city centre?**

   - Overall, there was a consensus amongst stakeholders on the principle of a new Cross Tay Link Road.
• There was support for an integrated approach and the need for the CTLR to be supported by other measures to maximise the opportunities provided by the removal of through traffic from the city centre of Perth.

• The key issue is the location of a new crossing.

2. Taking account of the problems and constraints (congestion, environmental etc) highlighted are there any additional constraints/issues that need to be considered?

• Economic and environmental factors associated with the different options for the CTLR are presented. Community/human costs should be given the same level of consideration.

• Design standards – we are planning for the long-term and the appropriateness of a single carriageway road needs to be considered / reviewed in this context to avoid building a road which provides insufficient capacity to support demand in the long-term.

• Consideration of funding options/mechanisms should be integral to the development of the CTLR.

3. Of the different corridors presented for the Cross Tay Link Road, which is the preferred corridor of your organisation?

• Broad support that Corridor G would not address the transport problems – key issues concern existing congestion problems on Dunkeld Road and the position whereby this Corridor would not be able to support the full development aspirations for Perth and the immediate wider region.

• On balance, those stakeholders who did not prefer Corridor C highlighted concerns relating to environmental impacts and also deliverability factors, in particular the location of the junction with the A9 in the context of proposals set out in the STPR and design standards in terms of junction spacing.

• Stakeholders who did not favour Corridor E highlighted community factors. There was also some concern over the length of this route and its attractiveness to road users.

• A number of Stakeholders were indifferent as to whether Corridor C or E should be progressed. Some felt it was not appropriate for their organisation to comment on a preferred corridor with it being for PKC to make the final decision taking into consideration all factors.

5.3 Break-out Session 2: City Enhancements – Key Points

A second break-out session took place to consider the City Enhancements. Stakeholders remained in the same groups and again a number of questions were posed for consideration.
4. Do stakeholders agree with the principle set out in Shaping Perth’s Transport Future of taking forward a City Enhancements package to capture the benefits of the CTLR and improve the cycling, walking and public transport networks, accepting also the need for parking and traffic management?

- Overall, there was consensus for the principle of the City Enhancements package.
- There was broad agreement a vision is required to set out what is wanted for the city centre and this should then be translated into different ways to achieve this vision. Without this there is a risk a piecemeal approach follows in the development and implementation of different measures.
- An integrated approach bringing improvements across the transport network is essential.

5. Out of the different levels of interventions presented for the City Enhancements what package should be the one which is taken forward?

- There was broad support the Council should be radical, bold and ambitious in taking forward the City Enhancements.
- There are inadequacies with the transport network at present and the Council should be moving forward with some elements now and not wait until the CTLR.
- The City Enhancements would also support wider policies of the council such as healthy living and public realm/quality of space initiatives.

6. What is the view of stakeholders on the priorities for enhancements to the public transport, walking and cycling networks supported by demand management and parking restrictions?

At this stage there was not a consensus on specific measures but rather a broad range of different measures were suggested, including:

- **Public Transport**: Park & Ride network (draw on the opportunities the CTLR presents for new sites such as Berthapark); bus/coach partnerships with the Council.
- **Walking**: review of pavement widths; signage to key destinations.
- **Cycling**: cycle storage facilities throughout city centre; cycle provision – city centre streets in particular; joined up cycle lanes.
- **Parking**: review structure of parking charges and provision with a view to incentivising the use of car parks outside the immediate city centre area.
- **Enforcement**: parking and contravening of boxed junctions.
- **Behavioural change**: new infrastructure and services need to also be supported by communication and education to encourage a change in behaviour.
5.4 SUMMARY
The Stakeholder Workshop provided the opportunity for different stakeholder groups, including representatives from the local community, to come together to discuss the CTLR and City Enhancements proposals.

In summary, the Stakeholder Workshop produced the following outcomes:

- Overall, there was general support for the principle of the CTLR;
- Of those stakeholders who stated a preference for Corridor C this was primarily on account of it providing the shortest route and also avoiding direct impact to local communities. Concerns were also raised by a number of Stakeholders in respect of Corridor C in relation to impacts on the Scone Palace Garden & Designed Landscape and also the delivery of a compliant junction design which takes into account STPR proposals to grade-separate Inveralmond roundabout;
- Of those Stakeholders not in favour of Corridor E this was primarily in respect to impacts on the local communities, in particular the settlement of Redgorton;
- Further consideration is required of a number of issues in particular the community impacts, re-routing of traffic to the A94 and design considerations of the CTLR;
- Support for the principle of the City Enhancements and desire to be radical in the approach adopted and scale of proposals taken forward; and
- The requirement to develop a vision specific to the City Enhancements package to establish the outcome sought and in turn direct the measures required to achieve this.
6 Summary and Next Steps

6.1 Introduction
The consultation on Shaping Perth’s Transport Future extended for a 17-week period from 8 October 2010 to 11 February 2011. The consultation activities included nine public exhibitions and a Stakeholder Workshop supported by a Consultation Questionnaire. Responses to the consultation comprised:

- 176 consultation questionnaires;
- 93 written submissions by letter or e-mail; and
- A Save Redgorton and Luncarty Residents Petition against Corridor E signed by 367 signatories.

6.2 Main Findings
Key issues raised as part of the consultation were as follows:

- There was support for the principle of the CTLR from a majority of respondees;
- CTLR Corridor C was identified as the preferred corridor by the majority of respondees to the Consultation Questionnaire. Comments in the written submissions received highlighted Corridor E is not the only option as presented in the MIR and in fact Corridor C emerged as the preferred route from the technical work reported in the Perth Traffic and Transport Issues Transport Appraisal;
- There was support expressed for the principle of the City Enhancements package;
- The largest proportion of respondees to the Consultation Questionnaire felt that moderate change was appropriate for the City Enhancements, while the majority view of stakeholders at the workshop supported more radical change. The written submissions focused primarily on the CTLR with few specific comments made with regard to the City Enhancements package, although the promotion of sustainable modes of transport was supported in principle;
- There was concern expressed at the level of consultation undertaken with local communities, in particular the residents of Redgorton and Luncarty. Some respondees were of the opinion the consultation with those communities most directly impacted by the proposals has been inadequate and did not fulfil the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy (Scottish Government, 2010);
- There was concern expressed by some respondees at the level of financial commitment required to deliver the proposals and also the adoption of a developer contribution mechanism at a time of economic restraint.

Table 6.1 outlines the response of PKC to key issues and, where appropriate, sets out actions which the Council intends to undertake, taking account of the consultation responses.
Table 6.1: Key Issues and PKC Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>PKC Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CTLR Principle | The CTLR is important to support the future growth and development of Perth and the wider region. The existing transport network could only support 35% of future development proposals. While market conditions are suppressed at present the intention is to plan for the long-term and the economic recovery. Detailed assessment, including modelling, was undertaken as part of the Perth Traffic and Transport Issues Transport Appraisal to understand the existing transport problems, their cause and required improvements which included consideration of a wide range of proposals. The appraisal was undertaken in accordance with the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG). The CTLR will also facilitate the opportunity to improve the wider transport network – public transport, walking and cycling networks. With no change to the transport network it can be expected that existing transport problems would become greater and new transport/movement problems would emerge and:  
  • Harm the future economic development of the city and wider region as the existing network could only accommodate limited future developments.  
  • Compromise any future opportunity to improve the public transport, cycling and walking networks.  
  • Further air quality problems within the Air Quality Management Area with transport identified as a key contributing factor when the designation was made in 2006. PKC therefore considers the CTLR is integral to improving the transport network, supporting the future growth of the area and also improving the local environment. |
| CTLR Design    | Further development of the CTLR would be progressed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) process which comprises the following stages:  
  • **Stage 1: Preliminary Assessment** – corridor assessment of different corridor options and the identification of a preferred corridor;  
  • **Stage 2: Route Option Assessment** – detailed assessment to identify a preferred route within the corridor progressed from Stage 1; and  
  • **Stage 3: Detailed Assessment** – detailed design of the preferred route alignment. The scope of the DMRB Stage 1 Assessment would extend to include the three CTLR corridors presented for consultation in Shaping Perth’s Transport Future plus any additional corridor options identified taking account of the outcomes of the consultation.  
For the three corridors identified through the Transport Appraisal, the DMRB Stage 1 Preliminary Assessment would
**Issue** | **PKC Response/Action**
--- | ---
| Essentially comprise a refinement of the corridors in terms of scheme costs and also provides the opportunity for further baseline data and constraints information to be gathered to facilitate the completion of a more informed corridor assessment. The recommended design of a rural single carriageway (S2) with a design speed of 100kph would also be subject to review as part of the engineering assessment completed at DMRB Stage 1 to ensure the most suitable design option is progressed.
| As part of the DMRB process a site level Environmental Impact Assessment would be undertaken. This would extend to a detailed environmental assessment of the alternative route alignments within the preferred corridor, supported by ecological surveys and a Habitats Regulations Appraisal as required.

**MIR Linkages**
The Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) provided the framework for the completion of the Perth Traffic and Transport Issues Transport Appraisal. This does not require the recommendation of a preferred option as such, but rather presents the results of the different options assessed for consideration by Investment Decision Makers (in this case PKC and Transport Scotland given the trunk road implications).
| The Main Issues Report (MIR) sought to stimulate discussion and encourage response on the future development of Perth & Kinross. The MIR is not a Draft Plan but seeks views on which policy and development options should be included in the Proposed Plan (due to be published in December 2011).
| In accordance with the planning process, the MIR was required to present a preferred CTLR Corridor. Due to concerns which had emerged regarding the deliverability of Corridor C at this point (in relation to junction spacing requirements on the A9 and also the impact on land with environmental designations) Corridor E was presented as the preferred corridor.
| Therefore, what has been viewed as an “inconsistency” is a reflection of the different requirements of the transport appraisal and planning processes.
| The scope of the DMRB Stage 1 Assessment would include Corridor C, E and G plus any new potential corridors emerging as a result of the consultation.

**Planning Issues – Greenbelt and Housing Sites**
The Main Issues Report (MIR) sought to stimulate discussion and encourage response on the future development of Perth & Kinross. The MIR is not a Draft Plan but seeks views on which policy and development options should be included in the Proposed Plan (due to be published in December 2011).
| The Proposed Local Development would include the preferred corridor for the CTLR (i.e. the findings of the Stage 2 DMRB). Where the alignment may impact on future development sites, the routing of the CTLR would be integral to the development of the Masterplans where appropriate.

**Funding**
PKC notes the concern of the public and stakeholders regarding the financial deliverability of the CTLR, particularly in view of the economic climate at present. It is however important the future of Perth and the wider region does not stagnate and there is therefore a need to plan for the longer-term future when economic conditions improve and there is an upturn in the market.
| The mechanism for any Developers Contribution model would be developed in accordance with the statutory requirements.
set out in Scottish Planning Guidance Circular 1/2010. This would also take account of different factors, including geographic coverage, development profile and timescales.

Any model would also take into consideration which developments should contribute to particular sections of the CTLR – with regards to Corridor C and E this is particularly relevant in terms of the sections from the A94 to the A9 and the A9 to Crieff Road.

City Enhancements

Further development of the City Enhancements would be undertaken with a view to identifying "quick wins" which could be progressed in the short-term and which are not directly dependent on the removal of through traffic from the city centre and, therefore, the delivery of the CTLR. Alongside this, a package of longer term measures which are more independent on the CTLR would also be developed.

The progression of the City Enhancements would also include work to further develop a vision and set of objectives specific to the City Enhancements.

The inclusion of measures to support behaviour change would also be incorporated into a City Enhancements package to help promote and encourage the use of alternatives to the private car and in doing so complement the provision of new infrastructure.

In view of the strategic nature of the rail themes identified as part of the optioneering process completed at the outset of the Perth Traffic and Transport Issues Transport Appraisal and proposals set out in the Strategic Transport Projects Review, the decision was taken that it would be more appropriate for strategic rail based issues to be considered outwith the Transport Appraisal. Accordingly, the City Enhancements package does not extend to include rail based measure but the measures proposed as part of the Package would serve to complement wider proposals to enhance rail travel to/from Perth and other communities within Perth & Kinross.

It should be noted PKC actively participates in discussions with national and regional bodies, such as Network Rail, Transport Scotland and TACTRAN, on rail issues.

Consultation Process

PKC is committed to engaging with local communities, businesses and other stakeholders in the Perth & Kinross Council area.

Community engagement events were organised as part of the consultation, however PKC notes the dissatisfaction in the local community, particularly the residents of Luncarty and Redgorton at the lack of direct consultation.

PKC is committed to ensuring ongoing consultation and engagement with communities as the proposals for the CTLR and City Enhancements are further developed.

The outputs of the consultation to date will directly feed into the CTLR DMRB Stage 1 study and further development of the City Enhancements package.

It is recognised the Redgorton and Luncarty Community Council is not currently active and there are concerns within the community as to how the views of residents will be represented and means of communication. All communication between
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>PKC Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PKC and other Community Councils would also include representatives from Luncarty/Redgorton. Taking account of comments received the impact on settlements has been incorporated as an assessment criteria to the Strategic Environmental Assessment. The results of the assessment are reported in the Environmental Report Addendum published alongside this Consultation Statement and will also inform the finalisation of Shaping Perth’s Transport Future in due course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 **Next Steps**

In terms of key next steps, the following activities are identified:

- Publication of Shaping Perth’s Transport Future Consultation Statement and Environmental Report Addendum.
- Completion of CTRL DMRB Stage 1 Preliminary Assessment;
- Further development of the City Enhancements package;
- Ongoing consultation, including a “Next Steps” workshop to provide the opportunity for PKC to report back to Stakeholders on the outcomes of the consultation in further detail and the emerging findings from the DMRB Stage 1 assessment; and
- Publication of finalised Shaping Perth’s Transport Future and SEA Post-Adoption Statement, taking account of the outcomes of the above activities.
Appendix A: Consultation Questionnaire

Shaping Perth’s Transport Future
Consultation Feedback Form

We would welcome your thoughts and views on the proposals set out in Shaping Perth’s Transport Future to improve the transport network in and around Perth. Your feedback and comments will help inform our work as proposals are developed in more detail.

1. Shaping Perth’s Transport Future sets out the principle of providing a new Cross Tay Link Road (CTRL) to remove non-local traffic from travelling through Perth city centre. Do you...
   - [ ] Strongly agree with the principle of a new CTRL
   - [ ] Agree with the principle of a new CTRL
   - [ ] Neither agree or disagree with the principle of a new CTRL
   - [ ] Disagree with the principle of a new CTRL
   - [ ] Strongly disagree with the principle of a new CTRL

2. Please use the space below to explain your answer, especially if you have ticked you disagree / strongly disagree.

3. Taking account of the problems and constraints (congestion, environmental etc) highlighted on Consultation Board 3 (see also www.pkc.gov.uk/transportconsultation) are there any additional constraints/issues that need to be considered?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] No opinion

   If Yes, please specify:

4. Out of the different corridors presented for the Cross Tay Link Road, which is your preferred corridor?
   - [ ] Corridor C
   - [ ] Corridor E
   - [ ] Corridor G
   - [ ] Other (Please specify: ..........................................................)

5. Please specify the main reason(s) for your preferred corridor:


6. Shaping Perth’s Transport Future sets out the principle of taking forward a City Enhancements package to capture the benefits of the CTLR and improve the cycling, walking and public transport networks, accepting also the need for parking and traffic management. Do you...
   □ Strongly agree with the principle of the City Enhancements package
   □ Agree with the principle of the City Enhancements package
   □ Neither agree or disagree with the principle of the City Enhancements package
   □ Disagree with the principle of the City Enhancements package
   □ Strongly disagree with the principle of the City Enhancements package

7. Out of the different levels of interventions presented for the City Enhancements what package should be the one which is taken forward?
   □ Minor change
   □ Moderate change
   □ Major change
   □ No change

8. Please specify the main reason(s) for your preferred package of improvements:

9. Are there any other key issues you think need to be addressed by the project team at this stage?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ No opinion
   If Yes, please specify:

The following information is optional (Please be assured all information will only be used for the purposes of this study and treated in confidence).
Name:

Address:

Post Code:

A little bit about you:
10. Gender: □ Male  □ Female
12. Employment: □ Employed/Studying □ Retired □ Other
13. Disability/physical and/or mental health: □ Yes □ No

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire.

Please return the questionnaire in the box provided or alternatively posted to:
Transport Planning, Perth & Kinross Council, Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street, Perth, PH1 5GD. All questionnaires should be returned by Friday 11 February 2011.

The information provided will be used within Perth & Kinross Council to inform the development of proposals for the future transport network in and around Perth and Local Development Plan. The information will only be shared with Halcrow Group Ltd as they are advising Perth & Kinross Council in the development of the transport proposals. In accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, you are entitled to know what information Perth & Kinross Council hold about you, on payment of a fee of £12. Applications should be made to Alex Deans, Transport Planning, Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street, Perth, PH1 5GD.
Appendix B: Shaping Perth’s Transport Future - Proposals

*CTLR CORRIDORS*
**CITY ENHANCEMENTS**

### Minor Change
- No change
- Reduction in existing on-street parking bays within the inner city centre area
- Review of the operation, management and enforcement of parking restrictions within Perth
- Improvements to traffic signal control throughout the city centre to improve bus journey times and reliability
- Improvements to existing Park and Ride sites at Gorne and Brooden
- Improvements to key trip generators, such as new developments to the north-west of the city centre and the rail station
- Development of routes to connect to new cycle/pedestrian bridge (*Connect 2 Bridge*)

### Moderate Change
- Changes in the operation of Perth Bridge to one-way eastbound for all traffic and Queen's Bridge to one-way westbound for general traffic with a contraflow eastbound bus lane
- Further reduction in existing on-street parking bays within the inner city centre area
- Review of commuter parking in Perth to identify where there are any areas of conflict between resident and commuter parking
- New sites at Walnut Grove and Bertha Park
- Review operation of bus services in the city centre to address bus on bus congestion and conflict with other road users
- Bus priority improvements facilitated by changes to the operation of Perth and Queen's Bridges
- Expansion of Park and Ride network to include Walnut Grove and Bertha Park
- Footway widening to build on the realisation of roadspace facilitated by the removal of parking.
- Development of off-road cycle links to surrounding communities.

### Major Change
- Change in the operation of the A038 Inner Ring Road to one-way clockwise.
- Radical reduction in existing on-street parking bays within the inner city centre area.
- Extension of parking restrictions outside the city centre area.
- Bus priority improvements facilitated by changes in the configuration of the Inner Ring Road.
- Development of bus/shell interchange
- Pedestrianisation.
- Segregated cycleways on A038 Inner Ring. Improved cycle/pedestrian provision across across Perth, Queen's and rail bridges.
- Installation of Intelligent Transport System, such as update of ear parking guidance system and variable message signs to disseminate information to drivers.
- Installation of real-time information system to allow the display of bus journey times at bus stops.
- Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) system to disseminate journey time information and enforce speed restrictions.
- Restrictions where road safety is a concern. Development of Heavy Goods Vehicle depot to reduce the number of HGV's in the city centre.
# Appendix C: Stakeholder Workshop Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persephone</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Transport Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus</td>
<td>Beveridge</td>
<td>Stagecoach in Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>Billett</td>
<td>Scottish Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moira</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Luncarty &amp; Redgorton Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Perth United Cycling Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Brydone</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>TACTRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Callan</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>NHS Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Scottish Citylink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Transport Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Deasley</td>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raine</td>
<td>Du Puy</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Access Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Ewen</td>
<td>TAYplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niall</td>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>TACTRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Garrow</td>
<td>Historic Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Gidney</td>
<td>Halcrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Gilmour</td>
<td>SIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Guthrie</td>
<td>TACTRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Halcrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td>Scone Palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian</td>
<td>MacEwan</td>
<td>Federation of Small Businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>Cycle Touring Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Maclehose</td>
<td>Stormontfield Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Maric</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Transport Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>McAninch</td>
<td>Enterprise North East Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td>Tayside Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>McKerracher</td>
<td>Stormontfield Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euan</td>
<td>McLaughlin</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Melville</td>
<td>By Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Letham Climate Challenge Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Morshead</td>
<td>Perth Racecourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Myles</td>
<td>Luncarty &amp; Redgorton Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Naysmith</td>
<td>Halcrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Nicol</td>
<td>SIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Scone &amp; District Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council - Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Halcrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Sangster</td>
<td>Tayside Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Sinclair</td>
<td>Scone &amp; District Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith and Sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Perthshire Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Tigg</td>
<td>Transport Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Transport Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Webley</td>
<td>North Tayside Badger Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrie</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Halcrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Winlow</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Heritage Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>