

Issue 24	Perth Area (within Core) Transport Infrastructure	
Development plan reference:	5.1.14 - 5.1.17 – Perth Area Transport Infrastructure, page 70-71 5.33.2 - 5.33.3 – Scone, CTRLR and Embargo, page 141 5.35.2 – Stanley Spatial Strategy, page 146	Reporter: David Buylla
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<div><div><div>Scone &amp; District Community Council (00043) Scottish Government (00092) Kenneth Robertson (00111) Helen Goodacre (00138) Ian Sansom (00216) David Gordon (00223) Lynne Palmer (00239) Y R Knowles (00335) John Andrews (00398) Sandra Service (00427) Bill Service (00428) Sam Morshead (00433) Karen Donaldson (00601) Gannochy &amp; Kinnoull Community Council (00667) J Donald McKerracher (00672) Annelie Carmichael (00731) Deirdre A Beaton (00741) George Beaton (00742) Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (00754) Dorothy Guthrie (00763) Helen Borland-Stroyan (00826) Luncarty, Redgorton &amp; Moneydie Community Council (00924/1/001) MBM Planning &amp; Development (07693) Persephone Beer (07744) R R MacKay (08100)</div><div>A Ritchie &amp; Son/M &amp;S M Bullough (08651) I L Steven (08733) Forestry Commission Scotland (08988) Stewart Milne Homes Limited (09029) J W Farquarson/G D Strawson (09117) Scone Palace &amp; Estate (09163) Tactran (09203) Methven &amp; District Community Council (09221) David Jeffrey (09228) SSE plc (09311) Burrelton &amp; District Community Council (09376) James Watt (09435) Perth City West LLP (09462) A &amp; J Stephen Limited (09727) G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817) Dr Charles Turner (09934) Jackie Turner (09935) Frank Moisey (09950) Lynne Graham (10186) Homes for Scotland (10214) John Munro (10277) Rachel Burns (10283) David Burns (10284) Mandy Burns (10285) Bruce Burns (10286)</div></div></div>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Perth Core Area Transport Infrastructure including proposed Cross Tay Link Road (CTRLR)	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><u>Supporting Text (Paragraph 5.1.14- 5.1.17)</u></p> <p>Lynne Palmer (00239/3/001): Contradiction in paragraph 5.1.15 in that it says to 'remove constraints on long-term developments of The City' while at the same time ensuring 'that the national Trunk Road network is not compromised.'</p> <p>Homes for Scotland (10214/1/037): Both the A9/A85 Crieff Road junction improvements and the CTRLR are significant infrastructure projects to relieve Perth's congestion issues</p>		

yet there is no clarity provided of how or when they will be delivered and who will pay for them. These significant issues should be addressed in Policy TA1B (S4\_Doc\_387) but are not. Supplementary Guidance is also required to show how this will be delivered.

Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667/4/001): While fully supporting the proposed transport solution, the Community Council has serious concerns that firmer plans need to be in place to ensure that sufficient financing is secured in order to meet this critical deadline. The Cross Tay Link Road should be given urgent and high priority.

James Watt (09435/1/003); TACTRAN (09203/15/001): Support the need for enhancements to Perth's transport infrastructure.

#### Developer Contributions and Funding

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/3/007): The requirement for more contributions will reduce project viability, deflate the land value and make it less likely that land owners will sell. Developer contributions will increase the cost per unit and push the house prices higher and reduce affordability.

Homes for Scotland (10214/1/034): Circular 1/10, paragraph 19 (S4\_Doc\_074) states '*Planning agreements should not be used to resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision*'. The Plan should make it clear that developers are not being asked to resolve these existing deficiencies. Any developer contributions relating to transport must be to mitigate a detriment created by the development, not to resolve existing problems created by others. The absence of Supplementary Guidance does not allow the industry to respond to this issue.

MBM Planning & Development (07693/20/002): Fully supports the Council's change of position and the support now given for Option C (southern route) as shown in the City of Perth Inset Map (S4\_Doc\_403). However no further details of how the CTRLR is to be funded and no indication is given on how any proposed developer contributions are to be calculated either in the Proposed Plan or as Supplementary Guidance which is surprising given that the Council have been working on the proposed CTRLR for a number of years.

George Beaton (00742/4/001): Supports the Cross Tay Link Road but Perth and Kinross Council needs to give this urgent attention and high priority especially in relation to funding.

A Ritchie & Son & M & S M Bullough (08651/8/001): Broadly support the package of measures outlined in the Perth Transport Futures document and the benefits they bring in the ability of the Perth area to deliver the TAYplan strategic requirements. However these facilities will benefit not just planned growth in this Local Development Plan or planned growth in TAYplan but will span a much longer period and, in the interest of fairness, the developer contributions should not specifically be focussed on allocated development in this Local Development Plan.

#### CTRLR Route

David Gordon (00223/1/002): Support policy of no significant housing development prior to CTRLR completion. However, even with CTRLR there will be increased pressure on Bridgend which could only be relieved by an additional inner CTRLR.

SSE plc (09311/1/013): Some of the east coast transmission line upgrading (are likely to impact on proposed route of CTRLR) so should be fully recognised in the LDP.

John Andrews (00398/1/001): Pleased that CTRL Route E has been rejected, but major concern about the impact of Option C, where it crosses the railway line and the River Tay. The nature of the terrain in that location is such that it is difficult to see how the railway line and the river could be crossed there without the construction of a bridge or bridges of such considerable height as to be enormously intrusive on the visual quality of the river corridor, a zone of sufficient importance for its attractive character as to have been previously designated appropriately and much used for quiet recreational purposes. There needs to be a re-think of the precise line of the road so as to minimise the potential damage.

Forestry Commission Scotland (08988/1/012): The big issue regarding the CTRL route near Scone is the loss of woodland and also the loss of prime red squirrel habitat. Moving the route to the South West would help to accommodate this, but would eat into the area designated for housing.

Scottish Government (00092/6/001): Transport Scotland agreed that the CTRL should be located approximately a mid-distance between Luncarty and Inveralmond Roundabout, provided sufficient evidence was submitted to address the issues raised at MIR stage. From a Transport Scotland perspective, any new alignment would create a minimum junction spacing of 1 kilometre from Inveralmond roundabout to the slip roads for the new Link Road.

Historic Scotland recognises that the proposed Link Road will have a significant impact on the designed landscape and on the prehistoric and roman archaeological remains. While not objecting to the Link Road, Historic Scotland wishes to make clear that a substantial programme of mitigation and archaeological investigation will be required in the delivery of the Link Road and in light of this would expect to be closely involved in the development of the Link Road should it be progressed.

In addition, detail is required on how the Link Road will tie in with the A9. This is especially important taking into account the close proximity of the A9, the Highland Mainline Railway and the River Tay. It was hoped that this detail would have been provided in advance of the publication of the Proposed Plan to allow the alignment to be acceptable to Transport Scotland. As this has not been provided, it is not possible to support the proposed alignment for the Cross Tay Link Road.

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/003): CTRL route runs through the Green Belt. The settlement of Stormontfield would have its access to Scone and beyond impeded by the CTRL. A bridge or underpass would therefore be required.

The junction with the A94 will require careful design to ensure Scone is still not used by Heavy Goods Vehicles in particular. Site H29 at North Scone will be split in half by CTRL and will have an impact on amenity, safety and the environment.

Helen Borland-Stroyan (00826/1/002): Support the proposals for the Cross Tay Road Link, to link up with the A93 and A94 north of Scone. However the ideal solution would be to extend the CTRL to a suitable junction on the A90, preferably enabling the road to use a low level route through the hills. From the A90 heavy traffic has easy trunk road access to all major towns and cities. A complete ban on heavy traffic passing through Perth could be brought into force, to the benefit of all residents in terms of air quality and the built environment.

John Munro (10277/1/010): The CTRLR would provide sites for a local supermarket and shops and also a small office park on the east side of the Tay. Sale of sites for these uses could provide finance for the new road. The construction of the CTRLR to link the main road North of Scone with the by-pass is a very dubious idea. It would not stop most traffic coming through Bridgend since much of this originates in, or is destined for Scone. Many large vehicles are going to, or coming from Dundee, the Carse, Fife or Edinburgh and would not use the new road. Those doing so would save only a few minutes. Yet the cost and environmental impact will be enormous.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/015): Supports the principle of a Cross Tay Link Road but has significant objections to the route proposed. This route comes directly through the Designed Landscape and the proposed Green Belt. It sits directly in the setting of Scone Palace, one of Perthshire and Scotland's most historic houses. The route is within close proximity to both the historic Schedule Monument of the roman camp site and areas of Ancient Woodland and semi-natural Ancient Woodland. It also severs one of the Estate's key farms, creating a large loss of agricultural land and complicating the management of that farming unit. The height of clearance required for the bridge to cross the A9, the railway and the Tay, in a single span will be significant and will create a bridge and associated road accesses which are highly visually intrusive and will also affect the Estate's fishing business.

Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/022): A9/A85 Junction improvements are urgently required, but the Community Council are sceptical of the proposed links to the Cross Tay Bridge, and request the latter is deleted.

Y R Knowles (00335/1/001); R R MacKay (08100/1/001): Objects to A9/A85 Junction proposals especially any development that will encroach on the crematorium and its 'garden of rest'.

JW Farquarson & GD Strawson (09117/5/001): The CTRLR is not proven to be economically viable and is likely to take a considerable period of time to implement. With this causing a delay in housing development it would be prudent to look at alternative sites for strategic growth.

Dr Charles Turner (09934/1/001); MBM Planning & Development (07693/20/001); Rachel Burns (10283/1/003); Bruce Burns (10286/1/003); Mandy Burns (10285/1/003); David Burns (10284/1/003); Deirdre A Beaton (00741/4/001); Annelie Carmichael (00731/3/001); Lynne Graham (10186/2/004); Jackie Turner (09935/1/001); Luncarty, Redgorton & Moneydie Community Council (00924/1/001): Fully support CTRLR Option C (southern route) as shown in the City of Perth Inset Map (S4\_Doc\_403).

#### Heavy Goods Vehicle Traffic

Lynne Palmer (00239/11/001 & 00239/3/002): Concerned about impact of Heavy Goods Vehicles travelling through Perth especially at Bridgend. The barriers at Friarton Bridge are too low and the Heavy Goods Vehicle drivers do not like this so prefer not to use it and travel through Perth instead.

#### Development Embargo

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/001): There does not appear to be an embargo on housing development at Ardler, Blairgowrie/Rattray, Bridge of Cally, Carsie, Coupar Angus, Kettins, Meigle and Meiklour.

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/002): Paragraph 5.1.17 is very confusing and could be open to interpretation as there is reference to '*infrastructure in place*,' '*under construction*' and '*committed project*'. It is impossible for the transport infrastructure to comply with all the criteria and this should be clearly stated within the LDP.

A & J Stephen Limited (09727/4/001): One of the package of measures identified is the Cross Tay Link Road but there is no indication of timescale or commitment to this project although it is noted with some concern that the proposed embargo on development affects some 86% of new sites in the Perth Area. Table at 5.1.11 shows the full extent of the embargo. This position is alarming as is the fact that the lifting of the embargo has no definitive timeframe. It is therefore impossible to proceed with viable development proposals or calculate the Council's commitment to maintaining the desired 7 year effective land supply as set out in paragraph 5.1.11 of the Proposed Plan.

Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/001): Requires assurance that no significant development will take place along the A93/A94 Corridor until the CTRL is constructed.

Sandra Service (00427/1/002); Bill Service (00428/1/001): Plan states that no large scale development should take place until the Cross Tay Link is a '*committed project*'. This should be amended to state that '*no development can take place until The Cross Tay Link is completed.*'

Frank Moisey (09950/3/001& 09950/3/002): Any delay to the CTRL may delay construction on certain sites identified in the Proposed Local Plan: 5.6.3 Balbeggie; 5.11.3 Burrelton/Woodside, 5.15.3 Damside/Saucher, 5.22.3 Guildtown, 5.27.3 Kinrossie, 5.31.3 Perth Airport, 5.33.3 Scone and 5.37.3 Wolfhill.

To ensure that the CTRL project will not stall it would seem to me that the conditions of the embargo mentioned in 5.1.17(1) namely:

*'To prevent the reduction in air quality and increased congestion in the Bridgend area of Perth there will be an embargo on planning consents for further housing for sites of 10 or more outwith Perth on the A93 & A94 corridors, until such time as the construction of the Cross Tay Link Road is a committed project. The embargo will not apply to brownfield sites.'* should be firmed up such that only when the Cross Tay Link Road is a completed project would any development be allowed for further housing for sites of 10 or more outwith Perth on the A93 and A94 corridors.

Homes for Scotland (10214/1/036): Major concerns about the implementation of the Plan because it requires major infrastructure to be committed before a substantial number of housing sites can be developed. Insufficient information provided to give the house building industry the assurances it needs to commit to developments, and to demonstrate deliverability of the Plan. It is not clear whether commercial developers will also have to contribute, and whether significant capital funding will be available from Scottish Government.

I L Steven (08733/1/002 & 08733/1/003): Supports the CTRL but the developer contributions policy for the CTRL is unsuitable as it prevents housing being built north of Perth until after the bridge is constructed.

Stewart Milne Homes Limited (09029/2/001): Object to the embargo on planning consents for further greenfield housing for sites of 10 or more outwith Perth on the A93 and A94 corridors until the Cross Tay Link Road is a committed project. Consider this is

an unreasonable constraint to the timeous delivery of an appropriate and required housing land supply by SPP (Core\_Doc\_048) and TAYplan (Core\_Doc\_099).

Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667/7/001): Understand the rationale for an embargo on planning consents for further housing pending the Cross Tay Link Road and supports the proposal, even though it is insufficient in scope. An assumption that additional housing in the Bridgend, Gannochy and Kinnoull area would not generate sufficient traffic to affect the traffic congestion, itself the sole reason for Bridgend being an Air Quality Management Area, fails to pass any test of reasonableness since the steep roads in this neighbourhood deter cycling and public transport is infrequent. Similarly, the proposition that brownfield sites (such as the Glebe in Scone) would not contribute to significant generation of additional traffic makes little sense.

George Beaton (00742/5/001 & 00742/6/002); Deirdre A Beaton (00741/5/001 & 00741/6/002): Support the embargo on planning consents for further housing pending the Cross Tay Link but it should also include the Bridgend, Gannochy and Kinnoull areas which generate traffic for the Bridgend area. The embargo recognises that there is a problem at Bridgend and any further housing will add to that. The present infrastructure at Gannochy cannot support more housing. Roads are overburdened with Bridgend being at full capacity with air quality at Bridgend at levels injurious to health. Other access roads (Lochie Brae, Manse Road, Muirhall Road) are dangerous and inadequate.

Annelie Carmichael (00731/1/001 & 00731/2/002): Supports the embargo on planning consents for further housing pending the Cross Tay Link but it should also include the Bridgend, Gannochy and Kinnoull area which generates traffic for the Bridgend area. The embargo recognises that there is a problem at Bridgend. Any further housing will add to that. People in this area use their cars to travel. It is unrealistic to think that they will use buses, cycle or walk most or all of the time. Public transport is infrequent. Most roads are steep and do not have room for cyclists and many do not have pavements. Any brownfield sites would also obviously contribute to significant generation of additional traffic. The present infrastructure in Gannochy cannot support more housing. Roads are overburdened with Bridgend being at full capacity with air quality at levels injurious to health. Other access roads (Lochie Brae, Manse Road, Muirhall Road) are dangerous, not fit for purpose and inadequate.

Perth City West LLP (09462/2/001): Paragraph 5.1.17(2) refers to an embargo on development of sites of 0.5 hectares or more. The wording and therefore the precise intention is not clear for example does this embargo relate only to planning applications which are submitted after the Local Development Plan has been adopted? Does this proposed embargo relate only to sites outwith the proposed new Perth settlement boundary? The wording and intention needs to be clarified to allow fuller comments to be submitted.

Object to the proposed embargo on development through background text in the Proposed Plan. Any major issues such as this should be explicit, with a policy basis and further reference to the intention and potential effects with regard to site allocations and Settlement Plans.

Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (00754/4/001): The A85 corridor 'embargo' on major new development is considered not properly justified as it will prevent acceptable development coming forward and proposes that any development will lead to increased congestion. Some developments could have a neutral impact. Some developments may help deliver the required improvements to the A9/A85 junction. If there is to be an

embargo this should be restricted to planning applications after adoption of LDP.

David Gordon (00223/1/001): Supports the proposed development embargo for Scone.

#### Scone Transport Infrastructure

Helen Goodacre (00138/2/001): Concerned about funding for CTRLR and housing being built before the CTRLR. Even with the CTRLR there will still be extra traffic through Bridgend as people will still take the shortest route.

Ian Sansom (00216/1/001): Appears housing development cannot go ahead before completion of the new connecting road but the road will not be built without the housing already in place.

Karen Donaldson (00601/1/001): The proposal for the CTRLR is not really going to benefit the population of Scone and towards Blairgowrie - who wants to travel a 20 mile route to get into the City Centre? - City Centre traffic will continue to use the route through Scone. Understanding is that Heavy Goods Vehicles etc will not be able to use the crossing therefore the present congestion in the heart of the village will continue until the Council can get their act together to ensure such vehicles travelling from the North East to Dundee etc are forced to use the A90 as was proposed when the road was built. Not only the proposed 800 houses for Scone but the 1000 or more in the A93/A94 corridor will only increase the current environmental issues with pollution in Bridgend, Gannochy and Atholl Street areas.

Dorothy Guthrie (00763/1/002): Sees little benefit of the proposed CTRLR to existing residents of Scone.

Sam Morshead (00433/1/002): A single lane carriageway may be insufficient to cope with potential traffic arising from events at Scone Palace or the racecourse.

Ms Persephone Beer (07744/1/008): Infrastructure should include new pedestrian/cycle bridge over the Tay to provide off-road route from Scone to Perth, Inveralmond etc. CTRLR should include cycle and pedestrian facilities and routes to it.

Scone & District Community Council (00043/1/002): Object to CTRLR but no reasons are provided.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/020): Welcomes Council's acknowledgement that it is the commitment stage which is the critical trigger. However disagree that the whole of site H29 should be embargoed given the need for housing sites to come forward urgently to meet demand. Scone is the largest village in Perth HMA and is well placed to meet significant housing allocations for the HMA. The Council and the Trunk Roads Authority have already accepted the argument at Almond Valley Planning Application 08/00678/OUT (S4\_Doc\_250) that despite the increase in road traffic flows air quality/congestion will actually be significantly reduced due to the increase in newer, cleaner vehicles over time. A small amount of housing could be brought forward in advance of the bridge being either committed or built without significant impact on congestion and traffic issues in Perth.

Kenneth Robertson (00111/1/003): Paragraph 5.33.2 is only part of the LDP which states further development will not take place until the proposed additional bridge over the River Tay has been completed. Reasoning applied here is surely applicable to all additional housing plans proposed for the area north west of Perth. New crossing will do nothing to

alleviate traffic bottleneck at Bridgend; any increase in housing on that side of the river will make the traffic situation intolerable. Questions the expected impact of the new crossing: if new housing is for those already working in Perth they will still travel via Bridgend; if new housing is for those working in the central belt then Scone is not the right place to build houses.

#### Stanley Transport Infrastructure

David Jeffrey (09228/2/001): The Stanley (Tullybelton) junction and Luncarty access should be upgraded as part of the proposals to upgrade the A9. The junction should not be removed due to inadequate local access roads in general as suggested by Perth and Kinross Council. The junction improvement is justified on economic and planning grounds and the expansion of Stanley should not go ahead unless the junction is improved.

### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

#### Supporting Text

Lynne Palmer (00239/3/001): Make two sentences out of one from paragraph 5.1.15 as together they contradict each other.

Homes for Scotland (10214/1/037): More detail required to demonstrate how and when the transport package of measures will be implemented.

Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667/4/001): The Cross Tay Link Road proposal to be given urgent and high priority.

#### Developer Contributions and Funding

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/3/007): Revise the developer contributions policy to ensure it is deliverable.

Homes for Scotland (10214/1/034): Any developer contributions relating to transport must mitigate a detriment created by the development, not to resolve existing problems created by others.

MBM Planning & Development (07693/20/002): Details of how the CTRLR is to be funded is required including how any proposed developer contributions are to be calculated either in the Proposed Plan or as Supplementary Guidance.

George Beaton (00742/4/001): High priority should be given to funding of CTRLR.

A Ritchie & Son & M & S M Bullough (08651/8/001): Consider securing developer contributions towards the Transport Futures measures from a wider catchment than just development at Perth in this LDP.

#### CTRLR Route

David Gordon (00223/1/002): An additional inner CTRLR linking the A94, A93 and crossing the Tay to the north of the North Inch is required to fully relieve the pressure on Bridgend.

SSE plc (09311/1/013): Site Specific Developer requirements should be amended to recognise the constraint the existing 275kV line and the future 400kV line will place on the development of the CTRLR.

John Andrews (00398/1/001): Re-think of the precise line of the CTRLR crossing the Tay River so as to minimise the potential visual damage.



Forestry Commission Scotland (08988/1/012): Move the CTRL route at Scone further to the south west.

Scottish Government (00092/6/001): Detail is required on the proposed layout of this road north of Inveralmond junction and in particular where it crosses the A9.

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/003): Green Belt requires protection. Settlement of Stormontfield will require a bridge or underpass. Junction with A94 will require careful design to ensure Scone is still not used by Heavy Goods Vehicles in particular.

Helen Borland-Stroyan (00826/1/002): The proposed CTRL should be extended east from the A94 to the A90. All heavy traffic should then be banned from Perth and its immediate environs.

John Munro (10277/1/010): CTRL not required.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/015): The preferred corridor for the Cross Tay Link Road (CTRL) should be altered and the most northerly route as explored in the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance appraisal and consultation, used instead.

Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/022): Request that the link between the A9/A85 improvements and the CTRL is deleted from the plan

Y R Knowles (00335/1/001); R R MacKay (08100/1/001): No work to the A9/A85 junction should result in any encroachment on the crematorium or the Garden of Rest.

J W Farquarson & G D Strawson (09117/5/001): Evidence that the CTRL is economically viable is required.

#### Heavy Goods Vehicle Traffic

Lynne Palmer (00239/11/001 & 00239/3/002): Weight restriction on Heavy Goods Vehicles should be imposed that come through Perth City. Warning lights at traffic lights to get Heavy Goods Vehicles to slow down should also be considered. Raise the height of barriers along Friarton Bridge to encourage Heavy Goods Vehicles to use it and not the bridges in Perth City Centre.

#### Development Embargo

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/001): Clarification is needed on exactly what settlements are included in the A93/94 embargo.

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/002): To comply, all the criteria associated with transport infrastructure at 5.1.17 should be clearly stated within the LDP.

A & J Stephen Limited (09727/4/001): If an embargo is imposed, can it be lifted earlier and within a certain timeframe, i.e. When land supply drops below a certain level and/or a length of time from adoption of Local Development Plan, for example, 2 years from 2014. If the Cross Tay Link Road doesn't happen or is delayed, surely not to develop any significant greenfield housing in these corridors is not an option.

Can exceptions be made to any embargo to allow sites, or parts of sites, to be released which are in all other respects deliverable and offer transport choice in terms of proximity to bus routes and ease of access. Can exceptions be made to housing sites with a

history of allocation through a previous Local Plan?

Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/001); Sandra Service (00427/1/002); Bill Service (00428/1/001); Frank Moisey (09950/3/001 & 09950/3/002): No significant development should take place along the A93/A94 Corridor until the CTRLR has been constructed rather than a '*committed project*.'

Homes for Scotland (10214/1/036): More information required to give the house building industry the assurances it needs to commit to developments, and to demonstrate deliverability of the Plan.

I L Steven (08733/1/002 and 08733/1/003); Stewart Milne Homes Limited (09029/2/001): Remove the A93/94 embargo.

Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667/7/001); George Beaton (00742/5/001 & 00742/6/002); Deirdre A Beaton (00741/5/001 & 00741/6/002); Annelie Carmichael (00731/1/001 & 00731/2/002): Include Ward 12 and brownfield sites within the area covered by the embargo on more than 10 houses to prevent the reduction in air quality and increased congestion in the Bridgend area of Perth. The proposed embargo on housing (Page 76) should be extended to include Gannochy (Site H3). Any development should include (1) a new road running south from the A94 (between Gannochy and Scone) to provide access to this site and the Murray Royal Hospital '*surplus assets*' area and (2) the provision of facilities which can be used to develop social capital for the whole Ward 12 area.

Perth City West LLP (09462/2/001): Clarity relative to Paragraph 5.1.17(2) and the potential embargo on development sites of 0.5 hectares or more is required.

Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (00754/4/001): Delete paragraph 5.1.17(2) or failing that reword 5.1.17(2) to '*Development for sites of 0.5hectares or more outwith the settlement boundary of Perth on the A85 corridor (i.e. The settlement includes allocated sites) which exacerbate congestion on the Crieff Road area will generally be refused planning permission, until such time as the construction of the new A9/A85 junction has commenced, unless development helps bring forward the new A9/A85 junction. The embargo shall not apply to planning applications submitted before the Local Development Plan is adopted.*'

#### Scone Transport Infrastructure

Ms Helen Goodacre (00138/2/001): None mentioned but assumed information required on funding of CTRLR and no housing should be built in Scone before the CTRLR is constructed.

Ian Sansom (00216/1/001): CTRLR should be built urgently and until then additional housing in Scone should not be given priority.

Karen Donaldson (00601/1/001); Dorothy Guthrie (00763/1/002): Delete the CTRLR proposal.

Sam Morshead (00433/1/002): CTRLR should be three lane carriageway.

Persephone Beer (07744/1/008): CTRLR should include cycle and pedestrian facilities and routes to it.

Scone & District Community Council (00043/1/002): Extent of the A93 and A94 corridors where the CTRLR embargo will be applied needs to be clarified. Coupar Angus and Blairgowrie/Ratray should be included in the corridor area.

Scone Palace and Estate (09163/4/020): Third Developer Requirement for site H29 '*Houses cannot be occupied until CTRLR constructed*' should be deleted.

Embargo on development at site H29 should be relaxed to allow an initial phase of housing to come forward before the bridge is either committed or built.

Kenneth Robertson (00111/1/003): No specific modification sought. Implied that the additional river crossing should be in place prior to any further development north west of Perth.

#### Stanley Transport Infrastructure

David Jeffrey (09228/2/001): Junction improvements on the A9 at Tullybelton required.

### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The following responses are supported by the Councils Delivering Infrastructure Background Paper (S4\_Doc\_440) which outlines the key infrastructure requirements and proposed timescales to deliver the strategic development areas.

#### Supporting Text

Lynne Palmer (00239/3/001): The Council is unable to determine what the apparent contradiction is within the text of paragraph 5.1.15.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Homes for Scotland (10214/1/037): The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Core\_Doc\_185) process is the technical process for determining the exact alignment of the CTRLR. The Councils Delivering Infrastructure Background Paper (S4\_Doc\_440) outlines the key infrastructure requirements and proposed timescales to deliver the CTRLR.

The Council also published and consulted on Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance (S4\_Doc\_446) from 12 November until 21 December 2012. The Supplementary Guidance looks at the cumulative impact of new development and requires a contribution which is reasonably related in scale and nature towards the package of transport infrastructure improvements measures. It responds to the issues which have been raised in this representation. The results of this consultation will be considered and the final Supplementary Guidance will be reported back to Committee in 2013

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667/4/001): The Council acknowledges that the CTRLR is critical and this is reflected in the Draft Action Programme (Core\_Doc\_091); the Councils Delivering Infrastructure Background Paper (S4\_Doc\_440); the Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance (S4\_Doc\_446) and the embargos imposed on certain developments.

The CTRLR is critical to the social economic development of Perth and the easing of congestion issues within the city centre. The capacity of the road infrastructure in and around Perth has long been recognised as the biggest constraint to the growth and

improvement of Perth. The Council has commissioned modelling work and studies as well as working with Transport Scotland and Tactran to identify a solution to the congestion issues. The package of measure identified includes the development of the CTRLR to the north of the city.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Developer Contributions and Funding

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/3/007); Homes for Scotland (10214/1/034); MBM Planning & Development (07693/20/002); George Beaton (00742/4/001); A Ritchie & Son/M & S M Bullough (08651/8/001): The Council published and consulted on Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance (S4\_Doc\_446) from 12 November until 21 December 2012. The Supplementary Guidance looks at the cumulative impact of all new development within the Perth area and requires a contribution which is reasonably related in scale and nature towards the package of transport infrastructure improvements measures. It responds to the issues which have been raised in these Representations. The results of this consultation will be considered and the final Supplementary Guidance will be reported back to Committee in 2013.

The development of Shaping Perth's Transport Future proposal has been a long and complex project following the production of Transport Scotland's STAG Guidance (Core\_Doc\_214). Having agreed the key projects, the Council's focus has been looking at the funding package. It is recognised that a partnership approach between the Council and the development industry will be required. This is being progressed through the development of Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance (S4\_Doc\_446), information contained within the Councils Delivering Infrastructure Background Paper (S4\_Doc\_440) and continued dialog with Transport Scotland.

The Council is conscious that any developer contributions can impact on the viability of a development proposal. However the Councils approach is to minimise the contributions by spreading the cost amongst all development which has an impact on transport infrastructure.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### CTRLR Route

David Gordon (00223/1/002): A number of route options were examined as part of the Shaping Perth's Transport Future (Core\_Doc\_021). Several routes including two routes just north of the North Inch were ruled out for environmental or operational reasons. These two routes would involve the loss of prime agricultural land and it was predicted that the existing congestion on the Dunkeld Road would worsen significantly. In addition to this it is highly unlikely that there will be finance available for a second road crossing of the Tay River.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SSE plc (09311/1/013): Any constraints within the route due to power line upgrades have not been identified to the Council through previous consultations. The route will be developed through a masterplan which will provide an opportunity to define how the site will develop in line with this and other constraints.

If the Reporter was so minded the Council would raise no objection to the proposed modification and recommends that this should be contained within the Perth Area Spatial Strategy.

John Andrews (00398/1/001): The range of heritage and environmental constraints requires to be minimised and mitigated and this limits the options available to the CTRL. These have been fully assessed by the Shaping Perth's Transport Future (Core\_Doc\_021) and its accompanying SEA (Core\_Doc\_130). A number of route options were examined as part of the Shaping Perth's Transport Future (Core\_Doc\_021). Several routes were ruled out for environmental or operational reasons and these include visual impact. In addition there is no finalised bridge design or exact route so it is impossible to fully assess what the visual impact could be.

The preferred route shown in the Perth Settlement Map (S4\_Doc\_403) at this stage is a band of search up to 200 metres in width within which the road will sit. At the finalised design stage of the CTRL any loss of trees will be minimised and appropriate mitigation will be put in place to deal with any loss.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Forestry Commission Scotland (08988/1/012): The exact route and design of the CTRL has yet to be finalised so it is impossible to fully assess what impact it could have. The preferred route shown in the Perth Settlement Map (S4\_Doc\_403) at this stage is a band of search up to 200 metres in width within which the road will sit. At the finalised design stage any loss of trees will be minimised and appropriate mitigation will be put in place.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scottish Government (00092/6/001): The Council is confident that the 1km distance specified by Transport Scotland can be achieved and therefore allays any fears expressed. The exact design of the CTRL has yet to be finalised but it is expected that it will not have any impact on the Inveralmond roundabout or the part of the A9 which it will cross. The preferred route shown in the Perth Settlement Map (S4\_Doc\_403) at this stage is a band of search up to 200 metres in width within which the road will sit. The exact detail of which will be addressed at the masterplan stage.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/003): The LDP proposes a new Green Belt on page 45 to surround Perth and certain settlements. Policy NE5 (S4\_Doc\_404) will restrict development in the Green Belt except for such essential projects as transport infrastructure which require a Green Belt location. The CTRL will need to connect with the existing roads and villages in the area including Stormontfield and this will improve their accessibility and is therefore considered a positive impact. The preferred route shown in the Perth Settlement Map (S4\_Doc\_403) at this stage is a search band and is up to 200 metres in width. The exact detail of which will be addressed at the masterplan stage.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Helen Borland-Stroyan (00826/1/002): A connection with the A90 is a major project which presents significant challenges mainly because of the Sidlaw Hills. It does not feature in Transport Scotland's STPR (Core\_Doc\_050) or Tactrans Regional Transport Strategy

(Core\_Doc\_022) and therefore would not be appropriate to include in the LDP. This does not prevent any future connection with the A90 but this is not seen as a priority requirement to alleviate current congestion issues. Connection with the A90 could be an issue that requires consideration in future Plans. The CTRLR will reduce a significant amount of HGV traffic but will inevitably not reduce it entirely because of Perth's designation as a nodal point in NPF2 (Core\_Doc\_020) and some traffic will finish in Perth. In addition, it is not the role of the LDP or the planning process to place a restriction on heavy traffic travelling through Perth and its immediate environs.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

John Munro (10277/1/010): The CTRLR is regarded as critical to the social economic development of Perth and the easing of congestion issues within the city centre. The capacity of the road infrastructure in and around Perth has long been recognised as the biggest constraint to the growth and improvement of Perth. The Council has commissioned modelling work and studies as well as working with Transport Scotland and Tactran to identify a solution to the congestion issues. The package of measure identified includes the development of the CTRLR to the north of the city and it has been demonstrated that this proposal will reduce a significant level of traffic from Perth and Bridgend.

The Council's Developer Contributions Policy will contribute to Perth's transport requirements commensurate with its impact and be in line with Circular 1/2010 (Core\_Doc\_097).

It will also not be possible to divert the sales receipts of privately owned land to fund the CTRLR.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/015): A number of route options were examined as part of the independent Shaping Perth's Transport Future Study (Core\_Doc\_021). Several routes including the northerly route explored in the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance appraisal were ruled out for environmental, operational and financial reasons. It is important to note there is no finalised bridge design and the exact route has yet to be finalised. The preferred route shown in the Perth Settlement Map (S4\_Doc\_403) at this stage is a band of search up to 200 metres in width within which the road will sit. However, it is expected that there should not be any adverse impact on Scone Palace and Estate including its designed landscapes, Scheduled Monuments and listed properties.

Regarding the issue of the farm being split in two by the CTRLR, this is a matter that will be dealt with at detailed design stage.

The Council considers that Scone Palace's overall tourist package will be significantly improved by the greater accessibility that will result from the development of the CTRLR. Ongoing dialog is taking place in an effort to resolve the outstanding issues to everybody's satisfaction.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/022): The CTRLR is regarded as critical to the social economic development of Perth and the easing of congestion issues within the city centre. The development of the A9/A85 link is promoted by TAYplan because it is

critical to the success of the CTLR project. They are also known difficulties involving Transport Scotland's Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) (Core\_Doc\_050) for grade separation of the Inveralmond roundabout without a significant loss of surrounding employment properties. The Perth Transport Futures package will deliver an overall improvement to the area and it is not possible to delete certain elements of it.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Y R Knowles (00335/1/001); R R MacKay (08100/1/001): Congestion at the A9/A85 is a major constraint. It has long been understood that an improvement to the existing and anticipated situation needs to be developed. It is also the first phase of the CTLR works to help reduce congestion within the city. Development is proposed next to the crematorium but it is considered that this will not encroach on it or have an adverse impact on its setting. It is recognised that the proposal will provide enhanced accessibility to the cemetery for both pedestrians and vehicles. The proposed route is in response to concerns of a previous route to the east of the crematorium, which was acknowledged would have a much more significant impact. This issue has been dealt with through the development management process with planning application 11/01579/FLL (Core\_Doc\_177). This proposal was approved by Perth & Kinross Council on 31 March 2012.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

J W Farquarson & G D Strawson (091175/001): The development of Shaping Perth's Transport Future (Core\_Doc\_021) proposal has been a long and complex project. The CTLR is regarded as critical to the social economic development of Perth and the easing of congestion issues within the city centre. Having agreed the key projects, including the CTLR, the Council's focus has been looking at the funding package.

It is recognised that a partnership approach between the Council and the development industry will be required. This is being progressed through the development of Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance (S4\_Doc\_446), information contained within the Councils Delivering Infrastructure Background Paper (S4\_Doc\_440) and continued dialog with Transport Scotland.

The Council is conscious that any developer contributions can impact on the viability of a development proposal. However the Councils approach is to minimise the contributions by spreading the cost amongst all development which has an impact on transport infrastructure

The Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance (S4\_Doc\_446) looks at the need for a financial contribution which is reasonably related in scale and nature towards the package of transport infrastructure improvements measures. It responds to the issues which have been raised in this representation. The results of this consultation will be considered and the final Supplementary Guidance will be reported back to Committee in 2013.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Heavy Goods Vehicle Traffic

Lynne Palmer (00239/11/001 & 00239/3/002): The development of Shaping Perth's Transport Future (Core\_Doc\_021) including the CTLR to the north of the city predicts there will be a significant drop in numbers of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) travelling

through the city centre, Bridgend and over Friarton Bridge. It will not be possible to fully restrict HGV movement into the city centre as some journeys final destination will be the city centre. It does not consider it necessary to look at Heavy Goods Vehicle weight restrictions and increasing barrier heights along the bridge, which in any event are not LDP issues. In addition, any improvement to Friarton Bridge is the responsibility of Transport Scotland because it is part of the trunk road network.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Development Embargo

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/001): The Proposed Plan recognises that delivering the key transport projects will take many years resulting in a number of sites being constrained until the infrastructure is in place or under construction. The Plan places an embargo on new development on a number of the major road corridors around Perth. It is proposed that when the Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance (S4\_Doc\_446) is adopted the restrictions are relaxed on the following basis:

- To prevent the increased congestion on the Crieff Road area of Perth, there is an embargo on further planning consents for developments of sites of 0.5ha or more out with Perth on the A85 corridor, until such time as the construction of the A9/A85 junction has commenced. Subject to the Council committing to building the junction through the Capital Programme, consents will be released where a contribution is made;
- To prevent the reduction in air quality and increased congestion in the Bridgend area of Perth there is an embargo on planning consents for further housing for sites of 10 or more out with Perth on the A93 & A94 corridors. This embargo does not apply to brownfield sites. When the Council have committed to building the Cross Tay Link Road through the Capital Programme, Major planning applications may be released using phasing agreements but smaller applications will be released where an appropriate contribution is made. Site H29 in Scone identified in the Proposed Plan will be released being limited to a maximum of 100 dwellings prior to the Cross Tay Link Road being completed.

When the Supplementary Guidance is adopted, planning consents which will contribute to the transport infrastructure should not be held up. While it is recognised that the road network may not be able to accommodate all of the proposed new development due the current economic climate the majority of sites will take many years to be completed. Sites will generally advance slowly with a small number of units being built as the market allows allowing for a limited volume of development to be accommodated in advance of the infrastructure being completed.

The A93/A94 embargo specifically relates to areas outwith the Perth City boundary but within the area designated in the LDP as the Perth Housing Market Area. The development embargo does not relate to the settlements listed by representation 00672/1/001 as they are all outwith Perth City and the Perth Housing Market Area.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/002); A & J Stephen Ltd (09727/4/001): Paragraph 5.1.17 of the Plan recognises that delivering the key projects will take many years resulting in a number of sites being constrained until the infrastructure is in place or under construction. The Plan places an embargo on new development on the A85 and A93/94 road corridors within the Perth Housing Market Area. The Council published and consulted on Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance



(S4\_Doc\_446) in late 2012 and the results of this will be reported back to Committee in 2013. It is proposed the adoption of the Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance will provide clarity and assist when consideration of development proposals within the identified embargo areas. Paragraph 5.1.17 should reflect the most up to date position.

If the Reporter is so minded the insertion of the suggested text to Paragraph 5.1.17 will help with this clarification:

*'It is recognised that delivering the key projects will take many years resulting in a number of sites being constrained until the infrastructure is in place or under construction.'*

1. *To prevent the increased congestion on the Crieff Road area of Perth there is an embargo on further planning consents for developments of 0.5 hectares or more outwith Perth on the A85 corridor, until such time as the A9/A85 Junction has commenced. Subject to the relevant agency committing to building the junction through the Capital Programme, consents will be released where an appropriate contribution is made;*
2. *To prevent the reduction in air quality and increase congestion in the Bridgend area of Perth there is an embargo on planning consents for further housing for sites of 10 or more outwith Perth on the A93 and A94 corridors. This embargo does not apply to brownfield sites. When the relevant agencies have committed to building the Cross Tay Link Road through the Capital Programme, Major planning applications may be released using phasing agreements but smaller applications will be released where an appropriate contribution is made. Site H29 in Scone identified in the Plan will be released being limited to a maximum of 100 dwellings prior to the Cross Tay Link Road being completed.'*

Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/001); Sandra Service (00427/1/002); Bill Service (00428/1/001); Frank Moisey (09950/3/001 & 09950/3/002): It is recognised at paragraph 5.1.17 (1) of the LDP that there will be an embargo on future planning consents for developments of 10 or more dwellings outwith Perth City boundary but within the Perth Housing Market Area along the A93 and A94 corridors until the CTRLR is a committed project.

An embargo until the CTRLR is constructed could cause significant issues with the development industry potentially being too far behind to meet the projected housing demand for Perth & Kinross. It could be a number of years before any planning applications are approved and development on the ground takes place. This raises significant planning and economic issues. It is considered unreasonable for the development industry to wait until the CTRLR is constructed. The timing of both the CTRLR being a committed project and the embargo being lifted is critical to the delivery of housing within Perth as a number of sites identified are currently constrained. It is considered that when the CTRLR becomes a committed project it will provide enough certainty that the development will happen and allow the embargo to be lifted and any planning decisions to be released.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Homes for Scotland (10214/1/036): The Council published and consulted on Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance Perth (S4\_Doc\_446) from 12 November until 21 December 2012. The Supplementary Guidance looks at the cumulative impact of new development and requires a contribution which is reasonably related in scale and nature towards the package of transport infrastructure improvements

measures. It responds to the issues which have been raised in this representation. The Supplementary Guidance clarifies that the Councils approach is to spread the cost amongst all development which has an impact on transport infrastructure. The results of this consultation will be considered and the final Supplementary Guidance will be reported back to Committee in 2013.

Detailed studies have shown there are serious constraints to development in Perth and the reason why the package of measures in Shaping Perth's Transport Future (Core\_Doc\_021) are being brought forward.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

I L Steven (08733/1/002 & 08733/1/003); Stewart Milne Homes Limited (09029/2/001): An embargo until the CTLR is committed is considered necessary because there are a number identified sites that are currently constrained and only the development of the CTLR will help alleviate this constraint. Without the CTLR and the embargo, development along the A93/A94 corridor will lead to increased congestion within Scone, Bridgend, and Perth city centre.

Whilst SPP requires an effective land supply they must all be sustainable. The statutory requirement to manage Air Quality Management Areas and allowing unconstrained development in the absence of a transport solution will not lead to sustainable development and result in a deterioration of air quality at certain locations.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667/7/001); George Beaton (00742/5/001 & 00742/6/002); Deirdre A Beaton (00741/5/001 & 00741/6/002); Annelie Carmichael (00731/1/001 & 00731/2/002): The area of Bridgend, Gannochy, Kinnoull and the rest of Ward 12 are all within the settlement boundary of Perth City. It would be unreasonable to place a development embargo on areas within the City boundary where the principle of development is generally accepted and where infrastructure and services are concentrated. The accessibility of Perth City Centre and the availability of public transport on the east bank of the Tay will result in a lower projected impact. However it is important to note that any large scale development proposals in this area will still require air quality assessments and transport assessments as part of the planning application.

It is also considered that there are not enough brownfield sites within Perth and Kinross to meet the projected housing demand and this means some greenfield sites will be required.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Perth City West LLP (09462/2/001); Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (00754/4/001): Detailed studies have shown there are serious constraints to development in Perth and is the reason why the package of measures in Shaping Perth's Transport Future (Core\_Doc\_021) is being brought forward.

The A9/A85 junction currently experiences severe congestion at peak times and until this issue is resolved by development of the first phase of the planned works then any significant development along the A85 will only exacerbate the issue. It is considered there is currently a clear need for the proposed embargo in advance of adoption of the LDP. It should also be noted that proposals for the implementation of the A9/A85 junction

upgrade are at an advanced stage.

Planning permission 11/01579/FLL (Core\_Doc\_177) has been granted for the required improvements to the A9/A85 junction and the Councils Composite Capital Budget – Additional Capital Expenditure December 2012 (S4\_Doc\_452) has made provision for its funding.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Scone Transport Infrastructure

Helen Goodacre (00138/2/001): Please refer to response to J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/002) & A & J Stephen Ltd (09727/4/001) in the Development Embargo section of this document.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Ian Sansom (00216/1/001); Karen Donaldson (00601/1/001); Dorothy Guthrie (00763/1/002): Detailed traffic modelling in 'Shaping Perth's Transport Future' (Core\_Doc\_021) has shown that trips through Scone will result in a significant reduction following construction of the CTRL. The CTRL is critical to the social economic growth of Perth and the easing of congestion issues within the city. Some brownfield sites in Scone have been given priority but there should be no development of any greenfield sites until the CTRL is a committed project.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Sam Morshead (00433/1/002): No roads in the region are triple carriageways on each side and the traffic analysis has shown that the predicted traffic levels will mean just a single carriageway would be required. A triple carriageway would not be required in this instance and also the cost of such may be prohibitive.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Persephone Beer (07744/1/008): There will be a complementary package of 'City Enhancements' that will provide for improvements to walking, cycling and public transport as well as public realm improvements as part of the overall 'Shaping Perth's Transport Future' (Core\_Doc\_021) strategy.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scone & District Community Council (00043/1/002): The A93/A94 embargo specifically relates to areas outwith the Perth City boundary but within the area designated in the LDP as the Perth HMA. The development embargo does not relate to the settlements outwith Perth City and the Perth HMA.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/020): Please refer to response to J Donald McKerracher (00672/1/002) and A & J Stephen Limited (09727/4/001) in the Development Embargo section of this document.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kenneth Robertson (00111/1/003): Please refer to response provided to Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/001); Sandra Service (00427/1/002) and Bill Service (00428/1/001); Frank Moisey (09950/3/001 & 09950/3/002) in the Development Embargo section of this document.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Stanley Transport Infrastructure

David Jeffrey (09228/2/001): Improvements along the A9 should be considered by Transport Scotland because it is a trunk road. It is understood that this section of the A9 is included in Transport Scotland's early implementation phase of the proposed A9 dualling between Perth and Inverness.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

1. In order to obtain further information on a number of matters, the council, together with parties who made representations about transport infrastructure matters, were asked to respond to a series of questions. Some were also invited to participate in a hearing session, which considered issues relating to Site H70. All of the additional evidence has been taken into account in examining this issue and making recommendations.

#### General points including those relating to the supporting text (paragraphs 5.1.14- 5.1.17)

2. Representations submitted about transport infrastructure matters reveal no dissent from the council's conclusion that significant improvements to transport infrastructure in the Perth area will be essential if the significant level of growth that is set out in the Proposed Plan is to take place without unacceptable traffic congestion and air quality implications. However, concern has been expressed over how such infrastructure is to be funded and over the timing of its delivery in relation to the delivery of development.

3. Policy TA1B requires development proposals to, among other things, incorporate appropriate mitigation, which could include the payment of developer contributions towards essential transport infrastructure improvements. Representors' principal concerns are not with the policy itself, but with the draft "Developer Contributions Transport Infrastructure" supplementary guidance, which will provide the detail of when such contributions would be sought and the basis for their calculation. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) expects matters of such detail to be set out in supplementary guidance rather than in the plan itself. In order fully to understand the council's intended approach to developer funding of transport infrastructure the draft guidance has been taken into account. However, the content of such guidance does not fall within the scope of this examination.

4. Paragraph 5.1.16 of the Proposed Plan identifies the challenge that will be faced in delivering the required transport infrastructure and the need for a partnership between the public and private sectors, which will require developer contributions to be secured, the details of which will be set out in supplementary guidance. This provides an appropriate indicator to users of the plan that developer contributions will be required and where to look for further detail of such requirements. There is no need for the policy itself also to refer to supplementary guidance on this topic, although it does refer to the availability of such guidance in connection with travel plans and transport assessments, so the council might consider it helpful also to include reference to developer

contributions supplementary guidance within the policy itself, via a minor drafting amendment.

5. It is recognised that there will require to be significant transport infrastructure improvements if all of the development allocations in the Proposed Plan are to be effective. However, it is unnecessary for the Proposed Plan to set out in any detail how or when these will be addressed or how, precisely they will be funded. Such details will inevitably evolve over time and would more appropriately be dealt with in supplementary guidance, which can be subject to more regular review. Any explanation within the Proposed Plan would be likely to become outdated (and therefore unhelpful) very quickly.

6. The Proposed Plan adequately highlights the importance of the proposed Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR) but, as the council (in response to a further information request) has confirmed that that project is not a proposal of the Plan, as its final route is unknown, there is no justification for requiring any greater detail at this stage on how that project might be funded.

7. The wording in paragraph 5.1.15 is not contradictory and requires no modification.

#### Developer Contributions and Funding

8. Reference should also be made to Issue 4, which examines infrastructure contributions more generally.

9. It is inevitable that a requirement for developer contributions towards transport infrastructure (or indeed any other developer financial contribution) will have some effect on land values and/or on the return that such developers could hope to achieve from their developments. It is also possible that this might have an inflationary impact on house prices within the developments in question. However, these issues are not, in themselves a reason not seek such contributions. For such requirements to be ruled out on purely economic grounds there would need to be convincing evidence that the principle of seeking developer contributions for transport infrastructure in the Perth area would be fatal to the achievement of the Proposed Plan's housing strategy. No convincing evidence has been provided that the effectiveness of any of the proposed development sites would be compromised in this way. Indeed, many prospective developers have indicated complete confidence in their site's effectiveness, in the knowledge that such contributions will be sought. The level of such contributions is a matter for supplementary guidance and is not before this examination.

10. The council intends that the suite of road improvements including the Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR) and A9/A85 junction improvement, together with improvements it wishes to carry out in the city centre, which will improve the attractiveness of public and active travel modes, will not only avoid the planned high levels of new development in and around the city causing any detriment to traffic congestion and air quality but will improve the existing situation. Had the council expected developers of sites that are allocated in the Proposed Plan solely to fund such improvements the objections that have been raised could be understood, as, contrary to Circular 3/2012, the development industry would have been expected not only to address the impact of its own development but to address pre-existing deficiencies. However, that is not the case. In response to a request for further information, the council confirmed that the split between developer and public sector financing of the required infrastructure improvements is predicted to be 56% from developers and 44% from other funding mechanisms. This is said to reflect the proportion of the total predicted cost that can reasonably be attributed to the new

development. It is recognised that this calculation is disputed. However, the level of developer contributions will be a matter for the supplementary guidance to establish and is not a matter before this examination. It is concluded that, insofar as the Proposed Plan makes reference to this issue (which is to establish the principle of developer contributions being sought) there is no justification for any modification.

### CTLR delivery

11. In response to representations which questioned the delivery timescale for the CTLR and the means by which it would be financed, a series of questions was put to the council and to other relevant parties. The responses to these reveal that, as stated above, the council expects there to be significant public investment in the works. The total cost of the CTLR and all other works is not yet known with any certainty, but is predicted to be in the order of £135 Million. The council expects 44% of this to be secured from public funding sources and yet the Scottish Government has confirmed that it has no plans to fund the CTLR (which it considers would not significantly contribute to national objectives) or any of the other road projects. The council has committed to forward-fund the cost of the A9/A85 junction and the first phase of the CTLR (at an estimated cost of £23.5 Million), some of which it expects to recover from developer contributions, but is unable to identify how the remaining significant public funding requirement will be met. This raises significant doubts as to the deliverability of the CTLR and associated City Enhancements Package within the plan period.

12. In addition, there is dissatisfaction among some elements of the development industry at the assumption that it should fund 56% of the cost of these works. While, as stated above, questions over what is the appropriate level of developer contributions are not matters for this examination, these representations serve to underline the lack of certainty over the development industry's ability to fund the majority of the required transport infrastructure works. The A9/A85 junction improvements and the first section of the CTLR from that junction into Site H7 can reasonably be assumed to be deliverable, as the council has resolved to forward-fund them and their scale is relatively modest in relation to the level of development that the Proposed Plan will release. However, the CTLR and associated City Enhancements Package, which are likely to require approximately £60 Million in developer funding, if one assumes (as seems unlikely at present) that the anticipated level of public funding can be secured, will pose a significantly greater challenge. It is appreciated that the council would require that this sum to be raised over a 30 year period rather than before 2024. However, that would still represent an ambitious target and, if the required infrastructure works are to be delivered within the plan period, there would need to be forward-funding from the council (presumably in the form of borrowing) of which there is little detail or certainty at this stage.

13. Taking all matters into account, it cannot reasonably be concluded that the CTLR will be a committed project within the lifetime of the Proposed Plan. This conclusion does not require any modification to how the Proposed Plan refers to this project, as it is not a proposal and is referred to because of its importance in addressing traffic congestion issues, which remains relevant despite the uncertain timing of its delivery. However, it has considerable significance for the examination of the suitability and effectiveness of a number of proposed development sites. See in particular Issues 20c, 20d and 21.

### CTLR Route

14. The council has confirmed that as the final route for the CTLR has not been

determined, the road is not a proposal in the Proposed Plan. An indicative route corridor has been shown on the proposals map, but this is approximately 200 metres wide and provides no certainty as to where the road would be built, even if one assumed that the road would lie within this corridor, as opposed to one of the other route corridors that have been considered in the past. Representations about the CTRL need to be considered in the context of uncertainty.

15. The council's evidence, which has not been challenged with any evidence of comparable value, is that the CTRL, in conjunction with the City Enhancements Package, will very successfully ameliorate the impact of development that is allocated in the Proposed Plan. There would therefore be no justification for a second, inner, Tay crossing. And the likelihood of securing public or developer funding for such an additional crossing seems extremely remote.

16. Any implications for the CTRL of the east coast transmission line upgrading can be dealt with when the route is being finalised. As only indicative details of the route are included in the Proposed Plan (and then not as a formal proposal), there is no need for the plan to refer to these works.

17. Concerns that have been expressed over tree and habitat loss, effect on nearby settlements, archaeological and landscape impact, the cost / benefit position and the visual impact of the bridge crossing over the river, railway and A9, will be important considerations when the route and the design of the proposed road and bridge are being finalised. They do not however require to be considered at this stage, as the route is not a proposal of the Proposed Plan.

18. There is insufficient evidence to support the requested creation of an extension to the CTRL so that it linked with the A90, or to justify the allocation of land on the east side of the Tay as an office or retail park. And, in any event as the CTRL itself is not a proposal of this plan, it would be impossible to identify in the plan where or how such additions were to take place.

19. There is no evidence that a single carriageway CTRL would have inadequate traffic flow capacity and no likelihood that funding for a dual carriageway solution could be secured. Pedestrian and cycling facilities should be considered when detailed designs for the CTRL are drawn up. But as the road is not a proposal of this plan, it would be inappropriate to specify this here.

#### A9/A85 junction improvements

20. The junction improvement works already have planning permission and have been designed so as to avoid encroachment upon the crematorium.

#### Heavy Goods Vehicle Traffic

21. The restriction of large goods vehicles entering the city centre is not a matter for a local development plan.

#### Development Embargo

22. Two development embargoes are proposed, which are set out in paragraph 5.1.17 of the proposed plan. These involve an embargo on greenfield housing development for sites of 10 or more outwith Perth on the A93 and A94 corridors until the CTRL is a

committed project and an embargo on development sites of 0.5 hectares or more outwith Perth on the A85 corridor until such time as the new A9/A85 junction has commenced. Representations about each are considered in turn.

23. It is reasonable that the proposed embargo affecting the A93 / A94 corridors does not extend beyond the Perth housing market area to include settlements such as Coupar Angus and Blairgowrie. There needs to be an outer edge to the area affected by the embargo and it is logical and reasonable to exclude settlements outwith the Perth housing market area, as development there is unlikely to exacerbate existing levels of congestion in Perth due to the distance from the city and the likely travel patterns of future residents.

24. It is also necessary to draw an inner boundary to the land affected by the embargo. It is accepted that development in the areas such as Bridgend, Gannochy and Kinnoull, which are within the city itself and would not therefore be affected by the proposed embargo, could increase traffic congestion and air quality problems within the city. However, a balance needs to be struck between avoiding the generation of any additional vehicular traffic in the city and permitting sufficient new housing to satisfy the identified housing requirement and to contribute (via developer contributions) towards funding the transport improvements that are required. Sites within the city boundary are comparatively well served with public transport and, despite the sometimes quite significant gradients of local roads, are located close enough to the city centre to permit residents to select active travel options. It is reasonable therefore for such sites to be excluded from the embargo.

25. There is uncertainty over the duration of the embargo. In paragraph 5.1.17 the proposed plan refers to the embargo subsisting until the CTRL is a committed project. However, it also refers to sites being constrained “until the infrastructure is in place or under construction.” The Proposed Plan should be consistent on the terminology used. It would be too significant a constraint upon development for the embargo to endure until the CTRL was completed, as there is inevitably a time delay (often of several years) between the grant of planning permission for a new housing development and the traffic impact of that development being realised. It would not therefore be unreasonable for planning permission for such development to be granted in advance of the CTRL being built, provided that there was certainty that the road project was a definite commitment. Such an approach would also be likely to assist with the funding for the CTRL project through developer contributions.

26. A number of representors have highlighted the significant effect of the embargo on the delivery of housing within the Perth area. This has been accounted for in Issue 21, which considers the Perth Strategic Development Area and in Issue 20c, which examines the housing land strategy. It has been concluded above that the CTRL is not likely to be a committed project within the plan period. Therefore, it must be assumed that the A93 / A94 development embargo will endure for the entire plan period. It has been concluded that, despite this, the Proposed Plan identifies sufficient housing land within the Perth area that is not affected by either of the proposed embargoes for the housing requirement to be met. When seen in the light of the existing traffic congestion and air quality concerns and the likely impact of additional development in the A93 / A94 corridor in advance of the CTRL, the embargo's significant constraint upon housing delivery is not therefore a reason to remove it from the Proposed Plan.

27. The proposed exclusion of brownfield sites from the embargo reflects an assumption that, being brownfield, such sites are, or are lawfully capable of, contributing to traffic



levels without the grant of planning permission for a residential development. This is a reasonable position and again achieves the correct balance between avoiding any exacerbation of traffic problems and achieving necessary levels of growth.

28. Turning to the proposed A9/A85 embargo, concerns have been expressed over its intended scope. In particular, whether the embargo would apply to proposals within the Perth settlement boundary and to proposals submitted prior to local development plan adoption. Neither of these concerns requires any modification to the Proposed Plan. The existing wording makes it clear that it is sites “outwith Perth” that are affected by the embargo. And, it is unnecessary for the Proposed Plan to confirm when this, or indeed any other provision is to be relied upon. Once the Proposed Plan is adopted, the A9/A85 embargo will have development plan status, which will give it particular significance in any development management decision. The purpose of this examination is to consider the suitability and appropriateness of the Proposed Plan when it is adopted, at which point any questions over the pre-adoption status of any particular provision would be irrelevant.

29. It is hard to imagine a development which would be affected by the proposed A9/A85 embargo (that is, one of at least 0.5 hectares site area) that would not have any impact on traffic flows. The proposed cut-off level therefore seems appropriate. However, in the event that a large but low-impact development were proposed., an argument for an exemption from the embargo could be made at the development management stage.

30. It is perhaps unusual that both proposed embargoes are set out in the Proposed Plan’s supporting text (and in the case of allocated sites in the site-specific developer requirements) rather than in policy. However, their effect will be clear to users of the Plan and there is no requirement therefore for any modification.

#### Scone Issues

31. The purpose of the CTLR is to address problems of traffic congestion and associated air quality problems within Perth. Its stated purpose is not to improve traffic levels in Scone or to discourage large goods vehicles from travelling through that settlement.

32. It has been concluded under Issue 25b that an initial phase of 100 houses could take place on site H29 in Scone in advance of the CTLR due to the relatively good public transport availability and the need for Scone to develop, given its status as a principal settlement in TAYplan.

#### Other matters

33. Whether any of the A9 accesses should be upgraded as part of Transport Scotland’s proposals to upgrade the A9 is a matter for Transport Scotland and not for this local development plan. Any views expressed by Transport Scotland on any proposed site allocation are examined under the Issue in which those sites are considered. Sites that are proposed for development in Stanley and Luncarty are discussed in Issue 25a.

#### **Reporter’s recommendations:**

No modifications.