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# Summary of Results

The draft Perth AQAP went out for consultation between 4/11/24 to 31/12/24. Though LAQM guidance recommends 6 weeks as an adequate consultation period, due to the consultation being close to Christmas time the consultation was extended to the end of the year to ensure maximum participation.

An online survey on PKC’s Consultation Hub was created for the consultation, comprising of 3 questions:

1. Overall, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the measures to improve air quality set out within the Perth AQAP?
2. If there are any areas within the AQAP which you disagree with or feel need to be changed, please tell us which these are (select all that apply)
3. Do you have any other comments on the overall AQAP?

Over the course of the consultation period, the survey received 88 responses, along with three formal responses submitted by email to Environmental Health. Feedback was also received on social media through a further 69 comments on posts sharing the consultation. In total across all forms of feedback, 160 responses were received.

The majority response to the plan in the online survey was unfortunately negative, with 44% of respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the plan’s measures in Question 1. 39% agreed or strongly agreed, while 17% neither agreed or disagreed.

When asked which categories of measures respondents felt most needed changed in Question 2, the main choices were C. Traffic Measures (46%), E. Reducing demand for traffic (45%), B. Relocate AQMA traffic (40%) and D. Reduce emissions from sources (39%). 20% of respondents agreed with all the measures proposed, while 7% disagreed with all measures.

Question 2 also had an open answers section, where 52 of the 88 respondents provided further information on what they felt needed changed. Common topics of feedback were:

* Traffic light signalling/Atholl St issues
* LEZ Concerns
* Public transport/P&R provision
* Impact of AQ measures on Perth Businesses
* Respondents not believing AQ is an issue in Perth
* Concerns about domestic burning emissions

Analysis of the received answers is included under Q2: Open Answers.

The survey concluded with Question 3 asking for any further comments on the AQAP overall. 38 of the 88 respondents gave an answer, with the majority of these repeating the main points of their answer to Q2. Again, full analysis can be found below under Q3.

The consultation results will now be analysed by the Perth AQAP steering group and the AQAP will be amended where appropriate before a final version is presented at Committee.

# Consultation Hub Survey Results

## Q1: Overall, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the measures to improve air quality set out within the Perth AQAP?

## Q2: If there are any areas within the AQAP which you disagree with or feel need to be changed, please tell us which these are (select all that apply):

## Q2: Open Answers

52 of the 88 survey respondents provided further information to justify their choices in the Q2 multiple choice section. For easy analysis, key topics from these answers have been extracted and grouped together below. Full unaltered responses can be found in the Appendix.

### 2.1: Traffic Lights, Roadworks and Atholl St Changes

* Enforce the 20mph in town AND add red light cameras to stop those who accelerate hard to beat the lights . Up to 3 go through AFTER its gone red. Not only does this increase the pollution but its only a matter of time before some is seriously injured due to this practice (Community/Elected Representative, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Replace all the old traffic lights with new “smart” ones however despite a lot of traffic signals in Perth able to be “smart” the traffic engineers seem unable or unwilling to program the lights as such. Examples of this is traffic on approach to junctions being forced to stop in favour of phantom traffic (or pedestrians) approaching from other directions. This is having the biggest negative effect on continuous flows thus generating congestion/pollution. The above policy in regards to traffic signal timing/phasing is in my opinion a deliberate action by P&K Council is to exaggerate claims that Perth is suffering from extreme traffic conditions to gain funding to address the perceived issues for schemes to promote anti car policies that will only benefit the minority. I drive as a profession and constantly see the above mentioned actions that cause congestion/pollution in Perth. Atholl Street congestion could be minimised by having smart signals that communicate with adjacent signals. The main flow should be allowed to continue through the following two sets of lights after gaining green on the 1st set. Camera enforcement of box junctions and the banning of right turns from Atholl Street into Methven Street and Atholl Street into Melville Street would also aid continuous flow. Traffic engineers also need to routinely get out of office and monitor signals for reliability. (Member of Public (MOP hereafter), “Professional Road User”, 50-65, Perth City)
* Traffic lights stop the continued flow of traffic. Sequences needs looked at. For example. When the lights are off at dobbies or inveralmond the traffic flows smoother thus reducing emissions (Community/Elected Representative, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* The only thing I would like to see happen to improve air quality is to remove a lot of the unnecessary traffic lights which increase congestion. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* The plan suggests the Atholl Street and Bridgend areas with worst pollution is due to the high buildings on both sides of the road. Has any thought been put into compulsory purchase of sufficient property in those areas (make small park there) or some “ventilation” system to circulate air outwith those areas? (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* You say you want to reduce idling, but your traffic management actively increases it by needlessly stopping traffic at junctions when there is no need. The resultant braking and acceleration results in increased emissions of respirable particulates from brakes, tyres and exhausts, increases fuel consumption and therefore emissions of exhaust gases, etc. Classic case on Newhouse Road. Also increases accident risk, as many drivers assume there is no joining traffic and jump the lights. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* Improve the traffic flow through Perth city centre as the continual hold-up at lights and roadworks increase emissions. This where you should be spending your efforts - traffic flow management. (MOP, Perth City)
* The worst street in Perth for emissions is Atholl Street, from around 4pm onwards. Most of which could be eased by better traffic Management (traffic light co-ordination)
* Think about how to keep traffic moving in town instead of stuck in jams / every set of lights. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)

### 2.2: LEZ Concerns

* DO NOT INTRODUCE A LOW EMISSION ZONE. Hybrid and electric cars are expensive to buy unfortunately we are not all able to afford these. Coupled with the increasing costs of bus travel and unreliability of bus travel from outwith the city centre (i.e Murthly, Bankfoot, Spittalfield, Blairgowrie) and the Scone Park & Ride being closed more than it is open and Broxden being full as it is now a bus station not a park and ride, You will be actively discriminating against residents that reside outwith the city centre (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* I can see no reason to move down a route that implies preparation for ULEZ. The Council is already doing everything it can to destroy the city centre, despite expressing words of concern. I would like to see a much longer term measurement and real data provided that can demonstrate what is happening. The graphs you have shown identify that emissions are already dropping without Council interference. (MOP, Perth City)
* I feel as if introducing LEZ and EV promotion isn’t adequate. As the city centre is such a small area it isn’t going to make a massive impact. And if extended over more of perth people with older cars who are financially struggling or in tricky situations will no longer have an easy way to travel to work or business. As much as public transport is healthy it is unreliable and not efficient. In recent years I have seen the bus routes become shorter and buses less frequent or not show up. The promotion in EV’s will eventually crash and be environmentally worsen our current situation due to the high usage of lithium and the production process it takes to get it and recycle it. Plus our parking and city is not ready for the size of some of these cars. And not many people can actually afford them. (MOP, 16-25, Perth City)
* If the map showing the area in red is where you are proposing for ULEZ, then I can't support it. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Do not introduce a LEZ - this will kill local business and has already done so elsewhere. Give the bypass and new Tay crossing time to be properly evaluated before introducing a money-grab like an LEZ. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* We should be careful we don't get into the same situation as other cities like Dundee when residents and businesses can't reach their home or premises. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)

### 2.3: Public Transport/P&R Provision

* Greater expansion of Safe active travel paths cycle lanes and development of P&R facilities should be further expanded and prioritised. (Community/elected representative, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* In order to put clean air policies in place, the transport situation needs to be sorted out. Park and ride is a good idea, but if you don't drive you have to depend on shuttle buses to bring you to and fro . After 8pm there were no buses from Broxden to town centre when we came back from Dundee, Edinburgh etc. So we had to get a Taxi into town. This was just before COVID, so i cant comment on what the situation is now. (MOP, 66-79, Perth City)
* (referring to impact of a future LEZ) Coupled with the increasing costs of bus travel and unreliability of bus travel from outwith the city centre (i.e Murthly, Bankfoot, Spittalfield, Blairgowrie) and the Scone Park & Ride being closed more than it is open and Broxden being full as it is now a bus station not a park and ride, You will be actively discriminating against residents that reside outwith the city centre (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Using cars less and encouraging people to use public transport is not viable if the transport is unreliable, scarce, and in some areas practically non existing. It also does not necessarily work for disabled people or those with chronic health conditions, as Stagecoach buses often are not accessible, or have not enough accessible seats. Stagecoach is also much more expensive than in other cities! The way Stagecoach has been managing transport links is abysmal, and it should be held accountable for letting its customers down. Stagecoach should lose their licence, and a set of minimum requirements should be drafted. One cannot ask people to use buses instead of cars without providing a reliable transport first, but for some reason the council is adamant to stay clear of having any plan in this respect. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Areas targeting personal vehicle use need to be looked at greater. The primary reason for these being used is convenience and counters to this which are noted are good but don't go far enough. Public Transport and it's infrastructure need improved to provide more convenient travel, particularly in more rural areas. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* You have listed the aim to have people park outside the centre but no provision for improved public transport. Have you actually tried using buses within Perth? I tried going from Dunked road to Edinburgh road and there is nothing that went even vaguely close. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Bus times are not suitable to allow working people to get to work on time and if you have school age children getting from Perth to outlying villages to meet school times is impossible. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* These proposed measure do not take cognisance of the needs of the local population. You have been naive in the extreme to propose further restriction to car use when the majority of the population live in areas where there is virtually no access to public transport. And to offer active and sustainable transport as a solution shows you know nothing about the demographics in terms of age and location. The people of Perth are not city dwellers but you persistently propose strategies that mimic UK urban changes that have already caused chaos and disruption and are unpopular in the extreme. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* As a mother of young children the safest option for me is to travel into town by car. Our public transport system would have to be remarkably improved in regularity, price, and span of day to day to support people to change. The free buses once a month are fantastic and that incentive DOES make us leave the car at home (but when there are two parents). (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* As much as public transport is healthy it is unreliable and not efficient. In recent years I have seen the bus routes become shorter and buses less frequent or not show up. (MOP, 16-25, Perth City)
* I live in Ardler, Perthshire, there is no connecting bus to travel to Perth let alone anywhere else. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Much better bus services are needed, not just better buses! Services within the city have declined significantly, with much reduced frequency (e.g. No 7/8 was every 10 minutes some years ago, now every 30), reliability, hours (e.g. lack of evening buses), whilst fares have increased much more than car parking charges. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)

### 2.4: Impact on Perth Businesses

* Reducing the way people are able to travel into town will no doubt benefit a few people, what about the town centre though? it is already in a sorry state due to shop closures so making it more difficult and potentially more expensive to travel into and park with the town will have a negative impact on the centre which is already suffering but at least the air will be clean. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)

* B.2 Car Park removal is stated as medium cost to council, however the cost to city centre businesses could be massive. People will shop where they can get their car nearby (out of town) or online. Why not make the car parks ULEZ compliant for 3 years before moving to all electric only. After all it is not cars that are bad, just polluting cars. While you are at it install solar canopies to charge the electric cars or supplement council offices. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* There is no need to "improve" air quality, no need to make everyone's lives more complicated, expensive or difficult. Perth is tiny, it is hard to access as it is, if you want to kill off all the trade then imposing ridiculous measures will certainly do that. The centre is dying anyway due to high rates. (MOP, “Scientist”, Outwith Perth)
* You are struggling to get people in to Perth as it is. It’s run down with over priced parking. I don’t feel you should be doing anything that could restrict footfall, on what looks like a deprived area now so sad (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Reducing parking spaces in the city centre and increasing parking charges only hurts city centre businesses- people will still use their cars but will drive to retail parks supermarkets or other cities to spend their money. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)

### 2.5: Concern about relocating traffic out with Perth City

* Extremely disappointing that perth has no LEZ yet and is still just considering this. It’s not acceptable that the expensive Tay Road Link will just move the traffic and air quality problems to other towns and villages in P&K. I live in Blairgowrie and our town urgently needs to be included in an equivalent piece of work. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* You are simply moving the problem to the western fringe of the city, building new developments at bertha park, Huntingtowerfield, western edge, Glasgow Road etc then sticking the ctlr smack in the middle with all the pollution from the traffic you are simply diverting from atholl street and Bridgend, you are not reducing the pollution simply relocating it. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* Measure B and A. AQAP should also deal with knock on effects of CTRL outwith city centre, including Broxden, Inveralmond, and Jeanfield road. These are predicted in the models used for the CTRL.
* what do you want, people in Perth, or people not in Perth? You cannot have it both ways if you are expecting everyone to cycle to Perth, because we won't. We have already all seen the disaster that the ULEZs have been to Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee and Edinburgh with all the traffic being forced out the city walls. Thus taking all the 'pollutants' to the ring outside, and all the traffic too. So all you are doing, it shifting the problem. And has anyone actually realised just how clean cars are nowadays? They emit f\*\*\* all in comparison to what they did. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)

### 2.6: Domestic Burning

* One of the main sources of emissions in Perth and Kinross comes from particulate matter from domestic solid fuel burning. The rise in use of wood burning stoves in Perth and Kinross has risen exponentially over the past 5 years and continues to do so. This rise in health harming particulate matter from this unaddressed source will negate any gains made from road transport curtailment measures and encouragement of active travel and public transport use in the region. Particulates from domestic solid fuel burning have overtaken road traffic as the bigger source of particulate matter pollution in the UK as has been consistently proven by a number of research sources and scientific reports and papers. Our organisation hears from members across Scotland including people living in Perth and Kinross, all of whom have noticed a substantial lowering in air quality since the use of wood burning stoves in their neighbourhoods has increased. This is a growing problem about which action must be taken if you are serious about improving air quality. (“Communities Against Woodsmoke”, 50-65, Perth City)
* There is no mention of the pollution caused by domestic wood burning. This creates significant levels of fine particulate matter PM2.5 pollution, as well as the emission of toxic gases and chemicals. Indeed domestic combustion is one of the biggest sources of PM2.5. Most of the PM2.5 emissions from domestic combustion come from households burning wood in stoves and open fires. Wood burning damages public health, is harmful to the environment and is anti-social. Wood smoke contains most of the same carcinogens as tobacco smoke, including benzene and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. In fact, research shows that wood smoke is more toxic than cigarette smoke. This is a real issue where I live in a suburban setting in Perth and appears to be unchecked and uncontrolled. Therefore, due to its significance and importance, I believe it should be included in the AQAP. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* Ban log burners and help people get chargers at home for ev’s (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)

### 2.6: Measure B.2 (Incentivise parking out with City Centre hotspots)

* Reducing the way people are able to travel into town will no doubt benefit a few people, what about the town centre though? it is already in a sorry state due to shop closures so making it more difficult and potentially more expensive to travel into and park with the town will have a negative impact on the centre which is already suffering but at least the air will be clean. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* B.2 Car Park removal is stated as medium cost to council, however the cost to city centre businesses could be massive. People will shop where they can get their car nearby (out of town) or online. Why not make the car parks ULEZ compliant for 3 years before moving to all electric only. After all it is not cars that are bad, just polluting cars. While you are at it install solar canopies to charge the electric cars or supplement council offices. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Limiting parking spaces will only make things worse, as Edinburgh showed clearly in Portobello and Craigentinny areas. Using cars less and encouraging people to use public transport is not viable if the transport is unreliable, scarce, and in some areas practically non existing. It also does not necessarily work for disabled people or those with chronic health conditions, as Stagecoach buses often are not accessible, or have not enough accessible seats. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Reduction in traffic use within Perth isn’t possible for everyone (thinking specifically disabled people with limited mobility). Bus routes too far away to be usable. Encouraging parking further from city center suggests parking capacity will be reduced in the city center. Plan needs to include sufficient capacity for disabled parking within city center (probably more than what is in place now). (MOP, 50-56, Perth City)
* You have listed the aim to have people park outside the centre but no provision for improved public transport. Have you actually tried using buses within Perth? I tried going from Dunked road to Edinburgh road and there is nothing that went even vaguely close. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* This is an absolutely appalling strategic approach by P&KC and will only succeed in the advancing destruction of our city. These proposed measure do not take cognisance of the needs of the local population. You have been naive in the extreme to propose further restriction to car use when the majority of the population live in areas where there is virtually no access to public transport. And to offer active and sustainable transport as a solution shows you know nothing about the demographics in terms of age and location. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* You are struggling to get people in to Perth as it is. It’s run down with over priced parking. I don’t feel you should be doing anything that could restrict footfall, on what looks like a deprived area now so sad (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Reducing parking spaces in the city centre and increasing parking charges only hurts city centre businesses- people will still use their cars but will drive to retail parks supermarkets or other cities to spend their money. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)

### 2.7: Measure B.3 (Encourage Low-Car Development)

* B.3 I would not buy a new house that did not have parking for an electric vehicle or any limited parking making any new houses financial suicide for developers. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Reducing the amount of available parking when planning new developments to "encourage" other forms of transport is a real bone of contention if you live right next to one of the new developments that does not have enough parking. I speak from long experience. A new development was built right next to us with totally inadequate parking for staff and public because, to quote the council officer we dealt with "we are not required to provide parking". As a result the area around us is a total no go area twice a day. It has been thus since day 1, and ten years later nothing has changed. The public still park on double yellow lines, on pavements, on landscaping and in totally inappropriate ways, making entering or exiting our property sometimes impossible, sometimes positively dangerous. Using this blunt tool to "encourage" a change of behaviour does not work in some circumstances. More detailed consideration needs to take place depending on the circumstances, and the views of locals, who know the area intimately, who knows their streets far better than officers who don't even live there, must be taken seriously instead of being shrugged off. (MOP, 50-56, Perth City)

Reducing parking at properties won’t reduce the cars people have it will cause more issues and arguments for people. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)

### 2.8: Don’t believe AQ is an issue

* Questions are loaded in favour of going ahead rather than no further action to proceed with changes...not once has anyone ever said " the air quality is bad today" to me. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Compared to England, our air quality is very good (MOP, 66-79, Perth City)
* The internal combustion engine nowadays is massively improved, with very few emissions. There is no need to "improve" air quality, no need to make everyone's lives more complicated, expensive or difficult. Perth is tiny, it is hard to access as it is, if you want to kill off all the trade then imposing ridiculous measures will certainly do that. The centre is dying anyway due to high rates. (MOP, “Scientist”, Outwith Perth)
* Nothing needs changed (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* There is absolutely no need to try and improve air quality if we’re all going to be driving electric cars in the near future. This is nothing other than more legislation to try and stop people driving their cars into the town centre which is completely destroying the city. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Why when the air quality in perth & Kinross is DAQI Level 3 do you feel the need to impose restrictions. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)

### 2.9: Pro-LEZ

* Extremely disappointing that perth has no LEZ yet and is still just considering this. It’s not acceptable that the expensive Tay Road Link will just move the traffic and air quality problems to other towns and villages in P&K. I live in Blairgowrie and our town urgently needs to be included in an equivalent piece of work. Please advise me, Blairgowrie and Rattray Climate Cafe and our Community Council on this. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* Overall, the plan is focusing on appeasing drivers of private vehicles and does not go far enough in creating a cleaner, healthier and fairer Perth which benefits everyone. The plan should be far more progressive, focussing on how we can get people out of cars and onto public transport and using active travel. Seriously considering a LEZ, trialling pedestrianisation of more of our city centre, more incentives to use public transport and creating segregated cycling infrastructure along key commuting routes would have far more impact than many of the measures proposed. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)

### 2.10: EV Comments

* Whole proposal isn’t about improving air quality but rather reducing/phasing out ICE private car usage, and pushing EV cars which are expensive and hugely damaging to the environment. All being done to tackle the bogus so called climate emergency, as part of Agenda 2030 goals. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* This has little to do with improving air quality and much to do with pushing Agenda 2030, phasing out private ICE cars and pushing expensive and environmentally damaging EVs. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* F - trying to promote the uptake of EVs. It is not the role of the Council to be telling the public what type of vehicles they should be using. There are currently problems in the EV market with drastic falls in second hand values, which is having a knock-on effect in the vehicle leasing industry. EVs are promoted as being environmentally friendly, but what happens to the batteries at their end of life? What about the non-environmentally friendly production? EVs tend to be heavier vehicles which could cause more wear to the already badly maintained roads. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* As for BEVs being cleaner? Where is the evidence for that? Manufacture of Li-ion raw materials for batteries is incredibly damaging to the environment, both in the mining operations, directly and indirectly, the transportation of the materials and finished products, especially given their geographic location. Or are you planning to build a gigafactory in Perth? The use of electric vehicles that must carry their own batteries has at a single stroke wasted all the design and development invested in shaving mass from vehicles over the past fifty years or so. Carrying a huge mass of battery has a devastating effect on efficiency, and also has serious safety implications, as the energy dissipated in a collision is proportional to the mass of the vehicle. Heavier vehicles result in more serious accidents. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)

### 2.11: Lack of Concrete Measures

* The plan is unambitious in terms of the need to reduce the level of traffic in Perth, and in particular the city centre, which is essential to meeting air quality targets. The plan should include concrete measures to introduce specific alternatives to car travel, in particular for short journeys between main residential areas, major employers and the city centre. (Member of the public (MOP), 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* In terms of disagreeing with the goals - these seem like they have not been thought through in practical terms, and instead promise vague 'taking into consideration' and 'prioritising'. It seems like a presentation to score points, and does not instil confidence that public opinion will be taken into account. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Measures need to be more assertive: Prohibited vehicles around school, Free bus travel, Protected cycle paths and walkways, Priority to pedestrians at crossings (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)

## Q3: Do you have any other comments on the overall AQAP?

52 of the 88 survey respondents provided further comments in Q3, with the majority of answers reenforcing the points they expressed in Q2. As for Q2 above, the key topics from these answers have been extracted and grouped together below, and the full unaltered responses can be found in the Appendix.

### 3.1: Traffic Lights, Roadworks and Atholl St Changes

* Perhaps address the traffic light system inadequacies causing stop start traffic and the never ending roadworks needlessly causing congestion instead of allowing traffic to move. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* The persistent and ubiquitous nature of roadworks in Perth must be contributing to the poor air quality. Almost daily travellers encounter temporary traffic lights, closed roads, reduced lanes/capacity. I know improvements must be done but surely a tighter rein could be kept on these never ending interruptions? (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Keep traffic flowing. There’s no point in targeting individuals for idling when your ineffective traffic management results in constant queues of traffic with engines idling. Get your light sequencing sorted, use intelligent light sequencing to deal with changes in traffic flow. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* The area of focus should be on traffic flow management not measuring pollution with a preset agenda. (MOP, Perth City)
* There are small pockets of traffic pollution in Perth & Kinross which should be addressed with improved traffic management but I see little purpose in pinpointing other areas for improvement which will little difference if we don’t openly address air quality risks associated with weather engineering. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* There are two roads in Perth which have been highlighted as being a problem and for that reason, a lot of investment has to be made to make private vehicle travel more unattractive and difficult. Perhaps the Council should look into how traffic management could be improved and the sequencing of traffic lights to prevent a build up of traffic in the two specific areas (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)

### 3.2: LEZ Concerns

* PKC will go ahead any way and introduce LEZ whatever result of this consultation. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* Thank you for not going ahead with a LEZ thus far, I live rurally and have an old vehicle which I would feel was an utter waste to scrap (and bad for the environment) and unfortunately, I have no choice but to drive to Perth for work as no public transport in my area and even if we did have it, I doubt the frequency would be suitable. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* DO NOT INTRODUCE A LOW EMISSION ZONE. Hybrid and electric cars are expensive to buy unfortunately we are not all able to afford these. Coupled with the increasing costs of bus travel and unreliability of bus travel from outwith the city centre (i.e Murthly, Bankfoot, Spittalfield, Blairgowrie) and the Scone Park & Ride being closed more than it is open and Broxden being full as it is now a bus station not a park and ride, You will be actively discriminating against residents that reside outwith the city centre. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Premature introduction of LEZ will kill Perth as the Park and ride cannot be relied on due to the EV charging points. (Community/Elected Representative, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Please do not introduce a Lez in Perth. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* What happens if I’m disabled have take my car to work daily and my car doesn’t meet the ULEZ range (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* No LEZ (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Continue to rule out LEZ formation for Perth. Perth could not implement one without serious negative implications on an already under pressure economy. In addition the AQ improvements would be minimal at best and may actually worsen areas outside. I only mention this as the Scottish Government have an unhealthy fixation on them. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)

### 3.3: Concern about relocating traffic out of Perth City

* I fear that Traffic coming South bound down the A9 and heading to Dundee/Aberdeen may use the Tay crossing to bypass the city centre and travel through Scone /Bridgend (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* I feel like pushing traffic out of the city centre only forces it just outside (craigie etc) (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Yes, you are simply relocating the problem (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)

### 3.4: Public Transport/Park & Rides

* Another Perthcentric survey that fails to address the poor public transport links in surrounding areas which ultimately causes private vehicle use. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Thank you for not going ahead with a LEZ thus far, I live rurally and have an old vehicle which I would feel was an utter waste to scrap (and bad for the environment) and unfortunately, I have no choice but to drive to Perth for work as no public transport in my area and even if we did have it, I doubt the frequency would be suitable. I now only have to work from the office 2-3 a week though so I have reduced my journeys and do any grocery shopping after work. I’d be fine with using a park and ride for city centre journeys. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* I agree with the general thrust of the document, but I feel a P&R facility at Bridge of Earn, linking to the excellent Ember bus would help Perth traffic reduction from that side of town and reduce the number of cars going into town. (Community/Elected Representative, 50,65, Outwith Perth)
* (talking about potential impact of an LEZ) Coupled with the increasing costs of bus travel and unreliability of bus travel from outwith the city centre (i.e Murthly, Bankfoot, Spittalfield, Blairgowrie) and the Scone Park & Ride being closed more than it is open and Broxden being full as it is now a bus station not a park and ride, You will be actively discriminating against residents that reside outwith the city centre. Public transport really needs to be looked at. If you live outwith the city centre, it is too expensive to get a bus!. Not only are fares expensive, buses frequently run late, breakdown or just don't run at all. Not to mention not being able to get a bus past 6pm. no incentive for anyone to go to the concert hall, cinema or pubs and restaurants as they have to get the last bus at 6pm! (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Insufficient parking at Broxden Park and Ride since the EV charging points installed and they are generally empty. Those of us from out with the city have to drive into the town now because of it. (Community/Elected Representative, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* The plan shouldn't penalise/impact people getting to and from work, either financially or by extending their day by restricting vehicle usage. Business vehicles can and should be targeted to be greener as should public transport. Public transport operating times needs to be sufficiently early and late and frequent and affordable to be utilised in preference to private vehicles and the connections need to be improved. Journeys to Edinburgh could be taken by train in preference to cars if the train journey time was reduced which would reduce traffic through Perth. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)

### 3.5: EV Comments

* Don't bother with the EV charging infrastructure, EVs are going to be a relic before you get this all in. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* If everyone in Perth had a BEV, how many charging points would they need, and where would the infrastructure come from? What about flat dwellers? (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* More 20-50w ev car chargers in the centre might encourage people with EVs to stay in town for a few hours and spaces for petrol cars. It will also allow residents without driveways to buy an EV. I would suggest you could maybe take half the chargers at broxden and distribute them around town. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Public EV charging needs to be more plentiful, be affordable and be located in safe spaces. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)

### 3.6: Overall Plan/Consultation Comment

* The AQAP, is by far too complex for an average user to read... no one will read the AQAP. A short brief summary would encourage more people to actually engage with the survey and the plan. When dealing with "the public" you need to be short and too the point, this published plan is far too comprehensive for the public to digest. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Impossible to comment on such an important document within the time limit. Only now have been made aware of it. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* Like many others responding to the Plan, I consider it ill thought out and insufficient thought given to long-term impact of natural reductions from more efficient (reduced emissions) from cars. As a town that wishes, I presume, to attract tourists then I don't see anything that is being done to a make the City more attractive. (MOP, Perth City)
* I would welcome a more progressive, forward thinking plan from PKC which will genuinely look to benefit our city. The current plan focuses too much on pandering to car drivers, who are the people causing the air pollution in the first place. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)

### 3.7: Active Travel

* More cycle/walking lanes away from traffic for safe school pupil movement would also be a benefit to the pupils health. (Community/Elected Representative, 50,65, Outwith Perth)
* Encourage walking and cycling: It is positive that the plan promotes walking and cycling as primary modes of transport to reduce vehicle emissions including The Sustrans Perth, People project that specifically tackles the area with high levels of pollution. This should be clarified to specifically tackle short car journeys as Transport Scotland has shown in 2022 that most journeys tended to be over short distances, with 17% of all journeys being under 1 km long and a further 25% between 1 and 3 km. The Perth Active Travel Hub being created has the potential to measure modal shift away from cars. (Business owner/operator in Perth, Live outwith P&K)
* You’re killing the town with cycle lanes, that aren't helping the motorist. I'm also disabled so, I need my car and won't use public transport, especially the buses because the are filthy. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)

### 3.8: Domestic Burning

* Whilst lots of measures will be taken to address pollution from traffic, pollution from other sources is being seriously neglected and ignored to the detriment of the health of the public. Asthma and Lung UK Scotland produced a report on Domestic Burning in Scotland that should ideally be read by every Local Authority intent on making a difference to the air quality in their area. Not only are there no smoke control areas within your Local Authority area but there is also no monitoring of this type of air pollution in neighbourhoods despite your Local Authority receiving 65 complaints on pollution from wood burning in the past 5 years. This we know from information gathered from our Freedom Of Information request to yourselves earlier this year. Air pollution from domestic solid fuel burning makes a significant contribution to poor air quality throughout the year but most noticeably during the autumn and winter months. This is a growing problem and needs to be addressed. Air quality researchers at Stirling University started the Stirlingshire Villages Project in 2022 whereby air pollution sensors were installed around the region to monitor particulate matter. These sensors are still taking readings and these readings are updated every 10 minutes and can be viewed online in real time by anyone. Please access the PurpleAir Live UK map to note the readings being taken, readings that regularly breach levels of the pm2.5 recommended limits set by the WHO. We would be happy to meet with you to discuss this issue further and we have a wealth of information available on our website which may help you formulate a plan for dealing with this growing problem. (Communities Against Woodsmoke, 50-65, Perth City)

### 3.9: Other

* As above, whilst PKC cannot solve entirely problems with national transport routes, A9 and M90, its decisions affect traffic levels and emissions from these routes beside the city and this on Perth residents, and it also need to take action to reduce effects of these on Perth citizens. There are other partners it needs to engage with e.g. NHS Tayside which create a lot of traffic demand, e.g. at PRI and Drumhar (central treatment centre). (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)

# Formal Consultation Responses

## Scone & District Community Council Response

* 1.2.1 We should like to congratulate PKC on their introduction to this document where causes and effects of air pollution are really well explained. However, the issues of Wood stoves are not mentioned. You cover all the other forms of air pollution. Legislation will be needed to reduce usage, but in the information pages of this document it would be helpful if documented as the problem here is education around the dangers of these stoves. This is a missed opportunity to educate and prevent air pollution. See: https://bylines.scot/health/no-fire-without-smoke-is-it-time-to-ditch-burning-wood-in-the-home/
* Intro table 2.1 is not the environment act.
* 1.3 CTLR. This para talks about city centre, but there are concerns around Bridgend, and PKC traffic modelling shows increased traffic at Bridgend with the CTLR. This needs an action point in the document. Scone is the ‘beneficiary’ of the CTLR and it is important that monitoring is in place to ensure displacing traffic from the city centre just merely moved the problem elsewhere.
* Fig 1.5 This only shows to 2018, we know emissions went up again after Covid, and the data have been published in the annual reports, so wondering why this is so limited?
* 2.1 We consider there are insufficient real-time monitors which measure PMs (N-3), more are needed in the various hot spots to get a full picture eg along Bridgend with the advent of the increased CTLR traffic. Further Villages, such as Scone, along the A94 will have more traffic and NO2 monitors should be randomly assigned in some of these villages, particularly if the A94 passes close to a school. Whilst we in Scone note that traffic modelling for the CTLR showed a decrease of 6 cars in every 100 for Scone, we should like this checked after the opening of the CTLR as most bypasses increase traffic in feeder roads. We also request an NO2 monitor in Scone for a period of 12m after the CTLR opens as the effects of the new builds in H29 and the CTLR have not been measured.
* As H29 is progressing the document should indicate that it is P&K plan to place at least one monitor within phases 3 & 4 to ensure the traffic diverted from Perth along the CTLR does not cause problems here (Fig 2.6). As this plan extends over quite a few years this should be added to the current document. We are concerned that the document refers only to the city centre issues (and Crieff) but there are no plans to monitor where the city traffic is displaced to, aka Scone and villages on the A94.
* Inveralmond will see a large increase in traffic from the CTLR and should have a monitor placed within the shopping area.
* 2.3 Although there was a clear effect from covid during lockdown, the bounce back seen thereafter is worrying, and should be indicated in this document for information as otherwise looks as if its being hidden. It also makes people aware, so if further measure required, they are accepted, but also the NO2 results in 2024 should be mentioned. This bounce back after covid is clearly seen in NO2 (Fig A1 in p56) in the 2023 AQ annual report, PM10 (Fig A3 p62) PM2.5 (A6, p67). And for the 2024 report, Atholl St PM10 remains above legal limits (Table A6 2024). A deeper discussion would aid public understanding.
* The exceedences for 2023 are not shown in the 2024 AQ report only 2022, so we are unable to see how many exceedences there were. This makes judging the plan difficult without full data. Further the PM2.5s, the worst for health, show a straight line ie no change, and a little increase in 2024. As excellent great strides have been achieved, documented in the plan, the hot spots not yet fixed should also be discussed, so the people of Perth understand the correct situation.
* An omission has been made of the last data point for 2024 NO2 in Atholl St fig 2.3. This is present in the 2024 AQAP in fig A1. As this point shows an upward trend, you may like to put in the correct figure into this plan? We note the same is so for PM10 where the last point, again showing an upward trend in the AQ annual report, is missing from the consultation document. We note that the PM2.5 results are not in the consultation document, and as these give a less optimistic view (as seen in the 2024 annual report) as they haven’t really changed, we should be up front about them. Again, if these stay up then consideration must be given to an LEZ, and it will come as a surprise if all the data are not shown.
* A1 Great to see the proposed improvements in links with Regional Transport Strategy. However, one big issue is that it takes much less time to Edinburgh by car than by train, this builds up traffic at Bridgend (and Broxden). Perhaps the Council could make representations to ScotGov about getting rid of the single line at Lady bank? We are sure the public Could get behind this. This would make freight easier to go by train on way to Inverness and aid reductions in traffic across new CTLR, where houses in Scone are being built along it.
* The detail here is insufficient to make any comment. As this is key it would be nice to see the details.
* A2 Mobility Strategy, it would be nice if these could be mandatory, we assume voluntary as no formal legislation available?
* A3. Ensuring air quality is taken into account in new developments. The council should request to developers that these measurements should be taken in Nov, early Dec or mid Jan instead of the 2 weeks in July during school holidays as seen by us in 2 planning applications.
* A4. The new build legislation will hopefully pass before many more houses are built. In the meantime the council should make it a policy to request alternative heating sources for wood stoves and biomass boilers. Whilst accepting that there is no legislation to force this, the effects of wood burning in the home are so damaging that the Council should make it their strategy to discuss and dissuade their use.
* Good to see enforcement of Green Travel plans from developers. These should NOT be limited to putting a leaflet through the door of the new build explaining that active travel is good for you as we saw in one planning application.

With the advent of 2030 legislation re EVs car chargers should also be widespread in developments and again persuasion can be effective. Where legislation is not available it would be powerful if Councils could band together and ask the Scottish Government for this addition of chargers in new builds, to be considered.

* B1 as shown by P&K CTLR traffic modelling, diverting traffic onto CTLR will increase traffic at Bridgend. This will affect Scone travellers going south from Scone, who already must sit for a considerable time in the air pollution generated. What are the specific plans for dealing with this?
* B2 there are no actual plans here. How will you incentives parking out with city hotspots? In Nov Council Minutes indicated that FURTHER city centre parking might have to be made available when Mill St is developed. This seems contradictory. What are the actual plans to do incentivise? Park & Rides? Protected cycle lanes (no one wants their kid cycling in the city), increased pedestrian areas?
* B3 as for B2. Restricting parking in new developments has been shown in many studies not to work. They just park on the road and much frustration is garnered. We have seen this in Scone where insufficient parking in the old Wheel Inn new build is causing blockages in adjacent roads including round the doctors surgery, with patients being unable to park close to the surgery for their appointments. When EVs become standard these measures will not be needed but are permanent. Better to work on the city centre. Pedestrianise, protected cycle lanes, better Ebuses – discuss with bus company re reconditioning of old diesel buses which you have shown are a big source of pollution (We note you have eliminated this later in the document, but we believe short sighted as buses, you say, are the most polluting). Discuss moving these buses away from city hotspots. And ask/contract the bus company to use EVs on these routes. We note the discussion in D1. This strategy of merely limiting parking spaces in new developments is likely to be ineffective and cause much angst.
* C1 Signs are mentioned. Pollution monitors with results as for speed should be used. This will alert the public for the need for change and make things like pedestrianisation, LEZs etc more acceptable. We suggest one at Bridgend and one in Athol St.
* C2 The plan should state that if no decrease in idling is seen then tickets will be issued, the 4Rs are rarely effective. This is a major problem round schools. We see this frequently in Scone, especially in winter as parents wait in cold cars for their children.
* D1. P&K should make it contractual where at all possible that all companies employed by the Council should use low emission vehicles.
* D2 the same comment here about speeding up the Edinburgh Perth train journey and beyond to get freight off the road. Good suggestion re decant to less polluting vehicles.
* D3 Public transport, Good ideas. We also need protected cycle lanes and pedestrian shopping areas. Grants could be provided to bus operators to recondition old vehicles with less emitting engines or batteries. Ask the Govt to extend their grants for this. There was poor take up as no push. The oldest buses are used for school run as council runs are the least profitable. Our children are sitting in the middle of toxic pollution, as it can be 3x higher in the bus than on the pavement. We have significant concern regarding the recent axing of a bus route in Scone ie at the Park & Ride which means a number of less mobile villagers are now taking their cars into Perth. Encouragement doesn’t seem to work, perhaps the document could discuss other alternatives?
* D4 LEZ. It should be stated what air pollution measures will make the council go this route? This has been discussed and discarded previously, but we have been an AQMA in Perth for so long this must be actively considered if no improvements seen. https://bylines.scot/health/to-lez-or-not-to-lez-the-reality-for-human-health/

The Council must consider supplying HEPA Air filters to the people of Atholl St. They have been subjected long enough to toxic air. One of us has spoken to a few elderly couple there who, uselessly, have filled their house with peace lilies in an effort to clean their air. Their curtains are stained with black carbon. This kindness would be seen as a real effort to help the people very much affected by Atholl St’s dangerous air pollution.

* D5 Good to see.
* D7 It is not clear what the actual strategy is for increasing car chargers. The privately owned Perth car parks should be asked to provide these or contracts not renewed. The people who live in the city are disadvantaged both by being unable to charge their cars at their own homes, and by city centre air pollution, and so many, many more than the 80 we have will be required. This is why chargers in new developments are crucial.
* D9 School Travel. Good action but also ensure that bus companies use EVs where possible as the oldest buses are used as Council contracts don’t pay well. Consider NO2 air quality monitors round schools on main roads (Fife council are doing this) with visible signage showing measures. Focus traffic warden efforts re idling round schools. Consider tredges or tree/hedge planting where schools close to traffic
* E. There is no successful Park and Ride in Scone, indeed stagecoach has reduced its service here because there is no passenger pick up. The statement is inaccurate. The worry is this land belongs to AJ Stevens and he could build on it at any time. Efforts should be made to reclaim this P&R for the sake of air quality in Perth.

A timeline should be given for investigation of where further P&Rs will be placed.

* F1 Encouraging active travel is rarely successful without protected cycle lanes. The Council declined to work with Sustrans on a pedestrian/cycle/wheels route with bridge across the Tay thus reducing traffic significantly and providing a safe route in for our children. Why, if F1 is truly P&K Strategy?
* F3 Ditto, without safe cycling routes into the city, this will probably be a waste of money. We have carried out a village wide questionnaire on Scone and the proposed route was very popular, but with many saying no elderly person or child would feel safe/be permitted to cycle on the dangerous road into Bridgend. Perhaps this could be an action point in the document ie to review this decision?
* F4 as above, P&K should only issue contracts to companies using low emission vehicles. This could be brought in over time eg 3rd Q 2026
* F5 An open day meeting with varied presentations would be useful, not only on the plans but about the health risks, and benefits of active travel, to get people onside.
* GI Again no actual details given. There should be monitors when H29 Phases 3 & 4 built, and in some of the feeder villages to the CTLR.
* G2 Again no real detail. The traffic modelling should be made public. It took 2 years to see the CTLR modelling.
* Table 4.1.Eliminations. Health is important and P&K issue contracts; these can specify low emission vehicles for school runs. Eliminating these puts our most vulnerable at risk
* Legislation. The document whilst giving the legal limits should note that whilst Scotland has the tightest regulations in Europe, they are still above the W.H.O. evidence-based recommendations particularly for NO2, thus alerting the public to the ongoing dangers particularly from NO2 which is at 40 vs WHO 10µg/m3.

We thank all who have drafted this document which has many good parts, and although our comments are many, we are pleased that PKC take this issue seriously. We hope our suggestions will be given consideration to be inserted into section 4: Action Plan

## Perth and Kinross Branch of Scottish Green Party Response

* 1.2.1 PKC is to be congratulated on such an excellent thorough introduction about the health and climate effects of air pollution. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the consultation document.
* However, where are issues of solid fuel burning discussed? All the other forms of air pollution are covered. Coal burning is associated with particulate emissions and is also a fossil fuel contributing to climate change. Wood burning is seen as useful in some fairly uncommon circumstances where rural people are wholly off-grid, intermittently off-grid, or seeking to reduce fossil fuel combustion, but it has also been demonstrated to contribute to serious PM2.5 emissions and thereby lower air quality. In the information pages, which are excellent, this issue could be discussed as few people recognise their dangers. The problem here is education around their health impacts and how to minimise these. This is a missed opportunity to educate on these dangers, how stoves can be used less in total, more efficiently, and more safely, and hence greatly reduce dangerous air pollution from these stoves. (References available on request).
* Another primary missing item is that, whilst transport is rightly discussed, there is an assumption that the CTLR will only divert traffic from the centre and yet this is unlikely to occur without interventions to prevent traffic rebound. We discuss this in more detail later.
* The 3rd key missing item is the importance of 20 minute villages and towns. A significant amount of house building continues with little infrastructure provided (apart from in Bertha Park), The council should have this in their strategy, to look at planning applications with a view to asking developers for key infrastructure items to prevent villagers always having to travel into Perth. This should be in this document. The same is so when considering public services. The proposed closure of 6 rural Libraries in Perthshire will produce multiple car journeys into Perth’s Library. Similarly, the closure of the health facility at Bridgend means people now travel right up polluted Atholl St to get to Bells Sport Centre from all villages on the east side of Perth. So we need to see air quality and car journeys being considered for all decisions the Council makes. This document should reflect this, that air quality and traffic will be taken into consideration during all decision making, and a question asked re this for each policy change.
* 1.2.2 It is good to see the linkages between air pollution and climate change. In particular, it would be useful specifically to note that with climate change, an increase in wildfire risk is apparent and likely to get worse, as seen in the Highlands last year, and wildfires have been demonstrated to have huge negative impacts on air quality and public health.

Note: the remainder of the Green Party’s response was the same as Scone & District Community Council’s as they were written in tandem, see above

## Dundee City Council Response

“I’ve had a read through the draft and find it a very comprehensive document that provides helpful sections on the public health impact of poor air quality and the linkages to other PKC policies and plans. There is a very comprehensive list of proposed improvement measures however there is no mention of how these are to be funded or current funding status, or any timeline on proposed revocation of the AQMA (these are within the new Policy Guidance and the AQAP template). Within this section (D. Reduce Emissions From Sources), there are no measures that relate to domestic burning and reducing PM emissions from this source, which is a target area in CAFS 2? All of the measures in this section relate to transport sources with no mention of non-transport emission sources – were these considered? Also, within D2 (page 32 of the draft), there is mention of the ‘PKC and Dundee’s EH managers are members of the Freight Quality Partnership’ – this is something that I was not aware we were members of?”

# Social Media Responses

This section summarises the feedback received from social media to date regarding the Perth AQAP consultation during November and December 2024.

The feedback falls roughly into two types:

1. Negative, critical of the consultation and the need for it.
2. Positive, providing helpful feedback on the areas covered by the consultations and other relevant suggestions.

Frequent issues raised include:

* Traffic signalling and congestion in city centre
* Caution over making any changes before CTLR is open and traffic stabilises
* Concern about a future LEZ

All the posts, anonymised, are detailed below.

FB - 4 November

* I am surrounded by houses using wood burning stoves which seriously affect my breathing. These should not be allowed unless you find a way to collect the toxic fumes in the chimney before the smoke reaches the atmosphere.
* Been a taxi driver for over 30 years , there has never been a build up traffic between 2 bridges like there is now , unless some event at Scone. Now we’re lucky if 5 cars get through lights causing congestion. Put lights back to how they were then traffic will flow. It’s usual council incompetence.
* After reading the draft and trying to do the survey but the need to split comments to each heading was difficult and needed a lot of cross referencing. My initial thoughts are:
	+ 2.3 Trends in pollution does not mention the rapid rise in electric vehicles, and future sales of now useable used cars and smaller family cars instead of luxury vehicles and company cars. Pollution levels will be dropping regardless of any measures by PKC.
	+ B.2 Car Park removal is stated as medium cost to council, however the cost to city centre businesses could be massive. People will shop where they can get their car nearby (out of town) or online. Why not make the car parks ULEZ compliant for 3 years before moving to all electric only. After all it is not cars that are bad, just polluting cars. While you are at it install solar canopies to charge the electric cars or supplement council offices.
	+ B.3 I would not buy a new house that did not have parking for an electric vehicle or any limited parking making any new houses financial suicide for developers.
	+ C.2 Why not install a lit sign above or near traffic lights with "No Idling" lit when amber lights comes on and goes out with Red/Amber Light.
	+ D.5 PKC just moved to "green" diesel instead of buying electric bin lorries, what message does that send out. At least purchase a small electric lorry and sweeper for the city centre only. Even consider a small electric gritter (you don't need a monster 6x6 gritter for town centres) and mini electric for footways
	+ F.1 As a cyclist I find the choice of Dunkeld Rd for a cycle route very strange, I don't want to cycle with cars, lorries and buses passing or offloading passengers, why not use one of the back streets or even use the outskirts of the North Inch, they all end up at the city centre anyway. You will need a massive modal switch from cars to bikes to make any difference so you will still need good streets for vehicles for a long time to come.
* Here's three radical ideas...---
	+ The 20MPH limit increases air pollution. To drive at 20MPH, most cars must run in 3rd gear as 4th bogs down the engine and combustion is highly inefficient.
	+ 30MPH allows to use 4th so the engine revs are lower, with fewer emissions but still in the RPM range of good efficiency. Cars have been engineered for this for decades. Many UK cars have a red tick on the tachometer marking the 30 and 60MPH speeds.
	+ It doesn't take a degree in maths to see that, to go from A to B in 3rd gear at 20MPH, the amount of emissions per mile travelled is much higher than at 30MPH in 4th. Shorter travel time = shorter period the car is in town = lower pollution in town.
	+ The slower the car, the longer the presence in town, the higher the pollution. A stationary car with the engine on creates infinite pollution.A car that drives through town (theoretically) at 1000MPH doesn't even register. Remove the 20MPH limits.
	+ --- Make cycles on traffic lights at intersections MUCH shorter so you don't have cars stationary for two minutes at a time and, by keeping traffic moving, keep air circulation.
	+ Consider a complete rethink of how traffic flows. With two parallel roads crossing town north to south and another pair east to west, make all them one way streets like South Street. You want cars to be moving as fast as possible and leaving town as quickly as possible. Do that.
* This the start of ULEZ.... covering the majority of 20mph city centre streets? Make sure the traffic lights are poorly set, loads of road works to aid new "pollution data"...
* Not sure about cars but the stink of sewage sometimes on Tay Street needs looked at
* You lot know how to waste money at a very alarming rate.
* General complaint about waste of money and call to remove the wind turbine at Aviva.
* Sorry, but this is typical of a Gen Z Plan. Heavy on presentation, ideas and actions but light on evidence of the problem and analysis of how much each of the actions has contributed to delivering the result. A clear example of the lack of analysis is your assumption that the improvement in air quality is due to improvements in vehicle engines/electric vehicles with no mention that traffic volumes are 15% below pre-pandemic levels. A cynic would say that this is a deliberate omission in order to exaggerate the benefits of the Cross Tay Link Road.
* PKC should wait till after the new tay crossing to the north of town is operational, then do the air quality assessment. The reduced through traffic in town will surely result in the required improvement without PKC doing even more to make Perth a poor business environment and making the existing driver experience in town even worse?
	+ Exactly this! The CTLR should relieve the horrendous bottlenecks on the existing bridges and at Bridgend. There will always be naysayers who say road improvements bring more cars, but it's much better to keep those cars moving rather than sitting in queues. As Henry says, wait for that to open, then look at all the other places where traffic queues for long periods. Spoiler Alert: Broxden Roundabout!
	+ Have you noticed the 15% reduction in traffic volume compared to pre-Covid? That's a pretty significant reduction that should have impacted on air quality. Have you noticed any reduction in bottlenecks on the existing bridges and at Bridgend? Presumably not because you'd have commented on it. How much of a further reduction in traffic volume do you expect there will be as a result of the CTLR?
	+ I would expect quite a reduction. Anyone from West of Perth needing to go north east will find it easier to nip up the bypass from the junction at the former market site towards Luncarty and over the new bridge. I have often had to go through the toon on that route whilst following other traffic doing exactly the same. We don't use the Southern bypass and Friarton bridge alternative because Broxden and Bridge end are such a snarl up, its currently easier to go through the toon.
	+ just wait for all the new south bound traffic that comes over the bridge, then needs to merge before Inveralmond round about in the south bound lane.... will cause a lot more jams so no doubt one of the new places to monitor "pollution/air quality".
	+ Agreed. So Inveralmond also needs consideration. There should really be a bypass connecting the A9 (inveralmond side) and the A90/M90 at Broxden.
	+ although highly unlikely in coming years, i still wouldn't be surprised if a new by pass roughly (give or take a few miles) will be proposed somewhere close to the well placed red lines on this screen grab from google. It would then likely allow for green/brown belt changes for more houses within the current bypass and new proposed one...



* + Broxden needs three more filter/slip lanes similar to the one going southbound from the Glasgow Road/Services by Creating three filter/slip lanes this would allow traffic from the A9 South travelling North to merge and in most cases they won’t even have to stop. The same principle for traffic coming from the Edinburgh side of the southern bypass to filter round onto the A9 South. The same idea for traffic coming down to Broxden from Inveralmond that wish to take the Glasgow Road to the services or go into Perth. All three filter/slip roads would reduce time sitting stationary thereby reducing pollution. But it’ll no happen.
	+ I don't doubt that some traffic will use the CTLR and avoid using the toon and the "congestion" at Bridgend but you have cited a personal scenario and no-one has bothered to assess what proportion of traffic at Bridgend that represents. The route you cite could still mean going through Bridgend. Reductions in traffic volume at one point may mean increases at another and will not mean reductions in air pollution overall. PKC statistics are from 2017. Traffic volumes dropped significantly during the pandemic but then increased after lockdown but are still 15% below pre-pandemic levels. There is already a reduction in "congestion" at Bridgend but it hasn't been measured and no-one has felt it. That's because there's always going to be congestion at bottlenecks like bridges. The benefits of the CTLR are an illusion. It's just pushing the problem somewhere else.
	+ The next phase of CTLR is to connect roundabout at A9/Kingsway to A9 via Bertha Park. 1st half already built from A9 to Bertha. It's in the documents.
	+ But that's not going to help at Broxden. I don't know where Kingsway is though, other than Dundee.
	+ The Road over Destiny bridge from Scone to A9 is to be called New Kingsway, bloody confusing.
	+ I've just watched the flythrough. I think what's needed is a proper through-route, at the same grade as the A9 itself. That proposed route has three rondabouts, goes past housing, and and has pedestrian crossings and traffic lights. So looks to be just a connector for Bertha Park, rather than a true connecting route for through-traffic.
	+ (PKC Response) Hello Henry, the Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR) was one of the main air quality improvement measures within the 2009 Perth Air Quality Action Plan and is included within the updated 2024 action plan as well. The air quality assessment carried out as part of the planning process for the CTLR predicted the crossing will have a noticeable improvement on Perth’s air quality, particularly along the Bridgend/Atholl Street corridor which is one of our main hotspots. While we expect the crossing to result in improvements in air pollution, there is no single solution to address all air pollution issues within Perth, which is why this action plan containing a combination of improvement measures has been developed.
	+ I absolutely agree with you on this, I have seen it elsewhere and it works.
	+ [Perth and Kinross Council](https://www.facebook.com/Perthandkinross?__cft__%5b0%5d=AZWzqKFRn7R_FcpmG2CjurLCf7QRTcXnVUrUxyJWFdbtnzKN6J8vXHSG0YjleUAususTTnUWwz8oKG4wgTNnmiP_WQOWR7reBirbh2d1vvx4JMn8r763MoPVSoOEh2WYEgtErR5PhQoFm_Xv4Gm4gUmN&__tn__=R%5d-R) The traffic figures on which you have based the benefits of the CTLR are from 2017. During the pandemic, traffic volume dropped significantly and air quality improved. Since then traffic has increased and then plateaued at 15% below pre-pandemic levels. Has Perth and Kinross Council monitored traffic volumes at Bridgend/Atholl Street during this period? If so, could you publish them? If not, how are you going to assess the impact of the CTLR. How much has the air quality improved compared to 2017 and how much more do you predict that it will improve with the CTLR?

FB 15 November

* Why consulting before the new road is open?? Pollution levels should drop significantly as a result. As the park and ride is now full of EV charging points with no other parking available for those who live outside Perth we need our cars to get to the shops. If you slap us with an LEZ or ULEZ then we cannot drive in and therefore businesses loose even more trade.
	+ Or you could just get your shopping delivered to your house.
	+ how will that improve the air quality tho?
	+ There has been an increase in the number of delivery vehicles and the resulting air pollution due to the number of private companies delivering straight to your door. As these are generally diesel engines that create a significantly higher level of particulates than any other fuel this would not help the situation and it increases the carbon footprint of anything bought online. There is also the issue that I may pay significantly more for goods as a result, why should I pay £8.95 postage for an item costing £6? I find supermarket home deliveries unreliable, living 20 miles from them means additional travel by car to then get the items they do not have in Stock. I make approximately one trip into Perth every 2 /3 weeks and I will visit between 5 and 15 shops while I am there, I may eat or drink too. My cars total mileage each year for my entire household is under 8,000 miles. Where sensible I use public transport and lift share. I am aware of my carbon footprint are you?
* Our air quality is near perfect...BUT maybe start cleaning drain gullies, which would stop flooding which in turn would stop any disease caused by dirty filthy water...
* OFGS! Stop wasting our money! Our air pollution is 2. We are ok. Why don't you clean out the Lade from outside Perth to the Tay, , the South Inch Boating pond, Craigie Burn from Craigie Hill downwards? It's a filthy, smelly disgrace!

FB – 3 December

* Waste of money! Our air is good
* sort the traffic lights and yellow boxes on Atholl str might be a start traffic nebr moves at tea time .
	+ And the timing of the lights kev it’s absolutely shocking it’s an accident waiting to happen
	+ don’t know why they bother with lights …..traffic goes through at red anyhow and at speed. A very dangerous junction for cars and pedestrians alike!
	+ It's the worst street for pollution. So much stop and start. I wonder if a roundabout would be better.
	+ lol they took the roundabout away at the police station area that's probably what's caused all the issues. every noticed when the lights are out everyone uses the highway code
	+ roundabouts are fine but there has to be pedestrian crossings at these intersections so that's what causes the hassle. And yes, isn't it great when the lights stop working and people just use their brains?
* Traffic lights at Broxden!!
* Is this more Communism to get folk out of their cars and confined to their 15-minute zones if not actually locked in their homes?
* 98 pages worth of ‘info’ which can be summed up from the first 2 paragraphs as someone is trying to justify their job. All things said here are bang on - attempts to make 15mins cities, attempts to force people to give up cars etc. All true. Fixing lights and present traffic management would have a far larger and much cheaper impact. This talk of ‘economic growth’ would be waffle as what ULEZs do is force everything out of towns. If anyone has had the misfortune of having to drive around Glasgow or Edinburgh in the last year will have experienced, along with the bomb-blast of disaster this has added to for the shops in the centre of Glasgow. Edinburgh is full of tourists, and a lot of undesirables (see recent reports of smash and grabs by gangs) With the huge improvements in unleaded fuel, ad-blue etc there’s never been cleaner towns and cities than we have now. This will kill off what’s left of Perth. And, in time, be also a waste of money as more and more cars and vehicles as they are upgraded in time fall into the ULEZ, so the whole thing becomes a moot point. Biggest case of FOMO ever from PKC with Perth being one of the cities that isn’t in a ULEZ.
* 15 minite city here we come....
* Stop putting monitors next to traffic lights where it is guaranteed to be a high pollution area.

FB – 7 December

* Regret that I cannot attend in Perth today, however please let me know when you will come to Blairgowrie for a similar event which is vital for us in the largest town in Perth and Kinross.
* Unfortunately can not attend, but keep up the phenomenal work.
* Lots of consultations lots of think tanks lots of fact finding missions many many many meetings take a year to decide, put tenders for the contract go with the cheapest for value for money , costs over run finish time drags on first company goes bust second company gets job more money more delays, welcome to Perth and Chaos council
* Unfortunately PKC has a tendency to learn the wrong lessons (eg the flaw in your revised plan for closing the North Inch flood gates) and this Action Plan is no different. Witness Point 2.3 where the report claims that the general improvement in air quality over the past 19 years is due to the implementation of PKC's strategies (an unsubstantiated assumption) and the improvement in vehicle engines. Both may have had some impact but I would suggest that of much greater significance is the massive reduction in traffic volume during the pandemic and the fact that, even now, traffic volumes are 15% below pre-pandemic levels.

FB – 13 December

* So I take it all the trees and shrubs growing out of the various different buildings in the town are some part of air purification system... With the 101 problems facing the town I hardly think spending money on a consultation should be a top priority....
* What an utter joke embarrassed for you.
* Air quality ,don't make me laugh maybe if our council spoke up more about what's being released into our air ,when the planes are out seeding the clouds and don't say this doesn't happen ,IT DOES ,I've seen it being done ,,trying to pull the wool over our eyes ,misleading your voters downright lying ,,,,, *(poster continues with general conspiracy theory-focussed comments about chemtrails and COVID which other commenters attempt to rebut)*
* If the toon wisnae gridlocked half the time it'd be fine...next it'll be wood burner and breath taxes

FB – 22 December

* What a load off utter pish, brainwashed idiots. This is what all this garbage is about (multiple money emojis)
* I’m going to admit I’m probably a keyboard warrior only because I haven’t got the confidence to stand up and talk in public, but here goes... I am sick to death of this council wasting money on consultations i.e. air quality, lack of taxis, wasting money on having plans drawn up for a revamp of the city centre by knocking down the shopping centre!! Drawing up plans for a new swimming pool that doesn’t include a leisure pool for families, shutting down the bells sports centre because of their complete incompetence to shut flood gates and cause millions of pounds worth of damage, using the biodiversity banner to turn the town into an unsightly mess ( driving in from Scone in the summer you couldn’t read the Britain in bloom sign for the 5 foot high weeds) , thankfully all the volunteers at Beautiful Perth have kept some of the borders looking beautiful, closing all the public toilets especially the ones in the inch carpark where tourist coaches and motorhomes park up, put it coin operated ones like in Coupar Angus if you don’t want to employ someone to attend them. Coaches will stop coming if there are no facilities. Would love to know how much money was wasted with the Christmas light switch on fiasco and Christmas cabins that mostly lay empty for a month and that weren’t actually there for the last shopping weekend of Christmas. And now they are on about a 10% rise in council tax giving them even more money to squander on ill-fated projects. Sort out the mess you have turned Perth into before it crumbles. Please save our once beautiful city.
* As mentioned- get a team in to look at how the traffic lights don’t work. absolutely no point in a set of traffic lights turning green if the cars are immediately stopped by a pedestrian crossing... other cities have down this and made huge gains.
* Sort bloody traffic lights for starters
* Exactly how precisely does merely responding to this "consultation" contribute to improving air quality? PKC has never explained how previous responses have impacted decision making. What happens is that Councillors and officers selectively pick out comments that support their particular opinions and completely ignore anything (however informed and evidence based) that does not suit. This "Plan" has so many comments on actions with no evidence of their effectiveness and so many "suggestions" that are meaningless that one has to wonder if PKC is genuinely committed to improving air quality and delivering "Net Zero" (whatever that means). PKC do not value the efforts of ALL their volunteers who are going over and above to improve the environment and I speak from personal experience of that. I will not be completing this survey.
* No to ULEZ (various follow-up comments of a conspiracy theory nature)
* Embarrassment. Wind takes care of that thanks.
* Load of rubbish

FB – 30 December

* No LEZ! You'll kill business. The Tay crossing will help alleviate traffic.
* Nothing to do with air quality. Just another money-making scam. It’s the final nail in coffin for businesses.
* Absolute joke….It's all about the (money emoji)
* Perhaps they need to look at the air quality hot spot in the sky first!!!!
* Wind takes care of that now trot on.
* Why bother with a consultation, lez will happen you've already decided.
* Jumping on the gravy train.
* Air quality…Such a scumbag move again. Let’s be honest about it, it is about getting more revenue from businesses and shoppers. … Perth centre is fragile as it is, you are risking total collapse.

X – 10 December

* Concerned about prospect of LEZ as my car is non-compliant, I can't afford to upgrade, and I need to access central Perth with my vehicle to support my elderly mum, who has dementia. Do her shopping, take her out to appointments etc.

X – 13 December (Perth)

* We need to stop all cars in Perth. A three-mile exclusion zone around the city centre, or £100 a day levy maybe to incentivise people. Then we might get rid of the unbearable smog.

# Appendix

## Full Q2 Open Answers

* The plan is unambitious in terms of the need to reduce the level of traffic in Perth, and in particular the city centre, which is essential to meeting air quality targets. The plan should include concrete measures to introduce specific alternatives to car travel, in particular for short journeys between main residential areas, major employers and the city centre. (Member of the public (MOP), 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Questions are loaded in favour of going ahead rather than no further action to proceed with changes...not once has anyone ever said " the air quality is bad today" to me. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Reducing the way people are able to travel into town will no doubt benefit a few people, what about the town centre though? it is already in a sorry state due to shop closures so making it more difficult and potentially more expensive to travel into and park with the town will have a negative impact on the centre which is already suffering but at least the air will be clean. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* - 2.3 Trends in pollution does not mention the rapid rise in electric vehicles, and future sales of now useable used cars and smaller family cars instead of luxury vehicles and company cars. Pollution levels will be dropping regardless of any measures by PKC.
* B.2 Car Park removal is stated as medium cost to council, however the cost to city centre businesses could be massive. People will shop where they can get their car nearby (out of town) or online. Why not make the car parks ULEZ compliant for 3 years before moving to all electric only. After all it is not cars that are bad, just polluting cars. While you are at it install solar canopies to charge the electric cars or supplement council offices.
* B.3 I would not buy a new house that did not have parking for an electric vehicle or any limited parking making any new houses financial suicide for developers
* C.2 Why not install a lit sign above or near traffic lights with "No Idling" lit when amber lights comes on and goes out with Red/Amber Light.
* D.5 PKC just moved to "green" diesel instead of buying electric bin lorries, what message does that send out. At least purchase a small electric lorry and sweeper for the city centre only. Even consider a small electric gritter (you don't need a monster 6x6 gritter for town centres) and mini electric for footways
* F.1 As a cyclist I find the choice of Dunkeld Rd for a cycle route very strange, I don't want to cycle with cars, lorries and buses passing or offloading passengers, why not use one of the back streets or even use the outskirts of the North Inch, they all end up at the city centre anyway. You will need a massive modal switch from cars to bikes to make any difference so you will still need good streets for vehicles for a long time to come. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Greater expansion of Safe active travel paths cycle lanes and development of P&R facilities should be further expanded and prioritised. (Community/elected representative, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Stop the fossil-fuel-burning jet skis on the Tay in the city centre (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* In order to put clean air policies in place, the transport situation needs to be sorted out. Park and ride is a good idea, but if you don't drive you have to depend on shuttle buses to bring you to and fro . After 8pm there were no buses from Broxden to town centre when we came back from Dundee, Edinburgh etc. So we had to get a Taxi into town. This was just before COVID, so i cant comment on what the situation is now. (MOP, 66-79, Perth City)
* DO NOT INTRODUCE A LOW EMISSION ZONE. Hybrid and electric cars are expensive to buy unfortunately we are not all able to afford these. Coupled with the increasing costs of bus travel and unreliability of bus travel from outwith the city centre (i.e Murthly, Bankfoot, Spittalfield, Blairgowrie) and the Scone Park & Ride being closed more than it is open and Broxden being full as it is now a bus station not a park and ride, You will be actively discriminating against residents that reside outwith the city centre (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Compared to England, our air quality is very good (MOP, 66-79, Perth City)
* First of all, monitoring data from 2020 should not be treated as current, and for any strategic plan a new assessment should be made - however not until the current major road works are completed, as the traffic is often brought to stand still due to the number of roads closed at once. In terms of disagreeing with the goals - these seem like they have not been thought through in practical terms, and instead promise vague 'taking into consideration' and 'prioritising'. It seems like a presentation to score points, and does not instill confidence that public opinion will be taken into account. Where 'incentivising' is mentioned, please mind not to turn it into penalising everyone that does otherwise. Limiting parking spaces will only make things worse, as Edinburgh showed clearly in Portobello and Craigentinny areas. Using cars less and encouraging people to use public transport is not viable if the transport is unreliable, scarce, and in some areas practically non existing. It also does not necessarily work for disabled people or those with chronic health conditions, as Stagecoach buses often are not accessible, or have not enough accessible seats. Stagecoach is also much more expensive than in other cities! The way Stagecoach has been managing transport links is abysmal, and it should be held accountable for letting its customers down. Stagecoach should lose their licence, and a set of minimum requirements should be drafted. One cannot ask people to use buses instead of cars without providing a reliable transport first, but for some reason the council is adamant to stay clear of having any plan in this respect. A side note - I am filling this in on my phone, and having to put comments against all the items above in one space is not ideal - a comment section next to each would be more practical. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Enforce the 20mph in town AND add red light cameras to stop those who accelerate hard to beat the lights . Up to 3 go through AFTER its gone red. Not only does this increase the pollution but its only a matter of time before some is seriously injured due to this practice (Community/Elected Representative, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* None of these measures have a large impact, so why are you wasting time and money on this. If you want to reduce air quality, stop the chemtrails polluting the skies above us. This will have a huge impact on the weather and air quality. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Whole proposal isn’t about improving air quality but rather reducing/phasing out ICE private car usage, and pushing EV cars which are expensive and hugely damaging to the environment. All being done to tackle the bogus so called climate emergency, as part of Agenda 2030 goals. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* This has little to do with improving air quality and much to do with pushing Agenda 2030, phasing out private ICE cars and pushing expensive and environmentally damaging EVs. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Replace all the old traffic lights with new “smart” ones however despite a lot of traffic signals in Perth able to be “smart” the traffic engineers seem unable or unwilling to program the lights as such. Examples of this is traffic on approach to junctions being forced to stop in favour of phantom traffic (or pedestrians) approaching from other directions. This is having the biggest negative effect on continuous flows thus generating congestion/pollution. The above policy in regards to traffic signal timing/phasing is in my opinion a deliberate action by P&K Council is to exaggerate claims that Perth is suffering from extreme traffic conditions to gain funding to address the perceived issues for schemes to promote anti car policies that will only benefit the minority. I drive as a profession and constantly see the above mentioned actions that cause congestion/pollution in Perth. Atholl Street congestion could be minimised by having smart signals that communicate with adjacent signals. The main flow should be allowed to continue through the following two sets of lights after gaining green on the 1st set. Camera enforcement of box junctions and the banning of right turns from Atholl Street into Methven Street and Atholl Street into Melville Street would also aid continuous flow. Traffic engineers also need to routinely get out of office and monitor signals for reliability. The internal combustion engine nowadays is massively improved, with very few emissions. (MOP, “Professional Road User”, 50-65, Perth City)
* The internal combustion engine nowadays is massively improved, with very few emissions. There is no need to "improve" air quality, no need to make everyone's lives more complicated, expensive or difficult. Perth is tiny, it is hard to access as it is, if you want to kill off all the trade then imposing ridiculous measures will certainly do that. The centre is dying anyway due to high rates. (MOP, “Scientist”, Outwith Perth)
* Traffic lights stop the continued flow of traffic. Sequences needs looked at. For example. When the lights are off at dobbies or inveralmond the traffic flows smoother thus reducing emissions (Community/Elected Representative, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* It's very interesting your concern for health ,then you add to this in residential areas . Dundee road for example. Increased traffic, resident there mentioned this. No one is going to read all the consultation you have ,but I think you know that. No one can afford new cars , nor new heating for houses. No go in city centre is a joke . Increasing isolation and costs . More traffic and costs for public. You notice the difference with all your staff back in the office , more fumes traffic what a joke. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Reducing the amount of available parking when planning new developments to "encourage" other forms of transport is a real bone of contention if you live right next to one of the new developments that does not have enough parking. I speak from long experience. A new development was built right next to us with totally inadequate parking for staff and public because, to quote the council officer we dealt with "we are not required to provide parking". As a result the area around us is a total no go area twice a day. It has been thus since day 1, and ten years later nothing has changed. The public still park on double yellow lines, on pavements, on landscaping and in totally inappropriate ways, making entering or exiting our property sometimes impossible, sometimes positively dangerous. Using this blunt tool to "encourage" a change of behaviour does not work in some circumstances. More detailed consideration needs to take place depending on the circumstances, and the views of locals, who know the area intimately, who knows their streets far better than officers who don't even live there, must be taken seriously instead of being shrugged off. (MOP, 50-56, Perth City)
* Nothing needs changed (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* Areas targeting personal vehicle use need to be looked at greater. The primary reason for these being used is convenience and counters to this which are noted are good but don't go far enough. Public Transport and it's infrastructure need improved to provide more convenient travel, particularly in more rural areas. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* what do you want, people in Perth, or people not in Perth? You cannot have it both ways if you are expecting everyone to cycle to Perth, because we won't. We have already all seen the disaster that the ULEZs have been to Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee and Edinburgh with all the traffic being forced out the city walls. Thus taking all the 'pollutants' to the ring outside, and all the traffic too. So all you are doing, it shifting the problem. And has anyone actually realised just how clean cars are nowadays? They emit f\*\*\* all in comparison to what they did. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Strategic Measures – We are supportive of the plan to Improve Links with Regional Transport Strategy, this section should also link to the Cycling Framework for Active Travel - A Plan for Everyday Cycling.

 B. Relocate AQMA Traffic – It is encouraging to see that 12km of new and improved paths for active travel infrastructure are being developed, but it is important that a Climate Compatibility Assessment is part of any future decisions on infrastructure as the plan itself recognises that roads could lead ‘to potential large increases in road traffic throughout the city and a corresponding increase in vehicle emissions’.

 The draft plan also looks at using park and ride as an intervention, and commits to ‘investigate options to incentivise parking out with the city centre such as improving walking and cycling infrastructure from outer car parks like South Inch, as well as reviewing parking charges within the city.’ This should be strengthened to include the park and choose options similar to the ones suggested for the Perth City Centre active travel hub such as bike hire facilities. The recent Dundee Air Quality Plan has examples of how bike hire schemes will be used to incentivise modal shift for reference. (Business owner/operator in Perth, Live outwith P&K)

* One area I have to highlight is the idling of cars around the North Inch Community Campus. During drop off and pick-up of children from St John's the children (and adults) have to walk through clouds of fumes every day. What this is doing to their lungs scares me and it is unavoidable. Added to this you see people sat in their cars in the cold waiting for the home bell in the parking spaces in front of the North Inch Community Nursery pumping exhaust fumes into the outdoor area of the nursery. It is so bad it is news worthy. And finally you see the same thing when parents are waiting for their children at clubs either in the campus building, or at the outdoor pitches. No-one ever gets a fine for idling. I don't know how you can stop this. The only thing that could be done is to clamp down hard on those that drop off their children illegally in the bus spaces in from of the North Inch Campus as every walking parent and child is affected by this. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Reduction in traffic use within Perth isn’t possible for everyone (thinking specifically disabled people with limited mobility). Bus routes too far away to be usable. Encouraging parking further from city center suggests parking capacity will be reduced in the city center. Plan needs to include sufficient capacity for disabled parking within city center (probably more than what is in place now). The plan suggests the Atholl Street and Bridgend areas with worst pollution is due to the high buildings on both sides of the road. Has any thought been put into compulsory purchase of sufficient property in those areas (make small park there) or some “ventilation” system to circulate air outwith those areas? (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* There is absolutely no need to try and improve air quality if we’re all going to be driving electric cars in the near future. This is nothing other than more legislation to try and stop people driving their cars into the town centre which is completely destroying the city. The only thing I would like to see happen to improve air quality is to remove a lot of the unnecessary traffic lights which increase congestion. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* You say you want to reduce idling, but your traffic management actively increases it by needlessly stopping traffic at junctions when there is no need. The resultant braking and acceleration results in increased emissions of respirable particulates from brakes, tyres and exhausts, increases fuel consumption and therefore emissions of exhaust gases, etc. Classic case on Newhouse Road. Also increases accident risk, as many drivers assume there is no joining traffic and jump the lights. As for BEVs being cleaner? Where is the evidence for that? Manufacture of Li-ion raw materials for batteries is incredibly damaging to the environment, both in the mining operations, directly and indirectly, the transportation of the materials and finished products, especially given their geographic location. Or are you planning to build a gigafactory in Perth? The use of electric vehicles that must carry their own batteries has at a single stroke wasted all the design and development invested in shaving mass from vehicles over the past fifty years or so. Carrying a huge mass of battery has a devastating effect on efficiency, and also has serious safety implications, as the energy dissipated in a collision is proportional to the mass of the vehicle. Heavier vehicles result in more serious accidents. As for the greater concern of climate change, it is a fact that if our entire country were to sink below the sea without trace, its tiny impact on global emissions would not be measurable. Focusing on local effects is fine, but please don’t insult our intelligence by suggesting that anything that’s done in our pathetic little backwater has any meaningful effect on global issues. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* You have listed the aim to have people park outside the centre but no provision for improved public transport. Have you actually tried using buses within Perth? I tried going from Dunked road to Edinburgh road and there is nothing that went even vaguely close. The pkc fleet being euro 6 or hybrid I'm unsure of this includes like bin lorries or just cars. If it's just cars I don't think there's an excuse for choosing hybrid or euro 6. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Reducing parking at properties won’t reduce the cars people have it will cause more issues and arguments for people. Bus times are not suitable to allow working people to get to work on time and if you have school age children getting from Perth to outlying villages to meet school times is impossible. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Measures need to be more assertive: Prohibited vehicles around school, Free bus travel, Protected cycle paths and walkways, Priority to pedestrians at crossings (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* One of the main sources of emissions in Perth and Kinross comes from particulate matter from domestic solid fuel burning. The rise in use of wood burning stoves in Perth and Kinross has risen exponentially over the past 5 years and continues to do so. This rise in health harming particulate matter from this unaddressed source will negate any gains made from road transport curtailment measures and encouragement of active travel and public transport use in the region. Particulates from domestic solid fuel burning have overtaken road traffic as the bigger source of particulate matter pollution in the UK as has been consistently proven by a number of research sources and scientific reports and papers. Our organisation hears from members across Scotland including people living in Perth and Kinross, all of whom have noticed a substantial lowering in air quality since the use of wood burning stoves in their neighbourhoods has increased. This is a growing problem about which action must be taken if you are serious about improving air quality. (“Communities Against Woodsmoke”, 50-65, Perth City)
* Extremely disappointing that perth has no LEZ yet and is still just considering this. It’s not acceptable that the expensive Tay Road Link will just move the traffic and air quality problems to other towns and villages in P&K. I live in Blairgowrie and our town urgently needs to be included in an equivalent piece of work. Please advise me, Blairgowrie and Rattray Climate Cafe and our Community Council on this. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* I can see no reason to move down a route that implies preparation for ULEZ. The Council is already doing everything it can to destroy the city centre, despite expressing words of concern. I would like to see a much longer term measurement and real data provided that can demonstrate what is happening. The graphs you have shown identify that emissions are already dropping without Council interference. Improve the traffic flow through Perth city centre as the continual hold-up at lights and roadworks increase emissions. This where you should be spending your efforts - traffic flow management. (MOP, Perth City)
* This is an absolutely appalling strategic approach by P&KC and will only succeed in the advancing destruction of our city. These proposed measure do not take cognisance of the needs of the local population. You have been naive in the extreme to propose further restriction to car use when the majority of the population live in areas where there is virtually no access to public transport. And to offer active and sustainable transport as a solution shows you know nothing about the demographics in terms of age and location. The people of Perth are not city dwellers but you persistently propose strategies that mimic UK urban changes that have already caused chaos and disruption and are unpopular in the extreme. The promotion and development of car clubs is laughable. Where do you think people are going? Most traffic is bypassing Perth (there’s no reason to stop in Perth now) and most young people only choose to live here to allow them to commute. You need to think about this community and understand what our needs are and stop following the current mantras. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* Overall, the plan is focusing on appeasing drivers of private vehicles and does not go far enough in creating a cleaner, healthier and fairer Perth which benefits everyone. The plan should be far more progressive, focussing on how we can get people out of cars and onto public transport and using active travel. Seriously considering a LEZ, trialling pedestrianisation of more of our city centre, more incentives to use public transport and creating segregated cycling infrastructure along key commuting routes would have far more impact than many of the measures proposed. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* You are struggling to get people in to Perth as it is. It’s run down with over priced parking. I don’t feel you should be doing anything that could restrict footfall, on what looks like a deprived area now so sad (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* You are simply moving the problem to the western fringe of the city, building new developments at bertha park, Huntingtowerfield, western edge, Glasgow Road etc then sticking the ctlr smack in the middle with all the pollution from the traffic you are simply diverting from atholl street and Bridgend, you are not reducing the pollution simply relocating it. Stop building tomorrows ghettos and concentrate on fixing what's broken, not appeasing rich out of town developers and vanity projects. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* Reducing parking spaces in the city centre and increasing parking charges only hurts city centre businesses- people will still use their cars but will drive to retail parks supermarkets or other cities to spend their money. As a mother of young children the safest option for me is to travel into town by car. Our public transport system would have to be remarkably improved in regularity, price, and span of day to day to support people to change. The free buses once a month are fantastic and that incentive DOES make us leave the car at home (but when there are two parents). (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* I feel as if introducing LEZ and EV promotion isn’t adequate. As the city centre is such a small area it isn’t going to make a massive impact. And if extended over more of perth people with older cars who are financially struggling or in tricky situations will no longer have an easy way to travel to work or business. As much as public transport is healthy it is unreliable and not efficient. In recent years I have seen the bus routes become shorter and buses less frequent or not show up. The promotion in EV’s will eventually crash and be environmentally worsen our current situation due to the high usage of lithium and the production process it takes to get it and recycle it. Plus our parking and city is not ready for the size of some of these cars. And not many people can actually afford them. (MOP, 16-25, Perth City)
* Why when the air quality in perth & Kinross is DAQI Level 3 do you feel the need to impose restrictions. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* If the map showing the area in red is where you are proposing for ULEZ, then I can't support it. The worst street in Perth for emissions is Atholl Street, from around 4pm onwards. Most of which could be eased by better traffic Management (traffic light co-ordination). Same applies to Bridgend in the morning rush hour (or two). I live in Ardler, Perthshire, there is no connecting bus to travel to Perth let alone anywhere else. Re-instate railway line (not going to happen), would be one of the beat improvements. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Of course I agree that our air quality should be monitored and improved where necessary. In Scotland our air quality is generally excellent but I’m deeply concerned about air pollutants over which we seem to have little or no control. I would like to see more open debate on geoengineering activities which seem to have fallen under the radar. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* Do not introduce a LEZ - this will kill local business and has already done so elsewhere. Give the bypass and new Tay crossing time to be properly evaluated before introducing a money-grab like an LEZ. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* C - Proposed use of ANPR cameras to monitor traffic. My understanding is that these are meant to be for police use for detecting criminal activity, not for local councils to monitor the population. There is a risk of scope creep if cameras start to be used for non-police activities.

F - trying to promote the uptake of EVs. It is not the role of the Council to be telling the public what type of vehicles they should be using. There are currently problems in the EV market with drastic falls in second hand values, which is having a knock-on effect in the vehicle leasing industry. EVs are promoted as being environmentally friendly, but what happens to the batteries at their end of life? What about the non-environmentally friendly production? EVs tend to be heavier vehicles which could cause more wear to the already badly maintained roads. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)

* All of them. (MOP, Outwith Perth)
* Think about how to keep traffic moving in town instead of stuck in jams / every set of lights. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* There is no mention of the pollution caused by domestic wood burning. This creates significant levels of fine particulate matter PM2.5 pollution, as well as the emission of toxic gases and chemicals. Indeed domestic combustion is one of the biggest sources of PM2.5. Most of the PM2.5 emissions from domestic combustion come from households burning wood in stoves and open fires. Wood burning damages public health, is harmful to the environment and is anti-social. Wood smoke contains most of the same carcinogens as tobacco smoke, including benzene and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. In fact, research shows that wood smoke is more toxic than cigarette smoke. This is a real issue where I live in a suburban setting in Perth and appears to be unchecked and uncontrolled. Therefore, due to its significance and importance, I believe it should be included in the AQAP. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* I would like you to measure how many chemicals they are spraying daily from plains and drones. Why aren't you talking about Geoenginering Chemtrails Haarp. Manmade Weather modification programmes. It's happening all over the country and the world but you all seems to ignore it ! You all know about this but claiming it's a Climate change! Climate change is one of the biggest scams that government came up with. Chemtrails destroying our water, air, animals, crops and anything alive really. Agenda 2030. You should remind yourself who you work for . You work for The People not Elites! (Community/Elected Representative, Outwith Perth)
* I don't disagree with any measures but additional measures needed:
* B and A. AQAP should also deal with knock on effects of CTRL outwith city centre, including Broxden, Inveralmond, and Jeanfield road. These are predicted in the models used for the CTRL.
* D. Use vegetation to reduce air pollutant levels impacting on houses near the A9 and M90.
* E and A. AQAP should work with NHS Tayside to reduce car use at PRI and Drumhar, e.g. better bicycle shelters, active travel including pedestrian access points at PRI from west Perth etc.
* D. EV charging point proposals are completely inadequate.
* G. Need local air quality monitoring near Broxden, Inveralmond and in residential areas downwind from A9 bypass and M90.
* F. Involve local people in air quality monitoring?
* E. New development planning needs to go further to incorporating active travel routes (linked to others), and reducing car use, and promoting EVs.
* E. Much better bus services are needed, not just better buses! Services within the city have declined significantly, with much reduced frequency (e.g. No 7/8 was every 10 minutes some years ago, now every 30), reliability, hours (e.g. lack of evening buses), whilst fares have increased much more than car parking charges.
* another link to climate change is that every time hard surfacing is put in for car parking whether at residential or other sites, there is an increased load on storm drains, and potential for surface water flooding especially during flash floods which are increasing in intensity with changing climate. Therefore reducing car parking provision (and area of new roads) also helps adaptation to climate change. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* The use of stop start vehicles doesn’t work properly due to bad manufacturing design. Most vehicle batteries don’t charge fully due to all the electronics in them therefore the stop start system is disabled to save battery power as it must be above 70% charge to work correctly. And most people don’t use it if it does work because they don’t like it. So other options have to be looked at in my opinion. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* We should be careful we don't get into the same situation as other cities like Dundee when residents and businesses can't reach their home or premises. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Ban log burners and help people get chargers at home for ev’s (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)

## Full Q3 Open Answers

* I fear that Traffic coming South bound down the A9 and heading to Dundee/Aberdeen may use the Tay crossing to bypass the city centre and travel through Scone /Bridgend (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* The AQAP, is by far too complex for an average user to read... no one will read the AQAP. A short brief summary would encourage more people to actually engage with the survey and the plan. When dealing with "the public" you need to be short and too the point, this published plan is far too comprehensive for the public to digest. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Another Perthcentric survey that fails to address the poor public transport links in surrounding areas which ultimately causes private vehicle use. Air quality is just fine! Perhaps address the traffic light system inadequacies causing stop start traffic and the never ending roadworks needlessly causing congestion instead of allowing traffic to move. Stop wasting council tax money on these ridiculous surveys, consultations and vanity projects. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* PKC will go ahead any way and introduce LEZ whatever result of this consultation. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* The persistent and ubiquitous nature of roadworks in Perth must be contributing to the poor air quality. Almost daily travellers encounter temporary traffic lights, closed roads, reduced lanes/capacity. I know improvements must be done but surely a tighter rein could be kept on these never ending interruptions? Also thank you for not going ahead with a LEZ thus far, I live rurally and have an old vehicle which I would feel was an utter waste to scrap (and bad for the environment) and unfortunately, I have no choice but to drive to Perth for work as no public transport in my area and even if we did have it, I doubt the frequency would be suitable. I now only have to work from the office 2-3 a week though so I have reduced my journeys and do any grocery shopping after work. I’d be fine with using a park and ride for city centre journeys. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* I agree with the general thrust of the document, but I feel a P&R facility at Bridge of Earn, linking to the excellent Ember bus would help Perth traffic reduction from that side of town and reduce the number of cars going into town. More cycle/walking lanes away from traffic for safe school pupil movement would also be a benefit to the pupils health. Perth Train station redevelopment could include a freight hub and this could be linked to an EV distribution network for the city centre, so larger vehicles could also be kept out of city centre. PKC could run this distribution service and charge for it! (Community/Elected Representative, 50,65, Outwith Perth)
* DO NOT INTRODUCE A LOW EMISSION ZONE. Hybrid and electric cars are expensive to buy unfortunately we are not all able to afford these. Coupled with the increasing costs of bus travel and unreliability of bus travel from outwith the city centre (i.e Murthly, Bankfoot, Spittalfield, Blairgowrie) and the Scone Park & Ride being closed more than it is open and Broxden being full as it is now a bus station not a park and ride, You will be actively discriminating against residents that reside outwith the city centre

Public transport really needs to be looked at. If you live outwith the city centre, it is too expensive to get a bus!. Not only are fares expensive, buses frequently run late, breakdown or just don't run at all. Not to mention not being able to get a bus past 6pm. no incentive for anyone to go to the concert hall, cinema or pubs and restaurants as they have to get the last bus at 6pm! (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)

* Insufficient parking at Broxden Park and Ride since the EV charging points installed and they are generally empty. Those of us from out with the city have to drive into the town now because of it. We cannot afford the electric cars! Nothing should be changed until the new road is open a significant volume of traffic currently causing high levels of pollution in Perth will then be diverted away from the city. Premature introduction of LEZ will kill Perth as the Park and ride cannot be relied on due to the EV charging points. (Community/Elected Representative, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Traffic officer and council officials need to actually act on survey responses and not dismiss them due to what do they know culture that they obviously follow. Sometimes the service user ( road iser) do actually know more than the university graduate experts that hide in offices and don’t actually live in the real world environment. I totally agree with the need to reduce our carbon foot print however we are on the eve of carbon free technology the argument for widespread change is a waste of finances as we have existing technologies and more enforcement of existing rules is all we need (MOP, “Professional Road User”, 50,65, Perth City)
* Waste of our money...remember, it is taxpayer's money, councils do not have their own, they get it from us. (MOP, “Scientist”, Outwith Perth)
* The traffic on Glasgow Road is atrocious. And I hope something can soon be done about the parking around Inch View campus at school start/end times. I'm a non-driver, but a parent who walks a lot with young children, and I cycle and use public transport. I'm fully on board with reducing traffic in the city, even if that's unpopular with some. (MOP (26-49, Outwith Perth)
* Yes, total waste of time and money. (MOP, 66-79, Perth City)
* Don't bother with the EV charging infrastructure, EVs are going to be a relic before you get this all in. (MOP, 26-49, Outwith Perth)
* We are supportive of the plan to:

Encourage walking and cycling: It is positive that the plan promotes walking and cycling as primary modes of transport to reduce vehicle emissions including The Sustrans Perth, People project that specifically tackles the area with high levels of pollution. This should be clarified to specifically tackle short car journeys as Transport Scotland has shown in 2022 that most journeys tended to be over short distances, with 17% of all journeys being under 1 km long and a further 25% between 1 and 3 km. The Perth Active Travel Hub being created has the potential to measure modal shift away from cars.

Encourage low-car development: Promoting developments that reduce reliance on cars is crucial for future transport investment and connectivity, enabling people to access goods and services within their neighbourhoods and city, this in turn will reduce the emissions that contribute to air pollution. We encourage embedding sustainable transport hierarchy into this work as well as The Place Standard Tool. (Business owner/operator in Perth, Live outwith P&K)

* I feel like pushing traffic out of the city centre only forces it just outside (craigie etc) (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Keep traffic flowing. There’s no point in targeting individuals for idling when your ineffective traffic management results in constant queues of traffic with engines idling. Get your light sequencing sorted, use intelligent light sequencing to deal with changes in traffic flow. And encourage motorcycling, which, as usual, has not even been mentioned in your entire proposal. Motorcycles improve traffic flow, and flowing traffic is good for air quality. They also take up less space. Finally, if everyone in Perth had a BEV, how many charging points would they need, and where would the infrastructure come from? What about flat dwellers? (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* More 20-50w ev car chargers in the centre might encourage people with EVs to stay in town for a few hours and spaces for petrol cars. It will also allow residents without driveways to buy an EV. I would suggest you could maybe take half the chargers at broxden and distribute them around town. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Yes. Whilst lots of measures will be taken to address pollution from traffic, pollution from other sources is being seriously neglected and ignored to the detriment of the health of the public. Asthma and Lung UK Scotland produced a report on Domestic Burning in Scotland that should ideally be read by every Local Authority intent on making a difference to the air quality in their area. Not only are there no smoke control areas within your Local Authority area but there is also no monitoring of this type of air pollution in neighbourhoods despite your Local Authority receiving 65 complaints on pollution from wood burning in the past 5 years. This we know from information gathered from our Freedom Of Information request to yourselves earlier this year. Air pollution from domestic solid fuel burning makes a significant contribution to poor air quality throughout the year but most noticeably during the autumn and winter months. This is a growing problem and needs to be addressed. Air quality researchers at Stirling University started the Stirlingshire Villages Project in 2022 whereby air pollution sensors were installed around the region to monitor particulate matter. These sensors are still taking readings and these readings are updated every 10 minutes and can be viewed online in real time by anyone. Please access the PurpleAir Live UK map to note the readings being taken, readings that regularly breach levels of the pm2.5 recommended limits set by the WHO. We would be happy to meet with you to discuss this issue further and we have a wealth of information available on our website which may help you formulate a plan for dealing with this growing problem. (Communities Against Woodsmoke, 50-65, Perth City)
* Impossible to comment on such an important document within the time limit. Only now have been made aware of it. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* Like many others responding to the Plan, I consider it ill thought out and insufficient thought given to long-term impact of natural reductions from more efficient (reduced emissions) from cars. As a town that wishes, I presume, to attract tourists then I don't see anything that is being done to a make the City more attractive. The area of focus should be on traffic flow management not measuring pollution with a preset agenda. Perth does not in the main have a serious air quality problem. (MOP, Perth City
* Please do not introduce a Lez in Perth. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* I would welcome a more progressive, forward thinking plan from PKC which will genuinely look to benefit our city. The current plan focuses too much on pandering to car drivers, who are the people causing the air pollution in the first place. (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Yes, you are simply relocating the problem (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* More ev chargers is a good idea. Better flowing traffic management also. My city centre emissions are often more than necessary because of how many streets I have to drive round to find a central space. If there are less spaces and increased charges the economy of the city centre is doomed (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* The plan shouldn't penalise/impact people getting to and from work, either financially or by extending their day by restricting vehicle usage. Business vehicles can and should be targeted to be greener as should public transport. Public transport operating times needs to be sufficiently early and late and frequent and affordable to be utilised in preference to private vehicles and the connections need to be improved. Journeys to Edinburgh could be taken by train in preference to cars if the train journey time was reduced which would reduce traffic through Perth. Public EV charging needs to be more plentiful, be affordable and be located in safe spaces. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* Your killing the town with cycle lanes, that aren't helping the motorist. I'm also disabled so, I need my car and won't use public transport, especially the buses because the are filthy. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* There are small pockets of traffic pollution in Perth & Kinross which should be addressed with improved traffic management but I see little purpose in pinpointing other areas for improvement which will little difference if we don’t openly address air quality risks associated with weather engineering. (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* What happens if I’m disabled have take my car to work daily and my car doesn’t meet the ULEZ range (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* No LEZ (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* The overall AQAP seems to be a sledgehammer to crack a nut. There are two roads in Perth which have been highlighted as being a problem and for that reason, a lot of investment has to be made to make private vehicle travel more unattractive and difficult. Perhaps the Council should look into how traffic management could be improved and the sequencing of traffic lights to prevent a build up of traffic in the two specific areas (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)
* It's just another Communist plan to circumvent Democracy and roll out control measures to keep us confined to our place. We see you. (MOP, outwith Perth)
* I may have missed it but where is the evidence the air quality in Perth is such an health issue that it requires such a process? (MOP, 26-49, Perth City)
* Look up Weather modification programmes on GOV pages. Information is everywhere to see! (Community/Elected Representative, Outwith Perth)
* As above, whilst PKC cannot solve entirely problems with national transport routes, A9 and M90, its decisions affect traffic levels and emissions from these routes beside the city and this on Perth residents, and it also need to take action to reduce effects of these on Perth citizens. There are other partners it needs to engage with e.g. NHS Tayside which create a lot of traffic demand, e.g. at PRI and Drumhar (central treatment centre). (MOP, 50-65, Perth City)
* Continue to rule out LEZ formation for Perth. Perth could not implement one without serious negative implications on an already under pressure economy. In addition the AQ improvements would be minimal at best and may actually worsen areas outside. I only mention this as the Scottish Government have an unhealthy fixation on them. (MOP, 66-79, Outwith Perth)
* Ensure all comments received are taken on board. (MOP, 50-65, Outwith Perth)