

## Planning

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 April 2026 09:27  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Reference TP/ED/26/0104

Dear Sirs

**OBJECTION: Proposed New Lenzie Academy at Whitegates Park**

I wish to object to the proposed development of the new Lenzie Academy at Whitegates Park, Lenzie. My objection is based on material planning considerations including:

- \* a flawed consultation process
- \* policy conflict and loss of protected space
- \* biodiversity impacts
- \* unjustified projected need
- \* transport issues
- \* environmental risk - flooding and contamination

### 1. Inadequate and Flawed Consultation Process

The consultation has been insufficient and has excluded key stakeholders. Many residents and other stakeholders were not consulted in good time and were not properly engaged. Furthermore, there has been a complete lack of transparency in the site selection process. No compelling, publicly available evidence has been provided to justify why this protected site was chosen over alternative, brownfield, or non-designated locations, as required by NPPF4. This failure undermines the entire application.

The Council's Education consultation did not show support for building on Whitegates Park. People were only asked if they wanted a new school in principle, not if they agreed with the location. The Report itself admits many "Yes" answers were conditional (eg "not at Whitegates Park") and that many objections focused on the site, but these were excluded from the analysis. The outcome therefore cannot be used to claim community backing or to override protections for designated open space. The proposal must go through full planning scrutiny, where the suitability of Whitegates Park will be properly assessed.

### 2. Policy Conflict and Loss of Protected Open Space

Inadequate justification for building on protected open space

Whitegates Park is designated public open space, and the application does not provide sufficient planning justification to override policies protecting such land under NPF4 and LDP2.

Whitegates Park is designated open space within the Local Development Plan. The proposal would remove this valued community green space entirely. This is contrary to policy, which requires open space to be protected unless clear evidence shows that alternatives have been fully and robustly assessed - a process which has not been transparently demonstrated. Whitegates Park is

designated open space forming part of the established Green Network and protected under Policy17 of the LDP2, the Open Space Strategy.

If this application seeks to reclassify Whitegates Park from protected open space, it is procedurally unsound. The LDP2 designation remains in force, and any change of use must be made through a formal amendment process, subject to consultation and examination. Attempting to bypass this process via a planning application would conflict with the plan-led system required under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 and NPF4.

### 3. Biodiversity Impacts

The development would result in the loss of almost all habitat, tree cover and wildlife connectivity on the site. Given the restricted footprint, it is unlikely that a genuine nature-positive outcome could be delivered.

The latest Technical Note confirms that Myrtle Avenue will come forward as a separate major planning application, rather than as secured mitigation linked to Whitegates Park. This material change undermines reliance on Myrtle Avenue to justify the current proposal.

The Council has resolved to make a Tree Preservation Order for Whitegates Park. Determination of this application should not pre-empt or undermine the statutory TPO process now underway.

### 4. Traffic Congestion and Road Safety Issues

The Transport Assessment under-estimates the likely traffic impacts and congestion around Initiative Road and surrounding residential streets, raising concerns about road safety and suitability of the location for a school of this scale.

Transport and road safety are major concerns. The surrounding roads already experience significant congestion and parking pressure at peak times. Introducing a large secondary school would make these issues worse and create additional safety risks for pedestrians.

### 5. Unjustified Expansion and Projected Need

A 1,400 pupil school assumes sustained high demand despite fluctuating roll projections, discretionary intake and recent catchment changes. Building to this scale on a constrained site risks over-provision and the permanent loss of protected green space without clear evidence of enduring local need.

6. There are also known problems with drainage and ground conditions at Whitegates Park. Standing water is frequently present, and potential ground-quality issues have been raised. Full geotechnical and contamination evidence, including how these interact, should be available before any determination is made.

The site discharges into the Luggie Water and onward to the River Kelvin, which already depends on flood defences. With climate change set to intensify flooding, Aviva projects that by 2080 more than twice as many properties in Scotland will be at risk from surface water. The developer's flood screening assertion that the site is not vulnerable flatly contradicts SEPA flood maps and historical records, and is therefore misleading.

7. The scale and massing of the proposed buildings would significantly alter the character and appearance of this open green space.

The plans do not clearly guarantee that existing public paths through Whitegates Park will remain open, unrestricted and accessible outside school hours.

8. The loss of the existing grass football pitch also reduces local sports and recreation provision for the community.

9. The Noise Impact Assessment acknowledges that sports pitch activity may raise noise levels by up to 10dB above evening background noise levels approaching 9pm. According to the Sport Scotland guidance referenced within the report, increases of this magnitude constitute a substantial adverse impact, raising concern about the effect on nearby residential amenity.

Furthermore, the land in question has a documented history of contamination, including asbestos. No independent, reliable remediation plan has been published. Proceeding without full transparency poses unacceptable health risks.

I walk to Whitegates Park every day (sometimes twice a day) with my dog. It is the only place in my area where my dog can be let off the lead to allow him to chase his ball without fear of him being hit with a car and its loss would directly affect my access to local greenspace.

The complete disregard by the Council for this valuable protected green space astounds me, not to mention the devastating affect it will have on the local wildlife.

For these reasons, I request that the application is refused. I would appreciate an acknowledgement of receipt of this objection.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of the author.