

Planning

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2026 15:01
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to the relocation and build of Lenzie Academy at Whitegates Park TP/ED/26/0104

Dear Planning Department

This has been sent by email as it exceeds the character count permitted on the Planning Portal.

I would like to object to the relocation and build of Lenzie Academy on Whitegates Park Site.

Environmental Concerns

Whitegates Park is designated as a “Protected Open Space” and should be Policy Protected as detailed in the EDC current Development Plan. In Local Development Plan 2 the site (Whitegates Park) is designated as “Open spaces of Regional or Neighbourhood importance.”

Mitigation cannot replace the impact of the loss of wet woodland, broad leaved woodland or lowland fen. As detailed in the Environmental Impact Assessment. These habitats do not stand in isolation but as part of a wider wildlife corridor/network which cannot be replaced to another site.

Likewise wildlife found in these habitats cannot be mitigated for at another site, notably bird (including protected species) and bat communities. In these cases Whitegates Park forms part of wider feeding and local migration routes which cannot be re-established in another location. Mitigation on site is also likely to be unsuccessful due to the changed environment, physical, noise and light pollution.

Building on Whitegates park will result in a permanent loss of a connected and functioning open space resource, with no secured or equivalent replacement. Myrtle Avenue does not provide comparable accessibility, integration or function.

In building on Whitegates Park I believe this to be contradictory to National Planning Framework 4, Policy 2 which includes the intent to protect biodiversity and strengthen nature networks. All Climate and Nature Policies 1 – 3 would be compromised by the loss of woodland, habitat and open space. Reliance on off-site mitigation is uncertain and not equivalent.

Inequalities/Wellbeing

Mitigation has been considered in respect of habitat and species loss/relocation. There is also a human impact with the loss of the community amenity area. The proposed mitigation (Myrtle Avenue) is in an area with existing greenspace, notably Lenzie Moss, Parkburn area and Boghead woods, used both by wildlife and residents. Whitegates Park is in an area that has been increasingly deprived of Greenspace over the last two decades.

Removing Whitegates Park would deepen existing inequalities between communities in East Dunbartonshire. The majority of users of the Whitegates Park area and walks will not use the proposed mitigation area as it is not within close proximity and does not form part of their local walking or commuting routes. The proposed mitigation could be seen as benefitting a small part of affluent Lenzie, to the detriment of existing users. In addition Whitegates Park is well located for the start of many health initiatives, e.g. health walks, GP referral walks, running groups, Ramblers and sports clubs that meet and use the facilities of the adjacent Sports Centre. East Dunbartonshire Health and Social Care Partnership (in A Public Health Framework for EDC) recognise the need for facilities such as Whitegates Park to “Increase access to physical activities and outdoor programmes to improve Mental Health, Wellbeing and connectivity to the wider environment.”

The proposal results in the loss of an established community asset which cannot be replaced on an equivalent basis, undermining place-based community value.

In proposing to mitigate at Myrtle Avenue I see this as contradictory to National Planning Framework 4, Policy 25 as the proposal would result in the loss of an established community asset which is not to be replaced on an equivalent basis, undermining place-based community value.

Transport Concerns

The Transport Assessment is predicated on the Whitegates Park location being within a 30 minute walk for the majority of pupils in the catchment area. Can it then be assumed that the majority of mitigation proposed is for those coming from outwith this area? If so the most effective solution would be to cap the school role for those living in this area. Or does the TA not state, but assume that although walking/active travel is the ideal, it is not what will happen in reality.

The Transport Assessment will only be relevant once the proposed mitigation to congested neighbourhoods and dangerous road crossings are agreed. At this stage all are subject to external funding or democratic processes such as “finalised with local residents”, “subject to Road Traffic Orders” or “not confirmed” and “to be discussed further” all quotes taken from the transport assessment.

The proposed drop off areas are all in residential areas with narrow roads and tight junctions not designed or able to be modified for increased traffic.

Of note is the route through the rail tunnel on Easter Garngaber Road. The TA demonstrates no substantive improvement or safety measures (e.g. pedestrian lights, road closure) in this area.

Financial Concerns

I understand that there are reasons (contamination, flooding, presence of peat) that the proposed site is expensive to build on. The figures seen imply that there will be unproportional uplift in Council Tax for East Dunbartonshire residents. This is not outlined in the Planning Application Documents, however it does support the significantly cheaper tandem build on the existing site.

Regards

