

Planning

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 April 2026 21:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Objection TP/ED/26/0104

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you about TP/ED/26/0104

I wish to formally object to the proposed development of the new Lenzie Academy at Whitegates Park, Lenzie. My objection is based on several material planning considerations, particularly transport and safety risks, environmental constraints, loss of protected open space, and deficiencies in the decision-making process.

1. Traffic, Congestion, and Road Safety The surrounding roads already experience congestion and parking pressures, particularly at peak times. The introduction of a large secondary school would significantly worsen traffic conditions, increasing risks to pedestrians and residents.

In particular, the narrow pavements and limited infrastructure between the main road and the proposed school site raise serious safety concerns for pupils and the wider community. The Transport Assessment appears to underestimate these impacts.

2. Environmental Risks: Flooding and Contamination The site is known to suffer from drainage issues, with standing water frequently present. There are also concerns regarding ground contamination, which would require extensive and costly remediation. These constraints appear not to have been fully considered when selecting the site.

Additionally, the site drains into the Luggie Water and ultimately the River Kelvin, both of which are sensitive to flooding. Available evidence, including SEPA flood maps, suggests that flood risk may be greater than indicated in the application.

I have concerns around how this would impact upon the surrounding streets where I live. I understand that Laurel Avenue has historically been flooded, by building upon the site the council may put the existing housing at risk of being flooded in the future.

3. Policy Conflict and Loss of Protected Open Space Whitegates Park is designated public open space within the Local Development Plan and forms part of the established Green Network. The proposal would result in the loss of this valued community greenspace, contrary to policies requiring such land to be protected unless robust evidence demonstrates that no suitable alternatives exist.

No transparent or credible site selection process has been presented to justify this loss. Any attempt to reclassify the land through a planning application rather than a formal amendment to the development plan would be procedurally unsound and contrary to the plan-led system.

4. Biodiversity Impacts

The development would lead to the loss of significant habitat, tree cover, and wildlife connectivity. Given the constrained nature of the site, it is unlikely that meaningful mitigation or a genuine nature-positive outcome could be achieved.

The separation of mitigation proposals (such as Myrtle Avenue) into a future application further weakens any reliance on these measures. In addition, the ongoing Tree Preservation Order process should not be undermined by premature determination of this application.

5. Impact on Character and Amenity

The scale and likely multi-storey design of the proposed school would be out of character with the surrounding area and would significantly alter the appearance of this open green space.

There are also concerns about noise impacts from extended use of sports facilities, with increases that may adversely affect nearby residential amenity, particularly in the evenings.

6. Loss of Community Facilities and Green Space The proposal would remove an important area used daily by residents for walking, exercise, and dog walking, as well as the existing football pitch. This represents a significant loss of recreational space and community wellbeing.

Personally I have used the park for over 40 years both for exercise and dog-walking. By removing the park you would be depriving my family of the green space on our doorstep that makes Lenzie what it is.

7. Unjustified Scale and Projected Need The proposed 1,400-pupil capacity appears excessive given fluctuating roll projections and recent catchment changes. This risks overdevelopment on a constrained site and the permanent loss of protected open space without clear evidence of sustained long-term need.

8. Inadequate and Flawed Consultation Process The consultation process has been insufficient, lacking transparency and meaningful engagement with key stakeholders. Many local residents were not consulted in a timely or effective manner. Furthermore, there has been no clear or publicly available justification for selecting this protected site over alternative brownfield or non-designated sites, as required under national planning policy.

The education consultation did not properly assess support for this specific location. Respondents were asked whether they supported a new school in principle, rather than whether they agreed with building at Whitegates Park. The report itself acknowledges that many responses were conditional or raised objections to the site, yet these concerns were not fully reflected in the conclusions. This undermines any claim of community support.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that this planning application be refused.

Yours faithfully,

