

Comments for Planning Application TP/ED/26/0104

Application Summary

Application Number: TP/ED/26/0104

Address: Whitegates Park Middlemuir Road Lenzie East Dunbartonshire

Proposal: Erection of a secondary school including road access, landscaping, car parking, sports pitches, recreational areas and associated development.

Case Officer: Fraser McNair



Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: as a result of the proposal. What the applicant doesn't say is the existing habitat is to be wiped out as a result of the proposal and alludes that the onsite and inferred off site replacement will take 30 years to reach the equivalent level of the existing WP site and some will never be replicated and In addition the proposed WP mitigation will not be accessible to the general public. The information contained within the applicants Flooding Risk Assessment (PL71) and associated supporting documents have been found to be inadequate (SEPA_CONSULTATION_RESPONSE-1030282 and EDC_FLOODING_OFFICER_CONSULTATION_RESPONSE-1030469) in support of the proposal.

The further information requested by the aforementioned consultees has not been made publically available therefore I can only conclude it has not been provided. SEPA have issued a holding objection which also appears to be the position of the Council Flooding officer.

In consequence I object to the proposal due to the risk of flooding to the site and surrounding properties.

With regard to the drainage strategy I am not reassured by the applicants drainage proposals that they mitigate for flooding and I am concerned that the council's Drainage Officer, bearing in mind the site is in a flood risk area and the vulnerable nature of the proposal, didn't think it prudent to visit the site or wait until clarification is received in response to the question(s) posed before offering no objection. I suspect the response is a holding objection rather than no objection.

The applicant's Ecology Impact Assessment in (PL50 page 51) outlines the ecological devastation that will occur at WP even with the mitigation measures in place.

The assessment also relies on the inferred park at MA to justify the destruction of the ecology at WP despite the author alluding to it being insufficient to mitigate for the loss. It is disingenuous to suggest that a 30 year timeframe mitigates for the loss of an already established ecosystem page 20 of