

---

which is another risk that is inadequately addressed .  
the houses at the foot of Laurel and Hazel Avenues were severely flooded some years ago  
mitigates flooding risk and how this will affect the contaminants on the site. A number of  
hard surfaces can only worsen the situation. It is not clear that the proposal adequately  
standing water as well as flooding. The proposal to then cover a major part of the site with

2. **Parts of the area are classified as a flood risk by SEPA** and in wet weather

3. **There will be a loss of Protected Green Space** which is a Fundamental Policy Breach. Whitegates Park is designated protected green space under LDP2 Policy 4 (Community Facilities) and Policy 17 (Natural Environment). The proposal would permanently remove a vital community asset used daily for walking, cycling, dog-walking, informal football and recreation. The proposal would remove a large area of public parkland in a town that already has a deficit of public park provision, directly conflicting with NPF4 Policy 20 which requires development not to exacerbate deficiencies in green infrastructure. Proposed Biodiversity mitigation was originally inadequate and inequitable and now no longer exists following the decision to obtain Planning Permission for the current school's site.
  
4. **Whitegates Park is one of the only freely accessible greenspaces** in this part of Lenzie. Its removal would disproportionately impact families, older residents and those with mobility issues. A fenced school campus is not a genuine replacement for open public space. Relocating green space proposed for mitigation to central Lenzie is inequitable. It removes a vital asset from the eastern boundary - already identified in the Council's Open Space Strategy as underserved - and transfers it to an area that is already well-provided. This exacerbates inequalities in access to greenspace.
  
5. **The selection of this site is unjustified** as the Council's statutory consultation does not demonstrate public support for building a school at Whitegates Park. The consultation question asked only whether people supported the idea of a new school in principle, not whether they agreed with the location. The outcome cannot therefore be relied upon as evidence of community support for development on Whitegates Park, nor can it be used to justify overriding Local Development Plan protections for designated open space.
  
6. **The traffic, parking and transport arrangements** have not been fully assessed and are inadequate.
  
7. **The decision that an Environmental Impact Assessment** was not required undermines the development of the site. The new school is a major development on protected Green Space involving contamination, flood risk, biodiversity loss and public health,
  
8. **The proposal for a new Lenzie Academy at Whitegates Park is unsound** and I urge the Planning Authority to reject this application in its entirety and to direct the Council to pursue a policy-compliant solution on a suitable alternative site that does not sacrifice protected greenspace and endanger public health.

