

# Objection to Planning Permission of New Lenzie Academy at Whitegates Park Lenzie

Name:



TP/ED/26/0104

The Planning Department  
Land Planning and Development  
East Dunbartonshire council  
Southbank House  
Strathkelvin Place  
Kirkintilloch G66 1XQ



I am writing to formally lodge my strongest possible objection to the proposed school development situated behind and adjacent to Laurel Avenue. As a lifelong resident of the Kirkintilloch and Lenzie area—with my family name, Martin, being synonymous with the historic Martin's Garage—I have a profound understanding of this community's layout, traffic patterns, and residential character.

I find the current proposal not only ill-conceived but fundamentally dismissive of the existing residents. My objections are based on the following critical points:

## 1. The "Hole in the Wall" and Permeability Risks

The planning documents suggest that an existing "Hole in the Wall" could serve as a pedestrian cut-through. This is a staggering admission of poor design.

- **Safety & Congestion:** By acknowledging this route, the council is effectively inviting hundreds of pupils and parents to utilize Hazel Avenue, Laurel Avenue, and Middlemuir Road as primary access points.
- **Infrastructure Strain:** These are quiet, residential streets, not arterial bypasses. Realigning these roads to "accommodate" such a flow will permanently destroy the quiet character of our neighbourhood.
- **The "Drop-off" Reality:** Regardless of official "encouragement," parents will naturally use the closest residential point for drop-offs. We risk turning Laurel Avenue into a de facto idling zone and car park every morning and afternoon.

## 2. Disregard for Local Resident Amenity

The disruption to a high-density family area of this nature is unprecedented.

- **Environmental Impact:** The increase in noise pollution and exhaust emissions from idling vehicles directly contradicts modern green planning initiatives.
- **Loss of Privacy:** The proximity of the build to existing boundaries on Laurel Avenue will result in significant overshadowing and a loss of the "quiet enjoyment" of our properties.

## 3. Inadequacy of Consultation and Local Knowledge

During the meetings held at the original Lenzie Academy, it became painfully clear that there is a disconnect between the planners and the geography of the site:

- **Lack of Expertise:** Council representatives were unable to answer basic topographical and logistical questions.
- **Unfamiliarity with Site:** It is unacceptable that individuals tasked with a multi-million-pound development admitted to never having walked the specific area or understanding the local bottlenecks.
- **Example:** When questioned on the impact on Middlemuir and Laurel Avenue, the responses were vague and lacked any data-driven traffic impact assessments that reflect real-world "school run" behaviours.

## Conclusion

The lack of foresight regarding the "cut-through" and the subsequent road realignments demonstrates a lack of care for the people who have built their lives here. Finally, I urge the Council to reconsider the fiscal responsibility of this specific site. It is common knowledge that the proposed land requires millions of pounds in remediation to address toxic soil contamination before a single brick can even be laid. In 2018 plans by East Dunbartonshire council to build a new smaller school were turned down because of this reason

In a climate of budget constraints, it is illogical to siphon off millions of pounds of taxpayer's money simply to make a hazardous site 'safe,' when those funds could be far better spent on a more suitable, shovel-ready location. By exploring alternative sites that do not carry these extreme environmental liabilities, the Council could avoid the unnecessary disruption to the area while delivering a superior facility without the exorbitant and avoidable costs of toxic land correction.

I have noted my additional objections below:

### 1. Policy Conflict & 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 greenspace 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 Policy 17 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.

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.

### 2. Traffic congestion and road safety issues:

The Transport Assessment underestimates 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.

3.

**Unjustified Expansion & 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.

4.

**Environmental Risks:**

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.

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.

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

The Noise Impact Assessment acknowledges that sports pitch activity may raise noise levels by up to 10 dB 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.

For these reasons, noted above I request that the application is refused.

Yours sincerely,

