TP/ED/26/0104 (Whitegates Park), Objections 917 to 1002 (Sent 24 October 2026)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
917	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Wholesale substitution of application documents requiring a new planning application (38 documents removed and 66 added)**	At the full council meeting on 1 October 2026, the Chief Planning Officer admitted on the public record that the incoming revised plans were so significantly different as to warrant re-assessment. Removing 38 original documents and adding 66 new ones alters the fundamental substance and engineering character of the scheme, meaning the council cannot lawfully process these changes as an amendment to a live application and must require a new planning application.	Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, Section 32A(2)
918	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Wholesale substitution of application documents requiring a new planning application (38 documents removed and 66 added)**	At the full council meeting on 1 October 2026, the Chief Planning Officer admitted on the public record that the incoming revised plans were so significantly different as to warrant re-assessment. Removing 38 original documents and adding 66 new ones alters the fundamental substance and engineering character of the scheme, meaning the council cannot lawfully process these changes as an amendment to a live application and must require a new planning application.	Scottish Government Planning Circular 3/2022 (Development Management Procedures), Paragraph 4.68
919	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Wholesale substitution of application documents requiring a new planning application (38 documents removed and 66 added)**	At the full council meeting on 1 October 2026, the Chief Planning Officer admitted on the public record that the incoming revised plans were so significantly different as to warrant re-assessment. Removing 38 original documents and adding 66 new ones alters the fundamental substance and engineering character of the scheme, meaning the council cannot lawfully process these changes as an amendment to a live application and must require a new planning application.	Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment (1982) 43 P&CR; 233
920	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Defective and misleading application description concealing major engineering operations**	Major earthworks, floodplain land-raising (+2.26m), watercourse infilling, 197.2m of perimeter retaining walls (up to 3.01m high), a 4.5m-deep foul pumping station, and site-wide chemical lime stabilisation constitute engineering operations in their own right. Concealing these works under generic landscaping and associated works wording renders neighbour notification unlawful, while amending the description on a live application is statutorily prohibited and mandates a fresh application.	Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, Section 26(1)
921	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Defective and misleading application description concealing major engineering operations**	Major earthworks, floodplain land-raising (+2.26m), watercourse infilling, 197.2m of perimeter retaining walls (up to 3.01m high), a 4.5m-deep foul pumping station, and site-wide chemical lime stabilisation constitute engineering operations in their own right. Concealing these works under generic landscaping and associated works wording renders neighbour notification unlawful, while amending the description on a live application is statutorily prohibited and mandates a fresh application.	Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, Section 32A(2)
922	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Defective and misleading application description concealing major engineering operations**	Major earthworks, floodplain land-raising (+2.26m), watercourse infilling, 197.2m of perimeter retaining walls (up to 3.01m high), a 4.5m-deep foul pumping station, and site-wide chemical lime stabilisation constitute engineering operations in their own right. Concealing these works under generic landscaping and associated works wording renders neighbour notification unlawful, while amending the description on a live application is statutorily prohibited and mandates a fresh application.	Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013, Regulation 9(2)(a)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
923	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Defective and misleading application description concealing major engineering operations**	Major earthworks, floodplain land-raising (+2.26m), watercourse infilling, 197.2m of perimeter retaining walls (up to 3.01m high), a 4.5m-deep foul pumping station, and site-wide chemical lime stabilisation constitute engineering operations in their own right. Concealing these works under generic landscaping and associated works wording renders neighbour notification unlawful, while amending the description on a live application is statutorily prohibited and mandates a fresh application.	Holborn Studios Ltd v London Borough of Hackney [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)
924	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unannounced floodplain land-raising (+2.26m), elevated sports pitches, and 197.2m of perimeter vegetated bagwork retaining walls (PL127 and Drawing 90501)**	Newly disclosed drawings reveal the park and sports pitches are being artificially raised by up to +2.26m behind 197.22m of proprietary vegetated bagwork retaining walls (141.457m southern wall up to 2.57m high and 55.765m northern wall up to 3.01m high). Topped with mandatory vehicular crash barriers, handrails, and 3.0m-4.5m sports pitch fencing, this creates a 3.7m to 6.7m vertical visual barrier never disclosed during Pre-Application Consultation, while omitting structural stability details over <2% CBR peat (Note 6) and encroaching into the southern flood channel.	Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, Sections 35A to 35C (Pre-Application Consultation)
925	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unannounced floodplain land-raising (+2.26m), elevated sports pitches, and 197.2m of perimeter vegetated bagwork retaining walls (PL127 and Drawing 90501)**	Newly disclosed drawings reveal the park and sports pitches are being artificially raised by up to +2.26m behind 197.22m of proprietary vegetated bagwork retaining walls (141.457m southern wall up to 2.57m high and 55.765m northern wall up to 3.01m high). Topped with mandatory vehicular crash barriers, handrails, and 3.0m-4.5m sports pitch fencing, this creates a 3.7m to 6.7m vertical visual barrier never disclosed during Pre-Application Consultation, while omitting structural stability details over <2% CBR peat (Note 6) and encroaching into the southern flood channel.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 14 (Design, quality and place) and Policy 22(b) (Floodplain storage)
926	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unannounced floodplain land-raising (+2.26m), elevated sports pitches, and 197.2m of perimeter vegetated bagwork retaining walls (PL127 and Drawing 90501)**	Newly disclosed drawings reveal the park and sports pitches are being artificially raised by up to +2.26m behind 197.22m of proprietary vegetated bagwork retaining walls (141.457m southern wall up to 2.57m high and 55.765m northern wall up to 3.01m high). Topped with mandatory vehicular crash barriers, handrails, and 3.0m-4.5m sports pitch fencing, this creates a 3.7m to 6.7m vertical visual barrier never disclosed during Pre-Application Consultation, while omitting structural stability details over <2% CBR peat (Note 6) and encroaching into the southern flood channel.	East Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2), Policy 16 (Water Environment, 6m buffer strip)
927	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Direct breach of the mandatory 6m undeveloped watercourse buffer strip by constructing a 141.5m retaining wall on the southern watercourse bank and infilling the western woodland drain (Drawings PL127 Rev P14 and 90501 Rev P08)**	East Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2) Policy 16 mandates a minimum 6-metre undeveloped buffer strip alongside all watercourses to protect bank stability, riparian habitat, and flood channel capacity. The revised engineering drawings breach this policy in two ways: first, by constructing a 141.457m southern vegetated bagwork retaining wall (up to 2.57m high) directly on the northern bank of the southern watercourse with a 0-metre buffer, where sloped bagwork and geogrid tie-backs will encroach into the flood channel; and second, by completely infilling and eliminating the open western woodland watercourse rather than maintaining a 6m buffer strip around it.	East Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2), Policy 16 (Water Environment, mandatory 6m undeveloped buffer strip)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
928	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Direct breach of the mandatory 6m undeveloped watercourse buffer strip by constructing a 141.5m retaining wall on the southern watercourse bank and infilling the western woodland drain (Drawings PL127 Rev P14 and 90501 Rev P08)**	East Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2) Policy 16 mandates a minimum 6-metre undeveloped buffer strip alongside all watercourses to protect bank stability, riparian habitat, and flood channel capacity. The revised engineering drawings breach this policy in two ways: first, by constructing a 141.457m southern vegetated bagwork retaining wall (up to 2.57m high) directly on the northern bank of the southern watercourse with a 0-metre buffer, where sloped bagwork and geogrid tie-backs will encroach into the flood channel; and second, by completely infilling and eliminating the open western woodland watercourse rather than maintaining a 6m buffer strip around it.	SEPA Land Use Planning System Guidance Note LUPS-BP-GU2b (Planning Background Paper on the Water Environment) and SEPA Good Practice Guide WAT-SG-44 (Riparian Vegetation Management)
929	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Direct breach of the mandatory 6m undeveloped watercourse buffer strip by constructing a 141.5m retaining wall on the southern watercourse bank and infilling the western woodland drain (Drawings PL127 Rev P14 and 90501 Rev P08)**	East Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2) Policy 16 mandates a minimum 6-metre undeveloped buffer strip alongside all watercourses to protect bank stability, riparian habitat, and flood channel capacity. The revised engineering drawings breach this policy in two ways: first, by constructing a 141.457m southern vegetated bagwork retaining wall (up to 2.57m high) directly on the northern bank of the southern watercourse with a 0-metre buffer, where sloped bagwork and geogrid tie-backs will encroach into the flood channel; and second, by completely infilling and eliminating the open western woodland watercourse rather than maintaining a 6m buffer strip around it.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 20 (Blue and green infrastructure) and Policy 22(d) (Flood risk and water management)
930	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Direct breach of the mandatory 6m undeveloped watercourse buffer strip by constructing a 141.5m retaining wall on the southern watercourse bank and infilling the western woodland drain (Drawings PL127 Rev P14 and 90501 Rev P08)**	East Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2) Policy 16 (or 18, renumbered by EDC) mandates a minimum 6-metre undeveloped buffer strip alongside all watercourses to protect bank stability, riparian habitat, and flood channel capacity. The revised engineering drawings breach this policy in two ways: first, by constructing a 141.457m southern vegetated bagwork retaining wall (up to 2.57m high) directly on the northern bank of the southern watercourse with a 0-metre buffer, where sloped bagwork and geogrid tie-backs will encroach into the flood channel; and second, by completely infilling and eliminating the open western woodland watercourse rather than maintaining a 6m buffer strip around it.	Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR) and SEPA Guidance WAT-SG-25
931	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful infilling of the western woodland watercourse and reversal of catchment hydrology into a flooded culvert (PL127 and PL128)**	Drawing PL127 Rev P14 contains a formal instruction to fill in the open woodland drain, reversing natural northward hydrology to divert 76.5% of the site's surface water outflow (30.6 l/s) into the southern boundary drain. On Drawing PL128, the applicant's own CDM Hazard Register (Item 2.01) and South Outfall note admit the southern drain already floods rear gardens on Larkfield Road via a blocked culvert and that the works will reduce available flood storage volume.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 22(c)(i) and Policy 22(d) (Flood risk and water management)
932	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful infilling of the western woodland watercourse and reversal of catchment hydrology into a flooded culvert (PL127 and PL128)**	Drawing PL127 Rev P14 contains a formal instruction to fill in the open woodland drain, reversing natural northward hydrology to divert 76.5% of the site's surface water outflow (30.6 l/s) into the southern boundary drain. On Drawing PL128, the applicant's own CDM Hazard Register (Item 2.01) and South Outfall note admit the southern drain already floods rear gardens on Larkfield Road via a blocked culvert and that the works will reduce available flood storage volume.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 20(a) and Policy 20(b) (Blue and green infrastructure)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
933	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful infilling of the western woodland watercourse and reversal of catchment hydrology into a flooded culvert (PL127 and PL128)**	Drawing PL127 Rev P14 contains a formal instruction to fill in the open woodland drain, reversing natural northward hydrology to divert 76.5% of the site's surface water outflow (30.6 l/s) into the southern boundary drain. On Drawing PL128, the applicant's own CDM Hazard Register (Item 2.01) and South Outfall note admit the southern drain already floods rear gardens on Larkfield Road via a blocked culvert and that the works will reduce available flood storage volume.	Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR) and SEPA Guidance WAT-SG-25
934	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful infilling of the western woodland watercourse and reversal of catchment hydrology into a flooded culvert (PL127 and PL128)**	Drawing PL127 Rev P14 contains a formal instruction to fill in the open woodland drain, reversing natural northward hydrology to divert 76.5% of the site's surface water outflow (30.6 l/s) into the southern boundary drain. On Drawing PL128, the applicant's own CDM Hazard Register (Item 2.01) and South Outfall note admit the southern drain already floods rear gardens on Larkfield Road via a blocked culvert and that the works will reduce available flood storage volume.	SEPA Land Use Planning System Guidance Note LUPS-GU27 and CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753)
935	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Invalidity of the June 2025 EIA screening opinion due to ongoing screening duties and engineering mitigations that breach the modest in scope test**	EIA screening is a continuing statutory obligation up to the point of determination. None of the newly disclosed heavy engineering works (+2.26m land raising, 197.2m of retaining walls, watercourse infilling, 4.5m-deep peat excavation for a sewage pumping station, piling all site drainage, and site-wide chemical lime stabilisation) were before the council in June 2025 or the DPEA in January 2026. These works are the opposite of modest in scope and generate severe secondary environmental effects, legally mandating a fresh EIA screening and full Environmental Impact Assessment.	Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017, Regulations 3, 8 and 11
936	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Invalidity of the June 2025 EIA screening opinion due to ongoing screening duties and engineering mitigations that breach the modest in scope test**	EIA screening is a continuing statutory obligation up to the point of determination. None of the newly disclosed heavy engineering works (+2.26m land raising, 197.2m of retaining walls, watercourse infilling, 4.5m-deep peat excavation for a sewage pumping station, piling all site drainage, and site-wide chemical lime stabilisation) were before the council in June 2025 or the DPEA in January 2026. These works are the opposite of modest in scope and generate severe secondary environmental effects, legally mandating a fresh EIA screening and full Environmental Impact Assessment.	Gillespie v First Secretary of State [2003] EWCA Civ 400
937	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Invalidity of the June 2025 EIA screening opinion due to ongoing screening duties and engineering mitigations that breach the modest in scope test**	EIA screening is a continuing statutory obligation up to the point of determination. None of the newly disclosed heavy engineering works (+2.26m land raising, 197.2m of retaining walls, watercourse infilling, 4.5m-deep peat excavation for a sewage pumping station, piling all site drainage, and site-wide chemical lime stabilisation) were before the council in June 2025 or the DPEA in January 2026. These works are the opposite of modest in scope and generate severe secondary environmental effects, legally mandating a fresh EIA screening and full Environmental Impact Assessment.	R (Barker) v Bromley London Borough Council [2006] UKHL 52

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
938	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Invalidity of the June 2025 EIA screening opinion due to ongoing screening duties and engineering mitigations that breach the modest in scope test**	EIA screening is a continuing statutory obligation up to the point of determination. None of the newly disclosed heavy engineering works (+2.26m land raising, 197.2m of retaining walls, watercourse infilling, 4.5m-deep peat excavation for a sewage pumping station, piling all site drainage, and site-wide chemical lime stabilisation) were before the council in June 2025 or the DPEA in January 2026. These works are the opposite of modest in scope and generate severe secondary environmental effects, legally mandating a fresh EIA screening and full Environmental Impact Assessment.	R (Champion) v North Norfolk District Council [2015] UKSC 52
939	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful project splitting between the Whitegates Park application (TP/ED/26/0104) and the Myrtle Avenue demolition applications (TP/ED/26/0052, 0340 and 0341)**	A developer, particularly where the developer and planning authority are the same council, cannot slice a single, functionally interdependent capital project into separate planning applications to evade cumulative Environmental Impact Assessment, waste, traffic, carbon, and heritage scrutiny. The planning authority has a mandatory statutory duty to assess the cumulative environmental impacts of the whole project together before determining either application.	Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017, Schedule 3 (Cumulative effects)
940	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful project splitting between the Whitegates Park application (TP/ED/26/0104) and the Myrtle Avenue demolition applications (TP/ED/26/0052, 0340 and 0341)**	A developer, particularly where the developer and planning authority are the same council, cannot slice a single, functionally interdependent capital project into separate planning applications to evade cumulative Environmental Impact Assessment, waste, traffic, carbon, and heritage scrutiny. The planning authority has a mandatory statutory duty to assess the cumulative environmental impacts of the whole project together before determining either application.	R (Swire) v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2020] EWHC 1298 (Admin)
941	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful project splitting between the Whitegates Park application (TP/ED/26/0104) and the Myrtle Avenue demolition applications (TP/ED/26/0052, 0340 and 0341)**	A developer, particularly where the developer and planning authority are the same council, cannot slice a single, functionally interdependent capital project into separate planning applications to evade cumulative Environmental Impact Assessment, waste, traffic, carbon, and heritage scrutiny. The planning authority has a mandatory statutory duty to assess the cumulative environmental impacts of the whole project together before determining either application.	Brown v Carlisle City Council [2010] EWCA Civ 523
942	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful project splitting between the Whitegates Park application (TP/ED/26/0104) and the Myrtle Avenue demolition applications (TP/ED/26/0052, 0340 and 0341)**	A developer, particularly where the developer and planning authority are the same council, cannot slice a single, functionally interdependent capital project into separate planning applications to evade cumulative Environmental Impact Assessment, waste, traffic, carbon, and heritage scrutiny. The planning authority has a mandatory statutory duty to assess the cumulative environmental impacts of the whole project together before determining either application.	R (Candlish) v Hastings Borough Council [2005] EWHC 1539 (Admin)
943	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unassessed deep excavations, dewatering, and chemical lime stabilisation within Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs)**	Internal consultation responses (1045875) confirm the development destroys 77% of the lowland fen and 61% of the wet woodland, which are protected Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs). Revised drawings introduce unassessed excavations deeper than 1m well inside the mandatory 250m buffer (including a 4.5m-deep foul pumping station at 47.0m AOD and 3,657.5 m^3 of buried tanks requiring peat dewatering), alongside site-wide chemical lime stabilisation (<2% CBR) that will leach high-pH alkaline plumes into the surviving wetland habitats.	SEPA Land Use Planning System Guidance Note 31 (LUPS-GU31): Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstractions and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
944	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unassessed deep excavations, dewatering, and chemical lime stabilisation within Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs)**	Internal consultation responses (1045875) confirm the development destroys 77% of the lowland fen and 61% of the wet woodland, which are protected Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs). Revised drawings introduce unassessed excavations deeper than 1m well inside the mandatory 250m buffer (including a 4.5m-deep foul pumping station at 47.0m AOD and 3,657.5 m³ of buried tanks requiring peat dewatering), alongside site-wide chemical lime stabilisation (<2% CBR) that will leach high-pH alkaline plumes into the surviving wetland habitats.	SEPA Regulatory Method WAT-RM-11 (Licensing Groundwater Abstractions including Dewatering)
945	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unassessed deep excavations, dewatering, and chemical lime stabilisation within Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs)**	Internal consultation responses (1045875) confirm the development destroys 77% of the lowland fen and 61% of the wet woodland, which are protected Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs). Revised drawings introduce unassessed excavations deeper than 1m well inside the mandatory 250m buffer (including a 4.5m-deep foul pumping station at 47.0m AOD and 3,657.5 m³ of buried tanks requiring peat dewatering), alongside site-wide chemical lime stabilisation (<2% CBR) that will leach high-pH alkaline plumes into the surviving wetland habitats.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 3 (Biodiversity) and Policy 5 (Soils)
946	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of new contaminant linkages via penetrative piling of all site drainage, deep peat excavation, and chemical lime stabilisation**	Despite trial pits recording free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL) on shallow groundwater and soil lead exceeding 7,000 mg/kg, the revised strategy mandates piling the entire site drainage network (PL128 Note 29), excavating 4.5m deep into saturated peat, and rotovating quicklime across the site. Driving piles and mixing alkaline lime through contaminated made ground into the water table creates vertical pollutant pathways and mobilises heavy metal leachate towards the Bothlin Burn and River Kelvin.	SEPA Position Statement WAT-PS-10-02 and Guidance WAT-G-071 (Assigning Groundwater Assessment Criteria for Pollutant Inputs, February 2025)
947	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of new contaminant linkages via penetrative piling of all site drainage, deep peat excavation, and chemical lime stabilisation**	Despite trial pits recording free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL) on shallow groundwater and soil lead exceeding 7,000 mg/kg, the revised strategy mandates piling the entire site drainage network (PL128 Note 29), excavating 4.5m deep into saturated peat, and rotovating quicklime across the site. Driving piles and mixing alkaline lime through contaminated made ground into the water table creates vertical pollutant pathways and mobilises heavy metal leachate towards the Bothlin Burn and River Kelvin.	CL:AIRE / SEPA Guidance (March 2025): Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention
948	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of new contaminant linkages via penetrative piling of all site drainage, deep peat excavation, and chemical lime stabilisation**	Despite trial pits recording free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL) on shallow groundwater and soil lead exceeding 7,000 mg/kg, the revised strategy mandates piling the entire site drainage network (PL128 Note 29), excavating 4.5m deep into saturated peat, and rotovating quicklime across the site. Driving piles and mixing alkaline lime through contaminated made ground into the water table creates vertical pollutant pathways and mobilises heavy metal leachate towards the Bothlin Burn and River Kelvin.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 9(b) (Brownfield and contaminated land) and Policy 23(e) (Health and safety)
949	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of new contaminant linkages via penetrative piling of all site drainage, deep peat excavation, and chemical lime stabilisation**	Despite trial pits recording free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL) on shallow groundwater and soil lead exceeding 7,000 mg/kg, the revised strategy mandates piling the entire site drainage network (PL128 Note 29), excavating 4.5m deep into saturated peat, and rotovating quicklime across the site. Driving piles and mixing alkaline lime through contaminated made ground into the water table creates vertical pollutant pathways and mobilises heavy metal leachate towards the Bothlin Burn and River Kelvin.	Scottish Government Planning Advice Note 33 (PAN 33: Development of Contaminated Land) and Environmental Protection Act 1990 Part IIA

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
950	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unassessed importation of external construction waste soil into a functional floodplain under an abolished SEPA Paragraph 19 waste exemption**	The applicant proposes importing external construction waste soil to raise the floodplain by up to +2.26m using a SEPA Paragraph 19 waste exemption (which was abolished on 1 November 2025 under the EASR reforms) and screening that waste soil against flawed DQRA thresholds (which falsely assume 75% hard capping vs 54% in the drainage model). Importing tens of thousands of tonnes of waste soil into a floodplain risks contaminants washing into watercourses, requires express planning permission covering the exact cross-section depths and earthworks, and generates thousands of unassessed HGV tipper movements.	Waste Management Licensing (Scotland) Regulations 2011, Schedule 1, Paragraph 19 and Schedule 3, Paragraph 19
951	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unassessed importation of external construction waste soil into a functional floodplain under an abolished SEPA Paragraph 19 waste exemption**	The applicant proposes importing external construction waste soil to raise the floodplain by up to +2.26m using a SEPA Paragraph 19 waste exemption (which was abolished on 1 November 2025 under the EASR reforms) and screening that waste soil against flawed DQRA thresholds (which falsely assume 75% hard capping vs 54% in the drainage model). Importing tens of thousands of tonnes of waste soil into a floodplain risks contaminants washing into watercourses, requires express planning permission covering the exact cross-section depths and earthworks, and generates thousands of unassessed HGV tipper movements.	Environmental Authorisations (Scotland) Regulations 2018 (EASR, November 2025 waste framework)
952	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unassessed importation of external construction waste soil into a functional floodplain under an abolished SEPA Paragraph 19 waste exemption**	The applicant proposes importing external construction waste soil to raise the floodplain by up to +2.26m using a SEPA Paragraph 19 waste exemption (which was abolished on 1 November 2025 under the EASR reforms) and screening that waste soil against flawed DQRA thresholds (which falsely assume 75% hard capping vs 54% in the drainage model). Importing tens of thousands of tonnes of waste soil into a floodplain risks contaminants washing into watercourses, requires express planning permission covering the exact cross-section depths and earthworks, and generates thousands of unassessed HGV tipper movements.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, 2015)
953	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unassessed importation of external construction waste soil into a functional floodplain under an abolished SEPA Paragraph 19 waste exemption**	The applicant proposes importing external construction waste soil to raise the floodplain by up to +2.26m using a SEPA Paragraph 19 waste exemption (which was abolished on 1 November 2025 under the EASR reforms) and screening that waste soil against flawed DQRA thresholds (which falsely assume 75% hard capping vs 54% in the drainage model). Importing tens of thousands of tonnes of waste soil into a floodplain risks contaminants washing into watercourses, requires express planning permission covering the exact cross-section depths and earthworks, and generates thousands of unassessed HGV tipper movements.	BS 3882:2015 (Specification for topsoil) and BS 8601:2013 (Specification for subsoil)
954	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Deliberate off-site spilling of 1:200-year and 1:1000-year exceedance flows into a blocked boundary watercourse (Table 4 and Drawing 92004)**	East Dunbartonshire Council's 2015 flooding and drainage guidance (Section 4.5 and Appendix A Item 4) mandates that 1-in-200-year overland exceedance flows must be contained safely on site and must not impact existing infrastructure or adjacent properties. In direct breach, Curtins' Drainage Strategy (Section 5.3.1 and Table 4) explicitly states that flow from the site will occur and routes up to 71.2 m^3 (1:200yr) and 721.8 m^3 (1:1000yr) of unattenuated exceedance floodwater from Node S25 straight into Drain 1, an open boundary ditch whose outlet culvert is blocked and already floods rear gardens on Larkfield Road.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Section 4.2, Section 4.5 and Appendix A (Item 4)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
955	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Deliberate off-site spilling of 1:200-year and 1:1000-year exceedance flows into a blocked boundary watercourse (Table 4 and Drawing 92004)**	East Dunbartonshire Council's 2015 flooding and drainage guidance (Section 4.5 and Appendix A Item 4) mandates that 1-in-200-year overland exceedance flows must be contained safely on site and must not impact existing infrastructure or adjacent properties. In direct breach, Curtins' Drainage Strategy (Section 5.3.1 and Table 4) explicitly states that flow from the site will occur and routes up to 71.2 m³ (1:200yr) and 721.8 m³ (1:1000yr) of unattenuated exceedance floodwater from Node S25 straight into Drain 1, an open boundary ditch whose outlet culvert is blocked and already floods rear gardens on Larkfield Road.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 22(c)(i) (Prohibition on increasing surface water flood risk to others)
956	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Deliberate off-site spilling of 1:200-year and 1:1000-year exceedance flows into a blocked boundary watercourse (Table 4 and Drawing 92004)**	East Dunbartonshire Council's 2015 flooding and drainage guidance (Section 4.5 and Appendix A Item 4) mandates that 1-in-200-year overland exceedance flows must be contained safely on site and must not impact existing infrastructure or adjacent properties. In direct breach, Curtins' Drainage Strategy (Section 5.3.1 and Table 4) explicitly states that flow from the site will occur and routes up to 71.2 m³ (1:200yr) and 721.8 m³ (1:1000yr) of unattenuated exceedance floodwater from Node S25 straight into Drain 1, an open boundary ditch whose outlet culvert is blocked and already floods rear gardens on Larkfield Road.	CIRIA Report C635 (Designing for Exceedance in Urban Drainage) and CIRIA C753 (The SuDS Manual)
957	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Omission of mandatory exceedance water depths, rates of rise, and ponding durations (Drainage Strategy Section 5.3.1 and Table 4)**	Section 4.5 of the council's 2015 flooding and drainage guidance requires that where overland flows occur during a 1-in-200-year event, the developer must submit calculations demonstrating five specific parameters: flood volumes, overland flow routes, depths of water, rate of rise, and durations. Curtins provides only flood volumes and schematic arrows, omitting all calculations of water depths, rates of rise, flow velocities, and durations across the car parks, pedestrian concourses, and sports pitches, leaving the planning authority unable to verify pupil safety.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Section 4.5 (Overland Flow Routes)
958	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Omission of mandatory exceedance water depths, rates of rise, and ponding durations (Drainage Strategy Section 5.3.1 and Table 4)**	Section 4.5 of the council's 2015 flooding and drainage guidance requires that where overland flows occur during a 1-in-200-year event, the developer must submit calculations demonstrating five specific parameters: flood volumes, overland flow routes, depths of water, rate of rise, and durations. Curtins provides only flood volumes and schematic arrows, omitting all calculations of water depths, rates of rise, flow velocities, and durations across the car parks, pedestrian concourses, and sports pitches, leaving the planning authority unable to verify pupil safety.	CIRIA Report C635 (Designing for Exceedance in Urban Drainage)
959	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Material discrepancy between written exceedance figures in Table 4 and the Causeway Flow computer printouts in Appendix F (7 flooding manholes omitted)**	Table 4 of the written Drainage Strategy (Part 1, page 19) contradicts the actual Causeway Flow computer printouts in Appendix F (Part 4, pages 15 to 18). In the 1:200-year printout, Node S35 floods 36.86 m³ (36,857 litres), which is completely omitted from the 1:200-year section of Table 4. In the 1:1000-year printout, 16 nodes flood a total of 979.55 m³, whereas Table 4 only discloses 10 nodes totalling 829.5 m³, omitting 7 flooding manholes (including 52.59 m³ at Node S32 beside the pitches and 13.91 m³ at Node S2 in the concourse) and under-reporting Node S7 by more than five-fold (20.9 m³ in Table 4 versus 109.90 m³ in the printout).	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Section 5.1 and Appendix A (Item 9)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
960	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Material discrepancy between written exceedance figures in Table 4 and the Causeway Flow computer printouts in Appendix F (7 flooding manholes omitted)**	Table 4 of the written Drainage Strategy (Part 1, page 19) contradicts the actual Causeway Flow computer printouts in Appendix F (Part 4, pages 15 to 18). In the 1:200-year printout, Node S35 floods 36.86 m³ (36,857 litres), which is completely omitted from the 1:200-year section of Table 4. In the 1:1000-year printout, 16 nodes flood a total of 979.55 m³, whereas Table 4 only discloses 10 nodes totalling 829.5 m³, omitting 7 flooding manholes (including 52.59 m³ at Node S32 beside the pitches and 13.91 m³ at Node S2 in the concourse) and under-reporting Node S7 by more than five-fold (20.9 m³ in Table 4 versus 109.90 m³ in the printout).	Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (Material error of fact and material misdirection)
961	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Material discrepancy between written exceedance figures in Table 4 and the Causeway Flow computer printouts in Appendix F (7 flooding manholes omitted)**	Table 4 of the written Drainage Strategy (Part 1, page 19) contradicts the actual Causeway Flow computer printouts in Appendix F (Part 4, pages 15 to 18). In the 1:200-year printout, Node S35 floods 36.86 m³ (36,857 litres), which is completely omitted from the 1:200-year section of Table 4. In the 1:1000-year printout, 16 nodes flood a total of 979.55 m³, whereas Table 4 only discloses 10 nodes totalling 829.5 m³, omitting 7 flooding manholes (including 52.59 m³ at Node S32 beside the pitches and 13.91 m³ at Node S2 in the concourse) and under-reporting Node S7 by more than five-fold (20.9 m³ in Table 4 versus 109.90 m³ in the printout).	Secretary of State for Education and Science v Tameside MBC [1977] AC 1014 (Duty of inquiry)
962	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Severe pipe surcharging and reverse flow during 1-in-2-year and 1-in-30-year storm events (Causeway Flow pages 8 to 11)**	Section 5.4 of the council's 2015 guidance strictly stipulates that no surcharging shall occur within the drainage system for a 1-in-30-year (3.33%) storm event. Curtins' own Causeway Flow outputs prove that 20 out of 33 nodes are surcharged during a 1-in-30-year storm (up to 1.692m depth at Node S7), with 6 pipes flowing backwards (up to -35.3 l/s at Link 2.000). Even in a routine 1-in-2-year storm, 7 nodes are already surcharged (up to 0.737m surcharged depth at Link 1.004) and 3 pipes suffer reverse flow.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Section 5.4 (Structural Integrity)
963	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Severe pipe surcharging and reverse flow during 1-in-2-year and 1-in-30-year storm events (Causeway Flow pages 8 to 11)**	Section 5.4 of the council's 2015 guidance strictly stipulates that no surcharging shall occur within the drainage system for a 1-in-30-year (3.33%) storm event. Curtins' own Causeway Flow outputs prove that 20 out of 33 nodes are surcharged during a 1-in-30-year storm (up to 1.692m depth at Node S7), with 6 pipes flowing backwards (up to -35.3 l/s at Link 2.000). Even in a routine 1-in-2-year storm, 7 nodes are already surcharged (up to 0.737m surcharged depth at Link 1.004) and 3 pipes suffer reverse flow.	Scottish Water, Sewers for Scotland (4th Edition)
964	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Deliberate disabling of best practice design rules and manipulation of surcharge approval settings in Causeway Flow (Appendix F pages 1, 7 and 8)**	On page 1 of the Causeway Flow simulation settings, the engineer manually unchecked the 'Enforce best practice design rules' box, and on page 7 altered the software's internal surcharged depth check from the mandatory 30-year return period down to a 2-year return period. Even with these weakened settings, the software's approval log on pages 7 and 8 flags 12 pipes failing cover depth limits (down to 0.444m), 2 pipes exceeding maximum velocity limits (up to 3.726 m/s), 5 pipes failing 30-year minimum self-cleansing velocity (down to 0.061 m/s, guaranteeing siltation), 3 links failing the 2-year surcharge check, and 2 foul-storm pipe clashes.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Sections 2.4, 2.5 and 5.4

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
965	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Deliberate disabling of best practice design rules and manipulation of surcharge approval settings in Causeway Flow (Appendix F pages 1, 7 and 8)**	On page 1 of the Causeway Flow simulation settings, the engineer manually unchecked the 'Enforce best practice design rules' box, and on page 7 altered the software's internal surcharged depth check from the mandatory 30-year return period down to a 2-year return period. Even with these weakened settings, the software's approval log on pages 7 and 8 flags 12 pipes failing cover depth limits (down to 0.444m), 2 pipes exceeding maximum velocity limits (up to 3.726 m/s), 5 pipes failing 30-year minimum self-cleansing velocity (down to 0.061 m/s, guaranteeing siltation), 3 links failing the 2-year surcharge check, and 2 foul-storm pipe clashes.	Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 (CDM Regulations)
966	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Deliberate disabling of best practice design rules and manipulation of surcharge approval settings in Causeway Flow (Appendix F pages 1, 7 and 8)**	On page 1 of the Causeway Flow simulation settings, the engineer manually unchecked the 'Enforce best practice design rules' box, and on page 7 altered the software's internal surcharged depth check from the mandatory 30-year return period down to a 2-year return period. Even with these weakened settings, the software's approval log on pages 7 and 8 flags 12 pipes failing cover depth limits (down to 0.444m), 2 pipes exceeding maximum velocity limits (up to 3.726 m/s), 5 pipes failing 30-year minimum self-cleansing velocity (down to 0.061 m/s, guaranteeing siltation), 3 links failing the 2-year surcharge check, and 2 foul-storm pipe clashes.	CIRIA C753 (The SuDS Manual) and BS EN 752 (Drain and sewer systems outside buildings)
967	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Placement of SuDS attenuation features inside a functioning floodplain and routing of exceedance floodwater across 3G pitches and contaminated soils**	Section 5.3 of the council's 2015 guidance prohibits placing SuDS features within a functioning floodplain to prevent SuDS becoming redundant during inundation and to avoid contaminants washing into adjacent watercourses. Despite admitting in Table 2 (page 15) that increased water flow risks mobilising soil contaminants (lead, PAHs, and NAPL), Curtins buries 3,987 m³ (3,657.5 m³ in PL128) of SuDS tanks inside the floodplain and routes exceedance floodwaters from Node S5 over the 3G sports pitches to soft areas and from Node S25 (721.8 m³) into Drain 1, flushing microplastic rubber crumb and soil toxins towards the Bothlin Burn and River Kelvin.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Section 5.3 (SUDS in a functioning floodplain)
968	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Placement of SuDS attenuation features inside a functioning floodplain and routing of exceedance floodwater across 3G pitches and contaminated soils**	Section 5.3 of the council's 2015 guidance prohibits placing SuDS features within a functioning floodplain to prevent SuDS becoming redundant during inundation and to avoid contaminants washing into adjacent watercourses. Despite admitting in Table 2 (page 15) that increased water flow risks mobilising soil contaminants (lead, PAHs, and NAPL), Curtins buries 3,987 m³ (3,657.5 m³ in PL128) of SuDS tanks inside the floodplain and routes exceedance floodwaters from Node S5 over the 3G sports pitches to soft areas and from Node S25 (721.8 m³) into Drain 1, flushing microplastic rubber crumb and soil toxins towards the Bothlin Burn and River Kelvin.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 22 (Flood risk and water management) and Policy 23 (Health and safety)
969	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Placement of SuDS attenuation features inside a functioning floodplain and routing of exceedance floodwater across 3G pitches and contaminated soils**	Section 5.3 of the council's 2015 guidance prohibits placing SuDS features within a functioning floodplain to prevent SuDS becoming redundant during inundation and to avoid contaminants washing into adjacent watercourses. Despite admitting in Table 2 (page 15) that increased water flow risks mobilising soil contaminants (lead, PAHs, and NAPL), Curtins buries 3,987 m³ (3,657.5 m³ in PL128) of SuDS tanks inside the floodplain and routes exceedance floodwaters from Node S5 over the 3G sports pitches to soft areas and from Node S25 (721.8 m³) into Drain 1, flushing microplastic rubber crumb and soil toxins towards the Bothlin Burn and River Kelvin.	sportscotland Datasheet 101 (3G Synthetic Turf Pitch) and Joint Position Statement on 3G Pitches (Microplastic containment)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
970	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unilateral refusal to provide East Dunbartonshire Council's mandatory minimum levels of SuDS water quality treatment (Drainage Strategy Section 2.3.1 and Appendix D)**	Section 5.2 of the council's 2015 guidance states that it is the council's sole requirement that minimum treatment levels are provided: 2 levels of treatment for roads and parking areas, and 3 levels for refuse collection and loading/delivery bays. In Section 2.3.1 (page 9) and Appendix D, Curtins admits the council specifically requested 2 levels of treatment for the car park during pre-application dialogue, but Curtins unilaterally refused to comply, dismissing the council's policy as superseded and providing only 1 level of treatment for the main car park and 1 proprietary separator for the service delivery yard.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Section 5.2 (Level of Treatment) and Appendix A (Item 11)
971	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unilateral refusal to provide East Dunbartonshire Council's mandatory minimum levels of SuDS water quality treatment (Drainage Strategy Section 2.3.1 and Appendix D)**	Section 5.2 of the council's 2015 guidance states that it is the council's sole requirement that minimum treatment levels are provided: 2 levels of treatment for roads and parking areas, and 3 levels for refuse collection and loading/delivery bays. In Section 2.3.1 (page 9) and Appendix D, Curtins admits the council specifically requested 2 levels of treatment for the car park during pre-application dialogue, but Curtins unilaterally refused to comply, dismissing the council's policy as superseded and providing only 1 level of treatment for the main car park and 1 proprietary separator for the service delivery yard.	East Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2), Policy 18 (Sustainable surface water management and water quality)
972	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Failure to complete mandatory CCTV culvert surveys and omission of the mandatory Appendix A checklist and Whole Life Costing Toolkit**	Sections 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.9 (Appendix A Items 2 and 16) require the applicant to submit a completed 18-point Flooding and Drainage Checklist, the SCOTS SuDS Whole Life Cost and Carbon Toolkit, and a CCTV survey of existing culverts and sewers, explicitly warning in Section 5.9 that if this information or checklist is not returned, the council will refuse review. Curtins omitted both the checklist and the toolkit, while Appendix C (pages 25 and 26) admits that no CCTV survey was carried out at the southern Larkfield Road culvert and that the northern pipes and manholes are buried, submerged, or blocked by mass tree roots.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Sections 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 5.9 and Appendix A (Items 2 and 16)
973	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Numerical instability and invalid mass balance errors in the 1:100-year, 1:200-year, and 1:1000-year Causeway Flow exceedance simulations**	Section 3.0 of the council's 2015 guidance requires hydrological and hydraulic modelling to comply with SEPA's Technical Flood Risk Guidance for Stakeholders, which mandates a model mass balance error of no more than +/-1% (99% to 101%). Curtins' Causeway Flow outputs in Appendix F record a lowest mass balance of 96.76% in the 1:100-year storm (3.24% error), 94.07% in the 1:200-year storm (5.93% error), and 89.98% in the 1:1000-year storm (over 10% of the floodwater volume vanishing in the solver), rendering the exceedance models mathematically invalid.	East Dunbartonshire Council Flooding and Drainage Guidelines for Developers (Rev B, May 2015), Section 3.0 (SEPA)
974	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Numerical instability and invalid mass balance errors in the 1:100-year, 1:200-year, and 1:1000-year Causeway Flow exceedance simulations**	Section 3.0 of the council's 2015 guidance requires hydrological and hydraulic modelling to comply with SEPA's Technical Flood Risk Guidance for Stakeholders, which mandates a model mass balance error of no more than +/-1% (99% to 101%). Curtins' Causeway Flow outputs in Appendix F record a lowest mass balance of 96.76% in the 1:100-year storm (3.24% error), 94.07% in the 1:200-year storm (5.93% error), and 89.98% in the 1:1000-year storm (over 10% of the floodwater volume vanishing in the solver), rendering the exceedance models mathematically invalid.	SEPA Technical Flood Risk Guidance for Stakeholders and SEPA Flood Modelling Guidance

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
975	Sent 24 Oct 26	**PL127 (Rev P14) proposed site levels, 1m to 4m perimeter retaining walls and flood displacement**	Newly published Curtins Drawing LZAC-CUR-XX-ZZ-DR-C-90002 Rev P14 (PL127) confirms that to restrict fill within the SEPA floodplain while maintaining a raised +2m plateau (53.1m-53.5m AOD), the developer has introduced a 1m-4m green retaining wall along the southern boundary and a 1m-2m green retaining wall along the northern boundary (Larkfield Road). This validates CEng Mike Dewar's warning that the development destroys floodplain storage and traps floodwater against neighbouring properties. Furthermore, constructing up to 4m retaining walls over deep peat either risks catastrophic rotational wall failure or requires deep sheet/bored piling that will act as an underground dam, forcing groundwater into adjacent residential gardens.	NPF4 Policy 22 (Flood Risk Displacement); NPF4 Policy 5 (Peatland Disturbance); EIA (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (Gillespie / Champion complex engineering mitigations); Section 32A of the 1997 Act (Substantial Variation).
977	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unjustified £108m capital overspend and debt burden**	The proposal represents a £108m needless overspend compared to recent school builds, burdening taxpayers with over £3,000 each over a 40-year borrowing period without demonstrating prudent capital allocation.	Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 (Best Value)
978	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Failure to benchmark capital costs**	FOI/22344 confirms the council holds no cost variance analysis explaining the £138m cost versus the £40.9m Boclair Academy baseline, proving site selection was predetermined without comparative financial appraisal.	Scottish Public Finance Manual (SPFM)
979	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Failure to benchmark capital costs**	FOI/22344 confirms the council holds no cost variance analysis explaining the £138m cost versus the £40.9m Boclair Academy baseline, proving site selection was predetermined without comparative financial appraisal.	HM Treasury Green Book
980	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Omission of project from corporate risk register**	The £138m project is entirely absent from the 2025-26 corporate risk register, and FOI/22345 confirms no quantitative risk assessment exists, hiding severe financial and geotechnical risks from democratic scrutiny.	Scottish Public Finance Manual (SPFM)
981	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Omission of project from corporate risk register**	The £138m project appears to be entirely absent from the 2025-26 corporate risk register, and FOI/22345 confirms no quantitative risk assessment exists, hiding severe financial and geotechnical risks from democratic scrutiny.	Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 (Best Value)
982	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Failure to quantify financial risk exposure**	The 2022 SCAPE risk register allocated £0.0 financial exposure to major site constraints like contamination and greenbelt policy, demonstrating a failure to monetise site abnormal costs before locking in the development.	Scottish Public Finance Manual (SPFM)
983	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Failure to conduct equality impact assessment prior to site selection**	FOI/22195 admits the project was not screened for an EQIA before choosing a site that destroys accessible community greenspace, representing an unlawful retrospective justification of a concluded decision.	Equality Act 2010 (Section 149, Public Sector Equality Duty)
984	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Failure to conduct equality impact assessment prior to site selection**	FOI/22195 admits the project was not screened for an EQIA before choosing a site that destroys accessible community greenspace, representing an unlawful retrospective justification of a concluded decision.	R (Brown) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2008] EWHC 3158 (Admin)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
985	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Failure to conduct equality impact assessment prior to site selection**	FOI/22195 admits the project was not screened for an EQIA before choosing a site that destroys accessible community greenspace, representing an unlawful retrospective justification of a concluded decision.	R (Bracking) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2013] EWCA Civ 1345
986	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Failure to conduct children's rights impact assessment**	The council failed to screen for a CRWIA before deciding to remove a 14.5-hectare open greenspace used by local children.	United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Incorporation) (Scotland) Act 2024
987	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Reliance on defunct negative EIA screening**	The chief planning officer admitted the revised plans are significantly different, meaning the original negative EIA screening is legally void and environmental baselines are erased.	Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (Regulations 8 and 10)
988	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful retrospective environmental justification**	The Council cannot attempt to patch together environmental justifications from the revised plans to excuse the lack of a formal Environmental Impact Assessment. The public has a statutory right to a comprehensive Environmental Statement prior to determination.	Berkeley v Secretary of State for the Environment [2000] UKHL 36
989	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Unlawful project splitting (salami slicing)**	Assessing the environmental impact of Whitegates Park without cumulatively assessing the inextricably linked off-site mitigation at Myrtle Avenue evades full statutory environmental scrutiny.	Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (Schedule 3(1))
990	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Significant departure from local development plan**	The chief legal officer confirmed the application is a significant departure from LDP2, mandating a pre-determination hearing and legally barring the council from issuing a decision without notifying Scottish Ministers.	Town and Country Planning (Notification of Applications) (Scotland) Direction 2009
991	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Significant departure from local development plan**	The chief legal officer confirmed the application is a significant departure from LDP2, mandating a pre-determination hearing and legally barring the council from issuing a decision without notifying Scottish Ministers.	Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2) Policy 13
992	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of vertical pollutant pathways by driving piles for buildings and all site drainage through contaminated made ground into the water table (Drawing PL128 Note 29)**	The applicant's foundation and drainage strategy relies on driven piles (including Drawing PL128 Note 29 instructing that all drainage is to be piled) to avoid hazardous waste landfill fees for excavated spoil. Driving piles straight through shallow made ground containing over 7,000 mg/kg of lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), asbestos, and free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL recorded in Trial Pits 2 and 3) forces solid and liquid contaminants downward into the underlying water table and creates preferential vertical pollution pathways.	CL:AIRE / SEPA Guidance (March 2025): Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention
993	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of vertical pollutant pathways by driving piles for buildings and all site drainage through contaminated made ground into the water table (Drawing PL128 Note 29)**	The applicant's foundation and drainage strategy relies on driven piles (including Drawing PL128 Note 29 instructing that all drainage is to be piled) to avoid hazardous waste landfill fees for excavated spoil. Driving piles straight through shallow made ground containing over 7,000 mg/kg of lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), asbestos, and free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL recorded in Trial Pits 2 and 3) forces solid and liquid contaminants downward into the underlying water table and creates preferential vertical pollution pathways.	SEPA Position Statement WAT-PS-10-02 (Assigning Groundwater Assessment Criteria for Pollutant Inputs, February 2025)

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
994	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of vertical pollutant pathways by driving piles for buildings and all site drainage through contaminated made ground into the water table (Drawing PL128 Note 29)**	The applicant's foundation and drainage strategy relies on driven piles (including Drawing PL128 Note 29 instructing that all drainage is to be piled) to avoid hazardous waste landfill fees for excavated spoil. Driving piles straight through shallow made ground containing over 7,000 mg/kg of lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), asbestos, and free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL recorded in Trial Pits 2 and 3) forces solid and liquid contaminants downward into the underlying water table and creates preferential vertical pollution pathways.	SEPA Guidance WAT-G-071 (Assigning Groundwater Assessment Criteria for Pollutant Inputs, February 2025)
995	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of vertical pollutant pathways by driving piles for buildings and all site drainage through contaminated made ground into the water table (Drawing PL128 Note 29)**	The applicant's foundation and drainage strategy relies on driven piles (including Drawing PL128 Note 29 instructing that all drainage is to be piled) to avoid hazardous waste landfill fees for excavated spoil. Driving piles straight through shallow made ground containing over 7,000 mg/kg of lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), asbestos, and free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL recorded in Trial Pits 2 and 3) forces solid and liquid contaminants downward into the underlying water table and creates preferential vertical pollution pathways.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 9(b) (Brownfield, vacant and derelict land)
996	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of vertical pollutant pathways by driving piles for buildings and all site drainage through contaminated made ground into the water table (Drawing PL128 Note 29)**	The applicant's foundation and drainage strategy relies on driven piles (including Drawing PL128 Note 29 instructing that all drainage is to be piled) to avoid hazardous waste landfill fees for excavated spoil. Driving piles straight through shallow made ground containing over 7,000 mg/kg of lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), asbestos, and free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL recorded in Trial Pits 2 and 3) forces solid and liquid contaminants downward into the underlying water table and creates preferential vertical pollution pathways.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 23(e) (Health and safety)
997	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of vertical pollutant pathways by driving piles for buildings and all site drainage through contaminated made ground into the water table (Drawing PL128 Note 29)**	The applicant's foundation and drainage strategy relies on driven piles (including Drawing PL128 Note 29 instructing that all drainage is to be piled) to avoid hazardous waste landfill fees for excavated spoil. Driving piles straight through shallow made ground containing over 7,000 mg/kg of lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), asbestos, and free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL recorded in Trial Pits 2 and 3) forces solid and liquid contaminants downward into the underlying water table and creates preferential vertical pollution pathways.	Environmental Protection Act 1990, Part IIA (Contaminated land)
998	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Creation of vertical pollutant pathways by driving piles for buildings and all site drainage through contaminated made ground into the water table (Drawing PL128 Note 29)**	The applicant's foundation and drainage strategy relies on driven piles (including Drawing PL128 Note 29 instructing that all drainage is to be piled) to avoid hazardous waste landfill fees for excavated spoil. Driving piles straight through shallow made ground containing over 7,000 mg/kg of lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), asbestos, and free-phase floating hydrocarbons (NAPL recorded in Trial Pits 2 and 3) forces solid and liquid contaminants downward into the underlying water table and creates preferential vertical pollution pathways.	Scottish Government Planning Advice Note 33 (PAN 33: Development of Contaminated Land)
999	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Mobilisation of heavy metal leachate and hydrochemical destruction of surviving wetlands via site-wide chemical lime stabilisation (Drawing 98001 Rev P04)**	Drawing 98001 Rev P04 instructs the contractor to carry out site-wide ground improvement such as lime stabilisation across the <2% CBR subgrade. Mixing quicklime into wet, acidic peat and contaminated made ground triggers an intense exothermic reaction and spikes soil and groundwater pH to 11-12+, destroying the natural metal-binding capacity of the organic peat, mobilising heavy metal leachate into boundary drains, and sending an alkaline plume into the surviving 23% of the lowland fen and 39% of the wet woodland.	SEPA Land Use Planning System Guidance Note 31 (LUPS-GU31): Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstractions and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems

No.	Status	Objection or area of objection	Why it matters, why it is a material consideration and why it is an objection to TP/ED/26/0104 OR why it demonstrates procedural unfairness or predetermination, and renders TP/ED/26/0104 unlawful	Relevant legislation or guidance
1000	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Mobilisation of heavy metal leachate and hydrochemical destruction of surviving wetlands via site-wide chemical lime stabilisation (Drawing 98001 Rev P04)**	Drawing 98001 Rev P04 instructs the contractor to carry out site-wide ground improvement such as lime stabilisation across the <2% CBR subgrade. Mixing quicklime into wet, acidic peat and contaminated made ground triggers an intense exothermic reaction and spikes soil and groundwater pH to 11-12+, destroying the natural metal-binding capacity of the organic peat, mobilising heavy metal leachate into boundary drains, and sending an alkaline plume into the surviving 23% of the lowland fen and 39% of the wet woodland.	Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR)
1001	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Mobilisation of heavy metal leachate and hydrochemical destruction of surviving wetlands via site-wide chemical lime stabilisation (Drawing 98001 Rev P04)**	Drawing 98001 Rev P04 instructs the contractor to carry out site-wide ground improvement such as lime stabilisation across the <2% CBR subgrade. Mixing quicklime into wet, acidic peat and contaminated made ground triggers an intense exothermic reaction and spikes soil and groundwater pH to 11-12+, destroying the natural metal-binding capacity of the organic peat, mobilising heavy metal leachate into boundary drains, and sending an alkaline plume into the surviving 23% of the lowland fen and 39% of the wet woodland.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 9(b) (Brownfield, vacant and derelict land)
1002	Sent 24 Oct 26	**Mobilisation of heavy metal leachate and hydrochemical destruction of surviving wetlands via site-wide chemical lime stabilisation (Drawing 98001 Rev P04)**	Drawing 98001 Rev P04 instructs the contractor to carry out site-wide ground improvement such as lime stabilisation across the <2% CBR subgrade. Mixing quicklime into wet, acidic peat and contaminated made ground triggers an intense exothermic reaction and spikes soil and groundwater pH to 11-12+, destroying the natural metal-binding capacity of the organic peat, mobilising heavy metal leachate into boundary drains, and sending an alkaline plume into the surviving 23% of the lowland fen and 39% of the wet woodland.	National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), Policy 20 (Blue and green infrastructure)