

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

Customer Details



Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the proposed development of Lenzie Academy at Whitegates Park.

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. 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. It would remove valued protected open space based on a non-transparent site selection process and inadequate public consultation.

The proposal also causes irreversible biodiversity loss, increases traffic and safety risks, and raises concerns about drainage to the wider area and into our waterways. A Tree Preservation Order for Whitegates Park was approved by Committee on 3 February 2026, with consultation agreed. The emerging TPO is a material consideration and should be afforded appropriate weight in determining this application. There are concerns about ground contamination, with inadequate plans to remediate this. We

have seen no reports on how contamination and flooding might combine to create wider dispersal of contaminants. Flooding is a major known problem in the area, and so far we have not seen the Reports on how that would be resolved. The proposed mitigation is insufficient, imbalanced and fails to compensate for the loss of open space to the area served by the current park. The creation of a new park at a brownfield site while destroying a green space is illogical and lacks credibility. A "new park" cannot compensate for the decades of mature biodiversity at the current site. 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.