Planning

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 November 2026 11:19
To: Planning
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: TP/ED/26/0104 - OBJECTION

Dear [redacted]

I formally OBJECT to planning application TP/ED/26/0104 on the grounds below.

Roll projections (PL89): inadequate justification for the scale of the proposal and the loss of open space

The applicant's Roll Projections Statement (PL89) is titled "Lenzie Academy Roll Projection – 7 years", but it contains no projected roll figures for any year. It states that a seven-year secondary projection is "dificult to perform to ensure accuracy" and that the author trusts projections "up to around 2 years in advance". It names no author, sets out no method and gives no scenarios. It cannot demonstrate the future need on which the size of the school, and the permanent loss of the park, depend.

The only data it provides do not clearly support the case. Catchment registrations for S1 were 193, 164, 228 and 209 in four of the last five years, all below the S1 capacity of 240. The fifth year (262) is described by the author as an anomaly caused by cancelled and duplicate registrations. The statement notes that some catchment registrants do not attend Lenzie Academy. The remainder of the cohort is made up of redirections and placing requests.

The statement also does not address the Council's own figures which report that the school roll rose only from 1,313 (2021-22) to 1,365 (2025-26), that pupils residing out of catchment fell from 502 to 388, and that placing requests received fell from 141 (2021-22) to 86 (2026-27). PL89 does not use or reconcile these trends.

The growth pressures it relies on, such as about 300 proposed homes in Lennoxtown, other developments "to commence", and part of North Lanarkshire, are not quantified. No pupil yield, dates or planning status are given. The concern about Kirkintilloch High School and Bishopbriggs Academy depends on decisions about catchments and placing requests, and not on this site. PL89 also does not say what total capacity the new school is designed for.

Finally, PL89 recommends keeping capacity "as planned" without considering a smaller or phased school, or building on the existing site. The Council has confirmed that it holds no assessment weighing the loss of this greenspace against the educational benefit.

I ask the planning authority to:
1. require the applicant to provide projected rolls for the next seven years, with the author, method, assumptions and scenarios;
2. require the applicant to state the school's total design capacity and to show how it relates to the projected roll;

3. require the applicant to demonstrate how the need case justifies the loss of open space under the relevant development plan policies, including whether smaller, phased or existing-site options were considered;
4. record the Council's assessment of this evidence in the Report of Handling; and
5. publish any new information and re-notify before the application is decided.

