From:	
То:	
Subject:	Re: FW: Proposed Residential Development - Clarendon Farm, Linlithgow - [OFFICIAL]
Date:	20 November 2015 11:34:38

Dear Fiona,

The comments in my email of 16 November referred to the consultation exercise held in the Low Port Centre, Linlithgow by Gladman on 2nd November. Gladman intend to re-apply for Planning Consent for their proposed development at Clarendon Farm. I will also be commenting and objecting to the proposed Local Development Plan.

It was interesting that Gladman considered that the access to Clarendon, proposed by the Council in the Development Plan via St Michael's Hospital, was unrealistic and impractical. One of the few statements by them that I agree with. They stated that it would not feature in their proposals. It appears to be a particularly strange, intrusive and uneconomic idea, particularly on a very prominent route through an area of hillside that the Council are designating, quite rightly, as a Special Landscape Area. Bizarre!

Regards

Brian Lightbody

On Tue, 17/11/15, McBrierty, Fiona

Subject: FW: Proposed Residential Development - Clarendon Farm, Linlithgow - [OFFICIAL] To:

Date: Tuesday, 17 November, 2015, 16:44

DATA LABEL: OFFICIAL

Dear Mr Lightbody

Thank you for your e-mail of 16 November 2015 regarding the above on behalf or residents of

Your comments have now been logged as an objection to the allocation of site reference H- LL 10 for HOUSING and will be regarded as your formal representation on the Proposed Plan.

Your objection reference number is WL/LDP/PP/0137.

At the end of the consultation period the council will consider all of the representations it has received before deciding whether to modify the Plan in response. Representations and any unresolved issues raised will then be submitted to the Scottish Government for Examination. Please be aware that this has been scheduled for Spring 2016. We will contact you and advise you of our response to your representation at that time.

Regards

Fiona McBrierty Development Planning and Environment Manager

-----Original Message-----From: wlldp Sent: 17 November 2015 16:39 To: McBrierty, Fiona Subject: FW: Proposed Residential Development - Clarendon Farm, Linlithgow - [OFFICIAL]

DATA LABEL: OFFICIAL

-----Original Message-----From: B LIGHTBODY Sent: 16 November 2015 17:02 To:

Cc: wlldp

Subject: Proposed Residential Development - Clarendon Farm, Linlithgow

Dear Sirs,

This email is a response to the Consultation for the above development proposal, held on 2nd November 2015.

I should like to register my objection to the proposals for the following reasons.

 The proposed development is exactly the same scheme that was refused Planning Permission by West Lothian Council and by Scottish Ministers following the recent Appeal Hearing.
The proposals are premature until the current Local

Development Plan process is concluded.

3. The education capacity issues, which were one of the principal reasons that the previous Planning Application was refused, have not been addressed and will not be resolved for some years, if indeed these issues can be resolved at all.

4. The considerable infrastructure problems that Linlithgow faces are not addressed in the proposed scheme. A comprehensive solution to these issues should be found before any significant housing developments should be considered.

5. The traffic generated by the development will cause further congestion and road safety risks to an already unsatisfactory and dangerous location at the Manse Road canal bridge, to the station access on Back Station Road and to its junction with the B9080.

6. Primary school children from the development will add to an already very difficult and unsatisfactory crossing arrangement at the canal bridge, increasing the risk of accidents, as recent incidents have confirmed.

7. Finally, the access to the development remains unresolved. It was confirmed by the Reporter in his judgement following the Appeal Hearing, and conceded by the Council, that the existing farm road could not be closed and that it was inevitable that residents of the proposed development would also use it. Indeed the Reporter considered, quite rightly, that it would be used far more 'than the Council considered likely'. He also pointed out that the transport assessment 'did not address this risk' and that 'The proposal has not been demonstrated to be acceptable.'

The residents of agree that the original access proposal was not acceptable and this issue remains completely unresolved.

For these reasons any application for Planning Permission for this proposal should be refused yet again.

Yours sincerely,

Brian Lightbody on behalf of the residents of





