

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Malk and Suzi" [REDACTED]  
Date: 22 Nov 2015 21:36  
Subject: Objection to H-LL 10 Clarendon Farm, Linlithgow  
[REDACTED]

H-LL 10 Clarendon Farm

Mr & Mrs Graham  
[REDACTED]

MIRQ0232

22/11/15

Linlithgow - Clarendon Farm - H-LL 10 - Page 198

Objection to site H-LL 10: Clarendon Farm, Linlithgow

We are very disappointed that the council's only concern to Clarendon Road being used as an access to a development site is the level differences. Manse Road, the leading road to Clarendon Road, has a council road sign stating that the road is unsuitable to long vehicles (see attached photo) - this is also the reason that it is not suitable as a bus route. We have witnessed major difficulties on this small, single lane, bridge when these vehicles try to use this route.

Another issue of this bridge and route is it is also the main safe route for children to the local school, added to that is Back Station Road pedestrian path is very small, which is also be a concern with cars, never mind developers heavy vehicles.

Adding to this issue, the developer, Gladman Development, who recently had an appeal dismissed by the Scottish Government Reporter, has again submitted a pre-application with no changes to detail, therefore using Manse Road/Clarendon Road as a main route. This highlights developers intentions with regard to this issue.

Please see attached photos.

Local roads cannot cope with more traffic and increased congestion and would also impact on the air quality in the High Street.

It states in the Proposed Plan that land for development can only be released when secondary school capacity is available, there is no mention of capacity of local primary schools - this was a main concern for the Scottish Government Reporter in July 2015.

The Union Canal has been identified as having potential to receive surface water and developer contributions COULD help to sustain and improve it - while we do have concerns about flood risk, we also have concerns over contamination to the Union Canal and the feeder burns to Linlithgow Loch.

It states in the Proposed Plan that agricultural land can be used for development, this is disappointing as not only do you lose a piece of prime countryside but protected wildlife is not taken into consideration.

### Additional comments

It is obvious from this response that we are disappointed that this site (H-LL 10) has been carried forward from the Main Issues Report to West Lothian's Proposed Plan, especially as the site had been recently dismissed by the Scottish Government Reporter.

It was also reported from West Lothian Council's Newsroom webpage in July: A spokesperson for West Lothian Council's Planning Service said: "The council is pleased with the outcomes of these important appeals.

"In particular the results reinforce the council's position of ensuring that any future development in Linlithgow must respect the attractive setting on the town, not to lead to extra congestion in the town centre and recognise capacity issues at local schools."

The inclusion of this site seems to contradict the above statement! What has changed in a short period of time to force such a dramatic change of heart, especially after the council fought so hard to stop the development?

Please can you make reference to our previous MIR reference when it goes to Scottish Government before adoption.

Mr & Mrs M Graham

<image1.jpeg>