



West Lothian Council

THE WEST LOTHIAN LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (LDP)

CONSULTATION RESPONSE PORTAL

Have Your Say on the Proposed Plan

Introduction

West Lothian Council has published its Proposed Plan together with supporting documents including an Environmental Report (SEA), Habitats Regulation Appraisal, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Equalities & Human Rights Impact Assessment. These can be viewed on the West Lothian Council website at www.westlothian.gov.uk/proposedplan.

If you wish to make representations on the Proposed Plan or associated documents you are encouraged to use this online consultation portal. It's quick and easy and will help us to process representations more efficiently, reducing the overall cost and environmental impact of the exercise.

You do not need to complete this questionnaire in a single visit. Just simply put your Survey Reference Number (CODE) in the top right corner of the screen to allow you to continue with your submission at a later date.

If you need assistance with completing or submitting your representation online please call the Customer Service Centre (CSC) on 01506 280000. Please advise the Customer Service Centre that your enquiry relates specifically to the Local Development Plan and ask for it to be logged and directed to the Development Plan and Environment Team. Someone will contact you. Alternatively you can email us at wlldp@westlothian.gov.uk We will endeavour to respond as quickly as possible but in any event within 3 working days of receiving your enquiry.

It is important that all representations are submitted no later than midnight on Sunday 22 November 2015. Representations received after that time will not be considered.

Your comments should be concise, having regard to paragraph 84 of Scottish Government Circular 6/2013: Development Planning which states that representations should be no more than 2,000 words plus any limited supporting productions.

Data Protection Statement

Please be aware that when you make representations on the Proposed Plan through the consultation portal (and/or in a conventional written format) personal information provided as part of a representation cannot be treated as confidential. Representations require to be made available online and for public inspection at the council's office (this would include your name but would exclude any information which would be subject to the Data Protection Act 1998 i.e. signature, postal address, telephone number, email).

We are also required to pass these details to the Scottish Government's Directorate of Planning and Environmental Appeals (DPEA). This is because they may at a later date wish to invite you to an Examination in Public of the Proposed Plan to discuss your representation.

Before using the consultation portal you should also note that any information posted may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002. West Lothian Council will not be liable for any loss or damage arising from or in connection with the disclosure of any information including the disclosure of user generated content.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Your Details

Please indicate in what capacity you are making this submission: *

Please note that this is a mandatory field

- as an individual (and representing your own views)
- as a representative of a private or commercial organisation (and representing the views of that organisation)
- as a representative of a public organisation (and representing the views of that organisation)
- as an agent (and making comments on behalf of other individuals that you represent or third parties)
- other

Please complete the following contact information: *

Please note that this is a mandatory field

Title

First Name

Surname

Email Address

Telephone

Postal Address

Organization Name

Client's Name

Is this the first time you have made a written representation on the Proposed Plan? *

Please note that this is a mandatory field

- yes
- no

If you have previously submitted a site to be considered for development when the Council was initially seeking Expressions of Interest (EOI), or commented on the Local Development Plan at the Main Issues Report (MIR) stage, or made a previous submission to the Proposed Plan please provide the reference given to you at that time if known.

EOI & MIR reference number can be found on any email or written communication we may have previously sent you

Enter EOI (Expression of Interest) reference here

Enter MIRQ (Main Issues Report) reference here

Please enter your survey reference number in the text box below. *

Survey Reference Number (CODE) can be found in the top right corner of this screen
 Survey Reference Number (CODE) will allow you to save your responses and return to finish the survey later

Please keep a note of your Survey Reference Number (CODE) for future reference

Please note that this is a mandatory field

2. FOREWORD (page 4)

This introduction by the Leader of the Council establishes the role of the LDP and how it will help deliver the council's core objectives.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

Please use the text box below for comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

I would like to log my objections to the proposed development in Nelson Park, Armadale for the following reasons:

1. This area of land is prone to severe flooding;

- a. One of the Councillors at the Committee meeting on 01 Jul 2015 stressed that this land should never have been put forward for development.
- b. The planning application states II/A to flood risk assessment although the guidelines state that there should be a flood risk assessment detailing mitigation strategies.
- c. There is no Drainage Impact Assessment - given the history with this land should this not have been done?
- d. Drainage Strategy states: "where possible surface water should be discharged to the local watercourse". What does this mean?
- e. The Drainage Strategy also states "more detailed consultation will be required at a later stage". When will this be?
- f. The Sensitivity Analysis suggest no risk of flooding. What measure will be put in place to ensure this? Can the council guarantee this?
- g. The Foul and Storm drainage will continue from the existing [REDACTED] drainage. Who will be responsible for maintaining this and who will be responsible if there are any issues with this?
- h. John Millar email dated 11 May states "The drainage is generally acceptable". There are also a number of questions from John which do not appear to have been answered.
- i. The planning application states that this area is known to flood.
- j. Reports are very vague on what action will be taken if any in relation to the current and any potential future flooding.
- k. There is little/no information on whether this will make the situation with flooding worse.
- l. Concerns over increased vermin due to flooding and surface water.

2. Specific Design Concerns;

- a. Due to the existing invert (drainage) levels the site has to be raised by on average 2.0m (as stated within the Lovell design response) This creates a requirement for approx. 18500 m3 of imported fill as there is very little cutting or excavation shown - to give perspective - on a medium density product (2000kg/m3) would equate to 1200nr - 30 tonne loads or 1800nr 20 tonne loads. Deliveries would access the site through [REDACTED] - 1200 relentless loads over and above the usual site congestion, would create an unreasonable amount of traffic, dust, dirt and noise significantly affecting the amenity of the estate and immediate area.
 - b. There is also the need for over 100m of retaining walls ranging from 1-3m in height. The main retaining wall runs down the east boundary against the tree screen, an area which is already prone to flooding and is constantly marshy.
 - c. There are no drainage measures shown to compensate for this and the wall will result in a valley - creating a moat effect. Increased flooding would be damaging to the tree screen, provide vermin sustenance and stench.
 - d. The site suffers a predominately westerly wind - so rubbish etc will be blown into the valley which will not be easily accessible to clear/maintain.
- e. The wall is at its highest point is (3.0m) which is adjacent to the 4 bedroom Type M house. A 3.0m fall is an unnecessary hazard in any public place and it seems irresponsible to situate the largest family home on the development next to this.

3. Loss of greenbelt;

- a. This is currently an area where children play.
- b. There has not been a habitat assessment.
- c. There has been no transport assessment.

4. Loss of Tree (s)

- a. Trees help with drainage and area is already known to flood.

5. Traffic Generation and Circulation

- a. There is already a significant amount of traffic using the access to [REDACTED]
- b. There is also a significant amount of traffic use this as a thoroughfare to Bathville Road.
- c. Please see above under design concerns the amount of material required to raise the land will result in approximately 30 tonne loads of fill being delivered to the site through [REDACTED], a residential area.

6. Lack of school places within Armadale

Houses with less than 3 bedrooms not being considered for the requirement of school places. There will be children in the flats and 2 bedroom houses. This was an issue within Wester Inch and is why Simpson Primary is having to be extended. We were informed at the committee meeting that the new school near Asda in Armadale will accommodate this. However the new school is not within the [REDACTED] catchment area and we have been informed that the new school will only accommodate primary 1-4.

7. Armadale Health Centre

The residents have concerns over the fact that Armadale Group Practice is already under a significant amount of strain.

There is a 3 week wait for appointments and if patients require an urgent appointment they are having to queue at the surgery.

8. Access is through private estate

- a. No other Lovell or Council development has the access through private estate.

The residents [REDACTED] had concerns over the cost of this development due to the amount of work required to raise the land, and had proposed some other sites which might be more suitable/economical for development:

1. Old Brickwork site (currently wasteland/ruin)
2. Old Citroen Garage
3. Land between Drummonds and Birkdale Park (fields)
4. A recent BBC news report dated 17 Nov stated that there are 27,000 homes lying empty across Scotland. Would it not be more cost efficient and economical to work on developing these already built homes to make them suitable for living.

I would also like to highlight some concerns that all of the residents had over the process for the original planning application, objections and Committee Meeting:

1. Although each of the residents who raised official objections had a number of questions relating to the development none of these questions were answered.
2. None of the objectors received any feedback or even acknowledgement of their objections.
3. We were led to believe that objections could not be submitted after the closure date. However my objection was noted (dated 18 Jun 2015) which was after the closure date. We are aware of a number of residents in both [REDACTED] who would have raised objections if they knew that it would have been noted.
4. We were also led to believe that only residents who received letters could raise objections, however this was not the case and some residents who did not received letters raised objections and these were noted. There were a number of residents who would have raised objections if they had known that they could.
5. It was decided on 23 Jun 2015 that the Nelson Park Development would be put on the agenda for 01 Jul 2015 on 23 Jun 2015. However the objectors were not informed about this meeting officially until 29 Jul 2015. Therefore having only 1 day to respond to confirm that they would attend and speak at this meeting.
6. Furthermore the proposed development in Nelson Park, which appears to have been approved without adhering to all council policies (not everyone who placed an official objection were invited to speak at the planning committee meeting where the plan was approved.
7. There was a petitions signed by over 200 residents, however the Committee would not accept this during the meeting on 01 Jul 2015 and advised the residents that it was too late to submit this. Can you advise if this can be submitted now, and if so how?

3. BACKGROUND (page 6, paragraphs 1.1-1.5)

Provides a brief historical context to the economic development of West Lothian which helps explain how settlements established and have developed.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

Please use the text box below for comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

4. CONTEXT (page 7, paragraphs 2.1-2.2)

Provides wider context for the LDP in geographic terms and explains how the LDP fits with the Strategic Development Plan (SDP1).

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

Please use the text box below for comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

I would like to log my objections to the proposed development in Nelson Park, Armadale for the following reasons:

1. This area of land is prone to severe flooding;

- a. One of the Councillors at the Committee meeting on 01 Jul 2015 stressed that this land should never have been put forward for development.
- b. The planning application states II/A to flood risk assessment although the guidelines state that there should be a flood risk assessment detailing mitigation strategies.
- c. There is no Drainage Impact Assessment - given the history with this land should this not have been done?
- d. Drainage Strategy states: "where possible surface water should be discharged to the local watercourse". What does this mean?
- e. The Drainage Strategy also states "more detailed consultation will be required at a later stage". When will this be?
- f. The Sensitivity Analysis suggest no risk of flooding. What measure will be put in place to ensure this? Can the council guarantee this?
- g. The Foul and Storm drainage will continue from the existing [REDACTED] drainage. Who will be responsible for maintaining this and who will be responsible if there are any issues with this?
- h. John Millar email dated 11 May states "The drainage is generally acceptable". There are also a number of questions from John which do not appear to have been answered.
- i. The planning application states that this area is known to flood.
- j. Reports are very vague on what action will be taken if any in relation to the current and any potential future flooding.
- k. There is little/no information on whether this will make the situation with flooding worse.
- l. Concerns over increased vermin due to flooding and surface water.

2. Specific Design Concerns;

- a. Due to the existing invert (drainage) levels the site has to be raised by on average 2.0m (as stated within the Lovell design response) This creates a requirement for approx. 18500 m3 of imported fill as there is very little cutting or excavation shown - to give perspective - on a medium density product (2000kg/m3) would equate to 1200nr - 30 tonne loads or 1800nr 20 tonne loads. Deliveries would access the site through [REDACTED] - 1200 relentless loads over and above the usual site congestion, would create an unreasonable amount of traffic, dust, dirt and noise significantly affecting the amenity of the estate and immediate area.
 - b. There is also the need for over 100m of retaining walls ranging from 1-3m in height. The main retaining wall runs down the east boundary against the tree screen, an area which is already prone to flooding and is constantly marshy.
 - c. There are no drainage measures shown to compensate for this and the wall will result in a valley - creating a moat effect. Increased flooding would be damaging to the tree screen, provide vermin sustenance and stench.
 - d. The site suffers a predominately westerly wind - so rubbish etc will be blown into the valley which will not be easily accessible to clear/maintain.
- e. The wall is at its highest point is (3.0m) which is adjacent to the 4 bedroom Type M house. A 3.0m fall is an unnecessary hazard in any public place and it seems irresponsible to situate the largest family home on the development next to this.

3. Loss of greenbelt;

- a. This is currently an area where children play.
- b. There has not been a habitat assessment.
- c. There has been no transport assessment.

4. Loss of Tree (s)

- a. Trees help with drainage and area is already known to flood.

5. Traffic Generation and Circulation

- a. There is already a significant amount of traffic using the access to [REDACTED]
- b. There is also a significant amount of traffic use this as a thoroughfare to Bathville Road.
- c. Please see above under design concerns the amount of material required to raise the land will result in approximately 30 tonne loads of fill being delivered to the site through [REDACTED], a residential area.

6. Lack of school places within Armadale

Houses with less than 3 bedrooms not being considered for the requirement of school places. There will be children in the flats and 2 bedroom houses. This was an issue within Wester Inch and is why Simpson Primary is having to be extended. We were informed at the committee meeting that the new school near Asda in Armadale will accommodate this. However the new school is not within the [REDACTED] catchment area and we have been informed that the new school will only accommodate primary 1-4.

7. Armadale Health Centre

The residents have concerns over the fact that Armadale Group Practice is already under a significant amount of strain.

There is a 3 week wait for appointments and if patients require an urgent appointment they are having to queue at the surgery.

8. Access is through private estate

- a. No other Lovell or Council development has the access through private estate.

The residents of [REDACTED] had concerns over the cost of this development due to the amount of work required to raise the land, and had proposed some other sites which might be more suitable/economical for development:

1. Old Brickwork site (currently wasteland/ruin)
2. Old Citroen Garage
3. Land between Drummonds and Birkdale Park (fields)
4. A recent BBC news report dated 17 Nov stated that there are 27,000 homes lying empty across Scotland. Would it not be more cost efficient and economical to work on developing these already built homes to make them suitable for living.

I would also like to highlight some concerns that all of the residents had over the process for the original planning application, objections and Committee Meeting:

1. Although each of the residents who raised official objections had a number of questions relating to the development none of these questions were answered.
2. None of the objectors received any feedback or even acknowledgement of their objections.
3. We were led to believe that objections could not be submitted after the closure date. However my objection was noted (dated 18 Jun 2015) which was after the closure date. We are aware of a number of residents in both [REDACTED] who would have raised objections if they knew that it would have been noted.
4. We were also led to believe that only residents who received letters could raise objections, however this was not the case and some residents who did not receive letters raised objections and these were noted. There were a number of residents who would have raised objections if they had known that they could.
5. It was decided on 23 Jun 2015 that the Nelson Park Development would be put on the agenda for 01 Jul 2015 on 23 Jun 2015. However the objectors were not informed about this meeting officially until 29 Jul 2015. Therefore having only 1 day to respond to confirm that they would attend and speak at this meeting.
6. Furthermore the proposed development in Nelson Park, which appears to have been approved without adhering to all council policies (not everyone who placed an official objection were invited to speak at the planning committee meeting where the plan was approved.
7. There was a petitions signed by over 200 residents, however the Committee would not accept this during the meeting on 01 Jul 2015 and advised the residents that it was too late to submit this. Can you advise if this can be submitted now, and if so how?

5. ROLE AND PURPOSE OF PLAN (page 7, paragraphs 3.1-3.5)

Establishes the role and purpose of the LDP in terms of its being a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for development in West Lothian and, when adopted by the Council, will replace the West Lothian Local Plan. It also sets out what documents the plan must comply with i.e. the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006 and what documents will accompany the plan i.e. the Action Programme etc.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

Please use the text box below for comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

I would like to log my objections to the proposed development in Nelson Park, Armadale for the following reasons:

1. This area of land is prone to severe flooding;

- One of the Councillors at the Committee meeting on 01 Jul 2015 stressed that this land should never have been put forward for development.
- The planning application states N/A to flood risk assessment although the guidelines state that there should be a flood risk assessment detailing mitigation strategies.
- There is no Drainage Impact Assessment - given the history with this land should this not have been done?
- Drainage Strategy states: "where possible surface water should be discharged to the local watercourse". What does this mean?
- The Drainage Strategy also states "more detailed consultation will be required at a later stage". When will this be?
- The Sensitivity Analysis suggests no risk of flooding. What measure will be put in place to ensure this? Can the council guarantee this?
- The Foul and Storm drainage will continue from the existing [REDACTED] drainage. Who will be responsible for maintaining this and who will be responsible if there are any issues with this?
- John Millar email dated 11 May states "The drainage is generally acceptable". There are also a number of questions from John which do not appear to have been answered.
- The planning application states that this area is known to flood.
- Reports are very vague on what action will be taken if any in relation to the current and any potential future flooding.
- There is little/no information on whether this will make the situation with flooding worse.
- Concerns over increased vermin due to flooding and surface water.

2. Specific Design Concerns;

- Due to the existing invert (drainage) levels the site has to be raised by on average 2.0m (as stated within the Lovell design response). This creates a requirement for approx. 18500 m³ of imported fill as there is very little cutting or excavation shown - to give perspective - on a medium density product (2000kg/m³) would equate to 1200nr - 30 tonne loads or 1800nr 20 tonne loads. Deliveries would access the site through [REDACTED] - 1200 relentless loads over and above the usual site congestion, would create an unreasonable amount of traffic, dust, dirt and noise significantly affecting the amenity of the estate and immediate area.
- There is also the need for over 100m of retaining walls ranging from 1-3m in height. The main retaining wall runs down the east boundary against the tree screen, an area which is already prone to flooding and is constantly marshy.
- There are no drainage measures shown to compensate for this and the wall will result in a valley - creating a moat effect. Increased flooding would be damaging to the tree screen, provide vermin sustenance and stench.
- The site suffers a predominately westerly wind - so rubbish etc will be blown into the valley which will not be easily accessible to clear/maintain.
- The wall is at its highest point is (3.0m) which is adjacent to the 4 bedroom Type M house. A 3.0m fall is an unnecessary hazard in any public place and it seems irresponsible to situate the largest family home on the development next to this.

3. Loss of greenbelt;

- This is currently an area where children play.
- There has not been a habitat assessment.
- There has been no transport assessment.

4. Loss of Tree (s)

- Trees help with drainage and area is already known to flood.

5. Traffic Generation and Circulation

- There is already a significant amount of traffic using the access to [REDACTED]
- There is also a significant amount of traffic use this as a thoroughfare to Bathville Road.
- Please see above under design concerns the amount of material required to raise the land will result in approximately 30 tonne loads of fill being delivered to the site through [REDACTED], a residential area.

6. Lack of school places within Armadale

Houses with less than 3 bedrooms not being considered for the requirement of school places. There will be children in the flats and 2 bedroom houses. This was an issue within Wester Inch and is why Simpson Primary is having to be extended. We were informed at the committee meeting that the new school near Asda in Armadale will accommodate this. However the new school is not within the [REDACTED] catchment area and we have been informed that the new school will only accommodate primary 1-4.

7. Armadale Health Centre

The residents have concerns over the fact that Armadale Group Practice is already under a significant amount of strain.

There is a 3 week wait for appointments and if patients require an urgent appointment they are having to queue at the surgery.

8. Access is through private estate

- No other Lovell or Council development has the access through private estate.

The residents of [REDACTED] had concerns over the cost of this development due to the amount of work required to raise the land, and had proposed some other sites which might be more suitable/economical for development:

- Old Brickwork site (currently wasteland/ruin)
- Old Citroen Garage
- Land between Drummonds and Birkdale Park (fields)
- A recent BBC news report dated 17 Nov stated that there are 27,000 homes lying empty across Scotland. Would it not be more cost efficient and economical to work on developing these already built homes to make them suitable for living.

I would also like to highlight some concerns that all of the residents had over the process for the original planning application, objections and Committee Meeting:

- Although each of the residents who raised official objections had a number of questions relating to the development none of these questions were answered.
- None of the objectors received any feedback or even acknowledgement of their objections.
- We were led to believe that objections could not be submitted after the closure date. However my objection was noted (dated 18 Jun 2015) which was after the closure date. We are aware of a number of residents in both [REDACTED] who would have raised objections if they knew that it would have been noted.
- We were also led to believe that only residents who received letters could raise objections, however this was not the case and some residents who did not receive letters raised objections and these were noted. There were a number of residents who would have raised objections if they had known that they could.
- It was decided on 23 Jun 2015 that the Nelson Park Development would be put on the agenda for 01 Jul 2015 on 23 Jun 2015. However the objectors were not informed about this meeting officially until 29 Jul 2015. Therefore having only 1 day to respond to confirm that they would attend and speak at this meeting.
- Furthermore the proposed development in Nelson Park, which appears to have been approved without adhering to all council policies (not everyone who placed an official objection were invited to speak at the planning committee meeting where the plan was approved).
- There was a petition signed by over 200 residents, however the Committee would not accept this during the meeting on 01 Jul 2015 and advised the residents that it was too late to submit this. Can you advise if this can be submitted now, and if so how?

6. VISION STATEMENT AND AIMS (page 8, paragraphs 4.1-4.3)

Establishes the vision for the LDP in terms of outcomes desired over the plan period and identifies the key aims of the plan by individual subject areas i.e. Economic Development & Growth, Community Regeneration, Sustainable Housing Locations, Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery, Town Centres and Retailing, the Natural and Historic Environment, Climate Change and Renewable Energy and Waste and Minerals.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

If you wish to make comments please begin by selecting the relevant sub-section(s) of Vision Statement and Aims from the list below.

- Economic Development and Growth (page 8)
- Community Regeneration (page 8)
- Sustainable Housing Locations (page 9)
- Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery (page 9)
- Town Centres and Retailing (page 9)
- The Natural and Historic Environment (page 9)
- Climate Change and Renewable Energy (page 9)
- Waste and Minerals (page 9)

Please use the text box below for comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

Economic Development and Growth (page 8)	<input type="text"/>
Community Regeneration (page 8)	<input type="text"/>
Sustainable Housing Locations (page 9)	<input type="text"/>
Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery (page 9)	<input type="text"/>
Town Centres and Retailing (page 9)	<input type="text"/>
The Natural and Historic Environment (page 9)	<input type="text"/>
Climate Change and Renewable Energy (page 9)	<input type="text"/>
Waste and Minerals (page 9)	<input type="text"/>

7. THE SPATIAL STRATEGY (INCLUDING POLICY FRAMEWORK) (page 10, paragraphs 5.1-5.10)

In the context of the Strategic Development Plan (SDP), the LDP identifies West Lothian as being one of thirteen Strategic Development Areas where development will be focused in sustainable locations where infrastructure is either available or can be provided and in locations where there are no environmental constraints.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

If you wish to make comments please begin by selecting the relevant sub-section(s) of the Spatial Strategy from the list below.

- Economic Development and Growth (page 12, paragraphs 5.11-5.22)
- Flexibility within traditional industrial estates (page 14, paragraphs 5.24-5.25)
- Enterprise Areas (page 17, paragraphs 5.24-5.25)
- Local business opportunities, small business start-ups and working from home (page 17, paragraph 5.26)
- Tourism (page 17, paragraphs 5.27-5.28)
- Promoting community regeneration (page 19, paragraphs 5.29-5.35)
- Housing land requirements for the LDP (page 20, paragraphs 5.36-5.49)
- Effective Housing Land and Generous Supply (page 23, paragraphs 5.50-5.53)
- New Housing Sites and Design (page 24, paragraphs 5.4-5.56)
- Strategic Allocations (including previously identified Core Development Area Allocations) (page 25, paragraphs 5.57-5.61)
- Whitburn/Charette (page 26, paragraph 5.62)
- Linlithgow and Linlithgow Bridge (page 26-27)
- Deans South, Livingston; Area for Comprehensive Re-development (page 27, paragraph 5.68)
- Affordable Housing (page 27, paragraphs 5.69-5.74)
- Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People (page 29, paragraph 5.75)
- Residential Care and Supported Accommodation (page 29, paragraphs 5.76-5.77)
- Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery (page 30, paragraphs 5.78-5.84)
- Providing for Community Needs (page 32, paragraphs 5.85-5.88)
- Education (page 32, paragraphs 5.89-5.92)
- Healthcare Provision (page 33, paragraphs 5.93-5.96)
- Sports Facilities (page 33, paragraphs 5.97-5.101)
- Green Infrastructure and Green Networks (page 34, paragraphs 5.102-5.105)
- Water and Drainage (page 34, paragraphs 5.106-5.107)
- Travel in and around West Lothian (page 34, paragraphs 5.108-5.112)
- Roads (page 35, paragraph 5.113)
- A71 Corridor (page 35, paragraphs 5.114-5.115)
- A801 Corridor (page 35, paragraphs 5.116-5.117)
- A89/A8 (page 35, paragraphs 5.118-5.126)
- Rail (page 37, paragraphs 5.127-5.130)
- Walking and Cycling (page 37, paragraphs 5.131-5.132)
- Town Centres and Retailing (page 39, paragraphs 5.133-5.138)
- Landscape Character and Local Landscape Designations (page 41, paragraphs 5.139-5.143)
- Countryside Belts (page 42, paragraph 5.144)
- Development in the Countryside (page 42, paragraphs 5.145-5.147)
- Lowland Crofting (page 44, paragraphs 5.148-5.152)
- Green Networks, Local Biodiversity Sites and Geodiversity Sites (page 45, paragraphs 5.153-5.155)
- Forestry (page 46, paragraphs 5.156-5.163)
- Union Canal (p.49 paragraphs 5.164-5.165)
- Pentland Hills Regional Park (page 49, paragraphs 5.164-5.165)
- Country Parks (page 50, paragraph 5.169)
- Allotments/Community Growing (page 51, paragraphs 5.170-5.171)
- Temporary/Advance Greening (page 51, paragraphs 5.172-5.174)
- Biodiversity (page 52, paragraphs 5.175-5.180)
- Geodiversity (page 53, paragraph 5.181)
- West Lothian Open Space Strategy (page 53, paragraphs 5.182-5.184)
- Historic and Cultural Environment (page 54, paragraphs 5.185-5.187)
- Conservation Areas (page 55, paragraphs 5.185-5.188)

- Former Bangour Village Hospital, Dechmont (page 56, paragraph 5.189)
- Conservation Area at Abercorn/Hopetoun Estate (page 56, paragraph 5.190)
- Other Areas of Built Heritage and Townscape Value (page 57, paragraphs 5.191-5.199)
- Listed Buildings (page 58, paragraphs 5.185-5.187)
- Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes (page 59, paragraphs 5.200-5.201)
- Historic Battlefields (page 60, paragraph 5.202)
- Archaeology (page 60, paragraph 5.203)
- Scheduled Monuments (page 60, paragraphs 5.204-5.206)
- Public Art (page 61, paragraphs 5.207-5.208)
- Climate Change Measures (page 62, paragraphs 5.209-5.214)
- Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy (page 63, paragraphs 5.215-5.221)
- Wind Farms and Wind Turbines (page 65, paragraphs 5.222-5.225)
- Energy and Heat Networks (page 66, paragraphs 5.226-5.229)
- Off-gas Grid Areas and Renewable Heat Requirement for New-build Housing (page 67, paragraphs 5.230-5.232)
- The Water Environment and Flood Risk Management (page 67, paragraphs 5.233-5.239)
- Air Quality and Noise (page 70, paragraphs 5.240-5.242)
- Edinburgh Airport (page 71, paragraph 5.243)
- Noise (page 71, paragraph 5.244)
- Contaminated Land (page 71, paragraphs 5.245-5.246)
- Vacant and Derelict Land (page 72, paragraphs 5.249-5.250)
- Minerals and Waste (page 73, paragraphs 5.251-5.256)
- Site Restoration (page 75, paragraphs 5.257-5.238)
- Unconventional Gas Extraction including Hydraulic Fracking (page 75, paragraph 5.259)
- Waste (page 76, paragraph 5.260)

Please use the text box below for your comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

I would like to log my objections to the proposed development in Helson Park, Armadale for the following reasons: 1. This area of land is prone to severe flooding; a. One of the Councillors at the Committee meeting on 01 Jul 2015 stressed that this land should never have been put forward for development. b. The planning application states II/A to flood risk assessment although the guidelines state that there should be a flood risk assessment detailing mitigation strategies. c. There is no Drainage Impact Assessment - given the history with this land should this not have been done? d. Drainage Strategy states: "where possible surface water should be discharged to the local watercourse". What does this mean? e. The Drainage Strategy also states "more detailed consultation will be required at a later stage". When will this be? f. The Sensitivity Analysis suggest no risk of flooding. What measure will be put in place to ensure this? Can the council guarantee this? g. The Foul and Storm drainage will continue from the existing [redacted] drainage. Who will be responsible for maintaining this and who will be responsible if there are any issues with this? h. John Millar email dated 11 May states "The drainage is generally acceptable". There are also a number of questions from John which do not appear to have been answered. i. The planning application states that this area is known to flood. j. Reports are very vague on what action will be taken if any in relation to the current and any potential future flooding. k. There is little/no information on whether this will make the situation with flooding worse. l. Concerns over increased vermin due to flooding and surface water. 2. Specific Design Concerns; a. Due to the existing invert (drainage) levels the site has to be raised by on average 2.0m (as stated within the Lovell design response) This creates a requirement for approx. 18500 m3 of imported fill as there is very little cutting or excavation shown - to give perspective - on a medium density product (2000kg/m3) would equate to 1200nr - 30 tonne loads or 1800nr 20 tonne loads. Deliveries would access the site through [redacted] - 1200 relentless loads over and above the usual site congestion, would create an unreasonable amount of traffic, dust, dirt and noise significantly affecting the amenity of the estate and immediate area. b. There is also the need for over 100m of retaining walls ranging from 1-3m in height. The main retaining wall runs down the east boundary against the tree screen, an area which is already prone to flooding and is constantly marshy. c. There are no drainage measures shown to compensate for this and the wall will result in a valley - creating a moat effect. Increased flooding would be damaging to the tree screen, provide vermin sustenance and stench. d. The site suffers a predominately westerly wind - so rubbish etc will be blown into the valley which will not be easily accessible to clear/maintain. e. The wall is at its highest point is (3.0m) which is adjacent to the 4 bedroom Type M house. A 3.0m fall is an unnecessary hazard in any public place and it seems irresponsible to situate the largest family home on the development next to this. 3. Loss of greenbelt; a. This is currently an area where children play. b. There has not been a habitat assessment. c. There has been no transport assessment. 4. Loss of Tree (s) a. Trees help with drainage and area is already known to flood. 5. Traffic Generation and Circulation a. There is already a significant amount of traffic using the access to [redacted] b. There is also a significant amount of traffic use this as a thoroughfare to Bathville Road. c. Please see above under design concerns the amount of material required to raise the land will result in approximately 30 tonne loads of fill being delivered to the site through [redacted] a residential area. 6. Lack of school places within Armadale Houses with less than 3 bedrooms not being considered for the requirement of school places. There will be children in the flats and 2 bedroom houses. This was an issue within Wester Inch and is why Simpson Primary is having to be extended. We were informed at the committee meeting that the new school near Asda in Armadale will accommodate this. However the new school is not within the [redacted] catchment area and we have been informed that the new school will only accommodate primary 1-4. 7. Armadale Health Centre The residents have concerns over the fact that Armadale Group Practice is already under a significant amount of strain. There is a 3 week wait for appointments and if patients require an urgent appointment they are having to queue at the surgery. 8. Access is through private estate a. No other Lovell or Council development has the access through private estate. The residents of [redacted] had concerns over the cost of this development due to the amount of work required to raise the land, and had proposed some other sites which might be more suitable/economical for development: 1. Old Brickwork site (currently wasteland/ruin) 2. Old Citroen Garage 3. Land between Drummonds and Birkdale Park (fields) 4. A recent BBC news report dated 17 Nov stated that there are 27,000 homes lying empty across Scotland. Would it not be more cost efficient and economical to work on developing these already built homes to make them suitable for living. I would also like to highlight some concerns that all of the residents had over the process for the original planning application, objections and Committee Meeting: 1. Although each of the residents who raised official objections had a number of questions relating to the development none of these questions were answered. 2. None of the objectors received any feedback or even acknowledgement of their objections. 3. We were led to believe that objections could not be submitted after the closure date. However my objection was noted (dated 18 Jun 2015) which was after the closure date. We are aware of a number of residents in both [redacted] and Church Place who would have raised objections if they knew that it would have been noted. 4. We were also led to believe that only residents who received letters could raise objections, however this was not the case and some residents who did not receive letters raised objections and these were noted. There were a number of residents who would have raised objections if they had known that they could. 5. It was decided on 23 Jun 2015 that the Helson Park Development would be put on the agenda for 01 Jul 2015 on 23 Jun 2015. However the objectors were not informed about this meeting officially until 29 Jul 2015. Therefore having only 1 day to respond to confirm that they would attend and speak at this meeting. 6. Furthermore the proposed development in Helson Park, which appears to have been approved without adhering to all council policies (not everyone who placed an official objection were invited to speak at the planning committee meeting where the plan was approved. 7. There was a petitions signed by over 200 residents, however the Committee would not accept this during the meeting on 01 Jul 2015 and advised the residents that it was too late to submit this. Can you advise if this can be submitted now, and if so how?

New
Housing
Sites and
Design
(page 24,
paragraphs
5.4-5.56)

8. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL BY SETTLEMENT (page 79)

Provides details of development proposals which are supported by the LDP in each town and village across West Lothian and assigns each one a unique reference for ease of identification.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
 no

If you wish to make comments please begin by selecting the relevant Settlement(s) from the list below.

- Addiewell & Loganlea (page 79)
- Armadale (page 80)
- Bathgate (page 81)
- Blackburn (page 82)
- Blackridge (page 83)
- Breich (page 83)
- Bridgehouse & Bridgecastle (page 83)
- Bridgend (page 83)
- Broxburn (page 84)
- Burnside (page 84)
- Dechmont & Bangour (page 85)
- East Calder (page 85)
- East Whitburn (page 86)
- Ecclesmachan (page 86)
- Fauldhouse (page 86)
- Greenrigg (page 86)
- Kirknewton (page 87)
- Landward area (page 87)
- Linlithgow & Linlithgow Bridge (page 89)
- Livingston (page 90)
- Longridge (page 93)
- Mid Calder (page 93)
- Newton and Woodend (page 93)
- Philpstoun/East & West Philpstoun/Old Philpstoun (page 93)
- Polbeth (page 93)
- Pumpherston (page 93)
- Seafield (page 93)
- Stoneyburn/Bents (page 94)
- Threemiletown (page 94)
- Torphichen (page 94)
- Uphall (page 94)
- Uphall Station (page 94)
- West Calder & Harburn (page 95)
- Westfield (page 95)
- Whitburn (page 96)
- Wilkieston (page 97)
- Winchburgh (page 97)

Please enter site reference(s)/proposals reference (as appropriate) and location/site address below.

[Site Reference/ Location / Site Address can be found in the relevant Settlement Statement](#)

	site reference	location/ site address
Addiewell & Logantea (page 79)		
Armadale (page 80)		
Bathgate (page 81)		
Blackburn (page 82)		
Blackridge (page 83)		
Breich (page 83)		
Bridgehouse & Bridgecastle (page 83)		
Bridgend (page 83)		
Broxburn (page 84)		
Burnside (page 84)		
Dechmont & Bangour (page 85)		
East Calder (page 85)		
East Whitburn (page 86)		
Ecclesmachan (page 86)		
Fauldhouse (page 86)		
Greenrigg (page 86)		
Kirknewton (page 87)		
Landward area (page 87)		
Linlithgow & Linlithgow Bridge (page 89)		
Livingston (page 90)		
Longridge (page 93)		
Mid Calder (page 93)		
Newton and Woodend (page 93)		
Philpstoun/East & West Philpstoun/Old Philpstoun (page 93)		
Polbeth (page 93)		
Pumpherstoun (page 93)		
Seafield (page 93)		
Stoneyburn/Bents (page 94)		
Threemiletown (page 94)		
Torphichen (page 94)		
Uphall (page 94)		
Uphall Station (page 94)		
West Calder & Harburn (page 95)		
Westfield (page 95)		
Whitburn (page 96)		
Wilkieston (page 97)		
Winchburgh (page 97)		

Please use the text box below for comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

Comment

Addiewell & Loganlea (page 79)	
Armadale (page 80)	
Bathgate (page 81)	
Blackburn (page 82)	
Blackridge (page 83)	
Breich (page 83)	
Bridgehouse & Bridgecastle (page 83)	
Bridgend (page 83)	
Broxburn (page 84)	
Burnside (page 84)	
Dechmont & Bangour (page 85)	
East Calder (page 85)	
East Whitburn (page 86)	
Ecclesmachan (page 86)	
Fauldhouse (page 86)	
Greenrigg (page 86)	
Kirknewton (page 87)	
Landward area (page 87)	
Linlithgow & Linlithgow Bridge (page 89)	
Livingston (page 90)	
Longridge (page 93)	
Mid Calder (page 93)	
Newton and Woodend (page 93)	
Philpstoun/East & West Philpstoun/Old Philpstoun (page 93)	
Polbeth (page 93)	
Pumpherstoun (page 93)	
Seafield (page 93)	
Stoneyburn/Bents (page 94)	
Threemiletown (page 94)	
Torphichen (page 94)	
Uphall (page 94)	
Uphall Station (page 94)	
West Calder & Harburn (page 95)	
Westfield (page 95)	
Whitburn (page 96)	
Wilkieston (page 97)	
Winchburgh (page 97)	

9. APPENDICES (page 99)

A number of appendices are included at the end of the LDP which provides additional detail on specific elements of the Proposed Plan.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

If you wish to make comments please begin by selecting the relevant Appendix(es) of the Proposed Plan from the list below.

- Appendix 1 - Employment Land Allocations (page 99)
- Appendix 2 - Schedule of Housing Sites / Site Delivery Requirements (page 119)
- Appendix 3 - Schedule of Land Ownership (page 259)
- Appendix 4 - LDP Supplementary Guidance (SG) and Planning Guidance (PG) (page 265)
- Appendix 5 - List of Policies (page 273)
- Appendix 6 - List of Proposals (page 275)

Please use the text box below for your comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

Appendix 1 - Employment Land Allocations (page 99)	<input type="text"/>
Appendix 2 - Schedule of Housing Sites / Site Delivery Requirements (page 119)	<input type="text"/>
Appendix 3 - Schedule of Land Ownership (page 259)	<input type="text"/>
Appendix 4 - LDP Supplementary Guidance (SG) and Planning Guidance (PG) (page 265)	<input type="text"/>
Appendix 5 - List of Policies (page 273)	<input type="text"/>
Appendix 6 - List of Proposals (page 275)	<input type="text"/>

10. GLOSSARY (page 280)

An explanation of unfamiliar terms or expressions used in the LDP is provided to assist understanding of the document.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

Please use the text box below for comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

11. PROPOSALS MAPS

The LDP comprises a series of five maps which define settlement boundaries and illustrate land use zonings.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
- no

If you wish to make comments please begin by selecting the relevant Proposals Maps from the list below.

- Proposals Map 1 - West Lothian
- Proposals Map 2 - Linlithgow & Broxburn Area
- Proposals Map 3 - Livingston Area
- Proposals Map 4 - Bathgate Area
- Proposals Map 5 - Villages

Please use the text box below for your comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

Proposals Map 1 - West Lothian	<input type="text"/>
Proposals Map 2 - Linlithgow & Broxburn Area	<input type="text"/>
Proposals Map 3 - Livingston Area	<input type="text"/>
Proposals Map 4 - Bathgate Area	<input type="text"/>
Proposals Map 5 - Villages	<input type="text"/>

12. ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS

Alongside the LDP is a suite of documents which are required by statute as part of the preparation and supporting evidence for the LDP.

Do you wish to make a comment?

- yes
 no

If you wish to make comments please begin by selecting the relevant Accompanying Documents from the list below.

- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report.
- Equalities & Human Rights Impact Assessment (EQHRIA).
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).
- Habitats Regulations Appraisal.
- Transport Appraisal (TA).
- Action Programme.

Please use the text box below for your comments.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report.	<input type="text"/>
Equalities & Human Rights Impact Assessment (EQHRIA).	<input type="text"/>
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	<input type="text"/>
Habitats Regulations Appraisal.	<input type="text"/>
Transport Appraisal (TA).	<input type="text"/>
Action Programme.	<input type="text"/>

13. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Do you wish to submit any additional comments on the LDP?

- yes
 no

Please use the text box below for your additional comments on the LDP.

Your comments should be concise and limited to no more than 2,000 words. You should fully explain the issues you wish to be considered when the Proposed Plan is presented to Scottish Ministers for Examination. Please indicate whether you are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan (i.e. your representation is an objection) or if your representation supports the Proposed Plan as written.

I would like to log my objections to the proposed development in Nelson Park, Armadale for the following reasons:

1. This area of land is prone to severe flooding;

- a. One of the Councillors at the Committee meeting on 01 Jul 2015 stressed that this land should never have been put forward for development.
- b. The planning application states II/A to flood risk assessment although the guidelines state that there should be a flood risk assessment detailing mitigation strategies.
- c. There is no Drainage Impact Assessment - given the history with this land should this not have been done?
- d. Drainage Strategy states: "where possible surface water should be discharged to the local watercourse". What does this mean?
- e. The Drainage Strategy also states "more detailed consultation will be required at a later stage". When will this be?
- f. The Sensitivity Analysis suggest no risk of flooding. What measure will be put in place to ensure this? Can the council guarantee this?
- g. The Foul and Storm drainage will continue from the existing [REDACTED] drainage. Who will be responsible for maintaining this and who will be responsible if there are any issues with this?
- h. John Millar email dated 11 May states "The drainage is generally acceptable". There are also a number of questions from John which do not appear to have been answered.
- i. The planning application states that this area is known to flood.
- j. Reports are very vague on what action will be taken if any in relation to the current and any potential future flooding.
- k. There is little/no information on whether this will make the situation with flooding worse.
- l. Concerns over increased vermin due to flooding and surface water.

2. Specific Design Concerns;

- a. Due to the existing invert (drainage) levels the site has to be raised by on average 2.0m (as stated within the Lovell design response) This creates a requirement for approx. 18500 m3 of imported fill as there is very little cutting or excavation shown - to give perspective - on a medium density product (2000kg/m3) would equate to 1200nr - 30 tonne loads or 1800nr 20 tonne loads. Deliveries would access the site through [REDACTED] 1200 relentless loads over and above the usual site congestion, would create an unreasonable amount of traffic, dust, dirt and noise significantly affecting the amenity of the estate and immediate area.
- b. There is also the need for over 100m of retaining walls ranging from 1-3m in height. The main retaining wall runs down the east boundary against the tree screen, an area which is already prone to flooding and is constantly marshy.
- c. There are no drainage measures shown to compensate for this and the wall will result in a valley - creating a moat effect. Increased flooding would be damaging to the tree screen, provide vermin sustenance and stench.
- d. The site suffers a predominately westerly wind - so rubbish etc will be blown into the valley which will not be easily accessible to clear/maintain.
- e. The wall is at its highest point is (3.0m) which is adjacent to the 4 bedroom Type M house. A 3.0m fall is an unnecessary hazard in any public place and it seems irresponsible to situate the largest family home on the development next to this.

3. Loss of greenbelt;

- a. This is currently an area where children play.
- b. There has not been a habitat assessment.
- c. There has been no transport assessment.

4. Loss of Tree (s)

- a. Trees help with drainage and area is already known to flood.

5. Traffic Generation and Circulation

- a. There is already a significant amount of traffic using the access to [REDACTED]
- b. There is also a significant amount of traffic use this as a thoroughfare to Bathville Road.
- c. Please see above under design concerns the amount of material required to raise the land will result in approximately 30 tonne loads of fill being delivered to the site through [REDACTED], a residential area.

6. Lack of school places within Armadale

Houses with less than 3 bedrooms not being considered for the requirement of school places. There will be children in the flats and 2 bedroom houses. This was an issue within Wester Inch and is why Simpson Primary is having to be extended. We were informed at the committee meeting that the new school near Asda in Armadale will accommodate this. However the new school is not within the [REDACTED] catchment area and we have been informed that the new school will only accommodate primary 1-4.

7. Armadale Health Centre

The residents have concerns over the fact that Armadale Group Practice is already under a significant amount of strain.

There is a 3 week wait for appointments and if patients require an urgent appointment they are having to queue at the surgery.

8. Access is through private estate

- a. No other Lovell or Council development has the access through private estate.

The residents of [REDACTED] had concerns over the cost of this development due to the amount of work required to raise the land, and had proposed some other sites which might be more suitable/economical for development:

1. Old Brickwork site (currently wasteland/ruin)
2. Old Citroen Garage
3. Land between Drummonds and Birkdale Park (fields)
4. A recent BBC news report dated 17 Nov stated that there are 27,000 homes lying empty across Scotland. Would it not be more cost efficient and economical to work on developing these already built homes to make them suitable for living.

I would also like to highlight some concerns that all of the residents had over the process for the original planning application, objections and Committee Meeting:

1. Although each of the residents who raised official objections had a number of questions relating to the development none of these questions were answered.
2. None of the objectors received any feedback or even acknowledgement of their objections.
3. We were led to believe that objections could not be submitted after the closure date. However my objection was noted (dated 18 Jun 2015) which was after the closure date. We are aware of a number of residents in both [REDACTED] who would have raised objections if they knew that it would have been noted.
4. We were also led to believe that only residents who received letters could raise objections, however this was not the case and some residents who did not received letters raised objections and these were noted. There were a number of residents who would have raised objections if they had known that they could.
5. It was decided on 23 Jun 2015 that the Nelson Park Development would be put on the agenda for 01 Jul 2015 on 23 Jun 2015. However the objectors were not informed about this meeting officially until 29 Jul 2015. Therefore having only 1 day to respond to confirm that they would attend and speak at this meeting.
6. Furthermore the proposed development in Nelson Park, which appears to have been approved without adhering to all council policies (not everyone who placed an official objection were invited to speak at the planning committee meeting where the plan was approved.
7. There was a petitions signed by over 200 residents, however the Committee would not accept this during the meeting on 01 Jul 2015 and advised the residents that it was too late to submit this. Can you advise if this can be submitted now, and if so how?

Before pressing the submit button please review your submission and make any changes. Once you have pressed SUBMIT you will be unable to go back to the survey.

Once we have received your submission we will send you a copy for your records. This could take up to 5 working days. If you do not receive a copy in that time please contact the Customer Service Centre.

CONFIRMATION OF YOUR PARTICIPATION

We will send you an email notification as soon as your survey is submitted.

Please enter your email address below.

fmccomb1976@yahoo.co.uk	fmccomb1976@yahoo.co.uk
-------------------------	-------------------------