

WLC REF: MIRQ0035

Please find below my comments on the Main Issues Paper for the proposed West Lothian Development Plan.

With regards question 29, I believe that Linlithgow should retain the definition as an area of restraint, as most of the factors which led to this initial categorisation remain the case to date.

There are still many access and parking problems with congestion on the High Street and the surrounding areas. In particular Manse Road and the Canal Basin are often congested, due to the narrowness of the carriageway and the volume of parking around the train station area. Often this poses a risk to pedestrians on a very narrow pavement, where people have to step onto the road to allow others to pass in the opposite direction. This is of particular concern, given that a number of the proposed preferred development sites would require access via Manse Road, thus increasing the volume further.

The lack of primary school capacity at Lowport is of particular concern as many of the proposed preferred development sites are in areas which are in the vicinity of the Lowport catchment area. Although there is acknowledged spare capacity at Springfield, it seems that few of the proposed preferred sites would be in areas which are near the Springfield catchment and if these new houses were to be included in the Springfield catchment then this would likely increase the traffic congestion and pedestrian access issues identified above. The plan makes no mention of nursery provision, however this is also an issue in the Linlithgow area. Although there are no specific catchments for nursery schools, the lack of local places again contributes to additional road congestion.

Your main issues document suggests there is a degree of community support for development in Linlithgow. This is not my experience of the issue and doesn't reflect the overwhelming objections which are received by planners in response to the planning applications which have been made for some of the proposed preferred development sites in recent years. In my experience, there is little community support for large scale developments in the area and particularly for some of the sites which are being proposed as preferred development areas.

I don't believe the main issues paper makes a convincing case for changing from the status quo of retaining the area of restraint classification, as too many issues have yet to be satisfactorily addressed to allow more development.

Yours sincerely

