From: To:

Subject: Fw: LINLITHGOW, HLL-12, PRESTON FARM FIELD

13 November 2015 09:35:53 Date:

Sir.

Please see attached, due a problem with my IP provider I cannot confirm that the original message was sent.

Regards.

Thomas Lawrie.

---- Original Message -----

To: WLLDP@westlothian.gov.uk

Cc:

Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2015 4:30 PM

Subject: LINLITHGOW, HLL-12, PRESTON FARM FIELD

Sir.

I am making this submission as an individual representing my own views. This is my first representation on the proposed plan.

The proposed development of this site contravenes all previous commitments by West Lothian Council to the development of Linlithgow and the restrictions they have previously imposed on any such development.

1. The roads infrastructure is totally unsuitable to accept both the increased traffic during the construction phase and in the long term - Preston Road is a disaster waiting to happen with congestion already a serious problem at the schools. Manse road is not suitable for heavy traffic as has been demonstrated by the problems at the canal bridge.

The increase in the number of cars also leads to an increase in demand for parking especially for rail travel. The current situation is critical and there are no plans in place to aleviate the problem

- 2. We have been told for many years that the schools were full, medical services were at the limit. In the propsed plans for Preston Field there is no provision for either to be improved/expanded
- 3. This land has always had green belt status, what right does the Developer / Council have to change this without proper consultation? It appears that the council has redrawn the greenbelt to match the Developer's plans and ignored previous resident objections.

The Canal has been developed as a tourist route/attraction with Linlithgow an essential stop on the route. Any development in Preston Field will remove the stunning views to the south towards Cockleroy when travelling on the canal - walking, cycling or on a boat.

4. The loss of prime agricultural land and a wildlife habitat should not be lost on the whim of a Developer and their co-horts in the Council. The land belongs to the people and their views should be recognised.

Other development proposals in the town have been turned down in areas which have appeared infinitely more suitable. What makes this site so attractive from the Developer's perspective? The answer is easy - money. It is much harder to understand the Council's perspective given the obvious disadvantages of allowing this development to go ahead with no plan in place to address school places, road infrastructure, medical facilities, environmental issues etc.

Thomas Ian Lawrie

