**Bathgate Community Council**

**RE: 1177/P/22 Planning permission in principle for residential development with associated works | Land To West Of Napier Avenue Bathgate**

Regarding the above, we would like to submit our objection based on the following –

1) Whilst on the local plan for a capacity of 10 the plan suggests 54 units. Seems a lot given the steep hillside & terrain. Is the number of 54 appropriate? The overview of the housing appears very dense. The Residential Development Guide (RDG) page 12 makes reference to density and the plan appears not to conform.

*Housing density should always relate to the character of the wider area and its accessibility.'*

*'The appropriate density for a specific site will vary and will be assessed on merit, taking into account the character of the site, its size, adjacent densities'.*

2) The entrance at Glebe Road is too narrow and will operate we understand on a single vehicle basis (who will have priority entering or leaving?) This is not appropriate for the size of the proposal.

3) Also the proposal to have the access for emergency vehicles along a single lane road at Wallace Road does not seem practical or appropriate for the size of the proposal.

4) During winter Crosshill Drive is out of action during periods of wintry weather. Cars cannot get up the hill and often need to be abandoned. It can be dangerous. The additional traffic (100 cars or so) would not be appropriate in these circumstances. Indeed during December 2022 the local fire engine had a difficulty due to the icy conditions, which potentially had a calamitous outcome. This very steep brae needs to be reassessed (fresh risk assessment) in order to alter from a secondary to primary route.

5) The SUDS is located downhill of the proposed development which is ok and It will depend on the developer what quality they install. However we are concerned that the position of the SUDS will be above the existing housing and we do not think this is correct. The positioning of the SUDS will bring with it a potential for flooding where little exists at present.

6) It has also been reported that there is occasionally an issue with an overspill of sewage in the area of Haig Crescent, which leads onto Wallace Road. This will be on the record and suggests that the infrastructure required for additional housing in the area is simply not there. This will need to be examined.

7) There is also a feeling in the community that the area which contained the (old) war memorial and the field above was bequeathed to the people of Bathgate following WW1. We would want this to be examined in much the same way as the common good exercise.

E-mail to Scott Hughes WLC dated 6/1/23 as follows –

*This piece of land has come up for discussion at the Community Council several times and councillors have reported that it has been referred to you for Common Good investigation. Can you confirm if it has and if yes what stage it is at.  Was it in Council ownership and if yes when was it sold and to who. There are local rumours that land was granted to the community after the First World War in that area.  If it hasn't been referred to you can you accept this as a referral?*

8) Finally and importantly, the impact of development in West Lothian are having an impact on GP’s practices, care in the community & education. Plans and preparation are urgently needed in order to protect our citizens and the first thing to do is not to allow non-authorised developments to proceed (In this case 54 units whilst planning for 10).

Regards

John Macdonald Planning Officer Bathgate Community Council.