



Linlithgow & Linlithgow Bridge Community Council

Letter 19/11/2015

## APPENDIX B

# Results of a Questionnaire Survey & Comments

from those attending:

Linlithgow: A Plan for the Future Exhibition

Low Port Centre

17<sup>th</sup> November 2015

## SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

	Yes	No	Indif	Blank	Total
<b>1. ENVIRONMENT.</b>					
a) District heating systems (Proposals ES1 and ES2, page 16)	56.16%	10.96%	23.29%	9.59%	100.00%
b) A solar farm at the CEMEX quarry site (Proposal ES3, page 16)	67.12%	13.70%	13.70%	5.48%	100.00%
c) Hydro-electric power plants on the River Avon (Proposal ES4, page 17)	65.75%	12.33%	16.44%	5.48%	100.00%
d) Sustainable design of new developments (Proposal ES5, page 17)	89.04%	4.11%	4.11%	2.74%	100.00%
e) Small farms and tree planting (Proposal ES6, page 17)	78.08%	5.48%	12.33%	4.11%	100.00%
f) Dealing with loch and watercourse pollution (Proposals ES7, page 17)	98.63%	1.37%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
g) Measures to cut down High Street air pollution (Proposal ES8, page 17)	97.26%	1.37%	1.37%	0.00%	100.00%
<b>2. HERITAGE AND TOURISM.</b>					
a) Enhancements to Linlithgow's Conservation Areas (Proposal B1, page 18)	87.67%	1.37%	8.22%	2.74%	100.00%
b) Restoration and re-use of Linlithgow Palace (Proposal B2, page 19)	80.82%	4.11%	12.33%	2.74%	100.00%
c) Preservation; public access to the garden at Annet House (Proposal B3, page 19)	78.08%	2.74%	16.44%	2.74%	100.00%
d) Tourist Information Centre on ground floor of the Burgh Halls (Proposal B4, page 20)	84.93%	2.74%	10.96%	1.37%	100.00%
e) Promotion of a larger hotel in Linlithgow (Proposal B5, page 21)	56.16%	16.44%	26.03%	1.37%	100.00%
f) Extension of Learmonth Gardens to the north (Proposal B6, page 21)	52.05%	5.48%	36.99%	5.48%	100.00%
g) Canalside facilities near St Michael's Hospital and canal marina near Park Farm (Proposals B7 and B8, page 21)	72.60%	5.48%	17.81%	4.11%	100.00%
<b>3. BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT.</b>					
a) A business park at Burghmuir (Proposal E2, page 23)	63.01%	17.81%	13.70%	5.48%	100.00%
b) A business centre at or near The Cross (Proposal E3, page 23)	58.90%	16.44%	19.18%	5.48%	100.00%
c) Dedicated home/business accommodation (Proposal E4, page 23)	56.16%	6.85%	26.03%	10.96%	100.00%

#### 4. HOUSING

a) Social-rented and affordable housing (Proposals H1 to H3, page 24)	86.30%	6.85%	2.74%	4.11%	100.00%
b) Infill private housing developments at Boghall East, Stockbridge North, Westerlea Sawmill Site (Falkirk Road) and whisky bond site (Edinburgh Road) (Proposals H4 to H6, page 25 and Proposals H9 and H10 on page 26)	80.82%	6.85%	8.22%	4.11%	100.00%
c) Mixed housing between Clarendon and Edinburgh Road and at Wilcoxholm Farm, bearing in mind that much of the land value derived these developments could be diverted to town improvements (Proposals H7 and H8 on pages 25 and 26; see reasoning on page 25 and 'planning gains' table on page 41)	67.12%	21.92%	6.85%	4.11%	100.00%

#### 5. TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY.

a) Traffic management to 'reclaim' the High Street (Proposal T1, page 28)	84.93%	9.59%	0.00%	5.48%	100.00%
b) Four-way motorway interchange at Burghmuir (Proposal T2A, page 29)	87.67%	5.48%	5.48%	1.37%	100.00%
c) High St Relief Road, hidden to north of Linlithgow Loch (Proposal T2B, p. 29)	71.23%	17.81%	4.11%	6.85%	100.00%
d) Roundabouts on Blackness Road at Springfield Road (east junction) and Kingsfield Road (Proposal T3, page 29)	67.12%	17.81%	4.11%	10.96%	100.00%
e) Eastern Local Distributor Road (Proposal T4, page 29)	65.75%	13.70%	8.22%	12.33%	100.00%
f) Relief of traffic over canal bridge, Manse Road (Proposal T5, page 30)	86.30%	6.85%	1.37%	5.48%	100.00%
g) Decked car park behind Regent Centre (Proposal T6, page 31)	71.23%	12.33%	8.22%	8.22%	100.00%
h) Commuter car park at Edinburgh Road (Proposal T7, page 31)	82.19%	8.22%	4.11%	5.48%	100.00%
i) Tourist parking at Blackness Road (Proposal T8, page 31)	87.67%	5.48%	2.74%	4.11%	100.00%
j) Improvements to railway station access/rail services (Proposal T9, page 31)	84.93%	6.85%	1.37%	6.85%	100.00%
k) Improvements to bus services and parking for tourist buses (Proposals T10 and T11, page 31)	83.56%	2.74%	5.48%	8.22%	100.00%
l) Creation of cycle network and specific improvements (Proposals T12 to T15 and T17, page 32)	78.08%	2.74%	13.70%	5.48%	100.00%

## 6. RETAILING AND TOWN CENTRE.

a) Redevelopment of Guyancourt Vennel (Proposal S2, page 34)	78.08%	9.59%	5.48%	6.85%	100.00%
b) Establishment of Arts Retail Quarter (Proposal S3, page 35)	56.16%	8.22%	26.03%	9.59%	100.00%
c) Neighbourhood shops within new housing areas (Proposal S4, page 35)	68.49%	13.70%	9.59%	8.22%	100.00%

## 7. CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT, EDUCATION AND HEALTH.

a) Provision of community rooms (Proposal R1, page 36)	78.08%	4.11%	10.96%	6.85%	100.00%
b) Development of Linlithgow Partnership Centre (Proposal R2, page 36)	76.71%	4.11%	9.59%	9.59%	100.00%
c) Redevelopment of Victoria Hall site to form community theatre/cinema (Proposal R3, page 37)	83.56%	5.48%	6.85%	4.11%	100.00%
d) Formation of Clarendon Public Park (Proposal R4, page 37)	65.75%	6.85%	19.18%	8.22%	100.00%
e) New/upgraded playing fields, community facilities and additional parking, Kettilstoun (Proposal R5, page 37)	75.34%	6.85%	9.59%	8.22%	100.00%
f) Establishment of permanent youth centre (Proposal R6, page 38)	79.45%	1.37%	12.33%	6.85%	100.00%
g) Construction of new primary school at Edinburgh Road (Proposal ED1, page 39)	71.23%	10.96%	9.59%	8.22%	100.00%
h) Creation of integrated health centre on town centre site (Proposal HE1, page 40)	82.19%	2.74%	8.22%	6.85%	100.00%

## 8 Financing

Do you support the Plan's proposals for funding/implementation (pages 41 & 44)	57.53%	5.48%	5.48%	31.51%	100.00%
--	--------	-------	-------	--------	---------

## Agreement across questionnaire

	75.00%	8.03%	10.65%	6.32%	100.00%
--	--------	-------	--------	-------	---------

## SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS (ignoring undecided)

	Yes	No
<b>1. ENVIRONMENT.</b>		
a) District heating systems (Proposals ES1 and ES2, page 16)	83.67%	16.33%
b) A solar farm at the CEMEX quarry site (Proposal ES3, page 16)	83.05%	16.95%
c) Hydro-electric power plants on the River Avon (Proposal ES4, page 17)	84.21%	15.79%
d) Sustainable design of new developments (Proposal ES5, page 17)	95.59%	4.41%
e) Small farms and tree planting (Proposal ES6, page 17)	93.44%	6.56%
f) Dealing with loch and watercourse pollution (Proposals ES7, page 17)	98.63%	1.37%
g) Measures to cut down High Street air pollution (Proposal ES8, page 17)	98.61%	1.39%
<b>2. HERITAGE AND TOURISM.</b>		
a) Enhancements to Linlithgow's Conservation Areas (Proposal B1, page 18)	98.46%	1.54%
b) Restoration and re-use of Linlithgow Palace (Proposal B2, page 19)	95.16%	4.84%
c) Preservation; public access to the garden at Annet House (Proposal B3, page 19)	96.61%	3.39%
d) Tourist Information Centre on ground floor of the Burgh Halls (Proposal B4, page 20)	96.88%	3.13%
e) Promotion of a larger hotel in Linlithgow (Proposal B5, page 21)	77.36%	22.64%
f) Extension of Learmonth Gardens to the north (Proposal B6, page 21)	90.48%	9.52%
g) Canalside facilities near St Michael's Hospital and canal marina near Park Farm (Proposals B7 and B8, page 21)	92.98%	7.02%
<b>3. BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT.</b>		
a) A business park at Burghmuir (Proposal E2, page 23)	77.97%	22.03%
b) A business centre at or near The Cross (Proposal E3, page 23)	78.18%	21.82%
c) Dedicated home/business accommodation (Proposal E4, page 23)	89.13%	10.87%

#### 4. HOUSING

a) Social-rented and affordable housing (Proposals H1 to H3, page 24)	92.65%	7.35%
b) Infill private housing developments at Boghall East, Stockbridge North, Westerlea Sawmill Site (Falkirk Road) and whisky bond site (Edinburgh Road) (Proposals H4 to H6, page 25 and Proposals H9 and H10 on page 26)	92.19%	7.81%
c) Mixed housing between Clarendon and Edinburgh Road and at Wilcoxholm Farm, bearing in mind that much of the land value derived these developments could be diverted to town improvements (Proposals H7 and H8 on pages 25 and 26; see reasoning on page 25 and 'planning gains' table on page 41)	75.38%	24.62%

#### 5. TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY.

a) Traffic management to 'reclaim' the High Street (Proposal T1, page 28)	89.86%	10.14%
b) Four-way motorway interchange at Burghmuir (Proposal T2A, page 29)	94.12%	5.88%
c) High St Relief Road, hidden to north of Linlithgow Loch (Proposal T2B, p. 29)	80.00%	20.00%
d) Roundabouts on Blackness Road at Springfield Road (east junction) and Kingsfield Road (Proposal T3, page 29)	79.03%	20.97%
e) Eastern Local Distributor Road (Proposal T4, page 29)	82.76%	17.24%
f) Relief of traffic over canal bridge, Manse Road (Proposal T5, page 30)	92.65%	7.35%
g) Decked car park behind Regent Centre (Proposal T6, page 31)	85.25%	14.75%
h) Commuter car park at Edinburgh Road (Proposal T7, page 31)	90.91%	9.09%
i) Tourist parking at Blackness Road (Proposal T8, page 31)	94.12%	5.88%
j) Improvements to railway station access/rail services (Proposal T9, page 31)	92.54%	7.46%
k) Improvements to bus services and parking for tourist buses (Proposals T10 and T11, page 31)	96.83%	3.17%
l) Creation of cycle network and specific improvements (Proposals T12 to T15 and T17, page 32)	96.61%	3.39%

## **6. RETAILING AND TOWN CENTRE.**

a) Redevelopment of Guyancourt Vennel (Proposal S2, page 34)	89.06%	10.94%
b) Establishment of Arts Retail Quarter (Proposal S3, page 35)	87.23%	12.77%
c) Neighbourhood shops within new housing areas (Proposal S4, page 35)	83.33%	16.67%

## **7. CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT, EDUCATION AND HEALTH.**

a) Provision of community rooms (Proposal R1, page 36)	95.00%	5.00%
b) Development of Linlithgow Partnership Centre (Proposal R2, page 36)	94.92%	5.08%
c) Redevelopment of Victoria Hall site to form community theatre/cinema (Proposal R3, page 37)	93.85%	6.15%
d) Formation of Clarendon Public Park (Proposal R4, page 37)	90.57%	9.43%
e) New/upgraded playing fields, community facilities and additional parking, Kettilstoun (Proposal R5, page 37)	91.67%	8.33%
f) Establishment of permanent youth centre (Proposal R6, page 38)	98.31%	1.69%
g) Construction of new primary school at Edinburgh Road (Proposal ED1, page 39)	86.67%	13.33%
h) Creation of integrated health centre on town centre site (Proposal HE1, page 40)	96.77%	3.23%

## **8 Financing**

Do you support the Plan's proposals for funding/implementation (pages 41 & 44)	91.30%	8.70%
--	--------	-------

## **Agreement across questionnaire**

	90.09%	9.91%
--	--------	-------

## COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES

### 1. Environment

#### *Information seeking*

- I am not sure that Hydro is realistic
- Doubts with solar farm and Hydro I would require more information to decide if the energy harvest will outweigh the environmental loss.
- Good parking areas have solar panels above for example both ground level and Regent Centre proposal.

#### *Opinion*

- Reduce the number of traffic lights to reduce High St air pollution.
- need for more environmentally friendly and sustainable energy.
- Should consider also total pedestrianisation of High St (allow public transport/bikes) and focus on alternative road access around Linlithgow
- High street pollution is a scandal and additional development is a very poor idea
- investigate and reduce loch pollution
- Hydro will impact the species in the Avon
- I think locally sourced energy is the way forward
- Those who farm large agricultural units will not like their farms subdivided around the fringes. Most tenants anyhow. Would not work. Forget that idea!
- There should be housing with the River Avon heat and power plant saves prime agricultural land.
- Planting shelter belts - yes. Subdividing some of the most fertile land in Scotland which benefits the whole of Scotland - no.
- There should be more wild spaces, habitats - wildlife always gets ignored.



## 2. Heritage and Tourism

### *Information seeking*

- Are there archaeological issues in developing Learmonth gardens?

### *Opinion*

- Tourist information centre is needed in the centre of town but not necessarily in the Burgh halls.
- There is increasing desirability of Linlithgow as a tourist attraction
- Rather than one large hotel, several family/locally operated hotels/B and B is preferred.
- Canal-side facilities would be good to have but a lower priority as limited option for canal holidays anyway -- do we really need more cafes?
- Hotel development not worth it because of close proximity of Edinburgh
- Restoration and reuse of parts of Linlithgow Palace e.g. the great Hall good for tourism/community use.
- The atmospheric feel of the Palace at the moment is lovely. However, if sensibly restored (ie the Landmark trust), it could be a special place for certain usage in keeping with the building -- lectures dinners. Maybe just a part of the Palace?
- Canal tourism important please refer to impact of development on canal tours.
- Canal-side facilities near St Michael's hospital is unsuitable site though the canal marina near Park farm may be possible but wait for the canal traffic to grow first.
- It would be nice to have a tourist information in Victoria Hall if that does not come about then yes Burgh halls is the obvious place.
- Developing the heritage assets is key to the town's future economy.
- Support should be given to local hotels before investing in new.

## 3. Business and Employment

### *Opinion*

- Only existing buildings should be used at Burghmuir and all hedges, pond naturalisation to remain.
- The four way motorway access is required before any business development.
- Need to increase employment opportunities in Linlithgow
- The business Centre at the Cross is needed by professionals working from home including meeting rooms, printing, etc.

- Any development at Burghmuir should not detract from the attractive entry into Linlithgow.
- Linlithgow has lost out to the Alba Centre in Livingston
- Encouraging local employment is key
- A business park at Burghmuir would have to be done in a very "green" way.

## 4 Housing

### *Criticism/information seeking*

- In the plan for the future document there is no picture from Beecraigs (Hillhouse wood) looking south to all the proposed new housing areas which will be highly visible even with landscaping particularly from light pollution and noise pollution.
- Lack of information on housing proposals
- Need more detail on Clarendon and Edinburgh road to believe it deliverable

### *Opinion*

- I oppose new housing, we cannot cope with more cars coming through the town equals pollution vehicle fumes problems with emergency vehicles fire engines in particular.
- There is not sufficient parking, school facilities any access through Linlithgow High Street to support more housing of any kind
- Should hold back developing "retirement" specific properties -- make standard and if retirees want them then they can, if not others can have these.
- I strongly support housing in the south-east where infill can be improved.
- Preston field is not in this plan for numerous reasons including isolated site, biodiversity, cultural heritage, protected species, increased traffic danger on Preston Road.
- Linlithgow needs more affordable housing
- I support Wilcoxholm farm development provided housing does not eliminate canal species diversity.
- I disagree with H4 field becoming housing land. It greatly adds to the approach to Linlithgow from the motorway enhancing allocation. I agree with housing proposals in principle, but enormous amount of care should be taken not to upset the environmentally attractive areas (SLA's) also prime agricultural land loss (class two as well as class three)
- I strongly support the (planning forum's) housing plan over the council's (WLDP) development plan which is looking to take site HL 12 and rezone it. It would be a disaster for the town, traffic would be far worse and the safety of children compromised.

- Classic "chicken and egg" situation. We need to allow significant development (in a controlled way) if we are to generate the "gems" that will allow the infrastructure improvements that are needed. Modest contributions should also be gained from the more piecemeal development is in addition.
- I support the plans housing proposals only if supporting road links are developed in tandem!
- I support the housing proposals but only if the infrastructure is in place.
- Clarendon, Edinburgh road is the only real possibility for substantive development.
- Need to look properly at co-housing. The existing models are outdated, the UK is well behind Europe/Scandinavia.
- Suggest whiskey bond side be used for car parking.
- Clarendon farm and Wilcoxholm farm is of High agricultural value.
- The plan for the future provides a very sensible approach to providing housing close to the town centre. This plan provides more housing than the councils LDP in better places in town without impacting on the local character and infrastructure.
- The plan should not be the start of "creep" to Beecraigs -- it should be the end of it.
- I object to the Preston field site being included in the local development plan and support the Linlithgow planning forum's plan to create a defensible town boundary which this site would be outwith.

#### **4 Transport and accessibility**

##### *Opinion*

- Need a dedicated cycle network not shared with motorised traffic
- Utilise more frequent smaller buses for the town service
- A relief road to the North would attract housing development. Extend eastern distributor road right round and make Station Road one-way an open access on the railway
- Totally against T4 connection Road from St Michael's hospital's to top of Manse Road okay.
- Traffic management is the key to making Linlithgow a more environmentally friendly place
- The station as it is "fit in" with the look of the town would not want a "glass monstrosity" as a frontage.
- I strongly support the four way motorway junction.
- On page 28 there is reference to a ban on traffic this would kill the town as experienced elsewhere in the UK. Quick on the pavement parking is ideal for many situations and we should keep this

- Relief for traffic over Manse road canal bridge would upset the SLA and the last piece of tranquillity (on the southern edge of the town). It would also increase the traffic on the rat run from Livingston via Dechmont.
- I cycle regularly along the busy High street but I know many who are fearful of the congestion. Safe cycle routes would encourage greater cycle dissipation and access to local shops.
- Get kids to school by bike by establishing a SAFE cycle network -- not a red line on the road.
- Sorting transport/roads network is fundamental -- at least the planning forum document considers strategic and tactical levels -- LDP is disappointingly mute on this.
- Improve space utilisation at rugby club car park -- much is wasted space and poor design
- Strongly support roundabouts on Blackness road this is an extremely difficult junction to negotiate with poor visibility at most times of the day.
- Four way motorway junction is essential even without more housing.
- Motorway upgrade junction access is essential.
- Really need to consider the Manse road bridge/access/Canal Centre. With other road developments may be not required
- Use the four way junction at M9 as Northern relief Road.
- Need four way junction this is a priority.
- The visual impact of a decked car park at the Regent centre is critical at this important location. One of the first things visitors see on arrival by train.
- Need more signs on manse road to stop long vehicles using it
- Too much talk about parking and use of cars etc and little about public transport all day/everyday!
- I strongly oppose the eastern local distributor road
- Congestion on High Street could just start with diverting traffic
- Do something about surface of Capstan Walk as it is dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists this is a well-used way people who support the environment by using their legs.
- Create dedicated cycle way along High Street, separate from the traffic (use curbs) so cyclists feel safe not scared
- It is sensible to provide relief roads T4 and T5 as effective infrastructure builds to enable the expansion of the town in the East.
- I agree with the decked car park proposal at the Regent centre but it must be sensitively developed.
- Ban heavy vehicles from Manse road bridge
- Increase commuter parking at Edinburgh road, parking charges would soon reimburse West Lothian Councils outlay.

## 6. Retailing and Town Centre

### *Opinion*

- The Guyancourt Vennel needs redeveloping but must include lots of studio, social as well
- Neighbourhood shops will kill off the High St shops.
- Neighbourhood shops should only be to basic level not to detract from the High Street
- The Guyancourt Vennel redevelopment is necessary but what about decently designed social housing we have enough shops in the High Street -- some empty.
- Why build more shops when there are empty units in the town centre
- I support the redevelopment of the Guyancourt Vennel, however, some more functional shops (grocer/fruit and veg/etc) would be also more suited rather than more charity/tourist (junk!) Even encouraging local eateries (restaurants) or even some chains to bring people to town (pizza express?)
- I do not support neighbourhood shops and supermarkets should be easily accessible by cycle/footpath
- Neighbourhood shop units will encourage more traffic and people
- Not in favour of allowing chain retailers although local sustainable businesses should be encouraged where possible
- Need to keep public access through High-street gained footfall and ease of those tourists and local access.
- More shops in housing creates more noise, more pollution with deliveries and more litter.
- Neighbourhood shops are good but I am not in favour of a large increase in the population of the town.

## 7. Culture, Leisure, Sport, Education and Health

### *Opinion*

- The proposed Clarendon Park would have to be substantial -- not just swings for kids. It would have to have environmental value also.
- Playing fields at Springfield area and community wing enhancement
- Sports capacity is based on the west forces of lots of traffic to flow through the town
- I agree the health centre must be in the town centre
- I agree the Victoria Hall should definitely be developed
- The health centre should remain in this town.

- Community rooms/halls to be large enough to hold an audience of 250 even 300 and concert hall.
- Need a new health and care centre at existing location
- health centre is in need of upgrading
- if a new primary school is necessary then does not have to be on Edinburgh road
- Secondary school in East of town. Reduce size of existing
- Currently playing fields/community facilities, severely lacking in comparison to the rest of West Lothian.

## 8. Other Comments

- The town needs to develop but that doesn't need to mean huge population growth. It could be an example of great sustainability.
- Provision of separate identified loading areas parking on main road and side streets by cars waiting for children
- Costs to fix existing problems would swallow up planning gain and not much left for dream aspects.
- We need a proper heat/energy strategy.
- West Lothian Council should ditch local development plan as soon as possible and do a proper Charette.
- Adequate provision for infrastructure before more development
- Well done to group for thinking about options
- Should have asked sex/age of respondents
- Thank you for all the hard work the planning forum have put into this
- Improved footpath to access the loch loop or at East End. Improve short stay parking lot walk access points
- The town is a jewel in a great location and development must progress. Access is absolutely paramount or the town will die.
- I object to the Preston farm proposal
- I have no further comments it is very comprehensive and unlike the council it is focused on what Linlithgow residents want and produced by people who live here.
- I am pleased to see that the building of 60 or more houses at Preston farm are not included as Preston road is congested enough and a fatal accident is imminent.
- I oppose proposals for housing at Preston farm. Preston road already far too busy.
- Prevent all development in special landscape areas and protect all class 2 and 3.1 farm land which is only 8% of Scotland.
- I agree with the thrust of the plan for the future. More joined up and less speculative in nature when looking at local development plan
- Kettlistoun should be made wild for wood species.
- Upgrade road to Livingston via Dechmont

- Linlithgow is special due to historic Royal Borough and must be enhanced for 21st-century recognising the importance regionally -- must be done sensitively. The plan for the future does this
- Developing County buildings and Sheriff Court/police station building sensitively for community use.
- I wonder if the neighbourhood shops might affect High-street shopping. It have supported it on the grounds that I find my local shop handy.
- Well done alternative planners
- There is need to balance short-term gains (in selling land) with long-term benefits (in preserving and enhancing the usefulness and attractiveness of the town as it is)
- Highly ambitious plan -- a timescale that is realistic. Would hold however Linlithgow is well behind the curve and probably missed the boat!
- Council/locals purchase redundant units in High St get the rent down and encourage local businesses to trade here
- I value the idea of the town plan (plan for the future) that is well thought out and its future looking.
- On High St ease traffic congestion. Upgrade sewage water supply gas and electricity and telecommunications.
- Infrastructure needs to be in place before housing development
- The priority is M9 junction
- Develop existing canal basin to be more visitor focused and available. Provision of language options to support existing and future tourists
- No development for housing or businesses or any other use except agriculture and no development on sites south and east of Oatlands Park these would be very detrimental
- Encourage people to walk in the High Street and around the loch etc forget online shopping
- This does not address the issue of taking heavy traffic flow through a residential area and past primary schools. This proposal does not solve congestion issues only moves them to an equally congested site. It also encourages the development of agricultural sites which I completely oppose.
- This is a wish list -- financially can't see it happening. Incorporate a time schedule
- I do not enjoy walking the canal bank in inclement weather to the railway station -- no parking available.
- Many people who were young with young families in 1970 now need sheltered housing. This would free their houses for the young people.
- I strongly agree with the planning as described in plan for the future. I'm particularly concerned about the amount of cars/traffic heading from Preston road to Manse road this is dangerous!

- Overall a great plan particularly in relation to a housing development.

### **Additional Comments from the Comments wall**

- No house building on Preston area
- Linlithgow residents slogan: -- no reduction in traffic congestion in High St and no planning approval to be awarded
- Use whiskey warehouse site for car parking for the town and station
- County buildings and old sheriff court building need to be restored and put into full use for community as a matter of priority not funding
- This plan has flaws but it is community driven. The West Lothian Council's local development plan on the other hand is top down and not solving our problems - reject it!
- Need more station parking
- Get traffic out of High St
- Developed 4 way access east of town to M9 to go west
- Sun and Oracle site should be new base for district/town heating plant powered by solar and biomass and deep geothermal
- Do not need another supermarket
- Make High-street safer for cycling -- dedicated (separate) cycle lane
- Proposed development on Falkirk road not suitable for housing development owing to access to Falkirk road
- Need a safe and effective cycle path network and car parking solution to remove on pavement or double parking on High St
- it's no good just proposing lots of new houses -- the land value must be used to help to solve the town's problems otherwise no new housing

End of Comments