



**Minutes of Linlithgow and Linlithgow Bridge Community Council  
on  
Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2020 at 19.30, online.**

**Present:** Chair John Kelly (JK), Fraser Falconer (FF), Joyce Hartley (JH), Paula Ryans Stokes (PRS), Mike Vickers (MV), Councillor Tom Conn (TC), Councillor David Tait (DT), Helen Hassel (HH) LCDT, and one member of the public.

**Apologies** Pamela Barnes (PB), Gordon Smith (GS), Martin Crook (MC), Liam Fraser (LF), Graeme Grant (GG), Ian Kelly (IK), Des Martin (DM), Maire McCormack (MMcC), Scott Oliver (SO), Ron Smith (RS,) Provost Tom Kerr (TK), Police Scotland - Andrew Murray (AM) and Peter Robertson (PR).

**Welcome** JK welcomed all to the meeting

**Declarations of interest:** No new declarations of interest noted

**1. Minutes of Linlithgow and Linlithgow Bridge Community Council Meeting Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> August 2020.** Proposed by MV and seconded by FF

**2. Matters arising.** TC advised the meeting that the Linlithgow Public Realm Design Guide is in review and will be presented to the next appropriate PDSP.

**3. Linlithgow Loch Report.** The content of the report was noted. The Linlithgow Loch summit convened by HES in November 2015 resulted in the formation of a Strategic Loch Management Group on which GS is a member. The primary current concern is very poor water quality considered to result from the outfall from septic tanks of properties on the Edinburgh Road, water from the canal and nutrients from farmland within the Linlithgow Loch catchment basin. The meeting noted the conclusion of the report which states that Linlithgow Loch remains an important asset for the town and for West Lothian. However, it remains in a long-term deteriorating condition due to pollution associated with surrounding land use within what is a complex catchment. This situation will remain unchanged until HES commits a realistic budget to the resolution of the problems over a realistic timeframe.

**4. West Lothian Local Outcomes and Improvement Plan.** JK introduced the plan which relates to planned improvements within communities in which a significant proportion live within the bottom 20% of the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation. 13 individual town plans have been developed by West Lothian CPP. JK stated that it could be argued that the report is irrelevant to Linlithgow and the same argument could be put forward for other areas of West Lothian concluding with the question “could we not all benefit from an improvement plan?” During the ensuing discussion, the following points were made:

- MV stated that the focus was economic and that the Community Planning Partnership tended to be peripatetic in moving its focus from one place to the next.

- TC stated there are many disadvantaged households, particularly pensioner households who would fall within the deprivation framework but live within a town which is on average fairly affluent.
- JH said that it would be possible to examine the small area statistics and consider small clusters of deprivation within Linlithgow.

It was decided to invite a representative of the Community Planning Partnership to attend the Community Council and address these and other issues. **Action JK**

**5. Community Notice Boards.** JK introduced the topic which had previously discussed with GS suggesting that new noticeboards were required. FF stated that LCDT is in shutdown and having no members in the office the boards have been untouched for several months. The current hinge arrangement is a deterrent to updating and a new design is required. TC questioned the demand for public notices and suggested that the focus being shifted to reference information. TC also stated that a bid could be made to the Councillors' disbursement fund. It was agreed that new boards were required. **Action LCDT**

## 6. Standing Reports

- a) **Chairman's report** In GS's absence there was no report.
- b) **Secretary's report** JK referred to the written report included with the meeting papers on which there were no questions
- c) **Treasurer's report** in the absence of the treasurer JK confirmed that there had been no expenditure over the previous month.
- d) **Police report.** There was no police report.
- e) **Planning report.** JK referred to the written report included with the meeting papers highlighting the following:
  - a. The planning guidance for the proposed Vennel development was considered at a Development and Transport PDSP on 4 September 2020. An introduction was given by Craig McCorrison who answered the five points put forward by the Community Council. This was followed by questions to officers by Councillors and JK attending under the terms of the participation request. How the site was to be disposed of and developed was outside of the remit of Craig McCorrison as a regulator of the process; this was a decision of the executive and subsequently those delegated to manage project procurement. The following points were made:
    - MV asked if there was any comment on the option appraisal prepared by the planning forum. JK confirmed that a very detailed question from Malcolm Hill, the joint Forum representative made reference to the document. Craig McCorrison confirmed this was a document prepared by the Community Council subsequent to the consultation process and not included in the papers presented to Councillors.
    - With regard to the inclusion or not of the Cross flats within the development FF said that it was very difficult to satisfy all involved; tenants, private tenants, private landlords and owner

occupiers. In the ensuing discussion it was stated that this situation was not unique, that the scope and scale of the problem was capable of resolution, that the problem needed to be seen in the context of the maintenance demand of the current building; and consideration given as to whether the building has reached its economic end-of-life.

- JH reported that a broadly similar development had been undertaken in Denny town centre where a 1960s development had been compulsorily purchased and the centre of the town dramatically improved. Lessons could be learned from this process. JH volunteered to obtain further information. **Action JH**
- MV queried the statement regarding the eight parcels of land and the economic review of the project based on the selected three parcels. MV asked that the Community Council obtain details of the eight parcels of land and the review undertaken by officers. **Action JK**
- a statement was made that the Cross should be the jewel in the crown at the centre of Linlithgow.

**f) 0598/LBC/20 and 0597/FUL/20 8 Flats at the former police station** JH reported that with the exception of some concerns over the roof detail of the new build block and the sufficiency of parking spaces this development was generally welcomed as being of good quality and suitable for the centre of Linlithgow.

**g) M9 Junction 3** concern was expressed at the roof tax of £16,000 for each new house constructed in Linlithgow to meet the £8.5 million cost of the M9 junction 3 slip roads. A part of the concern was the length of time it would take to “save up” the cost of the slip roads. Further the contribution to be made by Falkirk Council was not understood.

**h) JFCCWL report.** JK referred to the written report. JK raised the question of concern over the reported increase in end of road collections. TC confirmed that this was only applicable to rural situations e.g. long farm tracks. End of road collections would not be required in urban situations. There were no further questions on the Joint Forum report.

**7. AOB & Public Participation Questions.** There were no items of any other business nor any questions from the member of public attending.

**8. Meeting Close & Next Meeting** JK thanked everyone for their attendance. The meeting closed at 21.10. The next meeting of the Community Council is Tuesday, 27<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

John Kelly,  
Secretary,  
29th September 2020