



**Glasgow City Council**

**Planning Local Review Committee**

**Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration  
and Sustainability**

**Item 1**

**27th May 2025**

**Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654**

**25/00021/LOCAL – 143-143A Dumbarton Road, Glasgow**

**Amalgamation of premises to form cafe (Class 3) and associated external  
alterations.**

**Purpose of Report:**

To provide the Committee with a summary of the relevant considerations in the  
above review.

**Recommendations:**

That Committee consider the content of this report in coming to their decision.

Ward No(s): 23 – Partick East/Kelvindale Citywide: N/A

Local member(s) advised: Yes ☐ No ☐ consulted: Yes ☐ No ☐

**PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:**

*Any Ordnance Survey mapping included within this Report is provided by Glasgow City Council under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to make available Council-held public domain information. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey Copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. The OS web site can be found at <http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk> "*

*If accessing this Report via the Internet, please note that any mapping is for illustrative purposes only and is not true to any marked scale*

## **1 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS**

- 1.1 The proposal is located at Partick Cross at the junction of Dumbarton Road and Coopers Well Street. Comprising two adjoining commercial units – 143 and 143A. The units sit on the ground floor of a four-storey red sandstone tenement. Residential units occupy the upper floors
- 1.2 The site is located in the Partick East/Kelvindale ward and is located within Partick/Byres Road Local Town Centre.
- 1.3 The site is in an area of High Public Transport Accessibility.
- 1.4 The proposal (23/00993/FUL) seeks consent for an Amalgamation of premises to form cafe (Class 3) and associated external alterations.
- 1.5 The proposed opening hours of the café given via correspondence with the planning officer were 08:00-19:00 Monday to Sunday.
- 1.6 The proposed cooking equipment is not specified but a sample menu has been provided, which included sandwiches, pastries, soups and salads.
- 1.7 Externally, the existing shopfront was proposed to replace the two units with a new entrance at Coopers Well Street on the north-east corner and a takeaway hatch on Dumbarton Road. A recladding of fascia with lining boards with LED lights, reeded glass inner panes, new timber framed windows above wooden stallrisers and pilasters are in the proposal.
- 1.8 Elsewhere, 2 no. advertising boards, 2 no ventilation grills and a repainted deliveries door are to be installed to the south-east elevation.
- 1.9 The application property was vacant from at least June 2023 previously a vape shop ('Refill Station'). This was adjoined by a hot food takeaway which was previously a butchers from 2012 onwards. No information on the marketing of the property, has been supplied.
- 1.10 The proposal has since been implemented, despite the refusal of the application. An enforcement case will be pending the outcome of this review.

## **2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

- 2.1 NPF4 is part of the statutory Development Plan. Where there is an area of incompatibility it is expected that the newest policy document will take precedence, which will be NPF4 for the time being.

In this case, the relevant policies from NPF4 are:

- Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises
- Policy 12: Zero Waste
- Policy 13: Sustainable Transport
- Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place
- Policy 27: City, Town, Local and Commercial Centres

- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies are:

- CDP1: The Placemaking Principle
- CDP4: Network of Centres
- CDP11: Sustainable Transport

- 2.3 The relevant Supplementary Guidance is:
- SG1 (Part 2): The Placemaking Principle
  - SG4: Network of Centres
  - SG11: Sustainable Transport

### **3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)**

- 3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

1. The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.
2. The proposed development is contrary to the adopted National Planning Framework 4, Policy 27 City, Town, Local and Commercial Centres a) and c) and to Glasgow City Development Plan, Policy CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle and Supplementary Guidance SG 1 Placemaking (Part 2), Policy CDP 4 Network of Centres and Supplementary Guidance SG 4 Network of Centres (Assessment Guidelines 4: Proposed Non-Retail Uses within Major Town Centres, 10: Food, Drink and Entertainment Uses, 12: Treatment and Disposal of Cooking/Heating Fumes and 14: Waste Management and Disposal).
3. The style and design of the proposed shopfront would be contrary to Policy CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle and Supplementary Guidance SG 1 Placemaking (Part 2) as it would not complement that of the building and would significantly detract from the character of the building.
4. The proposal, which would result in 75% of the units on the street block frontage being in authorised non-Class 1A use, would detract from the vitality and viability of the Major Town Centre by decreasing its mix of uses and, therefore, is contrary to National Planning Framework 4, Policy 27.
5. The proposal would result in the unacceptable loss of Class 1A retail units and in 75% of the units on the street block frontage being in authorised non-Class 1A use, which would erode the retail character of the Major Town Centre to the detriment of its vitality and viability and therefore is contrary to SG 4, Assessment Guideline 4.
6. The proposal does not demonstrate that the property has been appropriately marketed for Class 1A use for a minimum period of 12 months prior to submission of the non-Class 1A proposal and that the marketing exercise was unsuccessful in attracting Class 1A operators and therefore is contrary to SG 4, Assessment Guideline 4.

7. The consideration of the Planning Authority is that there is still a reasonable prospect of Class 1 use being resumed in the unit and an exception to SG 4 requirements is not justified.
8. Due to the kitchen extract vent below neighbouring residential flats, the proposed development would adversely affect the wellbeing and amenity of residents of the flats on the upper floors of the tenement due to the effects of cooking odours and fumes. Therefore, the proposal does not meet the requirements of SG 4 Assessment Guideline 4, Assessment Guideline 10, and Assessment Guideline 12 and is contrary to National Planning Framework 4, Policy 27; Policy CDP 1; and SG 1.
9. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the proposal has made suitable arrangements for the management and disposal of waste. Consequently, the proposal does not meet the requirements of SG 4 Assessment Guideline 14 and is contrary to National Planning Framework 4, Policy 12.

## **4 APPEAL STATEMENT**

- 4.1 No appeal statement was submitted with the notice of review.
- 4.2 The applicant did not request any further procedure in the determination of the review.

## **5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS**

- 5.1 During the application process, there was one representation received, objecting to the proposal. The grounds given are that the proposal would result in commercial competition with nearby shops, this is not a material planning consideration.

## **6 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 Committee should consider if the following are in accordance with NPF4, the relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance, and if there are material considerations which outweigh the Development Plan considerations.

- 6.2 The following are relevant policy considerations.

6.3 **NPF4 Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises, NPF4 Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation**

NPF4 Policy 1 states that: “When considering all development proposals significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises.”

NPF4 Policy 2 states that:

- a) “Development proposals will be sited and designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible.
- b) Development proposals will be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.
- c) Development proposals to retrofit measures to existing developments that reduce emissions or support adaptation to climate change will be supported.”

Committee should note:

- The proposal is broadly in line with aims of development within established urban areas for compact growth.
- Committee should consider whether they are completely satisfied the development considers the climate and nature crises.

#### 6.4 **NPF4 Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place, CDP1: The Placemaking Principle and SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2),**

Policy 14 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the Place Principle. The policy required development to be designed to improve the quality of an area regardless of scale. Development will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places:

**Healthy:** Supporting the prioritisation of women's safety and improving physical and mental health.

**Pleasant:** Supporting attractive natural and built spaces.

**Connected:** Supporting well connected networks that make moving around easy and reduce car dependency

**Distinctive:** Supporting attention to detail of local architectural styles and natural landscapes to be interpreted, literally or creatively, into designs to reinforce identity.

**Sustainable:** Supporting the efficient use of resources that will allow people to live, play, work and stay in their area, ensuring climate resilience, and integrating nature positive, biodiversity solutions.

**Adaptable:** Supporting commitment to investing in the long-term value of buildings, streets and spaces by allowing for flexibility so that they can be changed quickly to accommodate different uses as well as maintained over time.

Policy 14 states that proposals that are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported. Further details of the six qualities of place can be found in Annex D of NPF4.

CDP/SG1 Part One includes the six Qualities of Place that apply to all development proposal:

- A place with character and identity: a place that is distinctive.
- A successful open space: a place that is useable, high quality and multi-functional.
- A legible and safe place: a place that is accessible, easy to navigate, and welcoming.
- A place that is easy to move around: a place that is well-connected and focussed on active travel.
- A vibrant and diverse place: a place that has multiple uses and high levels of street level activity.
- A place which is adaptable and sustainable: a place that is adaptable for future needs and demonstrates sustainable design.

This overarching policy for CDP/SG1 states that new development should encourage placemaking by being design-led, aspiring towards the highest standards of design while directing development to the right place. All development should respect and protect the City's heritage by responding to its qualities and character of its site and surroundings. Development should make

the City an appealing place to live, work and visit for all members of society, providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents.

Committee should note:

- External proposals include panel mouldings, reeded glass,
  - External proposals include also two advertisement boards and an illuminated new fascia board – additional advertising consent must be granted for all of these.
- Committee should consider whether this proposal is consistent with the qualities of successful places.
- Committee should consider if this proposal is of a high design standard that respects the City's place quality.

SG1 provides the following detailed guidance in relation to this proposal:  
*Alterations to Shops and Other Commercial Buildings*

This guidance seeks to ensure that alterations to shops and other commercial buildings enhance the appearance of buildings and the street scene generally, respecting the historic character of the property, and cause no dis-amenity to neighbours as a result of noise, vibration, etc.

Proposals for alterations to shops and other commercial buildings should:

a) respect the period, style and architectural character of the building.

All additional fittings to commercial units and shopfronts should not detract from the visual appearance of the building by obscuring the active shop window or adding clutter to the building.

*Frontage Alterations* - The following guidance applies:

- a) alterations to frontages should always be designed to take account of the age and style of the buildings in which they are located;
- b) on older properties (e.g. tenements), the original fascia should be retained or, if it is concealed by a dropped fascia (see Definition), this should be removed and the original fascia reinstated. If a sub-fascia is fitted, this should be glazed (the glazing could be reflective, coloured or etched if it is hiding fittings or existing lowered ceilings). Glazing should run from the bottom of the fascia down to the pavement. A stall riser may be used;
- c) lowered ceilings in older buildings can hide original features. In listed buildings, lowered ceilings should be removed to expose the original ceiling. Where lowered ceilings are proposed, they will only be acceptable where they are set back 1 metre behind the glass, or raked back at an angle, to avoid interruption of the glazed shopfront with an incongruous feature;
- d) in buildings where timber-framed shopfronts are still the established pattern, then timber should be used for the framing;
- e) if a unit extends across two adjacent buildings at different levels, then the fascia should be stepped, rather than carried through at the lower level; and
- f) extensive use of tiles or render is discouraged.

Committee should note:

- For a Class 3 use, the method of cooking cannot be controlled by condition. The menu provided indicates that some of the items could require additional extraction.
- SG1 guidance is looking for designs using sensitive materials, ideally timber framed, ideally retaining original fascia, and sensitive the design of the tenement. This development proposes highly ornate astragal panels, clad fascia with LED painted lining boards, and other features.

Committee should consider:

- If they are satisfied that dis-amenity to neighbours would not occur from vent extracting to the side
- If the proposal is a good reflection of the character of the tenemental building.

## 6.5 **NPF4 Policy 12: Zero Waste and CDP1/SG1: The Placemaking Principle - Waste Storage, Recycling and Collection and SG4: Network of Centres**

NPF4 Policy Intent: To encourage, promote and facilitate development that is consistent with the waste hierarchy.

The relevant guidance is:

Development proposals that are likely to generate waste when operational, including residential, commercial, and industrial properties, will set out how much waste the proposal is expected to generate and how it will be managed including:

- i. provision to maximise waste reduction and waste separation at source, and
- ii. measures to minimise cross-contamination of materials, through appropriate segregation and storage of waste; convenient access for the collection of waste and recycling and localised waste management facilities.

SG1 provides the following detailed guidance:

All new developments must include appropriate and well-designed provision for waste storage, recycling and collection. All waste/recycling areas must be located discreetly, to have no adverse visual impact or cause traffic/noise nuisance to neighbours. Applications must provide full details of the provision for waste storage, recycling and collection in the initial submission for planning permission.

### **SG4: Network of Centres - Assessment Guideline 14: Waste Management and Disposal**

Proposals for food, drink and entertainment uses will only be considered favourably if suitable arrangements for the management and disposal of waste (including recyclables) can be provided, to the complete satisfaction of



the Council. Plans to show details of on-site waste storage facilities will be required.

Committee should note:

- NPF4 and SG4 requires clarity on appropriate segregation, expected levels of waste generated and details of collection for both recycling and waste in a waste management plan.
- The area marked for refuse on the floor plan is in the basement ('Bin store below stairs'). No further information is given regarding waste management, and no management plan has been provided.
- Committee should consider whether they are completely satisfied with the arrangements for waste management and recycling, despite the absence of a waste management plan.

## 6.6 **NPF4 Policy 13 and CDP11/SG11: Sustainable Transport**

NPF4 Policy Intent: To encourage, promote and facilitate developments that prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport for everyday travel and reduce the need to travel unsustainably.

SG11 provides the following detailed guidance:

### **Cycle Parking**

The Council shall require the provision of cycle parking, in line with the minimum cycle parking standards specified (below), as well as the following guidance:

- a. Wherever possible, employee cycle parking should be located within buildings or a secure compound. Where such a location is not feasible, provision should be close to areas of high activity, such as the main entrance of development, to ensure cycling is encouraged through enhanced security provided by passive surveillance.
- b. Cycle parking should always be *safe, sheltered and secure*. The form of cycle parking provided should facilitate the securing of the frame of the bike to the "stand". "Sheffield" racks are a good, and preferred, example of such provision.
- c. Employment sites shall provide on-site showers, lockers, changing and drying facilities, as a means of promoting walking and cycling to work. These are important trip-end facilities that can positively affect an individual's decision to walk, run or cycle regularly.

Minimum standard for Restaurants/Cafés:

Staff: 1 space per 10 staff

Customer: 1 space per 50sqm public floor area.

### **Vehicle Parking**

Vehicle parking provision should be assessed against the standards set out below.

Maximum standard for Restaurants/Cafés:  
High Accessibility: 2 spaces per 100sqm public floor area

Committee should note:

- No cycle parking is proposed or shown in the plan, contrary to guidance.
- No vehicle parking is proposed, contrary to guidance.
- The site is located within a High Public Transport Accessibility Area. Existing cycle and car parking is nearby, which would be subject to existing controls.

Committee should consider:

- whether the lack of cycle parking provision is adequate in this case.
- whether no vehicle parking provision is acceptable for this area.

## 6.7 **CDP/SG4: Network of Centres**

*CDP/SG4: Network of Centres*

SG4 provides the following detailed guidance:

### **Food, Drink and Entertainment Uses**

This section is relevant when assessing development proposals for the following uses: Class 3 (Food and Drink), Class 11 (Assembly and Leisure) and specific Sui Generis uses (including hot food shops, public houses and composite/hybrid uses).

This guidance states the Council has to strike a balance between the encouragement of uses that make the City more vibrant, and the need to preserve a reasonable level of amenity for adjoining occupiers, particularly neighbouring residents.

### **Assessment Guideline 4: Proposed Non-Retail Uses within Major Town Centres**

In assessing proposals for non-retail use within Major Town Centres the following criteria will be applied:

1. In all Major Town Centres (except Partick/Byres Road Retail Core Areas\*):
  - a) If the proportion of ground floor Class 1 shop units is more than 70%\*\*,  
an application for a change of use of ground floor units from Class 1 to non-Class 1 may be considered favourably where it can be demonstrated that the proposal will:
    - (i) Contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Town Centre and provide an active frontage;
    - (ii) Not have an unacceptable effect on Town Centre or residential amenity; and

- (iii) In the traditional shopping streets of Major Town Centres, result in not more than 30%\*\* of the shop units within a street block frontage being in non-Class 1 use and not more than 3 adjacent non-Class 1 units within a street block. This provision does not apply to indoor mall shopping environments.
- b) If the proportion of ground floor Class 1 shop units is less than 70%, further changes of use will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the proposal will satisfy a) above and will achieve at least one of the following:
  - (i) Deliver the re-use of long-term vacant units; and/or
  - (ii) Accord with relevant Spatial Supplementary Guidance.
- c) It will not be necessary to satisfy the criteria within Sections a) (iii) and b) where there is a long-term pattern of vacant units within an individual street block .
- d) The loss of an operating retail unit, where there are vacant units within a centre, will normally be resisted. Where a proposal forms part of a comprehensive redevelopment within a Town Centre, the Council will consider the loss of operational retail units in the context of the units' significance and as part of the overall redevelopment scheme

Committee should note:

- The property lies in Partick / Byres Road Major Town Centre, and is situated in the Partick Secondary Retail Area.
- There are 68.3% Class 1 shop units within the Town Centre.
- There is not a pattern of long term vacancy within the street block in which the units are situated.
- While the property was long term vacant for over 12 months, no marketing information was supplied to demonstrate the units were advertised as retail use for 12 months, a necessary criteria for AG4 b) (i) to apply
- The proposed amalgamation of units and change of use would mean 75% of the units on the street block frontage would be in non-retail use, and that more than three adjacent units would be in non-retail use, both contrary to guidance.

Committee should consider:

- Whether they are satisfied the proposal contributes positively to the character and appearance of the town centre, and provides an active frontage
- Whether the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on residential or town centre amenity.
- Whether a loss of retail within a major town centre would be acceptable, given the lack of long term vacancy, and the existing clustering on non-retail uses within the street block.

### **Assessment Guideline 10: Food, Drink and Entertainment Uses**

The following criteria will be applied:

- a. City-Wide:

- i. Proposals for food, drink and entertainment uses must not result in a detrimental effect on the amenity of residents through the effects of increased noise, activity and/or cooking fumes. No more than 20%\* of the number of units in a street block frontage, containing or adjacent to residential uses, should be in use as a hot food shop, public house, composite public house/Class 3 or composite hot food shop/Class 3 use.
- b. Outwith the City Centre:
  - i. Hours of operation will be agreed with the Planning Authority, based on local circumstances and the impact of the proposal on residential amenity, but shall not exceed 08:00 to 24:00 hours.

\* When calculating the proportion of hot food shops, the Council will include any use which incorporates a hot food takeaway service and any unimplemented planning permissions for changes of use to hot food shop, public house, or Class 3 use, likely to include a hot food takeaway service.

Committee should note:

- The proposal if granted would result in 75% of the street block being in non-Class 1A uses, contrary to policy.
  - The proposal is outwith the City Centre.
  - The proposed opening hours are 08:00-19:00 Monday to Sunday, consistent with guidance.
  - The site is located immediately adjacent to/below an existing residential unit.
- Committee should consider if they are satisfied the site will contribute positively to the area, and would not affect residential amenity.
- Committee should consider whether the proposed use, hours of operation, and proximity to residential units will have a negative impact on residential amenity.

### **Assessment Guideline 12: Treatment and Disposal of Cooking/Heating Fumes**

- a. Proposals for a food and drink use will only be considered favourably if suitable arrangements for the dispersal of fumes can be provided, to the complete satisfaction of the Council. The following information will be required:
  - i. Plans to show all proposed cooking/heating equipment, with full details of the fume dispersal method. This information must be shown on both the Plan and Elevation drawings;
  - ii. Full specifications of the proposed ventilation system, including the design, size, location and finish;
  - iii. A full maintenance schedule of the ventilation system to ensure its continued effectiveness; and
  - iv. Prior to the installation of any system for the dispersal of cooking fumes or odours, a certificate from a member of the Building Engineering Services Association (BESA) shall be submitted confirming that the

proposed fume/odour treatment method will operate to its fullest specification, when fitted at the application site. The requirement will be secured by a suspensive condition imposed on any relevant planning permission granted.

- b. Dispersal of cooking/heating fumes should be by an externally mounted flue, erected on the rear or side elevation to a height sufficient to disperse fumes above any nearby property.

Committee should note:

- Should the proposed Class 3 use be granted, the method of cooking cannot be controlled by condition.
- A kitchen extract grille would lie below residential flat windows, causing potential disamenity to residents.

Committee should consider:

- If a low level ventilation system would be suitable on this site due to its location facing a front elevation.
- Whether they are completely satisfied with the lack of arrangements for the dispersal of cooking fumes.
- The potential impact on residential amenity from cooking odours and noise.

## **7 COMMITTEE DECISION**

7.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with the same or different conditions from those listed below; or
- b. Refuse planning permission.
- c. Continue the review to request further information.

## **8 Policy and Resource Implications**

### **Resource Implications:**

*Financial:* n/a

*Legal:* n/a

*Personnel:* n/a

*Procurement:* n/a

**Council Strategic Plan:** n/a

**Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:**

*Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2021-25? Please specify.*

n/a

*What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?*

no significant impact

*Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio-economic disadvantage.*

n/a

### **Climate Impacts:**

*Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions? Please specify:*

n/a

*What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?*

n/a

*Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?*

n/a

### **Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:**

Are there any potential data protection impacts as a result of this report  
N

If Yes, please confirm that a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) has been carried out

## **9 Recommendations**

That Committee consider the content of this report in coming to their decision.