



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

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

Item 1

15th April 2025

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

**24/00242/LOCAL – 619 Shields Road, Glasgow G41 2RT
Use of flatted dwelling as house in multiple occupancy (HMO) for 14
persons.**

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): 06

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 application site consists of a four storey tenement building located on Shields Road, Glasgow. The application site fronts the road to the west and is bound by Leslie Street to the north and tenement flats to the east and south. The site includes a communal garden ground to the rear of the tenement building. The application site is within Ward 6 – Pollokshields and is also located within East Pollokshields Conservation Area. The surrounding area is residential in character, with adjoining buildings on either side and those opposite predominantly in residential use.
- 1.2 It is proposed to change the use of a flatted dwelling to a House in multiple occupancy (HMO) for 14 persons.
- 1.3 The internal layout will form 8 bedsit units each with ensuite and limited kitchen facility. A lounge is proposed on each floor. The property can be accessed by a door on the front elevation. There is a door at the rear of the basement which accesses the common close. The proposal does not include any allocated vehicle parking spaces.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

- 2.1 The relevant National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) and City Development Plan (CDP) policies and Supplementary Guidance are:
- | | |
|-----------|---------------------------|
| Policy 13 | Sustainable Transport |
| Policy 14 | Design, quality and place |
| Policy 16 | Quality homes |
| Policy 23 | Health and safety |
- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidances are:
- | | |
|-------------|---------------------------|
| CDP1/SG1: | The Placemaking Principle |
| CDP10/SG10: | Meeting housing needs |
| CDP11/SG11: | Sustainable Transport |

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

- 3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:
- 01 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.
02. The development proposal is contrary to Policy 13: Sustainable Transport, Policy 14: Design, Quality & Place, Policy 16: Quality Homes and Policy 23:

Health and Safety of the National Planning Framework 4, CDP1: The Placemaking Principle, CDP 10 and SG 10: Meeting Housing Needs and CDP11 and SG11: Sustainable Transport of the Glasgow City Development Plan as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.

03. The proposal fails to accord with policies 14, 16 and 23 of NPF4 and CDP1, SG1: Placemaking and SG 10: Meeting Housing Needs of the adopted City Development Plan by reason of the impact the proposal will have upon the health and wellbeing of its tenants and local residents due to the introduction of a commercial use of the scale and quality proposed to a modest family home in an established residential area. Fourteen, potentially unrelated adults living in the sub-standard accommodation proposed would be detrimental to the health and wellbeing of tenants but also to neighbouring residential amenity due to increased traffic, noise and general activity. Furthermore, the proposed development will be detrimental to the amenity of the property and wider area and is inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places.
04. The proposal fails to accord with policies 14 and 16 of NPF4 and CDP1 and SG1: Placemaking of the adopted City Development Plan as no details regarding the arrangement for bin storage within the rear curtilage has been provided. This would be to the detriment of residential and visual amenity of the property and wider area.
05. The proposal fails to accord with policy 13 of NPF4 and CDP10 and CDP11 and SG11: Sustainable Transport of the adopted City Development Plan due to lack of consideration for inclusion of secure and sheltered cycle parking.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

- 4.1 A summary of the material points raised in the appeal statement is given below:
 01. It is unclear with the reason provided for the refusal as the previous approvals for similar HMO developments were granted despite concerns over parking and refuse management. The City's policies should reflect consistency and fairness in application, particularly when similar developments have been permitted under similar conditions.
 02. Provision for the proper and effective storage of waste within the premises was made by incorporating a dedicated waste storage facility. In addition, a scheme for the disposal of waste was included, which stipulates that waste will only be placed outside at the appointed time for collection by the appointed contractor. This would ensure that bins do not obstruct pedestrian movement, and that litter is not an issue.
 03. Considering the reason for refusal, there is no clarification on what constitutes overdevelopment – specifically, what number of occupants is considered acceptable and where these limits are defined.

04. In terms of parking, the majority of HMO tenants do not own a vehicle. The area is well served by public transport with public transport, two railway stations and bus services are very close to the property. Therefore, there will be no issues with increased parking.
05. The bin storage arrangement was confirmed with the photographs of the existing Council arranged refuse disposal system for the area. All of the flats in the area use communal bins on the street. There are no issues with the bin storage arrangement.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The previous planning application history for the property includes the following:

- 23/01923/FUL – Use of flat as house in multiple occupancy for 17 persons. – Withdrawn.
- 03/00267/EN – Enforcement Enquiry – Closed.
- 14/00247/EN – Enforcement Enquiry – Closed.
- 24/00149/EN – Enforcement Enquiry – Closed.
- 24/00238/EN – Enforcement Enquiry – Closed.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 There were 32 representations to the application, including objections from Pollokshields Heritage, Bailie Norman MacLeod and Councilor Jon Molyneux. The concerns have been summarised below:

- Excessive noise
- Overcrowded dwellings/health and safety concerns
- Detrimental to the character of the building and Conservation Area
- Parking and road safety
- Waste management
- Loss of residential accommodation
- Waste water issues
- Fire safety concerns
- Internal layout concerns including lack of provision for laundry and storage of prams, bicycles, etc
- Impact on quality of life for those living within the accommodation
- Proposal is out of keeping and out of scale with the local housing pattern
- Backcourt/garden - Not big enough to accommodate a large HMO as the communal garden is shared between two buildings (89 & 619) containing many residential flats.
- There is no information in the application to indicate how the property will be managed on a day-to-day basis.

- 6.2 There were 2 representations to the review which reconfirmed the representee's objections to the proposal. No consultations were undertaken.

7 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 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.

- 7.2 The following are the relevant policy considerations:

7.3 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.

CDP11 and SG11 – Sustainable Transport: This policy seeks to encourage the uptake of more sustainable modes of transport and to ensure that new development has suitable provision of car parking and cycle space.

Committee should note that

- the application site is within an area of “base” accessibility.
- there are various public transport options within 20 minute walk of the application site.
- No information has been provided regarding safe, sheltered and secured cycle parking.
- the proposal does not include any parking provision nor any electric vehicle charging points.
- The on-street parking within the area is not controlled.

Committee should consider whether:

- the lack of cycle parking provision, contrary to policy, is acceptable in this case.
- adequate vehicle parking is provided.
- the proposal adequately addresses the accessibility and ease of use for all users.
- the amenity of the residential area is impacted.

7.4 NPF4 Policy 14: Design, quality and place, Policy 16: Quality homes, CDP1/SG1: The Placemaking Principle

NPF4 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.

Policy 16 states that householder development proposals will be supported where they:

- i. do not have a detrimental impact on the character or environmental quality of the home and the surrounding area in terms of size, design and materials; and
- ii. do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.

CDP1 is an overarching policy which 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 that:

- the proposed internal layout consists of 8 bedrooms which include kitchenettes and en suites.
- The proposed plans show 6 of the bedrooms having 2 single beds and 2 of the bedrooms having 1 single bed.
- Each floor has a communal lounge.
- There is shared amenity space to the rear of the building, however, the flat does not provide direct access to this space.
- To access the rear of the building, a communal close must be used to reach the shared residential backcourt.

Committee should consider whether:

- The proposed internal layout impact on the amenity of the surrounding area.
- The proposal results in overdevelopment.
- The amenity of the residential area is affected by the building's use.
- The proposed development respects the qualities and character of the local environment.

7.5 **NPF4 Policy 23: Health and safety**

The intent of Policy 23 is to protect people and places from environmental harm, mitigate risks arising from safety hazards and encourage, promote and facilitate development that improves health and wellbeing.

Development proposals that are likely to raise unacceptable noise issues will not be supported. The agent of change principle applies to noise sensitive development. A Noise Impact Assessment may be required where the nature of the proposal or its location suggests that significant effects are likely.

Committee should consider whether:

- having 14 people in 8 bedrooms would have a negative impact on residential amenity?
- multiple occupancy on this scale would be appropriate for this context, where the surrounding area and the tenement building are primarily residential?

7.6 **CDP Policy 10 and SG 10: Meeting Housing Needs**

Policy CDP 10 aims to ensure that the City's growing and diverse population has access to a choice of housing of appropriate quality and affordability across all tenures. The Policy is supported by supplementary guidance, in this instance SG10 which states that proposals requiring planning permission for multiple occupancy (HMOs) must be considered against key locational criteria and the additional key criteria relating to design and amenity space.

Key Criteria – Locational

The following locational criteria will be applied to all multiple occupancy development proposals:

- a) In Hillhead and Woodlands, no further planning applications for multiple occupancies will be supported (see Figure 1).
- b) In all other locations, the proportion of multiple occupancies should not exceed 5% of the total number of dwellings comprising that unit within a given street or block (or other readily identifiable unit). Exemptions from this rule may include properties that have become completely isolated from family accommodation);
- c) In locations where on-street parking is controlled, residents' parking permits for HMOs shall be restricted to 1 permit per property. No parking permits will be issued for residents of HMOs granted planning permission after the adoption of SG 11;

d) In locations where on-street parking is not controlled, the potential impact of an HMO on on-street parking will be taken into account in determining the acceptability of the proposal, in accordance with 'Parking' guidance contained within SG 11.

Key Criteria – Design and Amenity Space

Planning applications for multiple occupancy will be determined against the following criteria:

- a) There must be individual access to a lit street. This will include main door flats and undivided dwellinghouses, but will exclude most properties served by a tenement close and/or communal stairs and properties which have already been subdivided;
- b) There must be direct access to amenity space, a refuse store and a drying area to the rear of the building. Recycling space should also be provided in accordance with 'Provision of Waste and Recycling Space' guidance contained within SG 5: Resource Management;

Committee should note that:

- On-street parking is not controlled at this site.
- The proposal does not include any parking provision.
- No details have been provided of the waste and recycling arrangements on site.
- The application property has individual access to a lit street.
- The application property is not within the boundary where new HMOs are prohibited.
- There is no record of a HMO planning application or permission within the street block comprising 619-635 Shields Road

Committee should consider whether:

- the waste and recycling arrangements are appropriate for 14 residents in this property?
- the development would impact on the existing on-street parking provision due to the proposed number of rooms and occupants?
- the proposed development considered appropriate for the location?

8 COMMITTEE DECISION

8.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with or without conditions;
- b. Refuse planning permission; or
- c. Continue the application for further information.

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

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