



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

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

Item 1

7th October 2025

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

**25/00052/LOCAL – Use of premises as homeless facility (Class 8) to
provide a 24 hour accessible facility (retrospective)**

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): 10

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 property is a ground and basement commercial unit within a contemporary 7-storey building with serviced apartments on upper floors. The property is in an area of high public transport accessibility. It is located within the Central Conservation Area and Ward 10 – Anderston/City/Yorkhill. The unit has been in operation, without planning permission, as a homeless shelter since November 2023.
- 1.2 The proposal is to change the use of vacant premises to a homeless facility (night shelter and soup kitchen) to provide a 24-hour accessible facility (retrospective) providing hot meals and beverages and sleeping accommodation for the night.
- 1.3 The proposal details the entrance at street level with a small reception area partitioned off from the remainder of the ground floor, with a stair leading to the basement which houses the night shelter. The submitted drawings indicate 4 no. rooms equipped with mattresses on the floor to provide sleeping space for 27 individuals. These beds are only available to 9am the following morning and cannot be used as ongoing accommodation.
- 1.4 There is a maximum of 6 staff working within the shelter at any one time, with the minimum being 2.
- 1.5 The applicant advises that the soup kitchen serves approximately 350 people a day, however only 100 "vulnerable" individuals will sit and eat within the shelter, such as older users. The remainder will be issued a meal to take away. 55,000 meals a month are served by HPS. Food is prepared in a central kitchen within their Broomielaw premises and then brought to the site where it is served.
- 1.6 The proposed access, on the basis of the submitted proposal, is from Glassford Street into a small reception area with desk, partitioned off from the remainder of the ground floor. Stairs will lead directly to the night shelter at basement level. However, it is noted that the main ground floor area, indicated to be outwith the scope of the application, appears to be in use as a kitchen/servery and eating area, accessible directly from the street.
- 1.7 No dedicated parking provision is proposed.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

2.1 The relevant National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) and City Development Plan (CDP) policies and Supplementary Guidance are:

Policy 12	Zero Waste
Policy 14	Design, Quality and Place
Policy 23	Health and Safety Policy
Policy 27	City, town, local and commercial centres

2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance are:

CDP 1	The Placemaking Principle
CDP 2	Sustainable Spatial Strategy
CDP 3	Economic Development
CDP 4	Network of Centres
CDP 9	Historic Environment
SG 1	Placemaking (part 1 & 2)
SG 2	City Centre Strategic Development Framework
IPG 3	Economic Development
SG 4	Network of Centres
SG 9	Historic Environment

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

- 1) The proposal has resulted in an elevated fear of crime associated with the increase in anti-social behaviour and crime in the locality, as evidenced by Police Scotland incident reporting from periods of 12 months before, and 12 months after the night shelter commenced operation in December 2023. The resulting fear of crime is considered detrimental to the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
- 2) The proposal is contrary to NPF 4 Policy 14 - Design, Quality and Place due to the negative impact on the perceived safety of walking routes in the vicinity resulting from nightly instances of long queues obstructing the footway.
- 3) The proposal is contrary to City Development Plan Policy CDP 10 and associated Supplementary Guidance SG10 - Meeting Housing Needs, due to the detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area, resulting from fear of crime associated with the increase in anti-social behaviour and crime in the locality since the night shelter commenced operation in December 2023.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

4.1 A summary of the material points raised in the appeal statement is given below:

1. The appellant argues that objections to the shelter's operation, based on alleged antisocial behaviour and harm to local amenity, are unsubstantiated and speculative, lacking verifiable evidence such as incident reports or photographs. The appellant argues that, given the lack of evidence and Police Scotland's non-objection, along with the shelter's compliant operation, the Council's refusal based on perceived fear is unsupportable and does not outweigh its social benefits.
2. The appellant argues that the shelter does not cause homelessness or antisocial behaviour but mitigates it, improves public amenity, and serves vulnerable people, and that planning law prohibits penalising a use simply for addressing visible social problems.
3. Although public concern is treated as a material consideration, case law makes clear it must be objectively justified and proportionately weighed, not based on sentiment or stigma. No evidence links the shelter to harm, and Police Scotland has not objected. By contrast, the facility delivers tangible, verifiable benefits: it provides life-saving shelter, reduces rough sleeping, offers pathways to services, and operates to rigorous safeguarding standards in line with CDP10, SG10, and national homelessness policy. Speculative fears cannot outweigh these proven outcomes; the planning balance must favour public interest and social need, not unsubstantiated anxiety.
4. The appellant argues that refusing permission for the Homeless Project Scotland night shelter ignores the serious human consequences, as its absence would force vulnerable people back onto the streets with heightened risks to life, health, and safety. The shelter delivers supervised, safeguarded, and policy-compliant emergency accommodation aligned with CDP10, SG10, and statutory duties under the Housing (Scotland) Act 1987. To refuse based on unsubstantiated fears while disregarding evidence of life-saving benefits is legally flawed, ethically troubling, and contrary to the planning system's role in promoting the public good.
5. Objectors' concerns about queuing have already been resolved by Homeless Project Scotland through an internal basement queuing system, eliminating large gatherings on the pavement and demonstrating responsive, good-faith management. Any residual concern could lawfully be addressed by a planning condition rather than refusal. To reject the shelter despite mitigation in place is factually inaccurate, legally disproportionate, and contrary to CDP10 and SG10, which promote inclusive and well-managed development. The queuing issue supports, at most, a condition; it cannot justify refusal.
6. The Planning Authority's reliance on Policy CDP 10 and SG10 to refuse the HPS night shelter on grounds of "fear of crime" and antisocial behaviour is

unsupported by evidence and misapplies planning law. The refusal replaces evidence with assumption and prejudice with planning judgement, overlooking CDP10's aim to support inclusive, specialist accommodation. In law and precedent, claims about queuing or antisocial behaviour carry no evidential weight and cannot outweigh the clear public benefit of shelter provision, safety, and support, rendering the decision unsound and inconsistent with policy.

7. The Policy CDP 10 seeks to provide quality housing and community accommodation, with SG10 ensuring specialist facilities like hostels are well-managed and integrated. The HPS night shelter meets and exceeds these aims, operating with 24-hour staff supervision, airport-style security, CCTV, and strict management protocols, with no evidence of breaches in health, fire, or licensing standards. Refusal Reason 03, citing fear of crime and amenity loss, is unsupported by Police Scotland or any statutory body and ignores that the shelter reduces nuisance by moving rough sleepers indoors. The refusal therefore misapplies CDP10/SG10 and undermines the integrity of the planning process.
8. Objections from National Car Parks Ltd, The Steps Bar, and MCTCC cite antisocial behaviour, drug use, and disturbance, but provide no objective evidence linking these issues to the HPS night shelter. MCTCC's own minutes confirm such problems pre-dated the shelter, and Police Scotland has raised no objection, with Inspector Watters explicitly noting no causal link. Claims by NCP and The Steps Bar lack substantiation through police reports, incident logs, or regulatory action, and photographic evidence submitted is undated and unverified. The shelter, by contrast, operates with strict security, CCTV, 24-hour staffing, and safeguarding protocols, exceeding SG10 requirements and reducing street-level nuisance by bringing vulnerable individuals indoors. Objections must be supported by probative evidence, not perception or prejudice. The objections therefore fail to demonstrate policy breach or material planning harm and should be afforded limited weight in determining compliance with CDP 10 and SG10.
9. The objection from The Spires Serviced Apartments relies on anecdotal guest complaints and claims of reputational harm but provides no probative evidence of material planning harm—no booking data, financial audit, or independent assessment—relying instead on unsworn narratives and prejudicial language. A speculative economic or reputational loss cannot justify refusal, and planning law requires findings to rest on relevant, intelligible evidence, not perception or prejudice. The issues cited by The Spires and MCTCC minutes, such as drug use in Ramshorn Graveyard, pre-dated the shelter's December 2023 opening and have no proven causal link; indeed, the shelter mitigates street-level nuisance through airport-style security, CCTV, safeguarding, and 24-hour supervision, exceeding SG10 standards. It is inconsistent to criticise a regulated facility while tolerating unregulated hotel placements for homeless individuals, which lack these

protections. The Spires' objection therefore reflects social discomfort rather than demonstrable planning harm and should be afforded little weight by the Local Review Body.

10. To address concerns about the visibility of service users, Homeless Project Scotland now requires guests to wait within a supervised, weather-protected basement area rather than queuing outside. This internal staging reduces public visibility, mitigates alleged disruption to neighbouring businesses, and aligns with CDP 10 and SG10. While no evidence links service users to actual criminality, the revised arrangements remove the visual interface cited by objectors, addressing perceived reputational or fear-of-crime concerns and providing a tangible, lawful mitigation consistent with planning policy.
11. The continued operation of the HPS night shelter is fully consistent with planning policy and necessary for public welfare. There is no substantiated evidence of harm—allegations of antisocial behaviour are anecdotal and contradicted by Police Scotland. The shelter addresses, but does not cause, long-standing issues like rough sleeping, and its benefits—reduced street homelessness, safer public spaces, and saved lives—far outweigh any perceived fear. Closure would force vulnerable individuals back onto the streets, imposing human and statutory costs, while queuing concerns have been mitigated internally and could be controlled by condition. The facility meets and exceeds CDP 10 and SG10 standards, providing safe, managed accommodation, and refusal would be legally, morally, and socially indefensible. The Local Review Body is therefore urged to grant consent.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 The previous planning application history for the property includes the following:
 - 21/02632/FUL - Use of vacant ground and basement premises as office. Granted with conditions.
 - 23/01408/FUL - Use of office premises as public house/nightclub (Sui Generis/Class 11). Granted with conditions.
 - 24/00009/EN - Alleged breach - Use of ground and basement of office premises for temporary homeless accommodation, ancillary/associated food preparation and heating of food(s) with reception area and associated respite rooms. Notice issued, appeal dismissed.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 There were 4 letters of objection received to the application. A summary of the points raised is below:

- The proposed use results in a conflicting and incompatible use and function given the proximity to residential properties and businesses.
- No information on how cooking odours would be managed.
- No information on how noise will be managed and mitigated.
- Lack of engagement with local residential and business communities.
- Lack of waste and recycling strategy, with bins left on the street.
- The night shelter operation has resulted in an increase in anti-social behaviour in the locality, including drug use, aggressive behaviour between patrons of the shelter, intimidation of patrons of neighbouring businesses.
- Queues for night shelter blocking entrances to other businesses.
- Increase in rough sleepers in the locality, including within private accommodation.

There were 2 letters of support received to the application. A summary of the points raised is below:

- The use aligns with the Placemaking aims of the City Development Plan insofar as it contributes to the creation of new and improved places that are fit for people, reinforcing social and community networks.
- The use aligns with Equalities Act, referenced by the Placemaking policies of the City Development Plan, which states that local authorities have a responsibility to: a) eliminate relevant discrimination, harassment, victimisation; b) advance equality of opportunity by removing or minimising disadvantage suffered by, and taking steps to reach, engage and meet the needs of, relevant groups, and c) foster good relations between people protected by the current equalities legislation and the wider community by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

6.2 There were 3 representations to the review which reconfirmed the representee's objections to the proposal. No consultations were undertaken.

7 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The key issues for Committee to consider are:

7.2 Design, Health and Safety and Placemaking

NPF4 Policy 14: Design, quality and place

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 the 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. Policy 14 seeks to promote well-designed development that supports lifelong wellbeing, encourages safe and welcoming environments, and improves both physical and mental health. This includes designing spaces, routes, and buildings to ensure they feel safe, with passive surveillance and other physical safety measures.

Policy 23 Health and safety

Policy 23 intends 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.

CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle

This general policy emphasises the creation of high-quality, healthy, and sustainable places. Developments must contribute positively to the surrounding area's character and amenity and aspire to be safe, pleasant, and welcoming (as stated in the six qualities of place set out in policy).

SG1: Placemaking Part 1 & Part 2 Supplementary Guidance 1 (SG1)

This elaborates on the placemaking principles and includes specific guidance on how developments should address issues such as crime prevention and anti-social behaviour. It encourages developers to design spaces that are safe, welcoming, and discourage behaviours that can lead to public nuisance.

Legibility & Safety

This section of the policy seeks to improve understanding of the urban environment and the individual's perception of safety by requiring development proposals to, inter alia:

- j) Incorporate community safety measures, such as active surveillance, within public realm areas, where appropriate.
- k) Incorporate active frontages, where appropriate, as buildings can provide passive surveillance for open space and active travel routes which can significantly affect people's perceptions of public space in term of enjoyment and safety.
- l) Seek to ensure that safe and accessible environments are created where the fear of crime does not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

Community Safety

4.20 It is expected that new development will incorporate crime prevention and community safety measures within their layout and design.

Committee should note that:

- The proposal details the entrance at street level with a small reception area partitioned off from the remainder of the ground floor, with a stair leading to the basement which houses the night shelter.
- The submitted drawings indicate 4 no. rooms equipped with mattresses on the floor to provide sleeping space for 27 individuals. These beds are only available to 9am the following morning and cannot be used as ongoing accommodation.
- The applicant advises that the soup kitchen serves approximately 350 people a day, however only 100 "vulnerable" individuals will sit and eat within the shelter, such as older users. The remainder will be issued a meal to take away. Around 55,000 meals a month are served by HPS.
- Food is prepared in a central kitchen within their Broomielaw premises and then brought to the site where it is served.
- Since the site visit, the Council has become aware that the ground floor is now in use as a kitchen servery and eating space, with gazebos erected on the footway to shelter queuing patrons.
- The operation of a 24-hour homeless facility has resulted in nightly occurrences of long queues forming on the footway outside the premises.
- A site visit on 11 February 2025 confirmed that the shelter is operating beyond the submitted details, with overnight capacity increased from 27 to 33 beds and the ground floor used as a staff break-out and meeting space rather than solely as a reception.
- Objections to the proposal raise concerns about fear of crime (which is a material planning consideration). Police Scotland data relating to incidents on Glassford Street prior to and during operation of the shelter has been submitted:
 1. The homeless shelter operation is considered to have commenced in late December 2023. Police Scotland records show that total call outs to Glassford Street rose from 514 in the 12 months up to December 2023 to 894 in the 12 months from January–December 2024, an increase of 74%.

2. Around 33% of these call outs were initiated by the shelter operator, reflecting proactive reporting and management of incidents.
3. The nature of incidents reported includes disturbances, public nuisance, drug/substance misuse, intruders, thefts, assaults, and sexual offences.
4. This evidence indicates a notable increase in Police activity in the area since the shelter commenced, which is relevant to assessing fear of crime, anti-social behaviour, and impacts on amenity and safety.

Committee should consider whether:

- Pedestrian movement, along what would otherwise be an active and safe walking route, is being obstructed?
- The obstruction, combined with evidence of associated antisocial behaviour and crime reported during the periods of operation, contributes to a sense of reduced safety for residents, pedestrians, and other users of the street?
- The proposal is contrary to the 'Healthy' quality of place in Policy 14, as nightly queues, associated antisocial behaviour, and reported incidents to Police Scotland create fear of crime and make walking routes feel unsafe, undermining safe and welcoming environments?
- By generating situations that compromise the safe use of public spaces and reduce passive surveillance opportunities, the development undermines the "Healthy" quality of place?
- The submitted Management Plan provides effective mitigation for footway obstruction and queuing issues, and safety and perception of safety for pedestrians and street users. Or whether the proposal as submitted provides active or passive surveillance of the public areas adjacent to the entrance to the shelter, or does it incorporate an active frontage?
- The scale and nature of the kitchen/servery and associated service arrangements are appropriate and whether they represent an intensification beyond what was applied for?
- The provision of food service (including takeaway and sit-in) and associated gazebos on the footway has an adverse impact on the design, functionality, and character of the city centre streetscape?
- The internal layout and reliance on mattresses on the floor to accommodate 27 individuals provides an appropriate standard of design and amenity for users?
- The increase in Police incidents, alongside objections and other evidence, has implications for amenity, safety, street vitality, and the quality of the public realm?

7.3 Network of Centres and Economy

Policy 27 – City, Town, Local and Commercial Centres

Policy 27 promotes a town centre first approach, aiming to enhance the vitality and viability of these centres by encouraging development that supports their role as hubs for community life, commerce, and services.

CDP 4 and its associated Supplementary Guidance **SG 4 Network of Centres** similarly aim to ensure that proposals within centres:

- i. Support the role of the centre as a hub for multiple activities;
- ii. Maintain accessibility and safe movement for pedestrians;

iii. Avoid negative impacts on street vitality, amenity, or the character of the centre.

CDP 2 Sustainable Spatial Strategy

CDP2 seeks to support sustainable patterns of development and ensure proposals contribute positively to the spatial strategy. **SG2** expands on CDP2, encouraging development that respects context and contributes positively to place-making.

CDP 3 Economic Development

CDP 3 supports use that sustain the competitiveness, vitality, and vibrancy of Glasgow's economy and centres. IPG3 expands on CDP3, particularly in terms of land use within centres, safeguarding active ground floor uses and promoting complementary activity.

Committee should note that:

- The facility operates 24 hours a day.
- Obstructed footways and congregation of users can reduce the quality of the public realm, impacting both residents' and visitors' experience of the city centre. These issues may conflict with planning objectives to create streets that are safe, accessible, and attractive for all users.
- Associated antisocial behaviour and incidents have been reported to Police Scotland./
- The submitted Management Plan does not provide measures to effectively mitigate footway obstruction, queuing, or safety concerns.
- The site's city centre location provides accessibility to services and public transport;
- The facility is considered to meet a social need;
- The ground floor is in use as a servery and eating space, with queuing on the pavement;

Committee should consider whether:

- The operation of a 24-hour facility in this location may affect street vitality and the balanced mix of uses, reducing the usability and vibrancy of the surrounding city centre environment?
- Evidence of Police Scotland reports create a fear of crime, thereby diminishing the perceived safety and attractiveness of the public realm?
- The lack of mitigation in the submitted Management Plan adequately addresses footway obstruction, queuing, and impacts on pedestrian movement?
- The observed activity associated with the facility is consistent in terms of maintaining street vitality, a diverse mix of uses, and safe, accessible public spaces?
- This facility contributes to the city economy, and is located appropriately alongside city centre commercial uses?
- The proposal integrates with its surroundings and supports safe, welcoming public spaces?

- The ground floor servery provides an appropriate active frontage in a commercial area of the city centre?

7.4 Housing Need - Care Provision

SG10: Meeting Housing Needs

Care in the Community Where elements of care are associated with a development, the following considerations apply:

3.9 All new development should:

- a) meet placemaking and design standards, as set out in SG1: Placemaking and Design;
- b) provide a mix of accommodation units, where appropriate;
- c) provide high quality indoor and outdoor amenity space;
- d) demonstrate high standards of design and inclusive design;
- e) ensure safe, easy and inclusive access for all people regardless of disability, age or gender, both into the building or site and to local amenities such as shops, community and leisure facilities;
- f) ensure adequate privacy levels are maintained for residents;
- g) demonstrate no adverse impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area; and
- h) demonstrate that it is compliant with the Care Inspectorate's National Care Standards

Committee should note that:

- The applicant has stated the shelter does not provide care; however, the operation has similarities to facilities where care-related criteria are normally applied.
- Objections to the application raise concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime in the locality, and that Police Scotland crime reports have been submitted to the Council in connection with the assessment of the proposal.

Committee should consider whether:

- The similarities between the shelter's operation and care-providing facilities would have an impact on the surrounding area and its amenity?
- The evidence from objections and Police Scotland reports has implications for the character and amenity of the locality?

7.5 Waste

NPF4 Policy 12: Zero Waste and SG4: Network of Centres

The intent of Policy 12 is to ensure all development proposals to reduce, reuse, or recycle materials in line with the waste hierarchy. Development proposals that are likely to generate waste when operational, including residential properties, will set out how much waste the proposal is expected to generate and how it will be managed including provision to maximise waste reduction and waste separation at source, and measures to minimise the 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.

SG4 sets out the requirements for waste management and disposal for premises serving food and drink.

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 that:

- No waste management plan has been provided. The submitted Management Plan or the proposed Basement Plan make no reference to waste collection, segregation, or disposal arrangements.
- Neither the submitted Management Plan of Shelter Operations nor the Proposed Basement Plan identifies arrangements for bin storage, uplift points, or compliance with Glasgow City Council's standards under SG 4.
- However, wheeled bins appear to be stored on the footway, as observed during the site visit.
- In the absence of a waste strategy, there is a real risk of overspill, vermin attraction, odour, and obstruction to the public realm.

Committee should consider whether:

- The lack of a waste management plan is acceptable?
- The storage of bins on the footway are considered to be an appropriate solution, or would they be detrimental to amenity, impacting the vitality of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area?

7.6 Historic Environment

CDP 9/SG 9 requires the Council to pay special regard to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area, including the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Committee should note:

- The proposal is located within the Central Conservation Area.
- The proposal involves use of the footway for queuing, and the use of a gazebo to shelter users.

Committee should consider whether:

- The character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved or enhanced by the visual impact associated with the use?
- Views which contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be affected?

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.

8.2 Section 43A(12)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that reasoning for the local review body decision is supplied in the decision notice. Should committee be minded to grant planning permission, material considerations that justify a departure from the plan would require to be identified.

9 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

10 RECOMMENDATIONS

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