Item 3

11th November 2025

Report of Handling for Application 24/01658/FUL

ADDRESS:	Site Formerly Known As 663 Balmore Road Glasgow
PROPOSAL:	Erection of flatted residential development (12no units) and associated works.
DATE OF ADVERT:	No advertisement was required.
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	No representations were received.
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	Scottish Water – No objection. The Coal Authority – **Objection**: The Coal Authority's information indicates that the site lies in an area where historic unrecorded coal mining is likely to have taken place at shallow depth. Voids and broken ground associated with such workings can pose a risk of ground instability and may give rise to the emission of mine gases.
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	No pre-application advice was sought.

EIA - MAIN ISSUES	NONE
CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
DESIGN OR DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
IMPACT/POTENTIAL IMPACT STATEMENTS – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
S75 AGREEMENT SUMMARY	NOT APPLICABLE
DETAILS OF DIRECTION UNDER REGS 30/31/32	NOT APPLICABLE
NPF4 POLICIES	Policy 1. Tackling the climate and nature crises Policy 2. Climate mitigation and adaptation Policy 3. Biodiversity Policy 9. Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings Policy 12. Zero waste Policy 13. Sustainable transport Policy 14. Design, quality and place Policy 15. Local living and 20 minute neighbourhoods Policy 16. Quality homes Policy 22. Flood risk and water management
CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES	CDP 1 & SG 1 – Placemaking CDP 2 – Sustainable Spatial Strategy CDP 5 & SG 5 – Resource Management CDP 7 & SG 7 – Natural Environment CDP 8 & SG 8 – Water Environment CDP 11 & SG 11 – Sustainable Transport CDP 12 & IPG 12 – Delivering Development

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	North Glasgow Strategic Development Framework (2023) Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment: Planning Guidance for Developers (2011)
REASON FOR DECISION	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.

Comments	
Planning History	21/02937/FUL – Refuse – Use of vacant site as self service car wash (sui generis).
Site Visits (Dates)	14th October 2024 – Erection of flatted residential development (12no units) and associated works.
Siting	The application site is a vacant site on Balmore Road that previously accommodated a police station. The site is bounded by residential dwellings to the south, residential flats and landscaping to the east, Balmore Road Playground and Park to the west and residential flats and a church to the north on the opposite side of Balmore Road. The site is within Ward 15, Canal.
Design and Materials	The proposal seeks consent for the erection of a four storey flatted block creating 12 flats, providing the following accommodation: 4 x 1 bedroom flats 8 x 2 bedroom flats The proposed layout would be a T shaped block fronting onto Balmore Road using an existing vehicle access to access a rear parking court. The proposed plans show an internal bin store, with no cycle storage or backcourt. The design would have alternating bands of facing brick and render with a concrete tiled pitched roof.
Daylight	The proposal would not create a loss of daylight to the adjacent existing properties.
Aspect	The proposed flatted block would front onto Balmore Road to the north.
Privacy	The proposal would not cause a loss of privacy to the adjacent existing properties.
Adjacent Levels	No details are given of the levels of the site and adjacent land. It is noted from the site visit that the site itself is relatively level.
Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)	No landscaping or garden ground is shown on the proposed plans.
Access and Parking	The proposal would reuse an existing vehicle access to the eastern side of the frontage onto Balmore Road, accessing 15 car parking spaces to the rear of the site. No cycle parking is shown.
Site Constraints	The application site is in an area identified as High Risk by the Coal Authority.
Other Comments	Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts require that when an application is made, it shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise. The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be: a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; b) whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed. Each development proposal will be considered on its individual merits and must respond to its setting appropriately to ensure protection and enhancement of amenity in the area. In respect of (a) the Development Plan comprises the National Planning Framework 4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted on the 29th March 2017.

NPF4

Policy 1. Tackling the climate and nature crises

When considering all development proposals significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises.

The proposal seeks to vacant site with a car dominated layout flatted development which does not provide for biodiversity enhancements. The proposal has not given due weight to the global climate and nature crises.

The proposal does not accord with Policy 1 on tackling the climate and nature crises.

Policy 2. Climate mitigation and adaptation

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.

The proposal has not been demonstrated to be designed to meet the requirement of SG 5 to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from the occupation and use of the dwelling. The lack of a Flood Risk Assessment and drainage details means that the proposal has not been adequately screened for flood risk, or taken into account climate change. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal has taken due accord of the requirement for climate mitigation and adaption.

The proposal does not accord with Policy 2 on climate mitigation and adaption.

Policy 3. Biodiversity

a) Development proposals will contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity, including where relevant, restoring degraded habitats and building and strengthening nature networks and the connections between them. Proposals should also integrate nature-based solutions, where possible.

c) Proposals for local development will include appropriate measures to conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity, in accordance with national and local guidance. Measures should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development.

NRS Biodiversity have advised that this proposal would require a biodiversity statement or plan showing how positive effects for biodiversity will be achieved.

The proposal lacks details of biodiversity enhancements and without these the proposal would not accord with Policy 3 on biodiversity.

Policy 9. Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings

a) Development proposals that will result in the sustainable reuse of brownfield land including vacant and derelict land and buildings, whether permanent or temporary, will be supported. In determining whether the reuse is sustainable, the biodiversity value of brownfield land which has naturalised should be taken into account.

c) Where land is known or suspected to be unstable or contaminated, development proposals will demonstrate that the land is, or can be made, safe and suitable for the proposed new use.

The proposal lacks any information on the existing biodiversity of the site, or of any improvements to be included in the development. The proposal also lacks a geo-environmental desk study and scope of proposed site investigations, which NRS Geotechnical and Land Remediation advise is required given the historical mapping shows the site surrounded by landfill.

The proposal is contrary to Policy 9 on brownfield, vacant and derelict land.

Policy 12. Zero waste

a) Development proposals will seek to reduce, reuse, or recycle materials in line with the waste hierarchy.

b) Development proposals will be supported where they:

i. reuse existing buildings and infrastructure;
ii. minimise demolition and salvage materials for reuse;
iii. minimise waste, reduce pressure on virgin resources and enable building materials, components and products to be disassembled, and reused at the end of their useful life;
iv. use materials with the lowest forms of embodied emissions, such as recycled and natural construction materials;
v. use materials that are suitable for reuse with minimal reprocessing.

c) 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 the crosscontamination of materials, through appropriate segregation and storage of waste; convenient access for the collection of waste; and recycling and localised waste management facilities.

Comment:
The proposal, for the erection of a residential dwelling, will generate waste when occupied. The proposal has indicated on the ground floor plan that waste and recycling storage would be internal to the common close at ground floor, although the management of this space may be challenging for the range of GCC recycling bins in addition to the waste bin and space for future recycling storage should the City Council adapt the recycling arrangements..

The application form states that "There will be a designated area to the rear of the flats that the refuse bins will be stored and taken out to the main road on collection day". No area to the rear is shown on the proposed plans and so it isn't clear how collection would be managed.

The proposal does not accord with Policy 12 on zero waste.

Policy 13. Sustainable transport

The application site is in an area of Base Accessibility within the Outer Urban Area. The proposal includes provision for an off-street car parking space per dwelling but shows no cycle parking. This is insufficient for the transport requirements generated by the proposed development and are not in line with the sustainable travel hierarchies.

The proposal does not accord with Policy 13 on sustainable transport.

Policy 14. Design, quality and place

a) Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale.

b) Development proposals 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.* *c) Development 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.* **Comment:** The proposed development is not designed to fit with the local architectural style. The proposal would, as addressed below under CDP 1 & SG 1, result in no private external amenity space for residents, reducing the areas for relaxation and recreation which would have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of future residents. The proposed development would be an incongruous addition to a prominent main road site and would not reflect the architectural styles of the local area. No Statement on Energy has been provided and no information has been provided that demonstrates the proposal would be energy efficient. The proposal is not consistent with the six qualities of successful place. The proposal is contrary to Policy 14 on design, quality and place. <u>Policy 15. Local living and 20 minute neighbourhoods</u> *a) Development proposals will contribute to local living including, where relevant, 20 minute neighbourhoods. To establish this, consideration will be given to existing settlement pattern, and the level and quality of interconnectivity of the proposed development with the surrounding area, including local access to:* *• sustainable modes of transport including local public transport and safe, high quality walking, wheeling and cycling networks;* *• employment;* *• shopping;* *• health and social care facilities;* *• childcare, schools and lifelong learning opportunities;* *• playgrounds and informal play opportunities, parks, green streets and spaces, community gardens, opportunities for food growth and allotments, sport and recreation facilities;* *• publicly accessible toilets;* *• affordable and accessible housing options, ability to age in place and housing diversity.* The application site is within walking distance of a local town centre, approximately 19 minutes walking time[1], and on a bus route. The town centre provides for a range of employment, shopping, health and social care facilities, child care and schools. The proposal accords with Policy 15 on local living and 20 minute neighbourhoods. <u>Policy 16. Quality homes</u> *a) Development proposals for new homes on land allocated for housing in LDPs will be supported.* *c) Development proposals for new homes that improve affordability and choice by being adaptable to changing and diverse needs, and which address identified gaps in provision, will be supported. This could include:* *i. self-provided homes;* *ii. accessible, adaptable and wheelchair accessible homes;* *iii. build to rent;* *iv. affordable homes;* *v. a range of size of homes such as those for larger families;* *vi. homes for older people, including supported accommodation, care homes and sheltered housing;* *vii. homes for people undertaking further and higher education; and*

[1] Estimated walking time from Google Maps: https://maps.app.goo.gl/yDnGmmbxvT5Gfr3z7

viii. homes for other specialist groups such as service personnel.

f) Development proposals for new homes on land not allocated for housing in the LDP will only be supported in limited circumstances where:

i. the proposal is supported by an agreed timescale for build-out; and
ii. the proposal is otherwise consistent with the plan spatial strategy and other relevant policies including local living and 20 minute neighbourhoods;
iii. and either:
· delivery of sites is happening earlier than identified in the deliverable housing land pipeline. This will be determined by reference to two consecutive years of the Housing Land Audit evidencing substantial delivery earlier than pipeline timescales and that general trend being sustained; or
· the proposal is consistent with policy on rural homes; or
· the proposal is for smaller scale opportunities within an existing settlement boundary; or
· the proposal is for the delivery of less than 50 affordable homes as part of a local authority supported affordable housing plan.

The application site is not an allocated housing site in the City Development Plan. The proposal is for the erection of a flatted block providing 12 new flatted dwellings that could meet a local housing requirement.

No timescale for the build-out has been provided, however this could be conditioned given the scale of development proposed. The proposal is considered to accord with the policy on local living and 20 minute neighbourhoods. The proposal would be a smaller scale opportunity within the existing settlement boundary.

The proposal accords with Policy 16 on quality homes.

Policy 22. Flood risk and water management

The application site is identified on the SEPA flood risk maps with the southern portion of the site having a medium likelihood (each year this area has a 0.5% chance) of surface water flooding.

The application has been submitted without the following required supporting information:

- Flood Risk Assessment
- Drainage Impact Assessment
- Drainage Layout
- Site Levels
- SuDS
- Drainage Maintenance Schedule
- Flood Exceedance Routing
- Self-Certification
- Independent Checks
- Professional Indemnity Insurance evidence
- Scottish Water confirmation for a new connection to the combined sewer

Without the above information NRS Flood Risk Management cannot support the proposed development and the proposal will not have been adequately screened for flood risk.

The proposal is contrary to policy 22 on flood risk and water management.

The proposal does not accord with the relevant policies of NPF4.

The City Development Plan

CDP 1 & SG 1 – Placemaking

Lower densities will, generally, be appropriate in the Outer Urban Area, sites with base accessibility may be developed to a maximum of 50 DPH.

The application site is identified as having Base Accessibility in the Outer Urban Area and is approximately 0.077HA with 12 units proposed, a density of 155.8dph which is more than triple the maximum density deemed acceptable for a site with base accessibility in the Outer Urban Area.

Residential Layouts should:

a) take a design-led approach towards aspect and orientation to maximise daylight and sunlight, reduce energy use, and prevent overlooking and loss of privacy, particularly when providing balcony and/or garden spaces;

b) make appropriate provision for refuse and recycling storage areas.

Additional Standards for Flatted Developments - In terms of communal private garden space, flatted developments should:

a) provide usable communal private garden spaces as "backcourts". Design and layouts should ensure privacy, particularly for ground floor residents; and

b) where a site's configuration or particular characteristics limits the ability to provide private garden space, then developers will be expected to:

i. provide creative alternative solutions (e.g. shared roof garden, usable balconies); and

ii. bring forward mitigation measures to improve internal amenity (e.g. more generous room sizes).

iii. make outside provision for clothes drying, in areas screened from public view and not subject to excessive overshadowing.

In terms of privacy and aspect in relation to flatted development, the following guidance applies:

a) Ideally all flats should have dual aspect (where single aspect is proposed developers will require to show that the amenity enjoyed by the flats is similar, if not better than that of dual aspect flats in a similar location. This will include consideration of the flat's outlook);

b) privacy is also important to the rear of flats, where ambient noise levels are lower. Habitable rooms, therefore, should be set back from public or common footpaths or areas of open space, parking or waste storage (this could be secured, for example, by the formation of private garden space between habitable rooms and any such use); and

c) flatted development, built on existing street frontages, should maintain established building lines and window patterns. Where there is no established building line, development should be set back from the pavement to ensure privacy for ground floor habitable rooms.

The proposal has indicated on the ground floor plan that waste and recycling storage would be internal to the common close at ground floor, although the management of this space may be challenging. The application form states that "There will be a designated area to the rear of the flats that the refuse bins will be stored and taken out to the main road on collection day". No area to the rear is shown on the proposed plans and so it isn't clear how collection would be managed.

The proposed layout provides no amenity for resident's, with not backcourt or IPG 12 on site provision. There is nothing in the layout which protects the privacy of ground floor flats, with parking right up to the proposed flatted block to the rear and the proposed

	flatted block onto the pavement to the front with no indication of any defensive planting or the materials of the space to the front. *It is expected that all new development, depending on the nature and scale of the development, will:* *a) employ high quality facing and roofing materials that complement and, where appropriate, enhance the architectural character and townscape quality of the surrounding area;* *b) use robust and durable materials that fit their context and are capable of retaining their appearance over time and in Glasgow's climate; and* *c) acknowledge the local architectural and historic context through the use of appropriate materials.* The design of the proposal has not demonstrated a placemaking approach, with large blank gables visible from the street, layering of different materials of differing quality and durability to the elevations, and a total lack of resident's amenity. The proposal is contrary to CDP 1, SG 1 and the Placemaking Principle. <u>CDP 2 – Sustainable Spatial Strategy & North Glasgow SDF</u> The proposed dwelling would increase residential density in an unsustainable location, with the site proposed to be more than three times the maximum density of SG1 and in an area of base accessibility in the outer urban area. The proposal is contrary to Principle PR10 of the North Glasgow SDF as the development has not been evidenced to be designed to achieve the Gold level of sustainability, with no Statement on Energy provided. The proposal does not accord with the Sustainable Spatial Strategy or the North Glasgow SDF. The proposal is contrary to CDP 2 and the North Glasgow SDF. <u>CDP 5 & SG 5 – Resource Management</u> No Statement on Energy was provided to support the application. The proposal has not evidenced that the flatted block has been designed to any of the Gold Level options or the required minimum carbon emission abatement through the use of Low or Zero Carbon Generating Technology. Had pre-application advice been sought, this requirement would have been made clear to the applicant. As no Statement on Energy has been provided the proposal does not accord with SG 5 which requires a Statement on energy for all new build properties. The proposal is contrary to CDP 5 and SG 5. <u>CDP 7 & SG 7 – Natural Environment</u> *Development shall not result in a loss of biodiversity or habitat connectivity. Wherever possible, development shall enhance biodiversity and/or habitat connectivity. New developments shall aim to incorporate existing habitats, enhance and expand them and/or help create new habitats as well as enhancing the ecosystem services that the development site currently supports, or could support. This can involve protecting and incorporating existing habitat features such as hedges, trees, ponds, streams, wetlands and even derelict areas into plans.* NRS Biodiversity have advised that this proposal would require a PEA (Ecological Appraisal) and a biodiversity statement or plan showing how positive effects for biodiversity will be achieved. The proposal lacks an ecological appraisal and details of biodiversity enhancements and without these the proposal would not accord with CDP 7 and SG 7. In addition to the other policy failures, the lack of this information and the likely resultant loss of

biodiversity.

The proposal does not accord with CDP 7 and SG 7.

CDP 8 & SG 8 – Water Environment
The application site is identified on the SEPA flood risk maps with the southern portion of the site having a medium likelihood (each year this area has a 0.5% chance) of surface water flooding.

The application has been submitted without the following required supporting information:

- Flood Risk Assessment
- Drainage Impact Assessment
- Drainage Layout
- Site Levels
- SuDS
- Drainage Maintenance Schedule
- Flood Exceedance Routing
- Self-Certification
- Independent Checks
- Professional Indemnity Insurance evidence
- Scottish Water confirmation for a new connection to the combined sewer

Without the above information NRS Flood Risk Management cannot support the proposed development and the proposal will not have been adequately screened for flood risk.

The proposal is contrary to CDP 8 and SG 8.

CDP 11 & SG 11 – Sustainable Transport
The proposal would provide an off street parking space for each proposed dwelling and a further 3 off street spaces, presumably for visitor parking. This is less than the minimum standard of one space per dwelling and one visitor space per four dwellings, in this case 4 visitor parking spaces are required.

It is presumed that the required passive EV infrastructure would be provided although no reference to this is made in the proposal.

No cycle parking is shown, where policy requires one safe, sheltered and secure resident's cycle parking provision and one space per four dwellings for visitors. A total of 12 safe, sheltered and secure cycle parking spaces are required, with a further 4 visitor spaces.

The proposal has a lack of car and cycle parking provision which is contrary to the minimum standards required.

The proposal is contrary to CPD 11 and SG 11.

CDP 12 & IPG 12 – Delivering Development
While SG 6 and SG 12 were adopted on the 9th September 2024, this application was received and assessment commenced prior to the adoption of these supplementary guidance. This proposal is considered under IPG 12 as part of the transition arrangements for existing live planning applications validated prior to the adoption of SG 6 and SG 12.

Existing Open Space Facilities
In terms of amenity space, there are no local parks within the 400 metre threshold specified in the policy. As such, and using the methodology agreed for assessment of amenity space, the level of existing provision in this area is deficient.

In relation to children's play facilities, there is a play areas within the 300m threshold which are accessible from the proposal site. As such, the overall level of provision of this category within the area is not considered to be deficient.

There are four basic categories of open space that will be considered in relation to residential development proposals:

- Amenity/Open Space
- Allotments/Growing Spaces
- Children's Play
- Outdoor Sport – formal and informal

Amenity
The amenity provision for this area is considered to be deficient and as such the developer would be expected to provide some, if not all of the amenity obligation on-site. The on-site requirement for this proposal comprising 4 one bed and 8 two bed flats is 80 square metres.

The developer is proposing no communal amenity space on site. This would provide nothing towards the requirement and fails to address the amenity requirement on site. This is contrary to IPG 12 which requires full on site provision of the requirement where a deficiency has been identified.

The identified overdevelopment of the site by the proposal makes this lack of any provision towards the requirement in an area of identified deficit more unacceptable.

Allotments/Growing Spaces
In terms of provision for allotments/community gardens the requirement is for 8 square meters. The applicant has not indicated growing spaces within the layout. This requirement may be met by means of an equivalent financial contribution of **£800.**

Children's Play
The children's play provision for this location is not considered deficient and as such, the developer may make a financial contribution for the children's play requirement, of £5,600.

Outdoor Sport
Due to the location and nature of the application site, in relation to outdoor sport, it is not considered feasible to meet these requirements on site. This element of the IPG 12 requirement may be met by means of a financial contribution, which has been calculated at **£5,600** (£6,200 formal £2,480 informal).

Conclusion
While it is normal practice to take a financial contribution for allotments/growing spaces and for outdoor sport, the lack of on site amenity provision, as is required by IPG 12, is contrary to the planning guidance and the principle of CDP 12. The lack of amenity is a result of the identified overdevelopment of the site by the proposed development and should be refused planning permission.

The proposal is contrary to CDP 12 and IPG 12.

The proposal is contrary to the City Development Plan.

In respect of (a) the proposal is contrary to the Development Plan.

In respect of (b) other material considerations include the views of statutory and other consultees and the contents of letters of representations.

<u>Material Considerations – Coal Authority & NRS Geotechnical and Land Remediation</u>
The Coal Authority are a statutory consultee where development in an identified High Risk area is proposed, such as the application site. The applicant has not provided a Coal Mining Risk Assessment resulting in the Coal Authority objecting to the proposal.

	Had the assessment against the Development Plan been more favourable, then it would have been reasonable to request this information from the applicant; however as the proposal is so significantly contrary to the Development Plan, the lack of this information and the objection of the Coal Authority is a further reason for refusal. In line with GCC developers guidance, NRS Geotechnical and Land Remediation recommend that, should the proposal be considered favourably, a geo-environmental desk study and scope of proposed site investigations is required. However as the proposal is so significantly contrary to the Development Plan, the lack of this information is a further reason for refusal. Should the applicant seek a substantially revised proposal for the site, then they must provide a Coal Mining Risk Assessment and a geo-environmental desk study, including scope of site investigations, with a future application. 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.
Recommendation	Refuse.

Date:	16/10/2024	DM Officer	**Neil Moran**
Date	16/10/2024	DM Manager	MTH