

Comments for Planning Application 24/00725/FUL

Item 6

4th February 2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 24/00725/FUL

Address: 17 Sinclair Drive Glasgow G42 9PR

Proposal: Use of cafe (Class 3) as hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) and replacement of flue to rear

Case Officer: Ross Middleton

Customer Details

Name: Miss Bailey Shelton

Address: Flat 3/1, 4 Battlefield Gardens, Glasgow G42 9JW

Comment Details

Commenter Type:

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The flue in question was put in within the past year. It reflects the sun directly into my kitchen in the midafternoon. My neighbors have also mentioned a similar problem with the blinding, hot light coming off of the thing.

I'm fine with replacing it with a better system, so long as there is a plan in action to make the surface of the flue a matte, non-reflective color. In the current plan, there's no mention of such a thing.

Comments for Planning Application 24/00725/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 24/00725/FUL

Address: 17 Sinclair Drive Glasgow G42 9PR

Proposal: Use of cafe (Class 3) as hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) and replacement of flue to rear (retrospective)

Case Officer: Neil Moran

Customer Details

Name: Miss Bailey Shelton

Address: Flat 3/1, 4 Battlefield Gardens, Glasgow G42 9JW

Comment Details

Commenter Type:

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I live adjacent to the property and my kitchen window faces the flue they're wanting to install. I'm opposed to the current plan because the flue is galvanized steel, so it reflects the morning sun into my kitchen window (which I know because the current flue is also galvanized steel). I'd like for the flue on the rear of the building to be painted to match the surrounding pipes (which are painted a red clay color).

Comments for Planning Application 24/00725/FUL

Item 6

4th February 2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 24/00725/FUL

Address: 17 Sinclair Drive Glasgow G42 9PR

Proposal: Use of cafe (Class 3) as hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) and replacement of flue to rear

Case Officer: Neil Moran

Customer Details

Name: Ms Kirsten McCormick

Address: Flat 1/1, 11 Sinclair Drive, Glasgow G42 9PR

Comment Details

Commenter Type:

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Change of use - in the documents associated with this proposal the agent states that work on a change of use has not already started/completed. This is incorrect - the unit has been operating as a takeaway since January 2024.

According to SG 4 Network of Centres SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE section 4.3 (c):

(i) Public houses, Class 11 and Sui Generis uses must not be located within, or immediately adjacent to, existing residential buildings

The takeaway at 17 Sinclair Drive is located within an existing residential building. The change also affects 11 Sinclair Drive with litter in the area and improper use of the entrance such as people sheltering to eat food. This impacts the amenity of residents wishing to enter without first having to engage with strangers in their doorway. This is primarily a residential street and nearby takeaways are mainly located in single storey blocks and not in residential buildings.

Replacement of flue to rear - in documents associated with the proposal it is stated that the applicant was unaware the installation of a replacement flue would require planning consent. This was not a like for like replacement. The new flue is almost double the size of the original and more suited to cooking uses that exceed the permitted uses of the current class 3 café which are clearly stated as being limited to sealed units such as microwaves and ovens only.

Should the planning department reach a decision to not grant a change of use, I would strongly object to this huge appendage staying in place. Although the flue is attached to common walls that are owned by the residents at 21 Sinclair Drive, access to the flue is via the residential close at 11 Sinclair Drive. This flue was erected without our prior notice or permission and impacted a scheduled repair that the residents had taken months in advance to arrange and confirm.

Furthermore, I believe this application is contrary to many key health aims of the Glasgow City Development Plan.

Comments for Planning Application 24/00725/FUL

Item 6

4th February 2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 24/00725/FUL

Address: 17 Sinclair Drive Glasgow G42 9PR

Proposal: Use of cafe (Class 3) as hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) and replacement of flue to rear (retrospective).

Case Officer: Neil Moran

Customer Details

Name: Mr Stuart Porteous

Address: Flat 2/1, 11 Sinclair Drive, Glasgow G42 9PR

Comment Details

Commenter Type:

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The takeaway has been operating since January 2024- the application documents stating change of use not already started is incorrect. Current government guidance is that a takeaway " must not be located within, or immediately adjacent to existing residential buildings". The takeaway is located within a residential building affecting 21 and 11 Sinclair Drive. The opening of the takeaway has resulted in an increase in noise and traffic with delivery drivers collecting orders. The installation of a flue (at least twice the size of the old flue) to the rear of the building caused considerable disruption to planned repairs that residents at 11 Sinclair Drive had scheduled due to the owners of 17 Sinclair Drive entering and erecting scaffolding to install the flue without seeking prior consent. The applicants argument that they were unaware the flue replacement required planning permission is incorrect. It is not a "like for like" replacement with the flue at least twice the size of old flue. Being close to Hampden stadium which hosts concerts and football matches will no doubt impact the residents near to 17 Sinclair Drive with increased noise disruption and litter. A previous application for a takeaway at another premise was rejected (twice) due to impact on local residents. I object to this application and would hope consideration will be given to refusing based on impact to residents living nearby.