



Planning Applications Committee

Report by
Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Item 1 (b)
28th January 2025

Contact: Claire Hunt Phone:

Application Type Full Planning Permission

Recommendation Refuse

Application	24/02023/FUL	Date Valid	30.08.2024
Site Address	795 Maryhill Road Glasgow G20 7TL		
Proposal	Erection of raised decking with use as beer garden to rear of public house (Retrospective).		
Applicant	Cafe Ibiza 795 Maryhill Road Glasgow G20 7TL	Agent	Blueprint Planning & Development Ltd. Janet Innes Beach House 1A Undercliff Road Wemyss Bay PA18 6AQ
Ward No(s)	11, Hillhead	Community Council	02_023, North Kelvin
Conservation Area		Listed	
Advert Type	Bad Neighbour Development	Published	6 September 2024
City Plan			

REPRESENTATIONS/CONSULTATIONS

In total 12 timeous objections and 7 letters of support were received. The grounds of support are summarised below:

- The creation of a social space to allow outside seating in nice weather;
- The proposal makes use of previously derelict land;
- Positive investment in the city and the creation of jobs for the area; and
- Allows for disabled/level access venue.

The grounds of objections are summarised below:

- The application is retrospective;
- Noise and other anti-social behaviour and disturbance;
- Loss of open space that is used by local residents;
- Fragmentation of green space and local habitats for wildlife;
- Increased traffic and obstruction to local Fire Service station;
- Alcohol use in proximity to the primary school;
- Visual impact of the decking area; and
- Proposed management of the external furniture is unacceptable.

External Consultations

West of Scotland Archaeological Service (WoSAS) – No objection.

SITE AND DESCRIPTION

Siting

The application site is a single-storey public house located on the western side of Maryhill Road. To the south is Maryhill Fire Station, to the north are playing fields associated with North Kelvinside Primary School, to the east across Maryhill Road is a modern residential flatted development with the Forth and Clyde Canal to the rear. This is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. To the west are two storey terraced housing on Kelvinside Avenue.

The land slopes down from Maryhill Road towards the area of green space to the south and southwest of the site.

The application site is located approximately 130m away from Maryhill Local Town Centre, to the north-west and is located within a High Accessibility by Public Transport Area. The site is designated as a 'Sports Area' on the Open Space Strategy Map and is located in a Coal Authority High Risk Area

The site is within Ward 11 – Hillhead.

Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought for the erection of a raised deck/terrace area to the rear (west) of the public house for use as an external seating area. This terrace structure has already been constructed and is in use

Due to the varying ground levels of the application site a timber support structure raises the deck area above ground level to allow for direct, level access out from the public house. At its highest point this is raised 2.26m from ground level (0.98m at lowest point). The deck area projects from the rear of the public house by 15.2m at its longest point (13.5m at its shortest) and has a width of 9.5m. Overall, this structure has a footprint of 133sqm.

This decking area is constructed of timber, with an anti-slip composite material used for the public floor area, and is screened at both base and terrace level using cedar shiplap cladding. The terrace has a 1.86m high screening around the perimeter.

A management plan has been provided stating that the external terrace area will be closed to the public at 20:45, and no cleaning of the area by staff will take place after 22:00.

A landscaping plan and biodiversity statement have been submitted, however, the proposed planting and other plans are outwith the red line boundary of the site, and therefore cannot be considered as part of this application as it is not possible to control or condition elements outwith the red line boundary of the site. The surrounding open space is in the ownership of Glasgow City Council.

Planning History

An application for this same site and proposal was refused (24/00695/FUL) in summer 2024. This application does not address the previous reasons for refusal, nor has it amended any site plans or designs, but has now included a management plan for the area.

A full planning history of this site is below:

- 24/00318/EN: Enforcement Enquiry: relating to unauthorised erection of terrace – Pending Consideration
- 24/00269/EN: Enforcement Enquiry: relating to unauthorised erection of terrace – Pending Consideration
- 24/00695/FUL: Use of external area as beer garden and erection of decking to rear of public house – Refused
- 13/03000/DC: Environmental improvements including resurfacing and new dropped kerb – Granted Subject to Conditions
- 13/01776/DC: Erection of extension to rear of public house and raised decking with balustrade (premises licence) – Granted Subject to Conditions

SPECIFIED MATTERS

Planning legislation now requires the planning register to include information on the processing of each planning application (a Report of Handling) and identifies a range of information that must be included. This obligation is aimed at informing interested parties of factors that might have had a bearing on the processing of the application. Some of the required information relates to consultations and representations that have been received and is provided elsewhere in this Committee report. The remainder of the information, and a response to each of the points to be addressed, is detailed below.

A. Summary of the main issues raised where the following were submitted or carried out

i. An environmental statement

Not applicable.

ii. An appropriate assessment under the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations 1994

Not applicable.

iii. A design statement or a design and access statement

Not applicable.

iv. Any report on the impact or potential impact of the proposed development (for example the retail impact, transport impact, noise impact or risk of flooding)

Not applicable.

B. Summary of the terms of any Section 75 planning agreement

Not applicable.

C. Details of directions by Scottish Ministers under Regulation 30, 31 or 32

These Regulations enable Scottish Ministers to give directions:

i. With regard to Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (Regulation 30)

Not applicable.

ii.

1. Requiring the Council to give information as to the manner in which an application has been dealt with (Regulation 31)

Not applicable.

2. Restricting the grant of planning permission

Not applicable.

iii.

1. Requiring the Council to consider imposing a condition specified by Scottish Ministers

Not applicable.

2. Requiring the Council not to grant planning permission without satisfying Scottish Ministers that the Council has considered to the condition and that it will either imposed or need not be imposed.

Not applicable.

POLICIES

National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) was adopted on 13th February 2023. NPF4 is the national spatial strategy for Scotland. It sets out spatial principles, regional priorities, national developments and national planning policy for Scotland. Due to the scale, nature and location of the proposed development, the following policies are considered relevant:

Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises

Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation

Policy 3: Biodiversity

Policy 14: Design, quality and place

Policy 20: Blue and green infrastructure

Policy 21: Play, recreation and sport

Policy 22: Flood risk and water management

The Glasgow City Development Plan (CDP) was adopted on 29 March 2017. The relevant Policies and Supplementary Guidance are listed below.

CDP1/SG1: The Placemaking Principle

CDP4/SG4: Network of Centres

CDP6/SG6: Green Belt and Green Network

ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSION

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.

A) DEVELOPMENT PLAN

In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises of NPF4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted 29th March 2017. In order to assess (a) the proposal must be considered against the following policies:

National Planning Framework 4

NPF4 Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises and NPF4 Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptations

Policy 1 is an overarching policy which must be considered for all development proposals, giving significant weight to the global climate and nature crises. **Policy 2** seeks to ensure that proposals are sited and designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible and allow adaptation to current and future risks of climate change.

Comment: No detail has been provided relating to how the decking area will address issues of drainage, contrary to policy. The impact on nature and the loss of open space will be addressed below within considerations relating to CDP6/SG6. Although this is a relatively small-scale proposal, overall, this is not considered to accord with these policy aims.

NPF4 Policy 3: Biodiversity intends to: *protect biodiversity, reverse biodiversity loss, deliver positive effects from development and strengthen nature networks.*

This states:

- 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.*

Comment: Although a biodiversity enhancement and landscaping plan were submitted with this application, the measures proposed are located outwith the application site's red line boundary on land outwith the applicant's ownership and therefore cannot be considered as part of this application. This application can only control and condition elements within the red line boundary. As no biodiversity enhancements have been included within the site itself, this is not in accordance with this policy.

NPF4 Policy 22: Flood risk and water management intends to: *strengthen resilience to flood risk by promoting avoidance as a first principle and reducing the vulnerability of existing and future development to flooding.*

This states:

- a) *Small scale extensions and alterations to existing buildings will only be supported where they will not significantly increase flood risk.*
- b) *Development proposals will:*
 - i. *not increase the risk of surface water flooding to others, or itself be at risk.*
 - ii. *manage all rain and surface water through sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS), which should form part of and integrate with proposed and existing bluegreen*

- infrastructure. All proposals should presume no surface water connection to the combined sewer;*
- iii. seek to minimise the area of impermeable surface.*

Comment: No details have been provided regarding the proposed drainage solution for the terrace area. Although the site is not indicated at being at risk of flooding, due to the sloping and bowl-like nature of the site, any additional water run off may increase the risk of pooling and potential flooding of the green space. No details have been provided as to the permeability of the surface decking, however, composite (ie plastic) decking is mostly impermeable. Overall, this proposal is considered to be contrary to this policy.

NPF4 Policy 20: Blue and Green Infrastructure and 21: Play, recreation and sport

NPF4 Policy 20 intends to: *protect and enhance blue and green infrastructure and their networks.*

This states:

- a) Development proposals that result in fragmentation or net loss of existing blue and green infrastructure will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not result in or exacerbate a deficit in blue or green infrastructure provision, and the overall integrity of the network will be maintained. The planning authority's Open Space Strategy should inform this.*

NPF4 Policy 21 intends to: *encourage, promote and facilitate spaces and opportunities for play, recreation and sport.*

This states:

- c) Development proposals which result in the loss of outdoor sports facilities will only be supported where the proposal:*
- i. is ancillary to the principal use of the site as an outdoor sports facility; or*
 - ii. involves only a minor part of the facility and would not affect its use; or*
 - iii. meets a requirement to replace the facility which would be lost, either by a new facility or by upgrading an existing facility to provide a better quality facility. The location will be convenient for users and the overall playing capacity of the area will be maintained; or*
 - iv. can demonstrate that there is a clear excess of provision to meet current and anticipated demand in the area, and that the site would be developed without detriment to the overall quality of provision.*

This should be informed by the local authority's Open Space Strategy and/or Play Sufficiency Assessment and in consultation with sportscotland where appropriate.

Comment: The proposal is not in accordance with these policies. This is discussed in more detail in relation to CDP6/SG6 considerations below.

NPF4 Policy 14: Design, quality and place

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.*

This states:

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.*

Further details on delivering the six qualities of successful places are set out in Annex D.

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 proposal is not in accordance with this policy. This is discussed further in relation to CDP1/SG1 considerations below.

City Development Plan

CDP1 and SG1 (Part 2) – The Placemaking Principle

CPD1 aims to improve the quality of development taking place in Glasgow by promoting a design-led approach. All development should contribute to placemaking standards by being well designed and appropriate to the area. Development should not introduce issues of residential or visual amenity, and should be designed so as to be in keeping with the local character of the area. This will contribute towards protecting and improving the quality of the environment, improving health and reducing health inequality, making the planning process as inclusive as possible and ensuring that new development attains the highest sustainability levels.

There is no specific policy guidance for the design of two storey external terraces. **SG1 (Part 2)** contains the following guidance relevant to this proposal:

Alterations to Shops and Other Commercial Premises

This guidance seeks to ensure that alterations to shops and other commercial buildings enhance the appearance of buildings and the street scene generally, and cause no dis-amenity to neighbours.

Proposals for alterations to shops and other commercial buildings should:

- a) respect the period, style and architectural character of the building;*
- b) not detract from the historic character of a listed building or property within a conservation area, see also SG9 - Historic Environment; and*
- c) not adversely affect residential amenity as a result of noise, vibration, etc*

Comment:

Due to its design, scale and height above ground level the external terrace is highly prominent and visible from Maryhill Road. The proposed design and materials are not in keeping with the existing public house, and the extensive use of the proposed solid timber cladding creates inactive and blank elevations to this terrace area.

The submitted Management Plan states that suitable lighting will be provided on the terrace, but no details of this have been included on the plans. Due to the open nature of the terrace and its siting, there may be the potential for light pollution. Without these details any impacts cannot be fully addressed, mitigated or controlled.

A two-storey external timber structure may present a fire safety risk. No building warrant for the structure has been submitted or approved and therefore the potential risk to public safety has not been assessed. As the structure is to the rear and is not directly overlooked by other properties it could encourage anti-social behaviour.

Overall, the design, materials, size and height of the proposed terrace is to the detriment of the character and wider visual amenity of the area, and is therefore contrary to CDP1.

CDP4/SG4: Network of Centres

This policy seeks to ensure outdoor food and drink uses do not introduce issues of residential amenity such as noise, for neighbouring residents.

SG4 provides the following detailed guidance:

Food, Drink and Entertainment Uses

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. The following guidance therefore deals primarily with issues of amenity arising from food, drink and entertainment development proposals.

Assessment Guideline 11: Outdoor Food and Drink Areas. This states:

Outwith the City Centre:

The provision of outdoor food and drink areas abutting existing premises will generally be supported where:

- i. They will not give rise to noise and activity levels likely to have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity;*
- ii. They are not likely to have a detrimental impact on the privacy of adjacent residential backcourts and amenity spaces;*
- iii. When located outwith Town Centres, they are not directly overlooked by residential property;*
- iv. They will not interfere with the safe passage of pedestrian or vehicular traffic;*
- v. Hours of operation, including setting up and removal of external furniture, are limited to between 08:00 hours and 22:00 hours (when located within Town Centres) or 08:00 hours and 21:00 hours (when located outwith Town Centres);*
- vi. High quality furniture and boundary treatment can be provided;*
- vii. External furniture can be stored within the associated premises when not in use.*

Comment:

The external terrace area is not directly adjacent to or immediately overlooked by residential properties, and therefore there are no privacy concerns.

Public representations received refer to issues of noise and anti-social behaviour disturbing nearby residents. Although there are no directly abutting residential properties, due to the elevated and open nature of the site, it would be possible for noise to carry from the terrace. Plans to address this are included within the Management Plan, however, noise matters rely on staff action to address, rather than noise mitigation measures being included within the design of the terrace itself. Relying on staff action to address noise complaints is not considered a suitable long-term solution, and therefore it is likely that nearby residents will be negatively impacted by future noise issues.

The site is located outwith a Town Centre, therefore the hours of operation (including setting and removal of furniture) are limited to between 08:00 and 21:00 hours. The submitted Management Plan states that customers will be moved indoors and the terrace closed by 20:45, however, states that staff will continue to clean and secure furniture up to 22:00, which is contrary to policy.

Policy requires external furniture to be stored internally within the premises when not in use. In this case, it is proposed to retain the outdoor furniture and umbrellas within the terrace, using proprietary fixings

to secure these. No details of these fixings have been supplied to allow for assessment. It is also proposed to store cushions internally during wet periods, but no details as to where these would be stored have been supplied.

As above, the boundary treatment for the terrace is not considered to be high quality.

Overall, this proposal does not comply with the noise, hours of operation and design requirements of SG4.

CDP6/SG6: Green Belt and Green Network

CDP6 states that the Council will support development that delivers an enhanced/extended Green Network as an integral, functioning part of the wider area. CDP6 states a presumption in favour of the retention of open spaces shown on the Council’s Open Space Map, and sets out the circumstances in which development on this space might be acceptable.

SG6 provides the following detailed guidance:

The Green Network – Protection and Enhancement

The Council expects that development proposals, masterplans and development frameworks will:

- *not have an adverse effect on the Green Network, including by fragmentation;*
- *deliver enhancements to the green network, including strengthening connections, taking account of the considerations in Table 3; and*
- *contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity including, where relevant, restoring degraded habitats and building and strengthening nature networks and connections between them, in line with NPF4 policy 3.*

Whilst new development should not have an adverse impact on the Green Network, there may be instances when other development plan considerations are accorded greater weight. In such circumstances, it is important that suitable mitigation is provided, in addition to measures to enhance biodiversity in line with NPF policy 3.

Open Space Protection

Policy CDP6 protects the categories of open space shown in Table 4, as identified on the Council’s Open Space Map.

Table 4: Protected Open Space

	Open Space Categories
“Publicly Usable” Categories	1 Public parks and gardens
	2 Communal private gardens (gardens in multiple private ownership, such as are found in the West End of the City)
	3 Amenity space
	4 Playspace for children and teenagers
	5 Green corridors
	6 Natural/Semi-natural greenspace
	7 Civic space
“Demand-led” Categories	8 Sports areas (inc multi-games courts)
	9 Allotments/community growing spaces
	10 Other functional greenspaces (including churchyards and cemeteries)

There may be some circumstances in which the Council will permit development on open space, including where for open spaces in a “demand-led” category:

- f) *the open space is for outdoor sports and its loss can be justified against criteria i to iii of part a) of NPF4 Policy 21 and the Council's Sports Pitch Strategy; or*
- g) *another type of demand led space is affected and its loss can be justified against points b) to d) of this paragraph; or*
- h) *there is a clear excess of provision to meet current and anticipated demand for that type of open space in the area and the proposal does not or could not meet an aspect of open space need (as set out in BOX 1); or*
- i) *it is to be developed in accordance with an approved masterplan that provides for open space to meet the requirements of the CDP, OSS, NPF4 and the Council's Food Growing and Sports Pitch Strategies.*

BOX 1: OPEN SPACE NEED

Does, or could, the open space have value in meeting an aspect of open space need, as set out in the Figure 1? In particular ...

- a) *in meeting the OSS Open Space Standards (aspects 1 & 2)? or*
- b) *in contributing positively to the landscape setting, character or appearance of the area (aspect 3)? or*
- c) *as an important, or potentially important, open space to the local community (aspect 4)? or*
- d) *as civic space, particularly in the city centre or town centres (aspect 5)? or*
- e) *as a site that meets, or could be brought into functional use to help meet demand for play/education (aspect 6), outdoor sports (aspect 7) or allotments/community growing (aspect 8)? or*
- f) *to enhance the connectivity and/or functionality of the Green Network (aspects 9 & 13)? or*
- g) *for nature conservation/biodiversity (aspect 12)? or*
- h) *in respect of other important green infrastructure functions, including flood management (aspects 11 & 15), addressing pollution (aspect 10) or helping the city adapt to or mitigate climate change (aspects 10 & 14)? or*
- i) *as a means of accessing other open spaces or other facilities for management and maintenance?*

Comment:

This site is designated as a 'Sports Area' on the Council's Open Space Map, and is therefore protected open space within the 'demand-led' category.

For development of a protected space within this category there must be no longer an identifiable demand in the City and the site must have little other open space value as detailed within Box 1. In this case, no supporting information in regard to the demand has been provided. However, it is noted that although this site is listed as a 'sports area', this is not a formal sports pitch or games area and is associated with the sports grounds of the neighbouring North Kelvinside Primary School. As above, even if there is no demand for the site to continue its 'sports area' use, it must then be assessed whether or not the site has any open space value as listed in Box 1.

As mentioned in the public comments and observed during a site visit the wider open space area is used by local dog walkers and offers a buffer space between the fire station and the school grounds. This therefore has value in terms of access and connections to open space and green infrastructure functions, and contributes to the setting and appearance of the area. The terrace area associated with the public house dominates the area of open space and encroaches upon this public open space both physically and in terms of noise associated with its use, reducing the attractiveness of this wider space for public use. This proposal does not meet any of the exception criteria which may allow for development on this site. This proposal is contrary to CDP6/SG6 and NPF4 Policy 20 due to the loss and fragmentation of open space.

B) MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

In respect of b), with regard to material considerations, other material considerations include the views of statutory and other consultees and the contents of letters of objection and letters of support. The consultee for this application did not raise any objection.

As noted above in total 12 letters of representation have been received in time in relation to the application, with a further two received out of time.

The letters of **support** can be summarised and addressed as follows:

- The creation of a social space to allow outside seating in nice weather.

Comment: This public house has an existing external seating area to the side of the property, and any new development must comply with policies to ensure residential amenity is protected.

- The proposal makes use of previously derelict land.

Comment: The land is designated as protected open space, it is not derelict or a development site.

- Positive investment in the city and the creation of jobs for the area.

Comment: This does not negate the requirement for planning permission or for the development to comply with planning policies.

- Allows for disabled/level access venue.

Comment: This public house has an existing ground level external seating area to the side of the property, and all new development must comply with planning policies.

The letters of **objection** can be summarised and addressed as follows:

- The application is retrospective.

Comment: This is correct, and the application has been subject to the retrospective fee surcharge.

- Noise and other anti-social behaviour and disturbance.

Comment: The potential for noise or other disturbance has been addressed above. The proposed noise mitigation strategy as proposed within the Management Plan is not considered to be acceptable, and due to the open nature of the site, it is possible for noise to carry to nearby residential properties.

- Loss of open space that is used by local residents.

Comment: The loss of open space has been addressed above. The site is designated within the Open Space Strategy as being protected open space, and this development does not meet any of the exception criteria which would allow for development.

- Fragmentation of green space and local habitats for wildlife.

Comment: This has been addressed above. The loss of protected open space and lack of biodiversity enhancement measures are listed as reasons for refusal.

- Increased traffic and obstruction to local Fire Service station.

Comment: The public house use is as existing and it is not considered that the external terrace would significantly increase traffic.

- Alcohol use in proximity to the primary school.

Comment: The public house is an established existing use, and this is not a material planning consideration.

- Visual impact of the decking area.

Comment: This has been addressed above. The scale, design and materials of the decking area are not in keeping with the existing public house. The terrace is visible from Maryhill Road and creates a blank expression to this frontage, to the detriment of the streetscene.

- Proposed management of the external furniture is unacceptable.

Comment: This has been addressed above. A revised management plan has been submitted, but although this states furniture will be secured no details of the fixings have been provided and no details of where any cushions will be stored internally during wet weather has been supplied.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposal has been assessed against and found not to comply with the policies of NPF4 and the City Development Plan. The concerns of the objectors and from the supporters have been addressed and there are no other material considerations.

The proposal is not considered to be of a high quality design; is likely to cause residential amenity issues; does not enhance the natural environment; and will result in the loss of protected open space. On this basis, it is recommended that the application for planning permission be refused for the following reasons.

DRAWINGS

The development has been refused in relation to the following drawing(s)

1. PL-LOC-01-B LOCATION PLAN; Received 15 August 2024
2. BW-LAY-11 PLANS, SECTION AND ELEVATIONS AS PROPOSED; Received 15 August 2024

As qualified by the above reason(s), or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

CONDITIONS AND REASONS

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.

01. The proposal is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) Policies 20: Blue and green infrastructure and 21: Play, recreation and sport and CDP6: Green Belt and Green Network of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) and its associated supplementary guidance insofar as the proposal would result in the fragmentation of and loss of protected open space which is considered to be of value.

02. The proposal is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) Policy 14: Design, quality and place and CDP1: The Placemaking Principle of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) and its associated supplementary guidance insofar as the design, scale and materials of the proposed terrace area would detract from the character and appearance of the local area to the detriment of visual amenity.

03. The proposal is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) Policy 3: Biodiversity insofar as no biodiversity measures or mitigations have been proposed.

04. The proposal is contrary to CDP4: Network of Centres of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) and its associated supplementary guidance insofar as potential noise issues have not been adequately addressed; the terrace will be operational beyond 21:00, contrary to policy; and the management or storage of external furniture have not been suitably addressed.

05. The proposal is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) Policies 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation and 22: Flood risk and water management in so far as no drainage strategy details have been submitted.

ADVISORY NOTES TO APPLICANT

ADVISORY NOTES TO COUNCIL

for Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

DC/CHU/06/12/2024

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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 license Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. The OS website can be found at **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.