Item 4

10th November 2026

Report of Handling for Application 24/02772/FUL

ADDRESS:	Site Of Bishoploch Homes At Hamlet B Former Gartloch Hospital 2346 Gartloch Road Glasgow
PROPOSAL:	Erection of residential development (49 units), includes earthworks and retaining walls, landscaping, car parking, infrastructure and associated works.

DATE OF ADVERT:	13 December 2024
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	1 No. representation (objection) was received for this application. It is summarised below: • Neglect of existing historic buildings – new development is being prioritised instead of the restoration of the existing listed hospital buildings. • Lack of essential amenities – local area already under significant strain and adding more housing without ensuring adequate infrastructure will only exacerbate these issues. • Traffic and road safety issues – the surrounding roads already face high traffic volumes and safety concerns without the addition of increased traffic from the proposed development. **Case Officer Comment:** • The restoration of the existing listed hospital buildings is not the subject of this application and therefore is irrelevant to this assessment. • A Statement of Community Benefit is required for proposals that include 50 or more homes under Policy 16 of NPF4. These statements require information on providing or enhancing local infrastructure, facilities and services. The development falls just under the threshold of requiring this statement. • It is considered that the proposed road and path infrastructure does not provide suitable connectivity to the wider area, as discussed in more detail within the below sections of the report.
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) - Application falls below the thresholds for which SEPA provides site specific advice.
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	No formal pre-application discussion recorded on Uniform. The application did not benefit from pre-application discussions. It should be noted that the applicant was advised to withdraw the application and submit for pre-application advice, with the intent to re-submit a full planning application when the required information was ready and the key concerns about the proposal had been addressed. The applicant advised they did not want the application to be withdrawn and therefore, it has been determined based on the information submitted to the case officer within an agreed timeframe.

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	The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the national spatial strategy for Scotland up to 2045. Unlikely previous national planning documents, the NPF4 is part of the statutory Development Plan and Glasgow City Council as planning authority must assess all proposed development against its policies. The following policies are considered relevant to the application: • **Policy 1 -** Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises • **Policy 2 -** Climate Mitigation and Adaption • **Policy 3 –** Biodiversity • **Policy 4 –** Natural Places • **Policy 5 -** Soils • **Policy 6 –** Forestry, Woodland and Trees • **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 17 –** Rural Homes • **Policy 22 -** Flood Risk and Water Management
CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES	The City Development Plan consists of high-level policies with statutory supplementary guidance providing further information or detail in respect of the policies. The following are considered relevant to the application: • **CDP1/SG1 -** Placemaking Parts 1 & 2 • **CDP5/SG5 -** Resource Management • **CDP6/SG6 -** Green Belt & Green Network • **CDP7/SG7 -** Natural Environment • **CDP8/SG8 -** Water Environment • **CDP11/SG11 -** Sustainable Transport
OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	• The Scottish Government Building Standards Division – Domestic Technical Handbook (January 2025). • Glasgow City Council - Design Guide New Residential Areas (2013). • Garthamlock, Craigend and Gartloch Local Place Plan, 29 May 2025 • Additionally, Scottish Government recently published the Planning and Housing Emergency – Delivery Plan (November 2024). In <u>The challenge</u> section, the report states that (**bold** added by officer): *"Evidence shows that the housing emergency has emerged as a result of a number of factors.* ***In Scotland, planning permission has been granted for many more homes than are currently being built. The Competition and Markets Authority, in a report published earlier this year, identified that since 2014, the average number of homes given planning permission in Scotland was 29,000 annually, and that this significantly exceeded housing land supply targets, and indeed the number of house starts (average 19,892 per year) and completions (average 19,160 per year), over the period as a whole.*** *This evidence on supply raises questions about how sites that already have planning permission, which in total are estimated to represent more than 164,000 unbuilt homes across Scotland, can come forward to delivery.* *To further understand the specific challenge for planning****, we have reviewed in more detail the land supply in the Glasgow and Edinburgh city regions, based on data gathered by local authorities in their latest housing land audits and***

	compiled by the Improvement Service, as well as commercially available construction data on activity on sites. This suggests, as a broad estimate, that across these regions land for around 114,000 homes has been granted planning permission and not yet completed. Of these, 38,000 units had started work on site. In addition to this, there was also allocated land for a further 64,000 homes that had yet to receive planning permission." While there is a housing emergency, in Glasgow this has been identified as being linked to homelessness, not the availability of land for private development. In any case it is not considered appropriate to justify the development of poorly designed housing sites on the basis of the housing emergency. It is not considered that the approval of this application, a private housing development of 49 dwellinghouse units, which is considered contrary to the Development Plan, is an appropriate way to address the very real need for good quality, modern, affordable and sustainable homes in Glasgow. Development for developments sake regardless of the quality is the antithesis of the Development Plan and of the planning authority's responsibility of delivering the right development in the right place.
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	**Development Management**

Ref	Proposal	Decision Issued	Decision
97/01071/DC	Approval of Masterplan.	11.05.2001	GC
07/01755/DC	Erection of residential development.	22.06.2007	VW
07/02013/DC	Erection of residential development.	19.08.2014	VW
19/01665/FUL	Use of land for storage of topsoil for a temporary period.	12.08.2019	GC

Site Visits (Dates)	30.01.2025. Application determined with the use of Google Maps and the drawings submitted.
Siting	The application site appears to be a dominantly greenfield site located between Heatherbank Road and Gartloch Village, sited within a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and the Bishop Loch Site of Special Landscape Importance (SSLI). The site is part of the City Development Plan's Housing Land Supply and is surrounded by residential properties which are part of the wider Gartloch Hospital masterplan. The site is located within Ward 21 – North East.
Design and Materials	The proposal seeks consent for the erection of 49 residential dwellinghouses, of 8 different house types: Type 1 (6 No.) – 2-bed (4P), semi-detached, no garage Type 2 (6 No.) – 3-bed (5P), semi-detached, no garage Type 3 (10 No.) – 3-bed (6P), semi-detached, no garage Type 4 (10 No.) – 3-bed (6P), semi-detached, internal garage Type 5 (4 No.) – 3-bed (6P), detached, no garage Type 6 (7 No.) – 4-bed (7P), detached, internal garage Type 7 (3 No.) – 4-bed (8P), detached, internal garage Type 8 (3 No.) – 4-bed (8P), detached, detached 1.5 garage The proposed layout is designed around a single vehicular access point on the west side of the site, creating a loop around the site. Some of the properties are located directly off the road, whilst others are located on a shared driveway with typically three properties sharing the driveway.

	Materials: Walls – Dry dash render in white (Stonepack Dolomite White Chip on White Backing) and cream (Stonepack Ashton Cream Chip on Magnolia Backing) Walls (Plinth Course & Facing Stone) – Ibstock, Anstone Standard Black Old Weathered (Split) Roof – Marley Duo Modern smooth grey tiles Cills & Window Surrounds – Plean, Caledonia (F1) Rainwater Goods - Black Upvc Facias & Soffits - White Upvc Garage Doors (where applicable) – Garador, Winsor, Jet Black Front Doors - Composite Door in Agate Grey Glazed Side Light
Daylight	The proposed dwellinghouses have dual aspect. Due to the distance between them, the proposed development would not cause a loss of daylight to the adjacent existing properties.
Aspect	The proposed residential dwellinghouses face inwards to the site from both adjacent roads, Heatherbank Road and Gartloch Village.
Privacy	The proposal would not cause a loss of privacy to the adjacent existing properties.
Adjacent Levels	The site has varying levels. The site is approximately 3-4m lower than the surrounding Heatherbank Road and Gartloch Village, creating embankments down from the existing road level. To the north of the site, ground levels sit slightly lower, which has resulted in standing water. The site gently slopes down to the existing pond to the south. The access point from the existing T junction on Heatherbank Road also sits higher than the main site level by approximately 3-4m. Ground modelling work is proposed as part of the works.
Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)	The application site is located within a TPO and the Bishop Loch SSLI. It should be noted that some elements of the overall proposal are out with the red line boundary, including tree removal, sections of proposed landscaping, and both onward link pathways. The red line boundary also does not include large sections of perimeter grassland which border the adopted road. Trees The proposed trees for removal include a tree group to the north of the site (to accommodate proposed link path) and seven trees to the southeast of the site (to accommodate site levelling and grading works). However, all proposed tree removal is out with the red line boundary for the application. A tree survey has been supplied with the application, which confirms that the species proposed to be removed are generally of relatively poor quality. 87 trees are proposed to be planted (mix of mostly heavy standard trees and some multi stem trees). It should be noted however that not all of the proposed tree planting is located within the red line boundary. Proposed landscaping Large sections of the proposed landscaping and the existing embankments between the proposed housing and the adjacent roads are also not located within the red line boundary. The main section of landscaping proposed as part of the development is in the form of a link path within the site surrounded by meadow and some trees. In addition to this, grass service strips, a play area and small amenity space immediately adjacent to the play space are also proposed.
Access and Parking	Driveway car parking is provided to each of the units, with some driveways located in front of the properties and some located to the side of the properties. Half of the house types have garages too. The applicant has stated that bicycle parking will be accommodated within the rear gardens or garages where provided.
Site Constraints	• Within the Protected Species Water Vole trigger map area

	• SSLI • TPO
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. In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises of NPF4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted 29th March 2017. <u>National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4)</u> Policy 1&2 are overarching policies that are applicable to all developments generally. **Policy 1 – Tackling the climate and nature crisis** *The policy intent is to encourage, promote and facilitate development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crisis.* **Policy 2 – Climate mitigation and adaptation** *To encourage, promote and facilitate development that minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change.* **Case Officer Comment:** The proposal seeks to develop a vacant site into a residential development with a car dominated layout, which as outlined below under the CDP assessment, does not provide sufficient biodiversity enhancements to compensate for the loss of biodiversity proposed. The proposal has not given due weight to the global climate and nature crises. The application proposes air source heat pumps and heat exchange/recovery systems as the renewable technologies for the proposed houses. However, the statement of energy also notes that gas boilers will be the main heating source for the proposed houses. As per the Technical Handbook (January 2025), gas boilers are no longer accepted in new build properties in order to improve the environmental sustainability of new builds. The proposed development therefore does not reflect development that actively seeks to minimise emissions or adapt to the impacts of climate change. There are also concerns with the flood risk information submitted, as outlined below under the CDP assessment (CDP8/SG8). As part of this, the proposal does not include any above or below ground Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) or any form of attenuation to limit the effects of climate change on the site or discharge to the SuDS Pond/Basin. It has therefore not been demonstrated that the proposal has taken due accord of the requirement for climate mitigation and adaption. Overall, the proposal does not accord with Policy 1 or Policy 2 of NPF4. **Policy 3 - Biodiversity** *This policy seeks to protect biodiversity, reverse biodiversity loss, deliver positive effects from development and strengthen nature networks.* *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. *d) Any potential adverse impacts, including cumulative impacts, of development proposals on biodiversity, nature networks and the natural environment will be minimised through careful planning and design.* **Policy 4 – Natural Places** *This policy seeks to protect, restore and enhance natural assets making best use of nature-based solutions.* *a) Development proposals which by virtue of type, location or scale will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment, will not be supported.* *f) Development proposals that are likely to have an adverse effect on species protected by legislation will only be supported where the proposal meets the relevant statutory tests. If there is reasonable evidence to suggest that a protected species is present on a site or may be affected by a proposed development, steps must be taken to establish its presence. The level of protection required by legislation must be factored into the planning and design of development, and potential impacts must be fully considered prior to the determination of any application* **Case Officer Comment:** A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been submitted with the application. As discussed in more detail under the CDP7/SG7 assessment, it is not clear from the information submitted how the development has been designed to avoid or mitigate the impact on biodiversity. There are concerns with the proposals, including the level of biodiversity loss across the site. A number of the mandatory requirements and recommendations from the PEA have also not been followed or proposed as part of the application. On this basis, the proposed development does not accord with Policy 3 or Policy 4 of NPF4. **Policy 5 – Soils** *c) Development proposals on peatland, carbon rich soils and priority peatland habitat will only be supported for:* *i. Essential infrastructure and there is a specific locational need and no other suitable site;* *ii. The generation of energy from renewable sources that optimises the contribution of the area to greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets;* *iii. Small-scale development directly linked to a rural business, farm or croft;* *iv. Supporting a fragile community in a rural or island area; or* *v. Restoration of peatland habitats.* *d) Where development on peatland, carbon-rich soils or priority peatland habitat is proposed, a detailed site specific assessment will be required to identify:* *i. the baseline depth, habitat condition, quality and stability of carbon rich soils;* *ii. the likely effects of the development on peatland, including on soil disturbance; and* *iii. the likely net effects of the development on climate emissions and loss of carbon.* **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.* **Case Officer Comment:**

	The proposal makes use of a vacant site for residential use. The PEA states that the site '*has considerable ecological value despite its appearance*'. As discussed within this report, it is not clear how the development has been designed to avoid or mitigate the impact on biodiversity, and the proposals appear to represent an overall loss of biodiversity. It is therefore considered that the proposals as they stand, do not represent a sustainable reuse of the land. A Report on Site Investigations was supplied to NRS Geotechnical and Land Remediation in 2023, before the planning application was submitted, and a number of outstanding issues were raised with the applicant. This file was not submitted for assessment as part of the planning application and it is advised in the design statement that an updated site investigation report will be provided, however this was not received. The applicant submitted a Proposed Scope of Supplementary Site Investigation (dated June 2025). Following a review by NRS Geotechnical and Land Remediation, there remain a number of points to address within the submission and updated reporting is required to include the incorporation of findings into one comprehensive site investigation report. It should also be noted that this site is partially underlain by peat soils. The applicant was advised that they need to demonstrate the extent of this within the site investigations and provide a justification and policy response to Policy 5 of NPF4. The information submitted following this request has been minimal. The applicant advised '*The area of peat is at a depth of 6m and approx. 600mm deep. It runs through the central section of the site, where the landscape corridor has been located. Further information will be provided in an updated Site Investigation*'. As an updated site investigation report has not been supplied, the required information under point d) of Policy 5 above has not been addressed. As there are outstanding points with regard to soils and other geotechnical information to address, the proposed development does not comply with Policy 5 or Policy 9 of NPF4. **Policy 6 – Forestry, woodland and trees** *b) Development proposals will not be supported where they will result in:* *i. Any loss of ancient woodlands, ancient and veteran trees, or adverse impact on their ecological condition.* **Case Officer Comment:** As discussed below in CDP7/SG7 assessment, the PEA submitted as part of the application states (**bold** added by case officer): '*Due to the proximity (c.10 metres) of the Lochwood plantation ancient woodland inventory site it is* ***strongly recommended*** *that works are not allowed to occur up to the limit of the red line boundary. A minimum buffer of 5 metres should function as a blanket root protection measure*'. The proposed development extends to the boundary limits of the red line boundary and therefore could have an impact on the root protection area of the adjacent ancient woodland inventory site. As stated in the PEA, the impact of this is that the construction and operational phase of the project could result in likely significant effects to features. On this basis, the proposed development does not comply with Policy 6 of NPF4. **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 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.* **Case Officer Comment:** Proposed materials for the development include render, facing stone, concrete and uPVC. The material palette of the houses themselves lacks natural or recycled materials, however given that the proposed materials tie in suitably with the surrounding material precedent set within the existing wider Gartloch development, they are considered to be acceptable with respect to zero waste considerations. The proposal, for the erection of a residential development, will generate waste when occupied. The drawings show designated space for storing 4 refuse and recycling bins for each dwelling. However, there is a need to demonstrate 5 bins per dwelling, and in addition the swept path analysis has not been conducted with the current standard refuse truck size (11.7m). The proposal as it stands does not fully comply with Policy 12 of NPF4. **Policy 13 – Sustainable transport** *b) Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the transport requirements generated have been considered in line with the sustainable travel and investment hierarchies and where appropriate they:* *i. Provide direct, easy, segregated and safe links to local facilities via walking, wheeling and cycling networks before occupation;* *ii. Will be accessible by public transport, ideally supporting the use of existing services;* *iii. Integrate transport modes;* *iv. Provide low or zero-emission vehicle and cycle charging points in safe and convenient locations, in alignment with building standards;* *v. Supply safe, secure and convenient cycle parking to meet the needs of users and which is more conveniently located than car parking;* *vi. Are designed to incorporate safety measures including safe crossings for walking and wheeling and reducing the number and speed of vehicles;* *vii. Have taken into account, at the earliest stage of design, the transport needs of diverse groups including users with protected characteristics to ensure the safety, ease and needs of all users; and* *viii. Adequately mitigate any impact on local public access routes.* **Case Officer Comment:** As discussed in more detail below in CDP1 / SG1 and CDP11 / SG11, there are a number of concerns with the design of the proposed development including the permeability, accessibility, and safety of the proposed scheme. The proposed development is designed around the private car, with the road dominating the site. The proposed development does not cater for the needs, ease and safety of all users and does not encourage sustainable transport use. Overall, the proposed development does not comply with Policy 13 of NPF4.

	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.* **Policy 15 – Local Living and 20-minute neighbourhoods** *The aim of this policy is to encourage, promote and facilitate the application of the Place Principle and create connected and compact neighbourhoods where people can meet the majority of their daily needs within a reasonable distance of their home, preferably by walking, wheeling or cycling or using sustainable transport options.* **Policy 16 – Quality homes** *This policy aims to encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable homes, in the right locations, providing choice across tenures that meet the diverse housing needs of people and communities across Scotland.* **Policy 17 – Rural homes** *This policy aims to encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable rural homes in the right locations.* **Case Officer Comment:** The proposed development seeks to erect 49 residential dwellinghouses in a rural location adjacent to other residential developments associated with the Gartloch Masterplan area. Residential land use in this area is therefore well-established. However, there are a number of concerns with the proposed housing development and whilst the existing residential schemes may have similar design qualities to the proposed, it is not considered appropriate to justify the proposed development based on the merits of consents that were granted at another time, under a different city development plan(s) and under a different national planning framework(s). The red line boundary for the application does not encompass all of the proposed development, including tree removal, landscaping, water management and pathways. As discussed in more detail throughout this report, the submitted information does not include a SWOT analysis or strategy/optioneering to show why this particular layout has been proposed. It is not clear how the site constraints have been actively considered. The applicant provided some written justification for the proposed design, however this did not alleviate or address the concerns expressed by the planning authority.

	The proposal fails to protect and mitigate the impact of the proposal on biodiversity and does not sufficiently demonstrate how flood risk and drainage will be managed. Peat is also present on site however the site investigation information has not been provided to demonstrate the full extent of the peat and justify in detail the design of the proposal against this constraint. The proposal is poorly designed, prioritising the private car over pedestrians and other more sustainable transport methods. The proposal is an inward facing development with limited connection to the wider Gartloch village, and with a lack of functional communal landscaping for residents. Overall, the proposal is not consistent with the six qualities of successful place and is not considered to provide high-quality housing on rural land. On this basis, the proposed development does not comply with Policy 14, 15, 16 and 17 of NPF4. **Policy 22 - Flood risk and water management** *c) 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 blue-green infrastructure. All proposals should presume no surface water connection to the combined sewer;* *iii. seek to minimise the area of impermeable surface.* *d) Development proposals will be supported if they can be connected to the public water mains. If connection is not feasible, the applicant will need to demonstrate that water for drinking water purposes will be sourced from a sustainable water source that is resilient to periods of water scarcity.* **Case Officer Comment:** As outlined below under the CDP assessment (CDP8/SG8), there are a number of concerns and missing information with regard to the flood risk and water management information submitted. On this basis, the proposal does not meet the requirements of Policy 22 of NPF4. <u>City Development Plan (CDP)</u> **CDP 1 & SG 1 – Placemaking** This Policy aims to improve the quality of development taking place in Glasgow by promoting a design-led approach. 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. **Case Officer Comment:** This application was submitted without pre-application discussions. Given the complexity and nature of the proposals, the application would have strongly benefitted from pre-application discussions. The applicant was advised to withdraw the application in light of the initial feedback provided by the planning authority, with the intention that an application could be submitted for pre-application and in time, a full planning application once concerns had been addressed. However, the applicant advised they did not want the application to be withdrawn and therefore, it has been determined based on the information submitted to the case officer within an agreed timeframe. The red line boundary for the application does not extend around the full proposed development. Tree removal, large sections of landscaping, connecting pathways, and the existing SuDS pond mentioned in association with the water management of the proposal are all located out with the red line boundary for the proposal. The submitted information does not include a SWOT analysis or strategy/optioneering to show why this particular layout has been proposed. It is not clear how the site constraints have been actively considered within the layout and design. Following the expression of concerns from the planning authority regarding the proposals, the

	applicant provided some written justification for the proposed design, however this did not alleviate or address the concerns. All residential developments must take into account the Placemaking Principles set out in SG1 - Placemaking, Part 1, as well as the guidance and standards set out in the Residential Design Guide (RDG). **SG 1** states: **2.41** *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* *c) wherever possible, retain all significant trees on sites, unless removal is necessary, e.g. for good arboricultural reasons.* *d) have roads designed to the standards set out in RDG* *e) incorporate a SUDS strategy to take account of the space and design requirements of the required SUDS scheme* *f) ensure that all new homes do not have upper rooms, balconies etc which directly overlook adjacent private gardens/backcourts.* *g) ensure sufficient permeability through the provision of walking/cycling routes and open spaces connected to the wider paths network and other community facilities. Off road paths should be located centrally and be overlooked in order to promote public safety.* **Case Officer Comment:** The proposed dwellinghouses have dual aspect and windows are considered to be sufficiently sized. Due to the distance between them, the proposed development would not cause a loss of daylight to the adjacent existing properties. There are no concerns with regard to privacy – habitable rooms and rear gardens will experience minimal overlooking. However, gable activation is considered limited, with some houses featuring entirely blank gables. This means there is little activation, particularly in key corner locations, around the site which poses concerns with regard to safety and supervision. The development generally faces inward, informally enclosing it from the existing residential developments and wider area. There is also a lack of safe and supervised routes into/out of the site as the connecting pathways are not fully overlooked. Rear gardens and three houses face on to the main section of the central landscape corridor, however this corridor is entirely fenced on one side and met with a shared driveway on the other side. The corner section of the landscape corridor/associated connecting pathway is entirely fenced off with limited overlooking from the upper floors of a couple of properties. The other proposed connected pathway to the south of the site is accessed via steps downwards with trees and landscaping on either side. This pathway also has very limited overlooking. Both connection pathways are located outside the red line boundary. There is no connection pathway on the east side of the site on to Gartloch Village, which is where the 310 bus runs. The applicant advised that a connection pathway could be facilitated here, however no revised drawings were supplied. This is considered a missed opportunity to encourage public transport use and facilitate connection between other existing housing estates. The overall layout has been designed around the private car, rather than creating safe and accessible pathways for pedestrians and active travel. This is demonstrated through the broken-up pedestrian pathways throughout the site. A grassed strip in between sections of hardstanding does not result in a safe, continuous pathway for users of the site, particularly wheelchair users or those with prams. The proposed landscape corridor makes up the main section of communal open space on the site and is supplemented by a small section of grassed landscaping located beside the proposed play area. The spaces are not considered to be high quality landscaping/open space, and they do not provide functional use for residents. The sections of open space are not well integrated into the site, with the landscape corridor

	acting solely as a pathway in/out of the site, and the other section appearing residualised. The play area is also located to one side of the proposed layout, where this should be ideally centrally located for all properties. The play space is located adjacent to several private rear gardens, which may cause issues with noise and disruption due to the proximity between the private and public spaces. Landscape buffers are however proposed to mitigate amenity impact on neighbouring properties. The play space features a range of play equipment and uses natural materials such as wood. Provision for refuse and recycling facilities are provided within each plot. The site is located within a TPO. Tree removal is proposed out with the red line boundary. A tree survey has been supplied with the application, which confirms that the species proposed to be removed are generally of relatively poor quality. It should be noted that there are existing areas of standing water to the north/northeast of the site. The rear gardens of a number of dwellings are located in this area. Within the submitted Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment it states (**bold** added by case officer): '*There will still be some runoff from the road embankment, and **potentially back gardens, which could continue to pond in this area post-development**. It is recommended that land drainage measures are installed to manage the risk of flows ponding between the site and embankment*'. The constraint of the existing water on the site has therefore not been sufficiently considered and addressed within the proposed site layout. This could result in boggy rear gardens for the houses proposed in this location, affecting the amenity and potentially rendering them unusable. The applicant has confirmed that any in-curtilage drainage will be maintained by the property owner but has failed to demonstrate suitable land drainage measures. **5.3** *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.* **5.4** *It is expected that when specifying the materiality of a new development, consideration will be paid to:* *a) microclimatic issues, with particular thought as to how the visual appearance of a development will be affected over time;* *b) mitigating the negative visual impact that air pollution can have on facing materials, see also SG1 - Placemaking, Part 2, Detailed Guidance - Air Quality;* *c) the lifespan and maintenance of the chosen materials (evidence of the maintenance requirements of the materials specified will require discussion with the Council and will be a consideration by the Council in assessing development proposals);* *d) ensuring that a development acknowledges and responds to the materials of the surrounding townscape and the hierarchies of streets and spaces. Proposals should harmonise with the prevailing materiality of the surrounding built environment. The Council will be supportive of schemes which specify locally sourced materials; and* *e) ensuring that the specified materials do not detract from the visual amenity of existing buildings and the surrounding environment.* **Case Officer Comment:**

	Proposed materials for the development include render, facing stone, concrete and uPVC. The material palette lacks natural or recycled materials, other than within the proposed play area, however given that the proposed materials tie in suitably with the surrounding material precedent set within the existing wider Gartloch development, they are considered to be acceptable. Overall, as mentioned above, the existing residential schemes in the wider Gartloch Village may have similar design features to the proposed development, however it is not considered appropriate to justify the proposed development based on the merits of consents that were granted at another time, under a different city development plan(s) and under a different national planning framework(s). On this basis, the proposal does not accord with all of the relevant criteria of policies CDP 1 and SG 1. **CDP 5 & SG 5 – Resource Management** **Case Officer Comment:** The statement of energy form proposes air source heat pumps and heat exchange/recovery systems as the renewable technologies for the houses. However, the statement of energy also notes that gas boilers will be the main heating source for the proposed houses, despite the design statement stating that the air source heat pumps will be the primary heating and hot water source. Gas boilers are no longer accepted in new build properties as per the Domestic Technical Handbook (January 2025). The form also appears to contain conflicting information as under gas consumption, it states zero kWh per year. On the basis of the conflicting information submitted on energy, the proposal does not accord with CDP 5 and SG 5. **CDP6 & SG6 – Green Belt and Green Network** CDP6 states that the contributions which may be sought from new development will reflect any requirements based on application of quality, quantity and accessibility standards, and identified local circumstances, as set out in the Open Space Strategy (OSS). **Case Officer Comment:** The proposal is for 49 dwellings (with a total of 154 bedrooms) in the outer urban area. Auchinlea Park (reference number 7) is the nearest community space to the site, but it does not sit within 400 metres of the site. The community space does not meet the Quality Standard, however Ward 21 – North East, where the site is located, overall does meet the Quality Standard. On this basis, the contribution towards the Accessibility and Quality Standard for this proposal has been calculated at **£144,958.57**. The waiting list (at the time of determination) for allotments in Ward 21 – North East is 11. On this basis, the contribution towards Allotments has been calculated at **£3,185.90** and the contribution towards Outdoor Sport has been calculated at **£17,681.76**. Overall, the total contribution under SG 6 has been calculated at **£165,826.23**. Whilst the requirement of CDP6/SG6 may be met by means of a financial contribution, as the proposal does not accord with policies within the CDP, including the principle of CDP 6 and SG 6, the application is recommended to be refused planning permission. **CDP 7 & SG 7 – Natural Environment** **Case Officer Comment:**

	The PEA states (**bold** added by case officer): *'The Site in its entirety, including the ephemeral, neutral grassland, marshy grassland, marginal vegetation and tall ruderal habitats, can be collectively described as an open mosaic habitat on previously developed land. This is a priority habitat on the U.K Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP), Scottish Biodiversity List (SBL) and Glasgow Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP). Although this habitat has no specific legal protections it is becoming more widely considered as valuable pseudo-natural habitat and* ***will mean that the Site has considerable ecological value despite its appearance. The loss or transformation of part of this habitat may create an ecological debt when considering the National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) policy 3, where the local planning authority will be looking to see biodiversity enhancement of the Site****'.* The PEA also notes that **all** habitats on site are assumed to be lost as part of the development and that due to the limited site area, it would be impossible to replace the open mosaic habitat like-for-like. The PEA provides a table showing the habitat areas removed and the habitat areas replaced. Whilst no calculations have been provided in terms of how the loss and gain equates in value and quality of each habitat, from the table it appears that most of the significant loss is habitat areas which fall under UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP), Scottish Biodiversity List (SBL) and Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) priority habitats. The significant gains noted in the table mostly appear to be from habitats with no noted habitat priority. As the proposed tree removal is also out with the red line boundary, this will not have been taken into account within the table. The proposed landscaping on site is limited and the open spaces are not considered to significantly enhance biodiversity value. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development represents a significant loss to valuable biodiversity habitat with little consideration of how the proposed development's layout and design could facilitate meaningful biodiversity enhancement. The PEA also states (**bold** added by case officer): '*Due to the proximity (c.10 metres) of the Lochwood plantation ancient woodland inventory site it is* ***strongly recommended*** *that works are not allowed to occur up to the limit of the red line boundary. A minimum buffer of 5 metres should function as a blanket root protection measure*'. The proposed development extends to the boundary limits of the red line boundary and therefore could have an impact on the root protection area of the adjacent ancient woodland inventory site. As stated in the PEA, the impact of this is that the construction and operational phase of the project could result in likely significant effects to features. As the proposed layout does not comply with the recommendations of the PEA and could impact trees with significance, it is not considered to be supportable. In addition to this, a Great Crested Newt survey is noted as mandatory to be submitted before determination by the planning authority. It is highly recommended that an Initial Invertebrate Site Assessment Survey also be commissioned. Neither of these surveys have been submitted prior to determination. On the basis of the above, the proposal does not comply with CDP7/SG7. **CDP 8 & SG 8 – Water Environment** **Case Officer Comment:** The applicant has provided a Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment (FRDIA), as well as a drainage layout and site levels. The main concern from NRS Flood Risk Management is that the red line boundary does not cover all of the proposals. This includes the existing perimeter public footway to the bottom of the raised platform and the surroundings including drainage ditches, existing/proposed circulation pathways and attenuation ponds. This means that flood risk and water management related development and modifications

	associated with the proposed development could potentially occur without the control of planning and environmental regulations. The proposal seeks to utilise the existing SuDS pond located out with the red line boundary to discharge the surface water flows from the development. The submitted FRDIA states that this pond was constructed to accommodate previous phases as part of the wider Gartloch development as well as the future (now proposed) Hamlet B phase. However, due to the time period elapsed since this was likely constructed, it is unclear how the pond has been sized, how climate change figures affect this, and how the development outflow impacts this. The information submitted does not provide full clarity on this. The proposal also does not include any above or below ground Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) or any form of attenuation within the red line boundary to limit the effects of climate change or discharge to the existing SuDS Pond/Basin. The requests for information have not been provided in full and the concerns raised by NRS Flood Risk Management have also not been addressed in full. The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment has not been self-certified or independently checked, and professional indemnity insurance has not been provided. Overall, the submission has not met the requirements of CDP8/SG8. **CDP 11 & SG 11 – Sustainable Transport** **Case Officer Comment:** The design and layout of the proposed scheme is not considered to be permeable or accessible for pedestrians. The red line boundary does not fully encompass the proposed link pathways on both the north and south elevations, and sections of the proposed link pathways have very limited overlooking by housing. There is no pedestrian pathway on the east elevation, where the existing bus stop for number 310 is located, preventing ease of access to the limited public transport options on offer. There are broken hardstanding footways throughout the proposed development, where safe and continuous footpaths are required to be provided on either side of the carriageway. A grass service strip is not considered to be appropriate footway provision for pedestrians, particularly for wheelchair or pram users. The proposed development is designed around the private car, with the road dominating the site. The proposed development does not cater for the needs, ease and safety of all users. Driveway car parking is provided to each of the units, with some driveways located in front of the properties and some located to the side of the properties. Half of the house types have garages too. Driveways should meet the carriageway at 90 degrees, and all visitor car parking should be parallel to the carriageway, however these design requirements have not been consistently reflected in the design, creating the potential for safety issues. NRS Transport Planning have also advised that the layout would require to be amended to remove all the turning head / spurs that do not form part of the submitted swept path layout. These should instead be private accesses, and the limit of adoption reduced accordingly. For this type of development, 100% passive Electric Vehicle (EV) parking provision is required. It is not clear from the drawings if passive EV parking provision is proposed, however, this is something that could be conditioned. The applicant has stated that bicycle parking will be accommodated within the rear gardens or garages where provided. The proposed development is located in an area of below base accessibility. The site is located adjacent to housing schemes that have been developed as part of the Gartloch masterplan. The principal of housing in this general location is therefore

	established, despite its existing lack of public transport. Bus number 310, with stops on adjacent road Gartloch Village, is the only public transport connection in close proximity to the site. Gartcosh, the nearest train station, is located approx.1.6 miles from the proposed development. On the basis of the above, the proposal does not comply with CDP11/SG11. **Case Officer Conclusion:** In respect of (a) the proposed development is in not accordance with the statutory Development Plan. It is contrary to NPF4 Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 22, and CDP Policies CDP1/SG1 (Part 2), CDP5/SG5, CDP7/SG7, CDP8/SG8 and CDP11/SG11. Regarding part (b), other material considerations include the views of statutory and other consultees and the contents of letters of representations. The representations have been addressed within this report. Taking the contents of this report into account, it is recommended that this application for planning permission be refused.
Recommendation	**Refuse**

Date:	**15.08.2025**	DM Officer	**Lisa Davison**
Date	01/09/2025	DM Manager	Ian Briggs

Reasons for Refusal

01. The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.

02. The proposal is contrary to Policy 1 'Tackling the climate and nature crises' and Policy 2 'Climate mitigation and adaption' of NPF4 and CDP 5 & SG 5: Resource Management of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that sustainability and addressing the climate crisis is not prioritised within the proposals. The proposals feature overall biodiversity loss within the site as well as discrepancies in the energy systems proposed within the submitted information and a lack of information and clarity on flood risk, drainage and water management.

03. The proposal is contrary to Policy 1 'Tackling the climate and nature crises', Policy 3 'Biodiversity', Policy 4 'Natural places', Policy 6 'Forestry, woodland and trees' and Policy 14 'Design, quality and place' of NPF4 and CDP 7 & SG 7: Natural Environment of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that it is not clear from the information submitted how the development has been designed to avoid or mitigate the impact on biodiversity. There is a significant level of biodiversity loss across the site with little consideration on meaningful biodiversity enhancement, a number of the mandatory requirements and recommendations from the PEA have not been followed or proposed as part of the application, and as part of this, the layout of the proposal may have an impact on the root protection area of the adjacent ancient woodland inventory site.

04. The proposal is contrary to Policy 5 'Soils' and Policy 9 'Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings' of NPF4 in that the proposal has not provided updated site investigation information to demonstrate the extent of peat on site and the justification for the proposed layout in relation to this, and to demonstrate that the land is or can be made safe and suitable for development.

05. The proposal is contrary to Policy 13 'Sustainable transport' of NPF4 and CDP 11 & SG 11: Sustainable Transport of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that the proposal is designed around the private car and fails to provide safe, accessible and permeable routes for ease of movement in and around the site for active travel, or encourage public transport use.

06. The proposal is contrary to Policy 14 'Design, quality and place', Policy 15 'Local Living and 20-minute neighbourhoods', Policy 16 'Quality homes' and Policy 17 'Rural homes' of NPF4 and CDP 1 & SG 1: Placemaking of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that the red line boundary does not fully encompass all of the proposed development. The constraints of the site have not been properly considered and factored into the design, resulting in residential development that lacks permeability and connection to the wider

area, a lack of functional communal landscaping for residents, significant loss of biodiversity on site, a lack of safe and supervised routes into/out of the site, and potential flood risk impacts.

07. The proposal is contrary to Policy 22 'Flood risk and water management' of NPF4 and CDP 8 & SG 8 'Water Environment' of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that the proposal has not been adequately screened for flood risk, does not provide sufficient information on drainage and water management and does not include any above or below ground Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) or any form of attenuation within the red line boundary to limit the effects of climate change or discharge to the existing SuDS Pond/Basin.

08. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 12 'Zero Waste' in that the proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate a swept path analysis for refuse collection.

Drawings

The development shall not be implemented in accordance with the drawing(s)

1. 24035-AT-01 - SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS - FIRE APPLIANCE Received 13 November 2024
2. 24035-AT-02 - SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS - REFUSE APPLIANCE Received 13 November 2024
3. 24035-SK-02 - CUT AND FILL Received 13 November 2024
4. 508-04-01A - LANDSCAPE PROPOSAL - SHEET 1 OF 4 Received 13 November 2024
5. 508-04-02A - LANDSCAPE PROPOSAL - SHEET 2 OF 4 Received 13 November 2024
6. 508-04-03A - LANDSCAPE PROPOSAL - SHEET 3 OF 4 Received 13 November 2024
7. 508-04-04A - LANDSCAPE PROPOSAL - SHEET 4 OF 4 Received 13 November 2024
8. 508.04.05A - LANDSCAPE - PLAY AREA Received 13 November 2024
9. HB-1100 REV B - SITE PROPOSAL Received 13 November 2024
10. HB-1000 - A LOCATION PLAN Received 13 November 2024
11. HB-1200 - RENDER COLOURS Received 13 November 2024
12. HB-HT1-001(P) - HT1 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS Received 13 November 2024
13. HB-HT1-002(P) - HT1 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS Received 13 November 2024
14. HB-HT2-001(P) - HT2 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS Received 13 November 2024
15. HB-HT2-002(P) - HT2 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS Received 13 November 2024
16. HB-HT3-001(P) - HT3 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS Received 13 November 2024
17. HB-HT3-002(P) - HT3 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS Received 13 November 2024
18. HB-HT4-001(P) - HT4 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS Received 13 November 2024
19. HB-HT4-002(P) - HT4 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS Received 13 November 2024
20. HB-HT5-001(P) - HT5 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS Received 13 November 2024
21. HB-HT5-002(P) - HT5 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS Received 13 November 2024
22. HB-HT6-001(P) - HT6 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS Received 13 November 2024
23. HB-HT6-002(P) - HT6 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS Received 13 November 2024
24. HB-HT7-001(P) - HT7 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS Received 13 November 2024
25. HB-HT7-002(P) - HT7 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS Received 13 November 2024
26. HB-HT8-001(P) - HT8 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND DETACHED GARAGE Received 13 November 2024
27. HB-HT8-002(P) - HT8 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS Received 13 November 2024
28. 24035-SK-09 - SITE SECTIONS SHEET 1 Received 28 November 2024
29. 24035-SK-10 - SITE SECTIONS SHEET 2 Received 28 November 2024
30. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report - REV 04 (FINAL) Received 11 August 2025
31. FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT - DATED 20.06.2025 Received 26 June 2025
32. GARTLOCH FULL DEVELOPMENT - DOUGLAS BAILLIE ASSOCIATES LTD Received 26 June 2025
33. 2505-07 - SI PLAN AND PROPOSED SCOPE OF ADDITIONAL GROUND INFORMATION Received 26 June 2025
34. 24035-SK-04 REV D - DRAINAGE LAYOUT Received 26 June 2025
35. 24035-SK-03 REV D - SITE LEVELS Received 26 June 2025
36. WOODLAND SURVEY Received 22 May 2025
37. GROUND LEVEL TREE SURVEY Received 22 May 2025
38. TREE SURVEY REPORT Received 22 May 2025

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