Item 1

10th November 2026

Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Tim Moss Ext: 76032

26/00043/LOCAL – Site adjacent to 127 Causewayside Street
Erection of flatted residential development and associated works.

Purpose of Report:

To provide the Committee with a summary of the relevant considerations in the above review.

Recommendations:

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

Ward No(s): 19 - Shettleston Citywide: n/a

Local member(s) advised: Yes ☐ No ☐ consulted: Yes ☐ No ☐

***PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING**:*

Any Ordnance Survey mapping included within this Report is provided by Glasgow City Council under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to make available Council-held public domain information. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey Copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. The OS web site can be found at <http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk> "

If accessing this Report via the Internet, please note that any mapping is for illustrative purposes only and is not true to any marked scale

1 LOCATION, DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS AND PROPOSAL

Location

1.1 The application site is on the eastern side of Causewayside Street, to the west of Fullarton Park.

1.2 The site lies on a protected open space under PAN65 'Green corridor – green access route' and is within ward 19 – Shettleston. The site has been cleared of its dense mature trees, shrubs and other vegetation as of 2024, which had occupied the site since at least 2014.

1.3 The site has a below base public transport accessibility.

Proposal

1.4 The proposal is no. six flatted dwellings across two interlinking blocks of three storeys. One block would sit one storey lower but be of the same height due to the slope of the site.

1.5 The flat mix would be five no. two-bedroom flats and a 1 no. one bedroom flat.

1.6 Waste and recycling facilities are proposed within the parking court located to the north of the block.

1.7 The two ground floor flats would have private gardens, while the remaining flats would have access to a communal landscaped amenity space.

1.8 Vehicle parking for 4no vehicles is provided to the rear. Cycle parking is also provided to the north of the development, adjacent to the main communal entrance.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

- **Policy 1**: Tackling the climate and nature crises
- **Policy 2**: Climate mitigation and adaptation
- **Policy 3:** Biodiversity
- **Policy 4:** Natural places
- **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 19:** Heat and cooling

- **Policy 22:** Flood risk and water management

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

- **CDP 5 & SG 5:** Resource Management
- **CDP 6 & IPG 6:** Green Belt & Green Network
- **CDP 7 & SG 7:** Natural Environment
- **CDP 8 & SG 8:** Water Environment
- **CDP 11 & SG 11:** Sustainable Transport

2.3 Other relevant material considerations are as follows:

- Glasgow's Open Space Strategy (Adopted February 2020). The site is protected open space 6.6 Green Corridor. This site is identified on the Council Open Space Strategy (February 2020).
- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment: Planning Guidance for Developers (2011)

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

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 NPF 4 Policy 1 'Tackling the climate and nature crises', Policy 2 'Climate mitigation and adaption', Policy 3 'Biodiversity', Policy 4 'Natural places', Policy 20. Blue and Green Infrastructure, CDP 6 Green Network and CDP 7 & SG 7 'Natural Environment' of the City Development Plan as the proposal lacks a Preliminary Environmental Appraisal, Tree Survey and the Biodiversity Net Gain statement. The proposal fails to provide the fundamental environmental and ecological reports or give significant weight to the global climate and nature crisis. The proposal does not demonstrate that the loss of protected Amenity Greenspace would be able to be adequately replaced or would result in an enhancement of the biodiversity on site, resulting in an unacceptable impact on the natural environment.

03. The proposal is contrary to CDP 2 'Sustainable Spatial Strategy', CDP 6 'Green Belt & Green Network' of the City Development Plan in that the development of the site would result in the unjustified loss of "Amenity Greenspace" and a section of Green Corridor, resulting in an unacceptable impact on the natural environment on the site and the local area.

04. The proposal is contrary to Policy CDP11 (Sustainable Transport) as it fails to provide an appropriate level of parking for a site with limited public transport accessibility. No sufficient justification or supporting evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the reduced provision would not adversely impact the surrounding area through the impacts of overspill parking.

05. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policies 14, CDP1, and CDP2 in terms of is unacceptable and poor design and placemaking, unacceptable impacts on

residential amenity, and the absence of key supporting technical and environmental information. The concealed access raises safety and security concerns, while habitable rooms and communal areas would experience poor daylight, sunlight, outlook, and overshadowing. The scheme also results in unacceptable overlooking and privacy impacts, introduces an uncharacteristic parking-led frontage, and fails to respond to the established character of the area. Required ecological and technical reports have not been submitted. As a result, the proposal does not demonstrate a high-quality, safe, sustainable, or well-designed development and is contrary to NPF4 Policies 14, CDP1, and CDP2.

06. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4 Policy 19 Heat and Cooling and CDP 5 - Resource Management. Specifically, no Statement on Energy has been submitted demonstrating Gold Level Compliance with Section 7 Sustainability of the Scottish Building Standard's Technical Handbook, and a minimum 20% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technologies. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate a contribution to energy efficiency and climate change mitigation. No detail has been provided confirming the development has been designed to prioritise natural or passive solutions by means of orientating windows to take advantage of solar gain

07. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4 Policy 22 Flood risk and Water Management and CDP 8 - Water Environment as the proposal is not supported by a Flood Risk Assessment or drainage impact assessment and therefore fails to adequately assess or address the potential impacts of flood risk and drainage on the site and the surrounding area.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

01. The site is wrongly categorized as a green corridor, it is not publicly accessible greenspace, it is a derelict former industrial site. This was a key reason for refusal.

02. It is fanciful to describe the site as 'Amenity Greenspace'. It's a tree-less derelict industrial site overgrown with weeds.

03. A previous Planning Application a few years ago (by others) was refused because parking was shown at the rear instead of the front. This current application is being refused because parking is now shown at the front (and the Planning Officer is suggesting the rear). The front is the best place for it. We offered to reduce the scheme from 6 flats to 4 flats if the number of spaces is a deal-breaker.

04. There are no overshadowing, overlooking or privacy issues whatsoever. Neighbouring properties are the same height or lower. Window sizes exceed Building Standards requirements

05. Another expensive unnecessary report designed to burden the applicant financially and block/derail the application. The site is higher than the adjacent public road as evidenced by the topographic contours. It cannot flood. This is basic common sense and doesn't need a specialist report. If this site 'floods' the entire city would be underwater.

06. This empty derelict site is an eyesore, not a 'haven for wildlife' It either becomes residential flats or gets used as industrial/commercial as a scrapyard / container storage yard.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 Relevant planning applications for this property are as follows:
23/00935/FUL: Erection of flatted residential development (6 units) and associated works - Refuse

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 There were three representations received to the application, all objecting. These are summarised as follows:

- Environmental issues: lack of address to concerns raised in previous application, lack of tree survey, ecological appraisal, environmental report or landscaping strategy. No response to comments by RSPB.
- Concern about the destruction of the habitat on the wildlife corridor
- Layout/Density Overshadowing neighbouring properties and loss of privacy to private gardens.
- Concerns that additional pressure on mining shafts within the area could impact the foundations of existing houses.
- Design of the development is not considered to complement the existing character and appearance of surrounding dwellings.
- Increased pressure on existing congestion through traffic generation, road conditions, and pollution within the area.
- No details provided confirming the management of surface water for the proposed development. Concerns that surface water flooding could adversely affect neighbouring properties.

Note: The three above responses asked that additional comments from the previous application be considered (23/00935/FUL) and argued that there was a lack of substantive change.

7 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Committee should consider if the following are in accordance with National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), the relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance, and if there are material considerations which outweigh the Development Plan considerations.

7.2 The following are the relevant policy considerations:

7.3 **Climate change, climate mitigation**

Committee should note that:

- *NPF4: Policy 1 - Tackling the climate and nature crises and Policy 2 - Climate Mitigation and Adaptation* require significant weight is given to climate crisis and mitigation in all proposals.
- No information on how climate issues could be mitigated against, such as the reuse of existing materials, are provided.
- NPF4 Policy 19: Heating and Cooling requires that development to be occupied needs to support sustainable temperature management, ideally of a passive or natural kind. NPF4 Policy 12: Zero Waste requires sustainable waste management through a re-use of existing materials. SG5: Resource Management requires applicants submit a Statement of Energy confirming the development achieves Gold Level compliance, including 20% Low and Zero Carbon Generating Technologies (LZCGT). This is through the form provided on the council website, this standardised format allows officers to see the specific design and efficiency measures proposed.
- The applicant has submitted a document that gives a single sentence commitment under headlines of key themes on built environment energy reduction. These do not meet the policy requirements

Committee should consider whether:

- They are satisfied that the environmental impacts are sufficiently considered in this application?
- They are satisfied with the lack of a statement of energy or details of LZCGT within the development?

7.4 **Biodiversity and Greenspace**

Committee should note that:

- *NPF4: Policy 3 – Biodiversity:* requires development to contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity, by restoring degraded habitats and building and strengthening nature networks and the connections between them. Measurements must be proportionate to the scale of development.
- SG7 – Natural Environment sets out guidance for open space and provides criteria for new development. It seeks to protect woodlands, hedgerows and individual trees.-Guidance is provided for open space in new development.
- The site is designated a 'Green Corridor' under SG6 Green Belt and Green Networks. Up until 2024, mature trees, hedging, native shrubs and other self-seeded plants were present on the site. SG6 provides guidance for the protection of green corridors which carry the protections of other elements of the Green Network.
- The officer requested a Preliminary Environmental Appraisal, a Tree Survey and a Biodiversity Net Gain statement to ascertain the biodiversity value of the site and understand how these impacts could be mitigated against.
- The appellant shared a document titled 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal' that followed a similar format to other requested documents and did not meet the standards required.
- A revised landscape strategy was submitted but was deemed insufficient for the level of biodiversity lost. This is contrary to policy.

- All three objections refer to the loss of a green corridor in the space that was previously regarded as a positive amenity to residents.
- The Coal Authority required a mining stability assessment and gave no objections to the report submitted.

Committee should consider whether:

- ➢ whether the there are adequate reasons to disregard the lack of an adequate landscape strategy in this instance?

Parking and active travel

Committee should note that:

- NPF4 Policy 15: Local Living and 20 minute neighbourhoods: requests that neighbourhoods are designed so that daily needs can be met within easy reach by walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport and will also shift the dependency on travel by private vehicles to reduce pollution and emissions
- NPF4: Policy 13 states that development proposals for significant travel generating uses will not be supported in locations which would increase reliance on the private car
- SG11 also gives the basic minimum standard for cycle parking in of 1 space per unit plus 0.25 spaces per unit for visitors. For vehicle parking a minimum standard of 1 allocated space per unit and with 0.25 unallocated spaces per dwelling for visitors. This would mean a requirement of 7 spaces for bicycles and vehicles.
- Parking is provided onsite for 4 vehicles with cycle parking for an estimated 7 bikes is to the rear.

Committee should consider whether:

- ➢ They are satisfied with the lack of cycle parking provision in this instance or whether further provision could be met through a planning condition?
- ➢ They are satisfied with the lack of vehicle parking provision in this instance?
- ➢ They are satisfied this development is adequately supported by public transport as requested by policy?
- ➢ They are satisfied the intensification of use here without adequate public transport will not result in car parking pressures outwith the development?

7.5 Residential Amenity and design

Committee should note

- NPF4 Policy 14 Design, quality and place, and Policy CDP1, The Placemaking Principle requires that Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale and will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places as set out by NPF14: Healthy, Pleasant, Connected, Distinctive, Sustainable and Adaptable.
- SG1: The Placemaking Principle: requires the authority to request a BRE Daylight and Sunlight Assessment where a habitable room may not achieve sufficient levels of daylight.

- SG1: The Placemaking Principle: sets out additional standards for flatted developments that they provide usable backcourts, that all flats are dual aspect (or of similar amenity), are set back from footpaths or waste and that flats maintain established building lines and window patterns on the street.
- Other guidance includes: a minimum 4-metre privacy between ground floor flats and communal paths and bin storage to be located within the backcourt area.
- The planning officer requested a BRE Sunlight & Daylight Assessment for the rear habitable rooms and the amenity space, to confirm a reasonable level of daylight would be provided.
- This was not provided. A series of section studies were given but these do not show the information required and it is not possible to assess the impact of the development on neighbouring properties.
- On "Infill Development" – Proposals for infill development will be assessed on their individual merits. Higher densities may be acceptable in areas with good public transport accessibility, subject to appropriate townscape considerations.
- The area however does not have good public transport accessibility.

Committee should consider whether:
- They are satisfied with the lack of adequate assessment into the loss of daylight in habitable rooms and the amenity space.
- The are satisfied the development will not give rise to privacy concerns with the overlooking of development windows.
- There will not be a lack of sunlight or aspect for the ground floor flats facing the boundary fence.

7.6 Flood risk management

Committee should note
- NPF4 Policy 22. Flood risk and water management seeks to ensure future flood risk is not exacerbated by development and facilitates the delivery of sustainable flood risk management solutions. SG8: Water Environment provides detailed guidance on Flood Risk Assessments and Drainage Strategies for new development. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required for developments over 5 or more dwellings or development of more than 250 sqm floor area. These require to be self-certified and independently checked in accordance with published Glasgow City Council policy 'Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment: Planning Guidance for Developers'.
- A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment was requested by the planning officer after consultation with the flood risk management team. The applicant has submitted a document which does not meet the standards of a flood risk assessment. These should be carried out by a qualified professional with indemnity insurance.

Committee should consider whether:
- They are satisfied with the lack of an adequate flood risk screening?

8 COMMITTEE DECISION

8.1 The options available to the Committee are:

a. Grant planning permission, with or without conditions;
b. Refuse planning permission; or
c. Continue the application for further information.

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

9 Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

Financial:

Legal:

Personnel:

Procurement:

Council Strategic Plan: Specify which Grand Challenge (s) and Mission (s) the proposal supports. Where appropriate the relevant Commitment can also be listed.

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2025-29? Please specify.

What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report? (no significant impact, positive impact or negative impact)

Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio-economic disadvantage.

Climate Impacts:

Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions? Please specify:

What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?

Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?

Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:

Are there any potential data protection impacts as a result of this report Y/N

If Yes, please confirm that a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) has been carried out

10 Recommendations

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