Item 1

10th November 2026

Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Andy Dale Ext: 76016

25/00079/LOCAL – Site Of Bishoploch Homes At Hamlet B Former Gartloch Hospital 2346 Gartloch Road Glasgow –

Erection of residential development (49 units), includes earthworks and retaining walls, landscaping, car parking, infrastructure and associated works

Continued from 17th February 2026

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): 21 – North East

Citywide: n/a

Local member(s) advised: Yes ☐ No ☐

consulted: Yes ☐ No ☐

1 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS

Location

1.1 The application site lies on a predominantly greenfield site located between Heatherbank Road and Gartloch Village. The site, known as (Hamlet B) extends to 1.94Ha.

1.2 The site is set within an expansive Tree Preservation Order (TPO) area and the Bishop Loch Site of Special Landscape Importance (SSLI). However the site is also identified in the City Development Plan's Housing Land Supply and is surrounded by residential properties which are part of the wider Gartloch Hospital masterplan. It is located within Ward 21 – North East.

1.3 Gartloch Village is a master planned development of the former Gartloch Hospital site originally granted master plan approval in 2001. The completion of the enabling new build Hamlets is linked to the completion of the conversion proposal for the Campus buildings.

1.4 The overall development was planned into key areas:

Campus: The central campus comprises the original hospital buildings, constructed in a French Renaissance style with Scottish Baronial detailing. Built in red sandstone with slate roofs, the grand buildings feature elaborate stonework, while ancillary structures are simpler. Most have been converted into residential apartments or Mews-style properties, with works ongoing to complete the remaining buildings.

Hamlets: New-build developments supporting the restoration of the hospital buildings, located in former clearings where modern hospital structures were demolished or land was used for ancillary purposes. Each Hamlet sits within woodland or is bounded by tree-lined roads and have been classified as A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H.

- 8 New Build Hamlets with Hamlets A, C, D, E, F, & G completed.
- Hamlet H is partially complete with a planning application currently lodged for the remaining 8 plots.
- Hamlet B will form the final phase of new build development on the overall Gartloch Village development.

The main infrastructure of the overall Village has previously been installed including the core roads, SUD's ponds and utility networks.

Proposal

1.5 The proposal is for a residential development comprising 49 units with associated infrastructure including open space on land within the Master Planned Gartloch Village development. Eight different house types are proposed:

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

1.6 The application site is set approximately 3-4m lower than the surrounding core roads Heatherbank Road and the road known as Gartloch Village, and would be accessed via the core road Heatherbank Road. This is a tree lined road leading round to the existing T junction splitting to access the existing development and the proposed development.

1.7 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. The site configuration results in back garden boundaries facing onto the road as house fronts are typically orientated towards the interior of the development

1.8 The proposed external finish includes the following:

- 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 Ligh.

1.9 There is a temporary fence installed along Heatherbank Road and Gartloch Village. These fences would be removed as part of the development.

1.10 Although no existing trees are within the application boundary, tree removals are proposed in two areas: seven trees east of plot 44 for site levelling, and a group of young trees north of plot 10 for a link footpath. Replacement planting is proposed in line with the biodiversity and landscape designs.

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 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

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

- CDP 1 & SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Parts 1&2)
- CDP 5 & SG 5: Resource Management
- CDP 6 & SG 6: Green Belt & Green Network
- CDP 7 & SG 7: Natural Environment
- CDP 8 & SG 8: Water Environment
- CDP 11 & SG 11: Sustainable Transport

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

1) 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.

2) 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.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) 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.

6) 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.

7) 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.

8) 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.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT AS SUBMITTED

4.1 A summary of the material points raised in the appeal statement are listed below. It should be noted that some of the points have evolved during the course of the period of continuation as set out in Section 7 of the report:

1. The application site is included in the Glasgow City Development Plan (2017) Housing Land Supply and is allocated for housing, where Policies CDP10 and SG10 apply, supporting a choice of quality, affordable housing across all tenures. The principle of housing development is therefore in accordance with the Development Plan. Additionally, the SG2 Greater Easterhouse SDF identifies the site as a brownfield site with development potential. The existing Enabling Development agreement for converting Category A-listed buildings is also a material consideration.

2. Sustainability and Climate Action: The development will incorporate low and zero carbon technologies, including Air Source Heat Pumps and Wastewater Heat Recovery Systems, to minimise lifecycle emissions. Dwellings are designed with optimal southeast and southwest orientations and will meet Gold sustainability standards for CO_2 emissions. Electric vehicle charging points will be provided for all properties. The scheme reuses existing land within Gartloch Village, avoids greenfield or greenbelt development, and supports the restoration of two historic buildings. Reference to gas boilers in the original application was an error and this has been removed.

3. Flood Risk, Drainage, and Water Management: The FRA was updated to reflect SEPA data released after the application submission, and DBA Engineers provided detailed responses explaining the proposed drainage system, which were not considered in the refusal. The refusal cited a lack of on-site SuDS or attenuation, but DBA confirmed that underground storage is not required. The development will instead use the established SuDS strategy from the wider masterplan, which has successfully managed overland flows for over 20 years.

    - Flood Risk: The site is not at risk of coastal or fluvial flooding. A small area in the northeast has potential pluvial risk due to historical works, which will be managed through Hamlet B's development, formal drainage, and local land drainage. SEPA's March 2025 flood maps show ponding along the southwestern boundary, but proposed drainage and raised site levels will mitigate this. Finished floor levels range from 83.4 mAOD to 85.4 mAOD, reducing flood risk across the site.
    - Foul Drainage: Foul flows from the proposed plots will connect to the existing Scottish Water sewer to the south. A Pre-Development Enquiry confirmed that the sewer network and wastewater treatment works have sufficient capacity to accommodate the development (DBA, 2025).
    - Surface Water Drainage: The site is served by three operational SuDS sub-catchments (A, B, and C) covering the Gartloch Village masterplan. SuDS A, in place for 20 years, serves the Core Campus, Hamlets A, C, H, and the proposed Hamlet H2 and B, discharging into an existing outfall to Bishop Loch. DBA modelling confirms SuDS A will continue to manage flows, including climate change allowances, with Hamlet B discharging to the existing SuDS pond to the southwest. Central site drains will be removed, with ponding managed via road and plot drainage, supported by field drains connecting to existing land

drains. Porous paving on driveways and treatment at the SuDS pond will manage runoff, while 84 new heavy standard trees will enhance sustainable drainage over time.

4. Biodiversity: The Ironside Farrar Ecology and Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan (2025) outlines on-site measures integrated with the landscape proposals, including grass mixes, wildflowers, shrubs, trees, hedges, and woodland understorey planting. Wildflower corridors, hedgerow links, and woodland clusters align with ecological greenways and movement corridors across Gartloch Village. Minor tree removals are proposed for footpaths and gardens, while surrounding trees will be retained and invasive species managed. Off-site enhancements on nearby lands further support biodiversity, with the plan confirming an overall biodiversity gain for the site.

5. Ancient Woodland: Ironside Farrar (2025) note the sensitivity of the woodland strip adjacent to Lochwood Plantation, recognised as ancient despite being fragmented, of low-to-moderate quality, and impacted by invasive rhododendron. The woodland's mapped extent across Heatherbank Road may be inaccurate, but planning policies require its protection and enhancement. A 5–10 m buffer within the site is proposed, along with compensatory planting of mature woodland specimens, phased rhododendron clearance, understorey enrichment, and long-term management to support the fragmented ancient woodland habitat.

6. Updated Site Investigation: Previous investigations by Mason Evans and GGS confirm the site is safely developable. Pre-application review by GCC Geotechnical (Nov 2023–July 2024) requested supplementary works, which could have been conditioned as part of approval. A Proposed Scope of Supplementary Investigation (Geovia, 2025) was submitted in June 2025, with Geotechnical confirming no further comments in October 2025. Detailed site investigations have since been undertaken, with the final report expected December 2025—exceeding the information normally required pre-determination.

   Supplementary investigations by Geovia reconfirm the peat extent identified by Mason Evans, with an additional previously untested area also containing buried peat (draft layout in Figure 8). Regardless, site investigations confirm the land is safely developable, with any further information able to be secured by condition.

7. Access, Transport, and Permeability: The site lies in an Outer Urban Area with below-base public transport accessibility but benefits from nearby bus services (including the hourly 310 service) and connections to footpaths, core paths, and train stations. The proposed layout prioritises pedestrians, with four pedestrian accesses versus one vehicle access, two of which connect directly to public transport and local amenities. A network of walking and cycling routes will link the site to the wider area, with delivery secured by

condition. The single loop road for vehicles minimises cul-de-sac effects, while landscape areas, link paths, and the play area are all designed to provide passive surveillance.

8. The site is allocated for housing in the CDP, completing Gartloch Village and restoring the Category A-listed hospital. The layout prioritises pedestrians and active travel, linking to bus services and the core path network. Three communal landscaped areas, including a play area, are proposed with passive surveillance from surrounding dwellings. Flood risk is managed through site design, drainage, and raised floor levels.

9. No objections were raised by GCC Waste and Refuse. The updated layout provides five bins per dwelling, converts two turning heads into shared drives, and swept path analysis confirms the internal roads can accommodate standard 11.7 m refuse trucks.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The previous planning application history for the property includes the following:

- 97/01071/DC – Erection of housing Outline Planning Permission Granted Subject to conditions (May 2001).
- 97/01071/DC Approval of Master Plan Approval of Master Plan (August 2001).
- 04/00010/DC - Amendment of condition 13 of application 97/01071/DC. Grant Subject to Condition(s) (12 Feb 2004).
- 07/01755/DC - Erection of a residential development Withdrawn after Validation June 2007.
- 07/02013/DC - Erection of residential development. Withdrawn August 2014.
- 24/02772/FUL - Erection of residential development (49 units), includes earthworks and retaining walls, landscaping, car parking, infrastructure and associated works Refused September 2025.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 One representation was received to the planning application. A summary of the points raised is 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.

6.2 Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) was consulted. They advised that the application falls below the thresholds for which SEPA provides site specific advice.

6.3 Nature Scot were consulted following the submission of information relating to the discovery of Great Crested Newt and in relation to the impact of the proposal on the Site of Special Scientific Interest status of Bishop Loch to the south of the site. Nature Scot raised no objection subject to safeguarding conditions.

7 REASONS FOR CONTINUATION AND REVISIONS

7.1 This item was first considered at the meeting on 20 January 2026. The Committee was advised that proposals outwith the application red line could not be controlled by condition, and that insufficient information to make a decision had been provided in relation to the following matters:

- Drainage and flood risk
- Biodiversity and trees
- Transport and active travel and the swept path analysis for waste management

7.2 Although the principle of residential development was accepted, the Committee agreed to refuse the application, and the suggested a re-submission. Prior to a decision notice being issued the decision was challenged by the applicant on the basis that that matters outwith the red line but still within the control of the applicant could be controlled by condition. It was also outlined that additional information relating to the outstanding matters listed above had been submitted but not taken into consideration.

7.3 At a subsequent meeting on 17 February 2026, this information was presented to the Committee and it was agreed that the case could be re-considered at a future meeting. The information that had been provided was circulated to internal consultees for comment, and their responses are set out below. It should be noted that the consultations led to additional discussion and further submissions which has led to the delay in bringing the item back to Committee.

7.4 Drainage and flood risk – a meeting was held between GCC Flood Risk Management and the applicant's consultants. Correspondence followed this meeting with updated information relating to SuDS pond levels and freeboard, pluvial risk analysis and calculations relating to SuDS treatments. This information has now satisfied NRS Flood Risk officers and the flood and drainage proposals are considered acceptable.

7.5 Landscape and trees – a site visit with GCC Senior Landscape Architect and the applicant was organised to consider the potential impact of the proposal on landscape and trees. It was acknowledged that there would be tree loss, although it was agreed that the trees affected were in poor condition, and that the proposed compensation would be satisfactory. This has led to the production of draft conditions designed to address the following matters.:

a. Completion of tree and other planting as set in the proposal in advance of house building.
b. A post completion inspection regime for planting.
c. Detailed location of a new footpath between two lime trees which form part of an avenue, to ensure that there is no or little damage to their root protection zones.

7.6 Biodiversity – The applicant's consultants have engaged with NRS Biodiversity colleagues regarding appropriate mitigation arrangements. Potential evidence of Great Crested Newt on the site was found through eDNA analysis. Further survey work did not establish any further evidence and it was considered unlikely GCN were on the site. However given their protected status further work was undertaken to ensure adequate compensatory habitat is retained on site and this has led to the creation of a draft condition informed by an updated Species Protection Plan.

7.7 In addition, the Bishop Loch to the south of the site is identified as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Consequently Nature Scot were a statutory consultee as the site lies in the natural drainage catchment of the Bishop Loch and SuDS pond outfall drains to it. Following consultation on the supporting information Nature Scot were happy for the proposal to proceed on the basis of safeguarding conditions to ensure there is no harmful outflow impact upon the protected loch. These include a condition survey, long term maintenance arrangements and a construction environmental management plan.

7.8 Transport and active travel – there was initial concern that aspects of the roads and path network were outside the red line boundary, and therefore could not be controlled. It was clarified that conditions could be applied to control these aspects, as the land was within the applicant's control.

7.9 An updated swept path analysis had been submitted, to demonstrate that larger vehicles could service the site. This is now considered suitable for vehicles for up to 12 metres to safely navigate with the updated layout. So the geometry is considered satisfactory.

7.10 Soils - The applicant had submitted an initial site investigation relating to the presence of peat on site. This concluded that the site is safely developable. GCC Geotechnical requested a further investigation, and a scoping report for this was provided by the applicant. The applicants have advised that peat within the development site is situated 6 meters below the surface. Consequently the depth of foundation will not go as deep therefore there should be no prospect for disturbance of the peat. Nevertheless a

safeguarding condition is attached to the draft conditions to cover any eventuality where peat or other carbon rich soils are discovered during construction.

8 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 Committee should consider if they feel the outstanding issues have now been satisfied. These are: drainage and flood risk, biodiversity and trees, and transport and active travel.

8.2 Drainage and Flood risk

NPF4 Policy 22 requires that development does not increase the risk of surface flooding and manages rain and surface water through SuDS which forms part of the integrated proposal. This is reflected by Policy CDP 8 and SG8 that require appropriate SuDS strategies.

The applicants have submitted an updated Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment which outlines that the site is not at risk of flooding elsewhere. It outlines that the SuDS arrangements would feed into the wider network serving the rest of the development and that this is considered to satisfy national and local policy requirements. NRS Flood Risk Management officers have confirmed that they are satisfied with the details in the updated Assessment and have no objection to supporting the application.

Committee should consider whether:

- the updated drainage and flood risk arrangements are deemed satisfactory in terms of managing flood risk
- the SuDS arrangements being incorporated into the wider village arrangements are satisfactory.

8.3 Biodiversity and Trees

Policies 3 and 4 of NPF4 seeks to protect biodiversity, reverse biodiversity loss, deliver positive effects from development and strengthen nature networks. Development proposals likely to have an adverse effect on protected species will only be supported where there is evidence species will be protected. Steps should be taken to establish presence and to set out protection and mitigation.

An updated series of studies have been submitted since the application was continued earlier this year. Following the potential discovery of Great Crested Newt (GCN) through an e DNA sample found on site in 2025, the applicants undertook a GCN survey spanning March and May of 2026 and a Species Protection Plan to establish a methodology for ensuring effective protection for protected species.

The surveys undertaken were unable to establish any further evidence of GCN although they did identify a number of other more common types of newt on site demonstrating the quality of the habitat. The proposal involves the removal of one pond within the site and the enhancement of a second pond within the masterplan area intended to operate as a more effective permanent habitat for species within the overall development. The pond to be lost within the application site is regarded as poorer quality and is to be filled in as part of ground reconfiguration for the proposed development. As part of these works the applicants have applied for a Protected Species license to Nature Scot as the pond has seen evidence of being a potential breeding site.

Through the proposed Species Protection Plan the arrangements for migrating any species from the pond to be filled would be undertaken in accordance with appropriate practices and reflecting the expectations set in the License process. This would take place over a period to ensure that sufficient time is offered to allow all species to relocate to the pond to be retained.

These arrangements have been agreed with NRS Biodiversity officers who are satisfied that these can be controlled via a condition ensuring the methodology spelled out in the Species Protection Plan is met. It should be noted that the License process is separate to planning permission but also that Nature Scot will not issue a License unless there is an extant planning permission in place.

Concerns were also raised regarding the proposal's potential impact upon Bishop Loch Site of Special Scientific Interest through the outflow of the SuDS pond. Consequently Nature Scot were consulted and have provided a series of safeguarding conditions to ensure there will be effective maintenance and systems in place to ensure that outflow does not have any harmful effect of the water environment of Bishop Loch.

Policy 6 states that: 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.

A group of seven trees and smaller group of younger trees are to be felled as a result of the proposal in order to accommodate new pathways and one block of housing. Following a site visit it has been agreed that the trees affected are of poor quality and the replacement planting of 92 trees within the development represents satisfactory compensation to satisfy policy and mitigate the loss.

Committee should consider whether:

- The proposals to ensure the protection of species including Great Crested Newt meet the necessary requirements for protected species
- The proposed protection of the Bishop Loch through protective conditions is satisfactory
- The loss of some trees on the site is adequately compensated by the proposed planting arrangements.

8.4 Transport and Active Travel

NPF4 Policy 13 requires that proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that transport requirements generated have been considered in line with sustainable travel and investment hierarchies, supporting access to local facilities through walking, wheeling and cycling networks and integrating transport modes.

Revised swept path drawings have been submitted that demonstrate the road geometry within the development can accommodate longer refuse and fire vehicles. NRS Transport Planning officers have confirmed that this can be effectively controlled via the Roads Construction Consent process.

Active travel within the site remains dictated by the nature of the overall village which is isolated and by its nature will attract private car ownership. The applicants have incorporated a footpath running through the site linking to existing footpaths running around the SuDS pond which is to be retained.

Committee should consider whether:

- the updated swept path analysis is satisfactory
- the proposed development sufficiently encourages sustainable modes of transport in its context.

9 COMMITTEE DECISION

9.1 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.

9.2 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.

10 Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

Financial: n/a

Legal: n/a

Personnel: n/a

Procurement: n/a

Council Strategic Plan: n/a

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2021-25? Please specify.	n/a
What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?	no significant impact
Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio-economic disadvantage.	n/a

Climate Impacts:

Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions? Please specify:	n/a
What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?	n/a
Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?	n/a

Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:

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

If Yes, please confirm that

a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) has been carried out

10 RECOMMENDATIONS

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