



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods,
Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Tim Moss Ext: 76032

Item 1

22nd September 2026

26/00039/LOCAL – Unit 11, 120 Stepps Road, Glasgow, G33 3NQ
Use of office building as place of worship/church (Class 10).

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): 20 - Baillieston

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 consists of a two-storey office unit on the corner of Consett Street and Consett Lane. The site is within the Queenslie Industrial Estate – an Area of Citywide Economic Importance (ACEI), a number of existing Class 4, 5 and 6 uses are nearby.
- 1.2 Committee should note: While the property has been listed as vacant in the appeal statement and the report of handling, no evidence has been provided and there is evidence of the property being used as offices and storage by a third party in 2022. A listing from 2021 was shared with the original application.
- 1.3 The site has a below base public transport accessibility. It is within the ward 20 – Baillieston.

Proposal

- 1.4 The development proposed is the use of the offices as a church/place of worship (Class 10 – ‘places for social activities of a religious body’).
- 1.5 The applicant indicates that the hall on the ground floor will accommodate 100 people but the plans suggest capacity for 120 people. The first floor will include two classrooms, two offices, toilets and a ‘younger persons church.’
- 1.6 The proposed opening hours are; Sunday 10:30am-1:15pm, Wednesday 6pm-7pm and Saturday 12:30pm-8pm.
- 1.7 No external alterations are proposed. There are two existing parking spaces, and a proposed additional three no. standard and one no. disabled parking bay. The site plan includes signage but this will be the subject of an additional advertisement consent outwith this appeal.

Committee should note: the proposal is likely a retrospective application according to the MP Maureen Burke, who stated in her letter of support that the proposal “has operated from this location since COVID-19 without any recorded issues.”

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 13:** Sustainable Transport
 - **Policy 14:** Design, Quality and Place

- **Policy 26:** Business and Industry

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

- **CDP 1 & SG 1:** The Placemaking Principle
- **CDP2:** Sustainable Spatial Strategy
- **CDP 3 & IPG3:** Economic Development
- **CDP11 & SG11:** Sustainable Transport

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 Policy CDP1 and SG1 and Policy CDP11 and SG11 of the Glasgow City Development Plan, and to Policies 13 and 14 of National Planning Framework 4, in that the site is not readily accessible by sustainable transport, fails to provide the minimum standard of cycle parking, and has not been demonstrated to meet a local need. The proposal would therefore encourage reliance on private car use. Furthermore, its location within an industrial estate, characterised by heavy vehicle movements, limited pedestrian infrastructure and poor natural surveillance, would fail to provide a safe, inclusive and well connected environment for users, particularly women, children and young people, contrary to the principles of successful placemaking.
03. The proposal was contrary to CDP 3 and IPG3 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and Policy 26 of NPF4 in that the proposed development is not a Class 4 (Business), 5 (General Industrial) or 6 (Storage and Distribution) use and is not considered to be a suitable alternative use that would complement the Queenslie Industrial Estate, an Area of Citywide Economic Importance (ACWEI).

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

01. The refusal reasons are not proportionate to the scale and nature of the proposal. Attendance is modest, structured, and supervised; peak activity occurs outside industrial hours.
02. The use does not generate retail-scale footfall. Industrial estates across Glasgow routinely accommodate low-impact Class 10 and 11 uses. The concern is therefore overstated.
03. CDP3 allows exceptions where the use does not undermine industrial operations. The unit is vacant, contributing no economic activity. The proposal

does not displace industrial employment. Activities occur outside core industrial hours, avoiding conflict with HGVs or industrial processes.

04. The report of handling gave concerns about public transport and cycle accessibility, but there are bus stops on Stepps Road and Edinburgh Road, within reasonable walking distance. There is ample off street parking. Industrial estates are not expected to meet town-centre accessibility requirements.
05. The report noted concern for health and safety, especially for women and children. The site is lit, supervised and controlled. Lots of industrial estates host similar uses without issue. The concern is not a basis for refusal.
06. There is material considerations for approval: Community benefit, efficient use of a vacant building, willingness to accept conditions around maximum occupancy and parking management.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 There are no relevant planning applications for the property.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

- 6.1 There were four representations received to the application, which can summarised as follows:
 - Increased traffic and road safety risks: access arrangements proposed could lead to accidents, the loading bay would be shared with HGVs.
 - Insufficient parking provision for the increase in visitors to the unit. Concern around
 - Incompatibility with other surrounding industrial uses – vehicles blocking roads needed for emergency vehicles, traffic congestion.
 - Concerns over compatibility of the proposed use with other existing industrial uses within the estate (e.g. HGV movements, increased usage of general public (including children/young people) in the industrial estate leading to health and safety concerns).

Committee should note: two letters of support have been submitted outwith the consultation period as additional documents by the applicant. One does not contain any specific planning considerations, referring mainly to the strengths of the organisation lodging the appeal. The other makes the following points:

- The use has operated from this location since COVID-19 without any recorded issues.
- Similar non-industrial uses are on this site.
- There is a strong need for community uses like this.

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 and 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.
- The proposal is to re-use an existing building.
- The area has a below base public transport accessibility, and could be deemed a travel generating use.

Committee should consider whether:

- They are satisfied that the environmental impacts are sufficiently considered in this application?

7.4 **Economic Development**

Committee should note that:

- NPF4: Policy 23 – Business and Industry require councils to identify employment land and states that ‘Other employment uses will be supported where they will not prejudice the primary function of the area and are compatible with the business/industrial character of the area.’
- CDP 3 & IPG3: Economic Development identifies Queenslie Business Park as an ACWEI – meaning it is of importance for business, financial services and manufacturing uses. The council resists uses outwith Class 4, 5 and 6 within these areas. Ancillary facilities are permitted where they enhance the attraction of an ACWEI.
- There is also a separate classification (“EDAs with Potential for Managed Change”) where the Council identifies alternative uses could prove appropriate.
- According to Queenslie Park Estate management, there are currently 2 office units available out of 57 units (350,000sq ft).
- There are a number of established business uses within the area, 2 of which have voiced objections on the grounds of the incompatibility of use.

Committee should consider whether:

- They are satisfied the use is compatible with the ACWEI?

7.6 **Design**

- NPF4 Policy 14 requires development proposed to be consistent with the 6 qualities of place. In particular, they include “Healthy”, “Pleasant”, “Connected.” This means that development should prioritize women’s safety, improve mental health, support natural and built spaces, and support well

connected networks that make moving around easy and reduce car dependency.

- SG1: Placemaking Principle (Part 1) 1.48 1.48 New or Replacement Community Facilities – Requires that new facilities are easily accessible by public transport, that there is a proven local need, the building in question should have capacity and flexibility to accommodate more than one use or activity, the proposal does not have an adverse impact on placemaking principles.
- The stated capacity is for 100 people, and there are 6 car spaces. The application site is located within a business park.

Committee should consider whether

- They are satisfied the use of the halls as a church is consistent with the intended design of a business park

7.6 **Parking and active travel**

Committee should note that:

- 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: Sustainable Transport states that significant travel generating uses should be sited at locations well served by public transport. Table 1 shows that 'community facilities' can be located in areas with 'base accessibility'
- The area has base public transport accessibility. SG11 also requests that travel-generating uses should be within 400m of public transport. The nearest bus stop is 482m walking. The transport statement submitted states only a 'small number of attendees walk.'
- SG11 also gives the basic minimum standard for cycle parking in places of worship, it is 1 space per 10 worshippers.
- For vehicle parking a maximum standard of 6 spaces per 100 sqm PFA or 1 space per 10 worshippers if defined as a 'place of worship' or a 'church hall'
- 100-120 worshippers are stated as part of the congregation.
- The applicant's transport statement says that less than 5% of the congregation currently use public transport. A formal car-sharing system is proposed – 80 visitors optimally sharing cars would result in 16 cars.
- No cycle parking spaces are proposed, and there are 5 vehicle parking spaces and 1 disabled space.
- The lack of sufficient parking provision has been raised by objectors to the development as a chief concern. The transport statement says that overspill onto public roads will be prevented by the additional parking, but expects 'lightly trafficked' streets.

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 this development is adequately supported by public transport as required by policy?
- They are satisfied the intensification of use here without adequate public transport will not result in car parking pressures outwith the dedicated parking provision ?

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.