Item 1

10th September 2024

Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

24/00042/LOCAL – Site at Springburn Road/Auchentoshan Terrace Erection of public house (Sui Generis) with office accommodation (Class 4) 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): 17 Citywide: n/a

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

1 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS

1.1 The application site is existing vacant open space located at the end of Auchentoshan Terrace and sits to the east of Springburn Road. The site is located adjacent to Springburn Fire Station and sits to the north of St Rollox Retail and Commercial Centre. The application site is located within Ward 17-Springburn/Robroyston and is within a High Accessibility area for public transport.

1.2 The proposal includes the erection of a public house with office accommodation across three storeys and associated car parking and landscaping. The proposal intends to replace the former Caledonian Bar which was located in Sighthill.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises
Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and adaptation
Policy 3: Biodiversity
Policy 12: Zero Waste
Policy 13: Sustainable Transport
Policy 14: Design, quality and place
Policy 27: City, town, local and commercial centres

CDP1 and SG1: The Placemaking Principle
CDP4 and SG4: Network of Centres
CDP5 and SG5: Resource Management
CDP7 and SG7: Natural Environment
CDP8 and SG8: Water Environment
CDP11 and 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 was contrary to CDP1 and SG1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and policy 14 and 27 of NPF4 in that the proposed development, by virtue of its scale, massing, design and materials, does not comply with the key placemaking principles set out in CDP1 and SG1 and would represent an incongruous development. In particular:

- The building form (external) is dictated by the programming of the inside of the building rather than responding to the place/local context and results in many corners and complex massing.
- The building is visually confusing and looks like an upscaled domestic development with extensions rather than an intended design for a commercial or community function.
- The roofline of the building is complex and confusing.
- Access to the building is complicated with a number of accesses shown on the west, north and east elevations.
- The entrance tower does not give the detail presence and identity required and adds another volume element to the design.
- The facades on each elevation appear complicated with multiple roof lines and forms related to the complex massing with setbacks.
- Due to a lack of information, there are no details on the rear boundary treatment.
- Due to lack of a landscape plan, it is unknown the impact the proposal may have on the existing trees on the site, how any mitigation measures would be installed and there is no information on proposed soft and hard landscaping.
- Due to lack of information, it is unclear how the proposed uses of the building will interact with each other, if any consideration has been given to either use adversely impacting on the other and any mitigation measures proposed.

03. The proposal is contrary to CDP4 and SG4 and Policy 27 of NPF 4 in that the applicant has failed to provide justification/evidence that demonstrates that the proposal cannot be accommodated in other town centre locations and due to lack of information, the applicant has failed to provide information on proposed cooking and ventilation methods.

04. The proposal is contrary to CDP5 and SG5 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and policies 1 and 2 of NPF4 in that the proposed development, due to lack of information submitted, does not demonstrate how the proposed development complies with requirements within Policy CDP5 and SG5.

05. The proposal is contrary to CDP7 and SG7 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and Policy 3 of NPF4 in that the proposed development due to lack of information submitted, does not demonstrate how the proposed development will potentially impact on protected species that could exist in the area, how it will impact on other biodiversity found on site, any mitigation measure to reduce these impacts and how these will be implemented.

06. The proposal is contrary to CDP8 and SG8 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the applicant has failed to provide a Flood Risk Assessment and has therefore, failed to demonstrate how flood risk will be managed and mitigated. Furthermore, the applicant has provided no

evidence of consultation with Scottish Water to accept surface water into the combined sewer and therefore, an adequate drainage strategy has not been proposed.

07. The proposal is contrary to CDP11 and SG11 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and Policy 13 of NPF 4 in that the proposed development does not provide a sufficient level of car parking for the proposed use of the building, and does not provide the minimum standard of cycle parking for the proposed use of the building. The development is thus likely to result in problems of overspill parking at the locus, and will fail to adequately encourage journeys by cycling.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

Statement of Review

The applicant considered each or the reasons for refusal in turn as follows:

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.

Applicant Comment: There are significant considerations to take into account:

- The site was specifically sold by Glasgow City Council to the applicant for the explicit purpose of constructing a Public House to replace the Caledonian Bar in Sighthill.
- There was a previous consent (Ref 15/0292/DC) for the erection of a new Public House, albeit now lapsed.
- Additionally, a 'Local Review' consent (Ref 15/00064/LOCAL) was granted for a proposed Public House (Refused application 15/01351/DC), although this too has lapsed.

- Committee should note that the City Development Plan provisions apply, regardless of the circumstances regarding the sale of the site. The previous applications are noted, although each proposal should be treated on its own merits, particularly as a new City Development Plan has been adopted since these applications were submitted.

02 The proposal was contrary to CDP1 and SG1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and policy 14 and 27 of NPF4 in that the proposed development, by virtue of its scale, massing, design, and materials, does not comply with the key placemaking principles set out in CDP1 and SG1 and would represent an incongruous development. In particular:

a. The building form (external) is dictated by the programming of the inside of the building rather than responding to the place/local context and results in many corners and complex massing.

Applicant Comment: The building design underwent thorough discussion during the pre-application phase, referenced as Ref 22/0085/PRE. Subsequent to this virtual meeting, adjustments were made, with officers emphasizing that the design reflects the client's preferences. It is important to note that the comment provided appears to be subjective and reflects the perspective of the case officer.

b. The building is visually confusing and looks like an upscaled domestic development with extensions rather than an intended design for a commercial or community function.

Applicant Comment: The design of the building underwent review during a pre-application meeting on 13/07/2022 attended by Colin Houston, an Architect from the City Design team. Subsequent adjustments were made based on feedback from this virtual session, with officers emphasizing that the design reflects the preferences of the client. It is worth noting that the comment provided appears to be subjective and reflects the perspective of the case officer.

Applicant Comment: The building design underwent thorough discussion during the pre-application phase, referenced as Ref 22/0085/PRE. Subsequent to this virtual meeting, adjustments were made, with officers emphasizing that the design reflects the client's preferences. It is important to note that the comment provided appears to be subjective and reflects the perspective of the case officer. - The building is visually confusing and looks like an upscaled domestic development with extensions rather than an intended design for a commercial or community function.

Applicant Comment: The design of the building underwent review during a pre-application meeting on 13/07/2022 attended by Colin Houston, an Architect from the City Design team. Subsequent adjustments were made based on feedback from this virtual session, with officers emphasizing that the design reflects the preferences of the client. It is worth noting that the comment provided appears to be subjective and reflects the perspective of the case officer.

c. The roofline of the building is complex and confusing.

Comment: The roof geometry is not complex or confusing. The comment provided appears to be entirely subjective from the perspective of the case officer. - Access to the building is complicated with a number of accesses shown on the west, north and east elevations. Comment: Once more, this perspective appears entirely subjective; access to the building is not inherently complicated. There are three access points on the West Elevation: the first leads through the tower to the Lounge bar/restaurant, the second

grants access to the sports bar, which can be opened up to the Lounge bar/restaurant for significant events, and the third entrance leads to the upper floors, housing the function room and the Third Sector hub. It is worth noting that the case officer altered the latter designation.

d. The entrance tower does not give the detail presence and identity required and adds another volume element to the design.

Applicant Comment: The design of the tower underwent discussion during the pre-application phase and was subsequently enlarged in accordance with the feedback received. It is important to note that the comment provided appears to be subjective and reflects the perspective of the case officer.

e. The facades on each elevation appear complicated with multiple roof lines and forms related to the complex massing with setbacks.

Applicant Comment: The project underwent discussion during the pre-application phase, referenced as Ref 22/0085/PRE, where this specific concern was not raised. It is important to highlight that the comment provided appears to be subjective and may not align with the principles of "form follows function," where the design should prioritise functionality over aesthetic considerations.

- Committee should consider whether the design is consistent with the key placemaking principles set out in CDP 1 and SG 1.

f. Due to a lack of information, there are no details on the rear boundary treatment.

Applicant Comment: The case officer was well aware that we were responding to the request for this information (Doc 11). The refusal notice was precipitous for this reason.

- Committee should note that this information has not been provided in relation to the Review.

g. Due to lack of a landscape plan, it is unknown the impact the proposal may have on the existing trees on the site, how any mitigation measures would be installed and there is no information on proposed soft and hard landscaping.

Applicant Comment: The case officer was fully informed of our efforts to address the information request (Doc 11), making the refusal notice premature. Although the landscape architect concluded their work on 22nd January, the report is not included in this appeal. It is our understanding that we cannot introduce information that was not available at the time of the unexpected refusal. Additionally, an email dated 29/11/23 from the case officer (Doc 13) indicated their expectation of feedback from the City Design team before providing further guidance. It was unexpected to receive a refusal notice without receiving the anticipated feedback from the case officer.

- Committee should note that the applicant would have been able to submit this information with the Review, as it is material, but has not done so.

h. Due to lack of information, it is unclear how the proposed uses of the building will interact with each other, if any consideration has been given to either use adversely impacting on the other and any mitigation measures proposed.

Applicant Comment: This application is for a Public House with a multi-purpose space suitable for private functions and third sector conferences. The development is designed to be car-free, catering to a large catchment area within walking distance, addressing the lack of community facilities in the vicinity. Additionally, the upper floor serves the community and would offer a Third Sector Hub, conveniently located within walking distance of the town centre and well-connected by multiple bus routes. This information was outlined in the Supporting Statement (Doc 9), which is not displayed on the planning portal but is cited in the City Design Team's response.

- Committee should consider whether the two uses can be successfully operated together.

03. The proposal is contrary to CDP4 and SG4 and Policy 27 of NPF 4 in that the applicant has failed to provide justification/evidence that demonstrates that the proposal cannot be accommodated in other town centre locations and due to lack of information, the applicant has failed to provide information on proposed cooking and ventilation methods.

Applicant Comment: The Glasgow City Council sold the site to the applicant with the specific intention of constructing a Public House to replace the Caledonian Bar in Sighthill. Furthermore, the first-floor plan provides a comprehensive layout of the kitchen, including the canopy and ventilation route, following accepted drawing conventions. Additionally, the external flue is clearly depicted on the East Elevation, denoted by the grey rectangle on the elevation drawing.

- Committee should consider whether the applicant has demonstrated that the proposal could not be accommodated in other town centre locations, and whether sufficiently detailed drawings and technical information has been provided in relation to the proposed cooking and ventilation methods.

04. The proposal is contrary to CDP5 and SG5 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and policies 1 and 2 of NPF4 in that the proposed development, due to lack of information submitted, does not demonstrate how the proposed development complies with requirements within Policy CDP5 and SG5.

Applicant Comment: This aspect should have been addressed during the validation process. Steps were taken to engage a consultant upon request, but the end-of-year holidays inevitably affected timelines. The appropriate course of action for the officer would have been to "stop the clock," as is

common practice, to allow for the proper and thorough response to the information requested.

- Committee should note that a Statement on Energy has not been provided with this Review, contrary to policy.

05. The proposal is contrary to CDP7 and SG7 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and Policy 3 of NPF4 in that the proposed development due to lack of information submitted, does not demonstrate how the proposed development will potentially impact on protected species that could exist in the area, how it will impact on other biodiversity found on site, any mitigation measure to reduce these impacts and how these will be implemented.

Applicant Comment: This aspect should have been requested during the validation process. Efforts were made to engage a consultant as soon as it was requested, but the timing coincided with the end-of-year holidays, affecting timelines. Ideally, the officer should have paused the process, as is typically done, to ensure adequate time for a comprehensive response to the information requested.

- Committee should note that this information has not been provided with this Review, contrary to policy.

06. The proposal is contrary to CDP8 and SG8 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the applicant has failed to provide a Flood Risk Assessment and has therefore, failed to demonstrate how flood risk will be managed and mitigated. Furthermore, the applicant has provided no evidence of consultation with Scottish Water to accept surface water into the combined sewer and therefore, an adequate drainage strategy has not been proposed.

Applicant Comment: The drainage strategy for the development of this site as a Public House was included in Application 15/0297/DC, a detail that the case officer should have been aware of. If this had been raised before the refusal, it would have been clarified accordingly. The Scottish Water Consultation Response (Doc 16) does not convey negativity, and typically, their recommendations would have been addressed through conditions, as seen in application 15/02927/DC.

- Committee should note that it would not be appropriate to use the drainage strategy for the 2015 application. Scottish Water does not object to the application , but recommends that the applicant confirm capacity for waste water treatment prior to the development.

07. The proposal is contrary to CDP11 and SG11 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and Policy 13 of NPF 4 in that the proposed development does not provide a sufficient level of car parking for the proposed use of the building and does not provide the minimum standard of cycle parking for the proposed use of the building. The development is thus likely to result in problems of overspill parking at the locus and will fail to adequately encourage journeys by cycling.

Applicant Comment: Apart from discouraging car usage, Public Houses are not typically venues where customers rely on car travel. In previous approved applications such as Ref 15/0292/DC and 15/00064/LOCAL, the same level of parking was provided and approved. Additionally, parking considerations were not discussed during pre-application stages.

- Committee should consider whether there is sufficient justification for the under-provision of car and cycle parking in this proposal.

4.3 Other Material Considerations Raised by the Applicant:

- The redevelopment of Sighthill led to the removal of vital community facilities.
- These facilities play a crucial role in supporting the health and wellbeing of the community.
- Remarkably, no objections have been raised from local community members against any of the applications—a rarity when proposing a new Public House within the city.
- The site was acquired by the applicant on the open market, explicitly for the construction of a Public House. Therefore, utilising CDP4, SG4, and Policy 27 of NPF 4 to refuse this application may be deemed as maladministration. Furthermore, suggesting relocating a community facility for Sighthill, St Rollox, and Springburn to the City Centre is impractical.
- Previous consents were granted with identical parking provisions, acknowledging the shift away from car usage in Glasgow. This aligns with the population's proximity to the site and the preferences of the local workforce, who often unwind with a drink after work without commuting to St Rollox.
- The application initially outlined a Third Sector Hub, integrating first-floor spaces with breakout areas above. Regrettably, post-validation, planners requested a change to describe these areas as offices, leading to confusion. In hindsight, this alteration would not have been agreed upon had the potential for confusion been anticipated.

In light of these considerations, the Committee may find it appropriate to approve this application, subject to conditions

- Committee should consider whether these matters are material to their consideration.

5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

5.1 There were no representations to the planning application or to the local review.

6 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Committee should consider if the following are in accordance with NPF4, the relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance, and if

there are material considerations which outweigh the Development Plan considerations.

6.2 The following are the relevant policy considerations:

NPF 4 Policy 1 - Tackling the climate and nature crises aims to encourage, promote and facilitate development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crisis.

Policy 2 - Climate mitigation and adaptation aims to encourage, promote and facilitate development that minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change.

CDP 5 / SG 5 Resource Management requires that all new domestic and non-domestic developments make use of low and zero carbon generating technologies in order to contribute to meeting greenhouse emissions targets. SG5 states that a Statement on Energy will be required to support all applications to which this policy applies.

- Committee should note that no Statement on Energy has been submitted, and is contrary to policy.

- Committee should consider the lack of information relating to energy efficiency measures within the proposal.

6.5 **NPF 4 Policy 3** seeks to protect biodiversity, reverse biodiversity loss, deliver positive effects from development and strengthen nature networks.

CDP7 and SG7: Natural Environment states that there is a presumption against development which would have an adverse effect on protected species, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

- Committee should note that the Protected Species Water Vole constraint has been flagged for the application site, and that the applicant has failed to submit a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.

- Committee should consider whether the impact of the proposal on existing habitats and protected species can be assessed or whether any mitigation measures can be developed given the lack of survey information.

6.6 **NPF 4 Policy 12** states that development proposals 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.

- Committee should note that bin and recycling storage facilities are provided on the ground floor for the development. There is no detail on how these bins will be accessed for collection and no external bin storage area has been identified on the site plan.

➢ Committee should consider whether there is sufficient detail in relation to bin collection and external storage.

6.7 **NPF 4 Policy 13** intends to encourage, promote and facilitate developments that prioritise walking wheeling, cycling and public transport for everyday travel and reduce the need to travel unsustainably.

CDP11 details how the City aims to help improve connectivity and promote more sustainable patterns of transport. SG11: Sustainable Transport includes cycle and car parking standards as follows:

Car Parking For public houses the maximum standard is 3 spaces per 100 sqm Public Floor Area (PFA) for sites within High Accessibility Areas.

Cycle Provision For public houses, the minimum standard is 1 space per 50 sqm public floor area for customers and 1 space per 10 staff.

- Committee should note that the proposal has included 2 car parking spaces, which is below the requirement, but fails to provide any information on cycle storage.

➢ Committee should consider whether the proposal includes appropriate facilities for car and cycle parking for staff and customers, or whether on-street parking would increase in close proximity to a fire station.

6.8 **NPF 4 Policy 14** states that development proposals will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places.

Policy CDP1: The Placemaking Principle sets out broad principles that should inform all development. It states that new development should aspire to achieve the six qualities of place. SG1 comprises two parts; Part 1 provides the context and approach of Placemaking established in Policy CDP1 and Part 2 contains detailed assessment criteria relating to physical design.

1.48 New or Replacement Community Facilities New community facilities or extensions to existing facilities, which meet the current and future needs of the local community, will be supported provided:

a) They are easily accessible by active travel and sustainable transport modes;
b) There is a local need; and
c) The land and/or building has the capacity and flexibility to accommodate more than one use or activity; and
d) The proposal is in line with key placemaking principles and does not have an adverse impact on townscape character, ecological interests or residential amenity.

- Committtee should note that there is support in principle for a new community facility within this area of Glasgow.

➢ Committee should consider whether the serious policy failures in terms of design and a lack of information on flooding, sustainability, biodiversity, cooking and ventilation methods for this proposal outweigh the support in principle.

Accessibility

- Committee should note that the site is accessible by public transport (train station is 10 minute walk and a number of bus stops on Springburn Road, Midton Street, Petershill Road), the applicant has failed to provide information on how the site will connect to the active travel network, and has failed to provide cycle provision which would help to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.

➢ Committee should consider whether the proposal includes sufficient detail on connections to the active travel network, and facilities for cycle storage.

Local Need

- Committee should note that the proposal is intended to replace a former pub in the Sighthill area which was subject to compulsory purchase.

➢ Committee should consider whether local need has been justified.

Accommodating more than one use

- Committee should note that while the size of the building may be able to accommodate both public house and office accommodation use, the applicant has failed to provide operational information (in the form of a management plan) as to how these uses would interact with one another and how any impacts (for example from noise) from either use would be mitigated.

➢ Committee should consider whether the lack of a management plan allows the assessment of whether the two uses can operate successfully within the same building.

Placemaking Principles and other impacts

- Committee should note the design, scale and massing of the proposal, and that there is a lack of information relating to: tree survey, landscape plan (including any new trees that are proposed), impact on biodiversity (particularly on protected species), bin storage and cycle parking.

➢ Committee should consider the impact of the proposal on place, and whether the lack of information allows the assessment of the impact of the

proposal on townscape character, ecological interests and residential amenity.

6.9 **NPF 4 Policy 27** states that development proposals will be consistent with the town centre first approach. Proposals for uses which will generate significant footfall, including commercial, leisure, offices, community, sport and cultural facilities, public buildings and public spaces:

i. Will be supported in existing city, town and local centres; and ii. Will not be supported outwith those centres unless a town centre first assessment demonstrates that

• All centre and edge of centre options have been sequentially assessed and discounted as unsuitable or unavailable;
• The scale of development cannot reasonably be altered or reduced in scale to allow it to be accommodated in a centre; and
• The impacts on existing centres have been thoroughly assessed and there will no significant adverse effect on the vitality and viability of the centres.

Policy CDP4: Network of Centres supports the "Town Centre First" principle for a variety of uses generating footfall and these include retail and commercial leisure as well as offices, community and cultural facilities and other public buildings. The guidance also includes assessment guidelines for food and drink uses.

SG4: Assessment Guideline 1: The Sequential Approach

a) In line with SPP, sites should be considered in the following order of preference:

1. Town Centres (including the City Centre, Major Town Centres and Local Town Centres)
2. Edge of Town Centre locations
3. Other retail and commercial leisure centres
4. Out of Centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes. Development proposals outwith a Town Centre must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority, that they cannot be accommodated at a sequentially preferable location.

b) In addition to a) above, proposals should also satisfy the following locational criteria: i) At Out of Centre locations- demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority, that the site is accessible by a range of sustainable modes of transport, particularly walking and cycling

- Committee should note that the application site is situated in an Out of Centre location and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal cannot be accommodated in other locations within town centres, edge of town centres or other retail and commercial leisure centres. The applicant has also failed to demonstrate that the site is accessible by a range of

sustainable modes of transport. It is noted that the nearest train station is within a 10 minute walking distance of the application site and it is assumed that there are bus stops nearby however this information along with walking and cycling routes has not been submitted with the application. Furthermore, the applicant has not provided cycle storage provision within the proposal which reduces the likelihood of users cycling to the site and has not provided the minimum parking requirements which could lead to an increase in on-street parking. While it is understood that the applicant may have chosen this location due to its proximity to Sighthill and the availability of the site at the time, the applicant has not demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority, why the proposal cannot be located within a town centre location.

- Committee should consider whether the applicant has provided sufficient information and justification for the proposal being located in an Out of Centre location.

Assessment Guideline 10: Food, Drink and Entertainment Uses In order to protect residential amenity, the following factors will be taken into consideration when assessing whether the location of proposed food, drink and entertainment uses is acceptable:

c) Outwith the City Centre:

i. Public houses, Class 11 and Sui Generis uses must not be located within or immediately adjacent to existing residential buildings.
ii. ii. Hours of operation will be agreed with the Planning Authority based on local circumstances and the impact of the proposal on residential amenity but shall not exceed 08:00 to 24:00hours.

- Committee should note that the proposal is not located within or immediately adjacent to existing residential buildings. The applicant has confirmed that the opening hours for the pub will be 11:00 to 23:00 Monday to Friday and 11:00 to 01:00 at weekends. The weekend hours fall out with the permitted hours of operation within this policy.

- Committee should consider whether the hours of operation, particularly those for weekends, are appropriate.

Assessment Guideline 12: Treatment and Disposal of Cooking/Heating fumes

a) Proposals for a food and drink use will only be considered favourably if suitable arrangements for the dispersal of fumes can be provided to the complete satisfaction of the Council. The following information will be required:

i. Plans to show all proposed cooking/heating equipment with full details of the fume dispersal method. This information must be shown on both the Plan and Elevation drawings;

ii. Full specifications of the proposed ventilation system, including the design, size, location and finish;
iii. A full maintenance schedule of the ventilation system to ensure its continued effectiveness; and iv. Prior to the installation of any system for the dispersal of cooking fumes or odours, a certificate from a member of the Building Engineering Services Association shall be submitted confirming that the proposed fume/odour treatment method will operate to its full specification when fitted at the application site.

b) Dispersal of cooking/heating fumes should be by an externally mounted flue, erected on the rear or side elevation to a height sufficient to disperse fumes above any nearby property.

- Committee should note that the first floor plan indicates that there will be a kitchen which will serve both ground and first floors and a flue will be installed on the side elevation (east) of the building. No information has been provided on: cooking/heating equipment, full details of the fume dispersal method, specifications and maintenance schedule of the proposed ventilation system.

➢ Committee should consider whether the proposals for the dispersal of cooking/heating fumes are acceptable, given the lack of information.

6.10 **CDP8 and SG8: Water Environment** requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out on proposals where their footprint is greater than 250m².

- Committee should note that the applicant has failed to provide a Flood Risk Assessment and SUDS. Scottish Water had no objections, but stated that further investigations would be required to confirm that the proposed development could be serviced. In addition, Scottish Water will not accept any surface water connections into the combined sewer system. The applicant has provided no evidence of consultation with Scottish Water to accept surface water into the combined sewer.

➢ Committee should consider whether the proposal would present a flood risk, how surface water would be accommodated, and how the development could be serviced for water and sewerage, given the lack of a Flood Risk Assessment, a drainage strategy, or confirmation of connection from Scottish Water.

7 COMMITTEE DECISION

7.1 The options available to the Committee are:

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

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	

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

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