

## REPORT OF HANDLING FOR APPLICATION 23/02002/FUL

<b>ADDRESS:</b>	Site At Springburn Road/ Auchentoshan Terrace Glasgow	<p style="text-align: center; margin: 0;"><b>Item 3</b></p> <p style="text-align: center; margin: 0;">10th September 2024</p>
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of public house (Sui Generis) with office accommodation (Class 4) and associated works	
<b>DATE OF ADVERT:</b>	13 October 2023	
<b>NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED</b>	2 neighbour notification letters were issued, the application was advertised in the local press and included within the "Weekly List of Applications". No representations were received.	
<b>PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES</b>	Scottish Water had no objections, but further investigations may be required to be carried out to understand if the development could be serviced.	
<b>PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS</b>	The applicant met with Council officers in 2022 and discussions centred around design amendments to the proposal, additional information required (including a Statement on Energy and a preliminary ecological appraisal), a justification as to why the proposal could not be accommodated within an existing town centre and further information on road access, car parking and cycle storage. The proposal that has been submitted has not addressed the advice set out in the Pre-Application response.	
<b>EIA - MAIN ISSUES</b>	NONE	
<b>CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE	
<b>DESIGN OR DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE	
<b>IMPACT/POTENTIAL IMPACT STATEMENTS – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE	
<b>S75 AGREEMENT SUMMARY</b>	NOT APPLICABLE	
<b>DETAILS OF DIRECTION UNDER REGS 30/31/32</b>	NOT APPLICABLE	
<b>NPF4 POLICIES</b>	<p>NPF4 was adopted on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2023 and is the national spatial strategy for Scotland. Glasgow City Council, as planning authority, must assess all proposed development against its policies. The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Policy 1:</b> Tackling the climate and nature crises</li> <li>• <b>Policy 2:</b> Climate Mitigation and adaptation</li> <li>• <b>Policy 3:</b> Biodiversity</li> <li>• <b>Policy 12:</b> Zero Waste</li> <li>• <b>Policy 13:</b> Sustainable Transport</li> <li>• <b>Policy 14:</b> Design, quality and place</li> <li>• <b>Policy 27:</b> City, town, local and commercial centres</li> </ul>	
<b>CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES</b>	The following policies (CD) and associated Supplementary Guidance (SG) are considered to be relevant to this application:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CDP1 and SG1:</b> The Placemaking Principle</li> <li>• <b>CDP4 and SG4:</b> Network of Centres</li> <li>• <b>CDP5 and SG5:</b> Resource Management</li> <li>• <b>CDP7 and SG7:</b> Natural Environment</li> <li>• <b>CDP8 and SG8:</b> Water Environment</li> <li>• <b>CDP11 and SG11:</b> Sustainable Transport</li> </ul>
<b>OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	NONE
<b>REASON FOR DECISION</b>	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.

	<b>COMMENTS</b>
--	-----------------

<b>PLANNING HISTORY</b>	<p><u>Planning Applications</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15/01351/DC- Erection of two storey public house (Sui Generis) with function suite- <b>Refused.</b></li> <li>• 15/02927/DC- Erection of public house with function room- <b>Grant Subject to Conditions</b></li> <li>• 19/01681/FUL- Erection of two storey public house (Sui Generis) with function suite- Section 42 application to delete condition 16 of 15/01351/DC approved at Local Review 15/00064/LOCAL- <b>Refused.</b></li> </ul> <p><u>Appeals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15/00064/LOCAL- Erection of two storey public house (Sui Generis) with function suite- <b>Allowed on Condition</b></li> <li>• 20/00001/LOCAL- Erection of two storey public house (Sui Generis) with function suite- Section 42 application to delete condition 16 of 15/01351/DC approved at Local Review 15/00064/LOCAL- <b>Dismissed.</b></li> </ul>
<b>SITE VISITS (DATES)</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> October 2023
<b>SITING</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The application site is located within Ward 17- Springburn/Robroyston and is within a High Accessibility area for public transport.</p>
<b>DESIGN AND MATERIALS</b>	<p>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.</p> <p><u>Design</u></p> <p>The architectural style of the building has taken a contemporary reference to the railway and industrial heritage of the local area. The building fronts onto Auchentoshan Terrace and it is assumed that either of the three access on the western elevation would be the main entrance to the building. However, the site plan shows additional accesses on the north elevation and on the south elevation. A large proportion of the west elevation (frontage) is glazed with a large number of windows, doors and rooflights.</p> <p>A clock tower element has been included in the building design which has a small, pitched roof. The roof line of the main building seems to step down significantly before the clock tower. There is a large roof element to the rest of the building which accommodates the office space. A large flue is proposed to be installed on the east elevation.</p> <p>Within the site, soft landscaping is proposed to be installed along with some tree planting to provide a boundary to Springburn Road. Stepped access is located on both sides of the building. Two car parking spaces will be provided. The drawings show a path located perpendicular to Springburn Road which connects the front of the building (west elevation) to the rear (east elevation). The path has three connecting points which lead out onto</p>

	<p>Springburn Road.</p> <p>The Ground floor would consist of Lounge Bar/Restaurant, Sports Bar, toilets, cellar and bin stores. The first floor will consist of dining room, function room, kitchen and toilets. The second floor will consist of 8 office spaces with break-out area and toilets. The opening hours for the ground and first floor will be 7 days a week from 11am until 11pm and is proposed to open until 1am on weekends. The office space (on the second floor) will operate Monday-Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.</p> <p><u>Materials</u></p> <p>The building will mostly be constructed of red brick facing walls, powder coated aluminium windows, interlocking concrete roof tiles and Velux roof windows. Signage will also be installed on the frontage of the building.</p> <p>The Council provided detailed design advice to the applicant on two occasions during pre-application stage with this application being submitted thereafter. Furthermore, the pre-application detailed a number of supporting documents (in relation to flood risk, landscape design, protected species, statement on energy, plant information, detailed elevation drawings) that require to be submitted with the planning application and a number of these have not been submitted.</p> <p>Given lack of information and that the design of the proposal has not been amended since pre-application stage, it is considered that there are serious policy failures.</p>
<b>DAYLIGHT</b>	No issues. There are no residential properties in close proximity to the application site.
<b>ASPECT</b>	<p>The application site is adjacent to the fire station on the south elevation and Springburn Road on the north elevation.</p> <p>It has been confirmed by the applicant that the main entrance would be the entrance under the clock tower however, the drawings submitted show two other possible accesses on this elevation which causes further confusion.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site plan shows three accesses on the north elevation and one on the south elevation.</p>
<b>PRIVACY</b>	There would be no direct overlooking of the proposal to other properties as the building would be located at the end of a street with no properties in close proximity.
<b>ADJACENT LEVELS</b>	The site slopes from east to west to Auchentoshan Terrace. No section drawings were submitted with the application; therefore, it is not possible to fully understand and assess how the proposal will deal with the existing levels of the site. The submitted drawings show that there will be external stepped access at each side of the building.
<b>LANDSCAPING (INCLUDING GARDEN GROUND)</b>	<p>The site plan shows some green space located on the west elevation at Auchentoshan Road with some tree planting. A landscape plan/scheme has not been submitted and there is no detail within the application on how the proposal impacts on the existing trees and no information on detail on the soft landscaping elements.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no detail on the boundary treatment to the rear of the building and no information on any potential mitigation for protected species</p>
<b>ACCESS AND PARKING</b>	<p>The proposal includes 2 car parking spaces, and this is not considered a sufficient number of spaces to satisfy staff and customer demand. Furthermore, the car parking proposed does not meet the minimum standards as set out in <b>CDP11</b> and <b>SG11</b>: Sustainable Transport.</p> <p>It has been confirmed by the applicant that the main entrance would be the entrance under the clock tower however, the drawings submitted show two other possible accesses on this elevation which causes further confusion.</p>
<b>SITE CONSTRAINTS</b>	NONE.
<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>	<p>Section 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts require that when an application is made, it shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise. The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be:</p> <p>a) Whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; and</p> <p>b) Whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>In respect of a) the Development Plan comprises the National Planning Framework 4</p>

adopted on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted 29<sup>th</sup> March 2017.

#### **National Planning Framework 4**

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

- **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

**Policies 1 and 2** intend to encourage, promote and facilitate the development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crises and that minimises and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change.

**Comment:** It is unclear whether the proposal includes any energy efficiency measures as no information, or a Statement on Energy has been submitted. Further information provided in assessment of **CDP5** and **SG5**.

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

**Comment:** The Protected Species Water Vole constraint has been flagged for the application site. At the time of determination, the applicant has failed to submit a preliminary species survey and therefore, the impact of the proposal on existing habitats cannot be assessed nor any mitigation measures be developed.

**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:

- Provision to maximise waste reduction and waste separation at source; and*
- 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.*

**Comment:** 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.

**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.

**Comment:** The proposal has included for 2 car parking spaces but fails to provide any information on bike storage. The application site is within a 10 minute walk of Barnhill train station. The site is located in a largely industrial/business area and therefore, there is a risk that there be an increase in on-street parking. Furthermore, the applicant has not demonstrated how it connects into the wider active travel network.

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

**Comment:** It is considered that the proposal is not consistent with the six qualities the design, scale and massing of the building Furthermore, the proposal has not demonstrated how it will connect to the surrounding areas of St Rollox, Springburn and the

new development at Sighthill. Please see further comments in **CDP1** and **SG1**.

**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.

**Comment:** The application site is not located within a town centre and it is considered that a public house/office accommodation would generate significant footfall. No information/evidence has been submitted by the applicant regarding the site context nor why the proposal could not be accommodated within an existing nearby town centre. It is unclear whether other locations within town centre areas have been sequentially assessed and discounted due to lack of evidence provided.

#### **City Development Plan**

The following policies (CDP) and supplementary guidance (SG) are considered to be relevant in the assessment of this application:

- **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

**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.*

**Comment:** While the Council is keen to support new community facilities within this area of Glasgow, it is considered that there are serious policy failures in terms of design and a lack of information on flooding, sustainability, biodiversity, cooking and ventilation methods for this proposal.

#### **Accessibility**

While 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.

### Local Need

This proposal has come to light, following the redevelopment of the Sighthill area and the former Caledonian pub being subject to compulsory purchase. Therefore, it can be argued that there is a local need to replace the pub within close proximity to Sighthill and the application site is within walking distance of Sighthill.

### Accommodating more than one use

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 as to how these uses would interact with one another and how any impacts from either use would be mitigated. In addition, there are various accesses on the front elevation of the building causing further confusion as to which access should be used for each use. A management plan would have been helpful to understand how these uses would operate jointly, security measures for each part of the building (given that there is no dedicated reception how would the offices be used/reserved?) and how any noise or other amenity impact would be mitigated (it is noted that the applicant has confirmed that floors would be constructed of concrete which would absorb airbourne sound, however further information is required for a full assessment).

### Placemaking Principles and other impacts

It is considered that the design, scale and massing of the proposal is not in line with the key placemaking principles of the City Development Plan.

The external building form is dictated by the programming of the inside rather than responding to the place outside and results in many corners and complex massing. It is considered that the building appears visually confusing, the elevational treatment is ineffective and looks like an upscaled domestic development with extensions rather than an intended design for a commercial or community function. On the west elevation the height of the roof is visually almost the same as the façade, with rooflights visible to the main frontage.

The complex massing utilises more materials than necessary and with its many corners provides a less efficient design in terms of thermal performance. This would put increased strain on energy requirements, though no Statement on Energy has been provided.

Internal provision has been provided for waste and recycling, however there is no indication of an external bin store for the development. There is no information on the detailed design of the internal store nor information on how the bins will be collected.

The entrance tower could be argued provides some limited civic function, however the practicalities and execution of this is questionable as it adds another volume element to the design. Furthermore, the feature does not give the detail presence and identity required. Each elevation has its own issues but the overarching issue is that the facades appear complicated for the wrong reasons, multiple roof lines and forms related to complex massing with setbacks. No 3D visuals were submitted so it is difficult to fully understand the massing of the building.

The building is standalone in its immediate context but located as such that it should provide a local gateway, however the proposal does not achieve this. No details are given to rear boundary treatments. The revised proposal has made minimal effort to incorporate the design comments given to the applicant at pre-application stage.

There are a number of existing trees on the site however, the applicant has failed to submit a tree survey and therefore, it is difficult to fully assess the impact of the proposal on existing trees and any potential mitigation measures. Furthermore, the applicant has failed to submit a landscape plan detailing soft and hard landscaping and species of proposed new trees, hedging etc resulting in the omission of a meaningful designed landscape. At Auchentoshan Terrace and Springburn Road, there is concern that the thin lines of vegetation proposed will not survive unless reinforced with a fence or wall along the edge of the road surface and footway. The planting at the southern corner should be planted (no grass) and a boundary fence or wall installed to show the boundary of the development. It is considered that the landscape design will not survive in its current form.

Due to lack of information, it has not been possible to assess the impact on biodiversity (in particular protected species) and no detail has been given on proposed mitigation measures or how the proposal will contribute to biodiversity gain.

Therefore, while the principle of erecting a community pub and office accommodation may be acceptable in this location, it is considered that the proposal does not comply with **CDP1** and **SG1** due the scale, massing, design and materials of the building and lack of detailed information.

**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*

**Comment:** 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.

*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. 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.*

**Comment:** 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 however, it is noted that these could be negotiated with the applicant.

*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.*

**Comment:** 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. However, the applicant has failed to provide any information on cooking/heating equipment, full details of the fume dispersal method and specifications of the proposed ventilation system. No maintenance schedule of the ventilation system has been provided and so the case officer has been unable to assess the ventilation methods for the proposal.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposal fails to comply with **CDP4** and **SG4** in regard to providing sufficient evidence/justification for its out of centre location, operating hours of the pub and lack of information on cooking and ventilation methods.

**CDP 5** and **SG5:** 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.

**Comment:** Given the lack of information, it is unclear whether the proposal incorporate low and zero carbon generating technologies. This proposal is not included on the exception list within page 15 of **SG5**, therefore a statement on energy is required. This statement has not been submitted with the application and therefore, there is no detail on how the proposal will meet the requirements of **CDP5** and **SG5**.

**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.

**Comment:** Given that the site is currently greenfield and the protected species constraint has been raised for the site, the Council requires a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal to be undertaken. The applicant has failed to provide this survey within the application documents and after email request from the case officer. Therefore, the Council are unable to assess any potential adverse impacts on protected species and other biodiversity from the development and any proposed mitigation for the site.

The proposal does not comply with **CDP7** and **SG7** due to lack of information.



**CDP8** and **SG8**: Water Environment requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out on proposals where their footprint is greater than 250m<sup>2</sup>.

**Comment:** The applicant has failed to provide a Flood Risk Assessment and SUDS and therefore, the case officer is unable to assess any potential flood risk to the proposal and there are no details or indication on any of the submitted drawings of a proposed drainage strategy for the site. While Scottish Water had no objections, it was 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.

Therefore, the proposal does not comply with **CDP8** and **SG8** due to lack of information.

**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.*

**Comment:** The proposal has included 2 car parking spaces, and this is not considered sufficient to satisfy the staff and customer demand for either the public house nor office accommodation. The low levels of parking would result in an increase in on-street parking which would not be encouraged in this location due to the close proximity to the fire station.

#### 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.*

**Comment:** The proposal has not included any detail within the submitted drawings or Planning Statement for cycle provision and therefore the minimum standard has not been met. Therefore, the proposal does not comply with **CDP11** and **SG11**.

**Conclusion:** This application was submitted with significant supporting information omitted and it is evident that the design of the building has not developed since pre-application stage which has made assessment of the application difficult. The Council had requested some of the information from the applicant however, this information has not been submitted. It is evident that the revised proposal has made minimal effort to incorporate the design comments given to the applicant at pre-application stage.

While the principle of a community facility/public house and office accommodation use may be supportable in this location, it is considered that the proposal has seriously failed on a number of aspects including design, massing, scale, materials, car parking/cycle provision, landscape, biodiversity, flood risk, sustainability, justification for locating this use outwith a town centre location and operational arrangements of the food and drink uses.

Due to the scale, massing and design of the building, the building appears visually confusing rather than contemporary and domestic in appearance and detail due to the oversized roof and many corners. The design fails to comply with Placemaking principles as the external building form has been largely dictated by the programming of the inside rather than responding to the place outside. Furthermore, there is no detail within the Supporting Statement or within the drawings of how the building relates to the surrounding environment. In terms of materials, no 3D visualisation has been provided to understand the colour intention or to show the building within the local context.

Due to the scale, massing and design of the building, each elevation has its own design

	<p>issues, but the overarching issue is that the facades appear complicated with multiple roof lines and forms related to complex massing and setbacks. The complex massing utilises more materials than necessary and with its many corners provides a less efficient design in terms of thermal performance.</p> <p>The proposal fails to provide the minimum standard of cycle provision and the maximum standard of car parking for a public house use which increases the risk of on-street parking in the area. The applicant has failed to provide information on how the proposal links with the existing active travel network.</p> <p>The proposal fails to provide detailed information required to assess the proposal's impact on flood risk, biodiversity and landscape and fails to provide information on proposed cooking and ventilation methods. Furthermore, the proposal fails to provide a justification as to why the proposal cannot be located within a town centre location.</p> <p>As outlined in the report, the proposal does not comply with CDP1, SG1, CDP4, SG4, CDP5, SG5, CDP7, SG7, CDP8, SG8, CDP11 and SG11 of the Glasgow City Development Plan and policies 1, 2, 3, 13, 14 and 27 of NPF4. Therefore, refusal is recommended.</p>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>Refuse</b>

Date: 17/1/2024	DM Officer	<b>Lorna Bonnes</b>
Date: 19/01/2024	DM Manager	Ian Briggs

Reasons for Refusal

01. The proposal was not considered 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.