



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

Item 1

26th November 2024

24/00135/LOCAL – 120 Woodville Street

Use of land for siting of shipping containers and erection to boundary fence and gate.

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): 05 - Govan

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 AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS

- 1.1 The proposal site is designated as a vacant derelict site, which sits on the corner of Woodville and Clynder Street. The site has an area of approximately 1486sqm.
- 1.2 The property is not located within a Conservation Area, but is in close proximity to a Category 'B' Listed former Glasgow Engineering Works building – Maritime House – which is sited on the opposite side of Woodville Street and 22.4m from the application site.
- 1.3 The site is located within an area of High Public Transport Accessibility.
- 1.4 The proposal seeks consent for use of the land as siting for 45 no. shipping containers (Class 6), the erection of a boundary fence and gate, and associated alterations to the existing access from Clynder Street.
- 1.5 31 no. shipping containers would be sited at the edge of the site and 14 no. would be sited in the centre. The containers would measure approximately 6.1m x 2.4m and 2.9m in height and would be constructed using black painted steel. There would be a minimum 6m space between the containers.
- 1.6 The proposed palisade fence and gate would measure 2.1m in height and would be painted in black. The fencing would run along the perimeter of the site, behind the low-level facing brick wall. The proposed gate would measure 5m wide to allow for two-way vehicle access.
- 1.7 The proposed hours of operation are 7am to 9pm.

2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

- 2.1 NPF4 was adopted by the Scottish Ministers on 13 February 2023 and is part of the statutory Development Plan. Where there is an area of incompatibility it is expected that the newest policy document will take precedence, which will be NPF4 for the time being.

In this case, the relevant policies from NPF4 are:

- Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises
- Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation
- Policy 3: Biodiversity
- Policy 9: Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings
- Policy 13: Sustainable Transport
- Policy 14: Design, quality and place
- Policy 20: Blue and green infrastructure
- Policy 22: Flood risk and water management
- Policy 26: Business and industry

- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies are:

- CDP1: The Placemaking Principle
- CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy
- CDP6: Green Belt and Green Network
- CDP7: Natural Environment
- CDP8: Water Environment
- CDP11: Sustainable Transport

2.3 The relevant Supplementary Guidance is:

- SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Parts 1 & 2)
- SG6: Green Belt and Green Network
- SG7: Natural Environment
- SG8: Water Environment
- 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 development proposal is contrary to Policy 1. Tackling the climate and nature crises, Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation, Policy 3: Biodiversity, Policy 6: Forestry, woodland and trees, Policy 9: Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings, Policy 14 Design, quality and place, Policy 20: Blue and green infrastructure and Policy 22: Flood risk and water management of the National Planning Framework 4 and CDP 1/SG 1- Placemaking: The Placemaking Principle, CDP 1/SG 1- Placemaking, CDP 2 - Sustainable Spatial Strategy, CDP 6 & IPG 6 - Green Belt & Green Network, CDP 7 & SG 7 - Natural Environment, CDP 8 & SG 8 - Water Environment and CDP 11 & SG 11 - Sustainable Transport of the City Development Plan as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom
03. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4, Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises due to the introduction of hardstanding across the entire site, removal of all soft landscaping and failure of the proposal to consider or mitigate against the impact of this.
04. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4, Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation due to the removal of all soft landscaping and the introduction of an impermeable surface across the entire site. The proposal has not been designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible, nor has it been designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.
05. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4, Policy 3: Biodiversity and CDP 6/IPG 6 - Green Belt & Green Network of the City Development Plan, given the

intension to remove all soft landscaping and trees on site and as a consequence of the proposals failure to include any enhancement to biodiversity or to consider protected species that may be present on site.

06. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4, Policy 6: Forestry, woodland and trees and CDP 7/SG 7 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that existing trees would be protected in relation to design, demolition and construction.
07. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4, Policy 9. Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings as the proposal has failed to consider sustainability and bio-diversity as part of the sites re-development to the detriment of this site and wider locale.
08. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4, policy 14: Design, Quality & Place of National Planning Framework 4 and CDP 1 of the City Development Plan in that the proposed development has not been designed to improve the quality of the area. The proposal will remove valuable greenery from the site and introduce a feature that does not complement nor enhance the site to the detriment of visual and residential amenity and the character of the street scene. Furthermore, the proposed development has been poorly designed, will be detrimental to the amenity of the area and is inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places due to its siting, built form and design.
09. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4, Policy 20: Blue and green infrastructure due to the proposals failure to protect and enhance blue and green infrastructure to the detriment of this site and wider locale.
10. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4, Policy 22: Flood risk and water management and CDP 8/SG 8 - Water Environment of the City Development Plan due to the applicant's failure to consider and to include measures to strengthen the proposal's resilience to flooding.
11. The proposal is contrary to CDP 7/SG 7 - Natural Environment of the City Development Plan as it has failed to protect existing wildlife and bio-diversity or consider enhancements to this in the design of the proposal.
12. The proposal is contrary to CDP 11 & SG 11 - Sustainable Transport of the Glasgow City Development Plan due to the proposals failure to demonstrate adequate visibility for both vehicular traffic and pedestrians to the potential detriment of safety.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

01. Initial resistance from planning focused on the fact that the city underground runs diagonally under the site at a shallow depth which

renders the site unsuitable for any form of built development, which is borne out by the fact that the nearby residential development did not encroach onto this site. Discussions with SPTE subsequently resulted in the SPTE accepting the proposed development.

02. It is clear from the list of reasons given for the refusal, that the planning officer has been heavily influenced by the requirements of NPF4, and has focused almost exclusively on the eco aspects of the application with absolutely no consideration of the economic gain, the supply of storage units which are much in demand, the rates which will accrue to the city council, the job opportunities which may be offered and the investment which will flow. In fact the assessment of the application has been wholly one dimensional, which renders it flawed and unsafe.
03. While NPF4 now has statutory status, just like local development plans, it offers guidance and direction on a range of matters, but it is not a bible of absolute doctrine to be rigorously applied and imposed without due consideration of the circumstances. It should be applied judiciously. This is a relatively small site where the opportunity exists to develop a storage facility. There are no financial margins for landscaping schemes or other bio-diversity initiatives and to attempt to impose them on a site of this nature is to fail to understand the legislation. To apply the policies as has been done, is unrealistic, unreasonable and not at all in the spirit of the legislation.
04. The application site, despite the glowing description expounded by the planning officer, is a vacant weed strewn industrial site in an industrial area. It cannot be developed due to the constraints imposed by the presence of the underground and is not in a location where it could be developed for any positive outdoor use, yet a developer, the appellant, is prepared to invest in the area and provide a service for which demand has already been identified with a possible 50% of the units potentially under lease, for use by small businesses and individuals for a range of purposes including storage and workspace.
05. Throughout the ROH there is no appreciation or understanding of the fact that any investment at this time is risky and that there has to be a financial return that makes investment worthwhile. Claiming that the proposed development does not contribute to bio-diversity, does not include climate mitigation and adaptation measures, makes no provision for the protection of blue and green infrastructures and no provision for existing wild life may be true, but I would question the relevance of this. What wildlife is being referred to, what blue infrastructure is being referred to, what soft landscaping is being sacrificed to create the proposal, what is meant by the loss of bio-diversity and /or habitat connectivity? The list of questions is endless because the policies identified have been applied with absolutely no understanding of the site. The proper application of policy can be positive and beneficial, but the blanket unconsidered imposition of policies, the majority of which have no locus in this application and then to claim that as a basis for refusing

the application, is baseless and cannot be considered as sustainable reasons for the refusal.

06. We believe that the conclusion reached by the planning officer namely: “the proposal will not contribute towards protecting and improving the quality of the environment, improving health and reducing health inequality” speaks volumes for the misguided and wholly distorted and confused assessment of the proposal. The proposal is for a storage area in an industrial area. It is not a panacea for all the ills of the neighbourhood. It was not intended to improve health and reduce health inequalities. It is storage plain and simple and while issues raised in NPF4 may have some currency they should not have been the sole basis for consideration.
07. The site does not form part of any green corridor, wildlife haven or any other bio-diversity area. It is an industrial site in an industrial area and to claim otherwise is disingenuous.
08. A proper assessment of the application should involve all relevant policies and guidance, it should not be based almost solely on one set of principles, in this case, eco factors, to the detriment of all other matters. An examination of the ROH leaves no doubt that the planning officer has, without any understanding of the site, sought to impose almost every eco policy, whether or not it was relevant.
09. In response to the reasons for refusal, the appeal statement notes:
- Reasons **01** is a catch all statement and **02** is specified further in the other reasons.
- 03** -There is hardstanding across the entire site because the proposed use requires that both the containers and the infrastructure has to be on hardstanding. Had the planning officer sought to ask it would have been possible to introduce greenery in all four corners.
- 04** – As per above though it must be stressed that there is no removal of soft landscape, but the removal of spoil and weeds. We note that one of the objectors objected to the loss of a community greenspace! This was never a community greenspace. It has always been industrial/commercial.
- 05** – We are not aware of any species on the site neither is the city Council, so to claim that we are affecting wildlife when it is not known whether there is in, is foolish.
- 06** – The existing trees are simply wild trees which over time have grown on the edge of the site. They do not form part of any green corridor or wildlife habitat.

07 – The site is industrial and the proposed use is for storage and the principle concern has to be that the storage facility functions properly and safety. The fact that the proposal utilizes shipping containers is a clear example of sustainability in practice. The ubiquitous shipping container is the ultimate in recycling and is now used for all manner of purposes like offices, shops, homes, surgeries. In fact the list of possible uses is endless.

08- The greenery on the site is essentially wild weeds and shrubs interspersed with spoil heaps. Why, on an industrial site there is a need to retain or create valuable greenery is unclear and to suggest that the introduction of storage containers in an industrial area is to introduce a feature which would be to the detriment of the area, is foolish. Equally it is unclear as to why a proposal for storage should be required to provide passive surveillance or encourage active lifestyles through the creation of walkable neighbourhoods

09 – While the description “blue and green infrastructure” has idyllic overtones, it is quite meaningless as there is neither blue or green infrastructure elements on the site which require protection.

10 – There is no record of flooding on the site or in the area so it is unclear what measures could be introduced or why measures would be considered necessary. It is also unclear as to what is meant by “local overheating” which is not something with which we or for that matter anyone we have approached, has heard of or has any experience of.

11 – There is no record of any wildlife on the site so there is no need to introduce or incorporate measures to protect non-existent wildlife.

12 – The site already enjoys a dropped kerb which will continue to be the entrance. There is no problem with visibility for either vehicles or pedestrians, so this is an irrelevance.

- 4.2 The applicant did not request any further procedure in the determination of the review.

5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 There were seven letters of representation received to the application, including one from Councillor Hutchison, all objecting to the proposal. A summary of the comments received is given below:

- The proposal would impact on residential amenity due to an increase in noise and the visual impact of the development;
- The site is immediately adjacent to residential properties;
- The proposal would result in a loss of trees and shrubs on the site;
- The site is designated as community greenspace, which would be lost;

- The proposal would result in an increase in traffic, impacting residential amenity and pedestrian safety;
- Potential structural concerns upon the subway;
- The area is in need of positive regeneration.

5.2 One letter of representation was received from Councillor Alam to this review in support of this proposal. As summary of the comments received is given below:

- Local industry creates jobs, promotes entrepreneurship and directs resources directly into the community;
- Support of proposal.

5.3 Strathclyde Passenger Transport (SPT) were consulted on the application and initially objected, expressing concern regarding the impact on the integrity of the Subway infrastructure. This objection was later withdrawn. An Asset Protection Agreement was signed and engineering acceptance agreed, subject to the following conditions:

1. No breaking work will be undertaken to the existing land, only slight works to accommodate a further layer of Type 1 which will be compacted and laid on top of the existing ground.
2. The depth of the Type 1 will be approximately 150-175mm.
3. The total number of storage containers are 45 single storey, not doubled up.
4. Each container will have a net weight of approximately 2000kg.
5. Whilst the site is in operation only 1 car/van will be allowed to enter and stay on site whilst loading and loading their stock.

A request was made by SPT to include these conditions if consent was granted.

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 relevant policy considerations:

6.3 **Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises and Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation**

NPF4 Policy 1 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crises. Policy requires that, when considering all developments, significant weight be given to the global climate and nature crises

NPF4 Policy 2 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate development that minimizes emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change. Policy 2 requires:

- a) Development proposals will be sited and designed to minimize lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible.
- b) Development proposals will be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.
- c) Development proposals to retrofit measures to existing developments that reduce emissions or support adaptation to climate change will be supported.

Committee should note:

- This site has been designated as derelict vacant since 2001.
 - The proposal would remove all vegetation from the site.
 - The site would be covered with impermeable hard standing.
 - No measures are proposed that address the climate and nature crises.
- Committee should consider whether the development has a detrimental impact on a nature positive place that is resilient to climate change impacts.

6.4 **Policy 3: Biodiversity, Policy 20: Blue and green infrastructure, CDP6: Green Belt and Green Network, and CDP7 Natural Environment**

NPF4 Policy 3 intends to protect biodiversity, reverse biodiversity loss, deliver positive effects from development and strengthen nature networks. The policy requires development proposals to contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity including the restoring of degraded habitats. Proposals for local development will include appropriate measures to conserve, restore, and enhance biodiversity. Measures should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development. Any potential adverse impacts, including cumulative impacts, of development on biodiversity, nature networks and the natural environment will be minimised. This will take into account the need to reverse biodiversity loss, safeguard the ecosystem services that the natural environment provides, and build resilience by enhancing nature networks and maximising the potential for restoration.

NPF4 Policy 20 intends to protect and enhance blue and green infrastructure and their networks. Development proposals that result in a fragmentation or net loss of existing green infrastructure will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not exacerbate a deficit in green infrastructure provision, and the overall integrity of the network will be maintained. Development proposals for or incorporating new or enhanced green infrastructure will be supported.

CDP6 aims to ensure the development and enhancement of Glasgow's Green Network by protecting and extending the Green Network and linking habitat network; providing for the delivery of multifunctional open space to support new development; protecting the Green Belt; and supporting development proposals that safeguard and enhance the Green Network and Green Belt.

CDP7 aims to ensure that Glasgow's natural environments, including its ecosystems and protected species, are safeguarded and, wherever possible, enhanced through new development; help and enhance biodiversity and protect the health and function of ecosystems; help the natural environment adapt to climate change; and protect important landscape and geological features in the City.

Committee should note:

- The proposal would remove all vegetation from the site.
- No biodiversity enhancements or nature-based mitigation proposals are proposed.
- No Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the vegetation to be removed has been provided nor has a survey for protected species using the site, as requested by the Council's Biodiversity team.
- Part of the site has been designated Amenity Greenspace under CDP6/SG6.

Committee should consider:

- Whether the proposal will contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity;
- If the proposed development would protect and enhance green infrastructure and networks; and
- If they are completely satisfied that there would be no adverse impacts on protected species caused by the proposed development.

6.5 **Policy 9: Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings**

NPF4 Policy 9 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate the reuse of brownfield, vacant and derelict land, and to help reduce the need for greenfield development. Development proposals that will result in the sustainable reuse of brownfield land including vacant and derelict land and buildings, whether permanent or temporary, will be supported. In determining whether the reuse is sustainable, the biodiversity value of brownfield land which has been naturalised should be taken into account. Proposal on greenfield sites will not be supported unless the site has been allocated for development or the proposal is explicitly supported by policies in the LDP.

Committee should note:

- The site has been designated as derelict vacant since 2001.
 - The proposal would remove all vegetation from the site and no planting is proposed.
- Committee should consider whether the proposed development is a sustainable reuse of the site.

6.6 **Policy 13: Sustainable transport and CDP11: Sustainable Transport**

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.

The relevant policy guidance is:

- a) Proposals to improve, enhance or provide active travel infrastructure, public transport infrastructure or multi-modal hubs will be supported. This includes proposals:
 - for electric vehicle charging infrastructure and electric vehicle forecourts, especially where fuelled by renewable energy.
- b) Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the transport requirements generated have been considered in line with the sustainable travel and investment hierarchies and where appropriate they:
 - i. Provide direct, easy, segregated and safe links to local facilities via walking, wheeling and cycling networks before occupation;
 - ii. Will be accessible by public transport, ideally supporting the use of existing services;
 - iii. Integrate transport modes;
 - iv. Provide low or zero-emission vehicle and cycle charging points in safe and convenient locations, in alignment with building standards;
 - v. Supply safe, secure and convenient cycle parking to meet the needs of users and which is more conveniently located than car parking;
 - vi. Are designed to incorporate safety measures including safe crossings for walking and wheeling and reducing the number and speed of vehicles;
 - vii. Have taken into account, at the earliest stage of design, the transport needs of diverse groups including users with protected characteristics to ensure the safety, ease and needs of all users; and
 - viii. Adequately mitigate any impact on local public access routes.
- c) Where a development proposal will generate a significant increase in the number of person trips, a transport assessment will be required to be undertaken in accordance with the relevant guidance.

CDP11 aims to ensure that Glasgow is a connected City, characterized by sustainable and active travel by supporting better connectivity by public transport, discouraging non-essential car journeys; encouraging opportunities for active travel; reducing pollution and other negative effects associated with vehicular travel; and optimizing the sustainable use of transport infrastructure.

More detailed guidance is provided within SG11: Sustainable Transport as follows:

Cycle Parking

The Council shall require the provision of cycle parking, in line with the minimum cycle parking standards specified (below), as well as the following guidance:

- a) Wherever possible, employee cycle parking should be located within buildings or a secure compound. Where such a location is not feasible,

provision should be close to areas of high activity, such as the main entrance of developments, to ensure cycling is encouraged through enhanced security provided by passive surveillance.

- b) Cycle parking should always be safe, sheltered and secure. The form of cycle parking provided should facilitate the securing of the frame of the bike to the “stand”. “Sheffield” racks are a good, and preferred, example of such provision.
- c) Employment sites shall provide on-site showers, lockers, changing and drying facilities, as a means of promoting walking and cycling to work. These are important trip-end facilities that can positively affect an individual’s decision to walk, run or cycle regularly.

Minimum standard for Storage and Distribution (Class 6) use:

Staff: 1 space per 750sqm gross floor area

Visitor: 1 space per 3000sqm gross floor area

Vehicle Parking

Vehicle parking provision should be assessed against the standards set out below.

Maximum standard for Storage and Distribution (Class 6) use:

High Accessibility: 0.25 spaces per 100 sqm gross floor area

Committee should note:

- The site is located within an area of High Public Transport Accessibility.
- No vehicle or cycle parking is proposed.
- The total site area is approximately 1480sqm.

Committee should consider:

- Whether the proposed development provides adequate cycle parking provision.
- Whether the proposed development provides adequate vehicle parking provision.
- If this proposal successfully promotes the use of sustainable transport options.

6.7 **Policy 14: Design, quality and place and SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 1)**

Policy 14 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the Place Principle. The policy required development to be designed to improve the quality of an area regardless of scale. Development will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places:

Healthy: Supporting the prioritisation of women's safety and improving physical and mental health.

Pleasant: Supporting attractive natural and built spaces.

Connected: Supporting well connected networks that make moving around easy and reduce car dependency

Distinctive: Supporting attention to detail of local architectural styles and natural landscapes to be interpreted, literally or creatively, into designs to reinforce identity.

Sustainable: Supporting the efficient use of resources that will allow people to live, play, work and stay in their area, ensuring climate resilience, and integrating nature positive, biodiversity solutions.

Adaptable: Supporting commitment to investing in the long-term value of buildings, streets and spaces by allowing for flexibility so that they can be changed quickly to accommodate different uses as well as maintained over time.

Policy 14 states that proposals that are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported. Further details of the six qualities of place can be found in Annex D of NPF4.

CDP/SG1 Part One includes the six Qualities of Place that apply to all development proposal:

- A place with character and identity: a place that is distinctive.
- A successful open space: a place that is useable, high quality and multi-functional.
- A legible and safe place: a place that is accessible, easy to navigate, and welcoming.
- A place that is easy to move around: a place that is well-connected and focussed on active travel.
- A vibrant and diverse place: a place that has multiple uses and high levels of street level activity.
- A place which is adaptable and sustainable: a place that is adaptable for future needs and demonstrates sustainable design.

- Committee should consider whether this proposal is consistent with the qualities of successful places.

6.8 **Policy 22: Flood risk and water management and CDP8: Water Environment**

Policy 22 intends to strengthen resilience to flood risk by promoting avoidance as a first principle and reducing the vulnerability of existing and future development to flooding. Policy 22 requires development proposals to:

- i. not increase the risk of surface water flooding to others, or itself be at risk.
- ii. manage all rain and surface water through sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS), which should form part of and integrate with proposed and existing bluegreen infrastructure. All proposals should presume no surface water connection to the combined sewer;

- iii. seek to minimise the area of impermeable surface.

CDP8 aims to aid adaption to climate change; protect and improve the water environment; support the development of integrated green infrastructure throughout the City; meet the requirements of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 and Scottish Planning Policy; and contribute to the overall reduction of flood risk and make satisfactory provision for SUDS. Applicants will be required to demonstrate that proposals contribute to:

- minimising and reducing flood risk;
- avoiding any increased risk of flooding from any source either within the development site, or outwith the site as a consequence of the development; and
- avoiding any increase in the quantity and rate of surface water run-off from any site.

Committee should note:

- All vegetation within the site would be lost and replaced with hard standing covering the entirety of the site.
 - No SUDS provision is included within the proposal, contrary to policy.
 - No Flood Risk Assessment or Flood Risk Screening Checklist has been provided to support the application.
 - As per SEPA Flood Maps, the site is designated high risk of surface water flooding. There is no specific river or coastal flood risk.
- Committee should consider if this proposal successfully mitigates against flood risk.

6.9 **Policy 26: Business and industry**

NPF4 Policy Intent: To encourage, promote and facilitate business and industry uses and to enable alternative ways of working such as home working, livework units and micro-businesses.

The relevant policy guidance is:

- a) Development proposals for business and industry uses on sites allocated for those uses in the LDP will be supported.
- b) Development proposals for business, general industrial and storage and distribution uses outwith areas identified for those uses in the LDP will only be supported where:
 - i. It is demonstrated that there are no suitable alternatives allocated in the LDP or identified in the employment land audit; and
 - ii. The nature and scale of the activity will be compatible with the surrounding area.
- e) Development proposals for business and industry will take into account:

- i. Impact on surrounding residential amenity; sensitive uses and the natural and historic environment;
- ii. The need for appropriate site restoration at the end of a period of commercial use.

Committee should note:

- The site is designated as vacant land, but the site has not been allocated for business use.
- The site is outwith any Economic Development Area in the City Development Plan.

Committee should consider:

- If the nature and scale of this proposal is acceptable in this location.
- If this proposal will have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity and the environment.
- Whether the proposal has demonstrated that there are no suitable alternative sites allocated in the City Development Plan.

6.10 **CDP1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2)**

This overarching policy states that new development should encourage placemaking by being design-led, aspiring towards the highest standards of design while directing development to the right place. All development should respect and protect the City's heritage by responding to its qualities and character of its site and surroundings. Development should make the City an appealing place to live, work and visit for all members of society, providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents.

- Committee should consider if this proposal is of a high design standard that respects the City's heritage.

6.11 **SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2)**

Non Residential Development Affecting Residential Areas

This guidance aims to ensure that any non-residential development in proximity to residential development does not harm residential amenity or erode the character of residential neighbourhoods.

All proposals for non-residential uses will be considered against the following criteria:

- a) Outwith the Network of Centres and Economic Development Areas identified in the Plan, permission will not normally be granted for uses that would generate unacceptable levels of disturbance, traffic, noise, vibration, and emissions (particularly outside normal working hours) or which propose the storage of quantities of hazardous substances in close proximity to housing.

- b) Uses which prove acceptable to the Council will require to provide adequate screening for any outside storage of materials and introduce traffic mitigation measures, where appropriate, in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding residential area.

Committee should note:

- This proposal is located outwith of both the Network of Centres and the Economic Development Areas.

Committee should consider:

- If this proposal would generate an unacceptable level of disturbance for local residents.
- If the screening and mitigation measures proposed are acceptable in this instance.

6.12 **CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy**

This overarching policy aims to influence the location and form of development to create a 'compact city' form which supports sustainable development. It seeks to ensure that the City is well-positioned to meet the challenges of the climate emergency and economic changes, building a resilient physical and social environment which helps attract and retain investment and promotes an improved quality of life.

This proposal is located within the Govan - Partick Strategic Development Framework area which has the following vision for the area:

By 2030 Govan-Partick will be recognised as an urban district of well-connected but distinct neighbourhoods, providing a very high quality of life, creating a context for nationally significant economic development and a narrowing of social inequalities. The area will be recognised as a leading Innovation District, where technical excellence contributes to inclusive growth and the building of a liveable place. Over the next decade the City Council, partner agencies and the wider network of stakeholders will share knowledge and resources to affect a fundamental shift in the image and performance of this city-district. This process of change will benefit all of the community, and will contribute to the overall social and economic success of the city-region.

- Committee should consider whether or not this proposal supports the development of a compact city of well-connected and liveable places that narrow social inequalities.

7 **COMMITTEE DECISION**

7.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with the same or different conditions from those listed below; or
- b. Refuse planning permission.

- c. Continue the review to request further information.

8 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 n/a

*Glasgow's net zero
carbon target?*

**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

9 Recommendations

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