

REPORT OF HANDLING FOR APPLICATION 25/00459/FUL

ADDRESS	Site To The West Of 2114E Pollokshaws Road Glasgow	Item 3 28th October 2025
PROPOSAL	Erection of 1No. dwellinghouse (Contrary to CDP).	

DATE OF ADVERT	Adverts (LBA, Conservation Area, Affect LB/Con and Development Contrary to Development Plan) Edinburgh Gazette – published 28 March 2025 Evening Times – published 28 March 2025 Site Notice (LBA, Conservation Area, Affect LB/Con) Site Notice – posted 28 March 2025
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	11 neighbour notification letters were issued and the application was included on the Weekly List of Applications. Five responses were received – one from Network Rail as a neighbour, one from a neighbour within Sheeppark Farm, one from Pollokshaws and Eastwood Community Council, and two from interest groups (BM Friends of Pollok Country Park and the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland). Four of the responses object to the proposal. The material points of objection from the representations are summarised and contextualised as follows: • The principle of the erection of a new dwellinghouse on this application site in the designated Green Belt is significantly contrary to the Development Plan. • The application site is on land which does not form part of the historic development of Sheeppark Farm and is not related to the previous redevelopment of the Sheeppark Farm farmsteading buildings and land. The representation acknowledged that, from their own research of historic mapping, that <i>“This current proposal is on a field with no existing buildings and to the best of our knowledge has only ever had a small steading of around 5% of the footprint of the building being proposed, which appears and then disappears from maps sometime between 1944 and 74.”</i> • The application site is within, and proposed development would be detrimental to the character and quality of, the following other heritage and natural designations in this location of Pollok Country Park and as such is contrary to the Development Plan. ○ Pollok Park Conservation Area (HES reference) ○ Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape – Pollok Park (Nether Pollok) (HES reference GDL00317) ○ Pollok Country Park and Pollock Estate City-Wide Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) ○ Pollok Country Park Site of Special Landscape Importance (SSLI) • No technical surveys or reports have been submitted that consider or demonstrate, justify and/or mitigate the proposed development’s impact on the application site, on the above listed designations, and on the neighbouring residential properties. Specific references to missing information include: ○ <i>“sustainability statement”</i> ○ <i>“topographical survey”</i> ○ <i>“ecological information”</i> ○ <i>“tree survey”</i>

	○ “environmental impact information” ○ “very little building design information” ○ “lack of detail regarding materials” ○ “no details of landscaping or groundworks” • The private road which gives access to the 6no. existing residential properties at Sheeppark Farm and to the Polloksaws Bowling Club, and which would give access to the proposed development, is also a Core Path (reference C145) which connects public access from Pollokshaws Road to Pollok House and the wider interconnected core path network within Pollok Country Park. The new access would increase vehicle traffic onto this private road and Core Path, and would require the existing gate access to the field to be widened and developed for residential vehicle access. Without information submitted to the contrary, this is likely to result in the loss of or damage to protected trees on the northern side of this Core Path which are within and adjacent to the site and the existing gate access. • The proposed siting and design of the development within the site may be detrimental to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. <u>Officer Comments</u> The case officer agrees that the above points are material objections to the proposed development and to this application. The material points of objection are considered within this Report of Handling in the assessment of the proposal against the relevant policies in the Development Plan. Of particular weight is the fact that no justification has been submitted by the applicant or the agent, either within the pre-application or this application, to competently demonstrate that the proposal meets at least one of the stated exception criteria and all of the requirement criteria in in Policy 8 of NPF4 and in CDP6 and SG6 of the adopted CDP.
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	None
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	Formal pre-application advice was sought for this application. The pre-application reference number is 24/02087/PRE and the address provided is 2114D Pollokshaws Road, Glasgow, G43 1AT. The pre-application Outcome Report is dated 10 October 2024. The conclusion of the Outcome Report is as follows: <i>“The proposal is not considered to accord with NPF 4 and the Development Plan. It is contrary to NPF4, Policy 1. Tackling the climate and nature crises, Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation, Policy 3: Biodiversity, Policy 7, Historic assets and places and Policy 8, Green Belts.</i> <i>It is also contrary to City Development Plan policies CDP 1/SG 1- Placemaking, CDP 2 – Sustainable Spatial Strategy, CDP 6 & SG 6 – Green Belt & Green Network, CDP 7 & SG 7 – Natural Environment, CDP 9/SG 9 Historic Environment.</i> <i>The proposal would introduce a structure that goes against the significant protected status of this site. The use proposed would be incompatible with the sites status as greenbelt land and would not protect or enhance the character, landscape, natural setting and identity of this settlement.</i> <i>The loss to bio-diversity is unacceptable and will not deliver the better, healthier and more bio-diverse Glasgow which the Development Plan strives to achieve. The proposal also fails to protect, preserve or enhance the cultural significance, character and integrity of this gardens and designed landscapes and as such would not be supported.</i> <i>In conclusion, the proposal will not contribute towards protecting and improving the quality of the environment, improving health and reducing health inequality. The proposal is incompatible with the 6 qualities of place.</i>

	<i>Please note that the above advice is without prejudice to the formal consideration of any subsequent application.”</i> The submitted Planning Statement provides a response to the pre-application Outcome Report which focuses on confronting the conclusions within the Outcome Report. However, the Planning Statement does not itself provide a competent assessment of the content of the relevant planning policies from the Development Plan that were identified in the Outcome Report. Moreover, the proposed development itself has not been altered from what was submitted to the pre-application to respond to the relevant planning policies. The drawings show the exact same development. It is evident that the applicant and agent have not considered the Development Plan and that they disagree with the Outcome Report for pre-application 24/02087/PRE.
--	--

EIA – MAIN ISSUES	None
CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES	Not applicable
DESIGN OR DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT – MAIN ISSUES	Not required. A supporting Planning Statement has been submitted.
IMPACT/POTENTIAL IMPACT STATEMENTS – MAIN ISSUES	Not applicable
S75 AGREEMENT SUMMARY	Not applicable
DETAILS OF DIRECTION UNDER REGS 30/31/32	Not applicable
NPF4 POLICIES	The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the national spatial strategy for Scotland up to 2045. Unlike previous national planning documents, the NPF4 is part of the statutory Development Plan and Glasgow City Council as planning authority must assess all proposed development against its policies. The following policies are considered relevant to the application: Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation Policy 3: Biodiversity Policy 4: Natural Places Policy 6: Forestry, Woodland and Trees Policy 7: Historic Assets and Place Policy 8: Green Belts Policy 13: Sustainable Transport Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place Policy 16: Quality Homes Policy 20: Blue and Green Infrastructure Policy 22: Flood Risk and Water Management

CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES	CDP1, SG1 (Part 1) and SG1 (Part 2): The Placemaking Principle CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy CDP5 and SG5: Resource Management CDP6 and SG6: Green Belt and Green Network CDP7 and SG7: Natural Environment CDP8 and SG8: Water Environment CDP9 and SG9: Historic Environment CDP11 and SG11: Sustainable Transport
OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 Historic Environment Scotland Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape listing for Pollok Park (Nether Pollok) ref. GDL00317 Pollok Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2016, GCC) Design Guide New Residential Areas (March 2013, GCC) Local Biodiversity Action Plan (GCC)
REASON FOR DECISION	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.

	COMMENTS
PLANNING HISTORY	The application site has no planning history prior to this application and the associated pre-application (as below). Ref: 24/02087/PRE Description: Erection of 1No. dwellinghouse Decision: Closed
SITE VISITS (DATES)	Site visit 10 April 2025. Application determined using Google Maps and the drawings provided.
SITING	Current Site and Surrounding Area The application site is a triangular shaped field, which has been in historic use for grazing and agriculture. It is greenfield land and appears to be predominantly grassland with a few shrubs / bushes or small trees within the site including a large shrub / bush on the eastern boundary. On the day of the site visit, the grass was long and there were no grazing animals within the site. The site is bounded by a post and wire fence around its perimeter, by a mature tree belt on its southern boundary and by mature woodland to the northern and western boundaries. The adjacent land to the east is soft landscaped verge, a tarmac private access road, the 6no. existing residential properties formed from the conversion of the historic Sheeppark Farm steading, and the garden ground of 2114E Pollokshaws Road which is one of the residential properties. To the south of the site there is a Core Path (reference C145) and the private access road which provides vehicle and active travel access onto the nearest adopted public road and footway which is Pollokshaws Road to the east. There is an existing field gate in the southeast corner of the site which is the only access to the application site. The private access road runs underneath the Pollokshaws Road, Railway Underbridge to South of Pollokshaws West Station which is a Category B Listed Building (reference LB33960). The Railway Underbridge was built circa 1847 for the Glasgow Barrhead and Neilston Railway.

	To the south of the Core Path and private access road there are agricultural fields and the Pollokshaws Bowling Club with its associated access to its private car park taken from the same private access road. The application site is located within Pollok Country Park. It is also subject to several Development Plan policy, historic environment and natural environment designations. They are listed in the Site Constraints section in this report, below. Furthermore, it is adjacent to the designations which cover the woodland on the northern and western boundaries of the application site: • White Cart Water Green Corridor • White Cart Water City-Wide Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) The application site is within Ward 2 – Newlands / Auldburn Historic Development The 6no. residential properties to the east of the application site are within the historic developed land of Sheeppark Farm. The first OS Map to show Sheeppark (or Sheep Park) Farm is from the 1860's, and it shows the farm steading as one connected building on approximately the same footprint and plot as the following three properties (apart from later extensions) – 2114B, 2114C and 2114D Pollokshaws Road. The footprint and plot of 2114E Pollokshaws Road is shown in the next OS Map dating from the 1890s, indicating this part of the farm steading was built between the 1860s and the 1890s. 2114A Pollokshaws Road was subsequently built sometime between 1948 and 1951 on the land to the east of the farm steading building group which was shown on previous OS Maps to be in use as formal garden ground and / or an orchard to serve Sheeppark Farm. In contrast, the application site is shown in the OS Maps from 1860s until present day to have been in continuous use as a field, either for grazing or agriculture. The 1860s OS Map shows the site within a large field with it's southern boundary defined by an access track or road and its eastern boundary adjacent to the Sheeppark Farm building group as described above. The 1890s OS Map shows the site with its current shape and its northern and western boundaries defined by the planting of the still existing woodland. As submitted by the applicant, and confirmed by a review of historic OS mapping by the case officer, the footprint of a building within the application site is shown on the OS National Grid Maps, 1944 – 1974 in all revisions (A through C). The building footprint is not shown on the OS Map in the 1930s or in the OS Map from 2005. There is no building within the site currently and there has not been a building for at minimum 20 years.
DESIGN AND MATERIALS	The proposed development comprises the erection of one dwellinghouse, the formation of an access and associated ground and landscaping works. Design The submitted drawings provide very little information on the detailed design of the development, and no stated information or indicative architectural rendering or detailing of the proposal's material finishes. What is shown is summarised below. The application site area is approximately 5025.5 sqm or 0.50245 hectares. The existing field access is proposed to be “upgraded” and the submitted Site Plan as Proposed drawing (dwg no. 31106/2) shows that the width of the existing field access gate is to be widened with the extra width shown as being approximately 0.5m to the west and an overall width of approximately 5.9m. The drawing does not show the existing, historic and protected mature tree belt that is planted along this boundary. No additional technical information – such as a Tree Survey or technical drawings showing the exact works proposed to widen the existing field access – has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed access works will not detrimentally impact on the health and vitality of the mature trees which are immediately adjacent to the existing field access gate because of these works. A long driveway is shown (approximately 51m in length) from the field access heading north to the indicated car parking and turning area, sited on the eastern third of the site

	near the boundary. The driveway is approximately 3m in width for 33m of its length, and then it widens to approximately 5.9m at the upgraded access onto the private access road. The proposed dwellinghouse and integrated garage have a footprint area of approximately 273 sqm. The elevations drawing (dwg no. 31106/5) show the dwellinghouse and garage to be two storeys. The floor plan drawings (dwg nos. 31106/3a and 31106/4a) show the dwellinghouse to have 5 bedrooms, 5 bathrooms, a study, a games room, an open plan lounge / kitchen / dining / family room, a utility room, and a double garage. The dwellinghouse is shown to be surrounded by a patio area, a walkway, and the car parking and turning area. The patio area is on the southwestern corner to the front and side of the dwellinghouse. The car parking and turning area is on the southeastern corner to the front and side of the dwellinghouse, and looking towards the south part of the site and towards the private access road and neighbouring residential properties to the east. The walkway and rear part of the patio area are on the northern elevation and rear of the dwellinghouse, and it includes indicative space for waste and recycling bin storage on the northeastern corner. Materials The submitted drawings do not show or state in text the proposed materials for the development. The submitted Planning Statement only says the following on page 2, <i>"The dwelling will be built to a traditional design and incorporate a palette of materials to be found on the adjacent original buildings, namely stone and slate with timber windows and doors. The dwelling will be constructed to the latest building regulations which will ensure a high level of insulation as well as incorporating a ground sourced heat pump and other eco friendly apparatus, with the aim of delivering a building which will be as carbon neutral as possible."</i> Due to the sensitive location of the site within the Green Belt, the Pollok Park Conservation Area, and the Inventory of Garden of Designed Landscape designations, both the detailed design and the specific material finish of all parts of the proposed development are required to be submitted to allow for a meaningful assessment of the proposed development against the Development Plan policies. The application is not supported by the minimum required level of detailed design information or the material finish of the proposed development. The submitted drawings and Planning Statement are lacking. <u>Officer Comments</u> The applicant submitted an application for planning permission. However, while the level of information submitted is sufficient to allow the application to be validated it is wholly insufficient to allow the case officer or any other planning officer or decision maker to competently assess the proposed development and determine that the proposal will comply with the Development Plan. This is demonstrated in the assessment in this Report of Handling in the Other Comments section, below.
DAYLIGHT	The applicant has not submitted information on overshadowing from the proposed development on land within the site or onto land within neighbouring residential properties. However, this information is not considered to be required as the proposed development will not significantly reduce the amount of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring land or dwellinghouses due to its siting within the application site, the height of the dwellinghouse (approximately 6.4m), and the distance between the dwellinghouse footprint and the neighbouring residential properties. Regarding loss of daylight and sunlight, the proposal generally complies with page 60 in the Design Guide New Residential Areas planning guidance which states that <i>"There should be no adverse impact on existing or proposed neighbours in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight."</i>
ASPECT	The principal (front) elevation of the proposed dwellinghouse faces southwest towards the private access road and the Core Path, however, the siting of the dwellinghouse is approximately 54m north of the existing field gate access at its closest point. The

	dwellinghouse is therefore set well back in the site and due to the high number of window and door openings – 40 in total comprising 33 windows and 7 doors – on all elevations there will be significant overlooking of both the site itself as well as of the existing dwellinghouses to the east and the rear garden area of 2114E Pollokshaws Road.
PRIVACY	The applicant has not submitted information about the potential loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties that would result from the proposed development. As stated in the Aspect section above, there are 40 window and door openings on the proposed two storey dwellinghouse with integrated garage. Of that total: • five window openings and one door opening are on the southeast elevation which faces towards the existing neighbouring residential properties across the private access road; and • 10 window openings and three door openings are on the northeast elevation which faces towards the rear of the site as well as overlooking the private rear garden area of 2114E Pollokshaws Road. Due to the very limited information shown on the submitted drawings, it is not clear whether the proposed development includes the retention or replacement of the existing post and wire fence boundaries. Post and wire fences provide no visual screening. If retained, they would not mitigate against the significant increase in overlooking between the application site and the proposed development, and the existing neighbouring residential properties within the converted Sheeppark Farm steading buildings. If replaced, a taller and/or more solid timber fence or boundary structure may create a visual divide which would not be in keeping with the immediate character of the existing development along the private access road and would likely be detrimental to the character and amenity of the Pollok Park Conservation Area and the Garden and Designed Landscape designation as, again, it would not be in keeping with the immediate character of this location or with the wider managed estate and country park character of these designations. It is considered that, based on the limited information submitted, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on both the residential amenity of the existing neighbouring properties and the residential amenity of the new dwellinghouse itself because of unmitigated overlooking and loss of privacy. This is contrary to page 60 in the Design Guide New Residential Areas planning guidance which states that <i>“There should be no adverse impact on existing or proposed neighbours in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight.”</i>
ADJACENT LEVELS	The applicant has not submitted information on the topography of the land within the site. As seen on the site visit, the land generally rises to the north and west. Due to the height of the grassland within the site it was not clear if the land itself is generally flat or if there are areas of small mounds and depressions.
LANDSCAPING (INCLUDING GARDEN GROUND)	The applicant has not submitted technical information – such as a topographical survey, Tree Survey, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) Report, and/or a Biodiversity Survey – on the existing habitats, vegetation, protected plant and animal species, and biodiversity within the site. Moreover, they have not submitted information about the proposed hard or soft landscaping within the site and they have not shown how the proposed development will protect or enhance the existing trees and biodiversity on the site. The following areas provide the only information provided by the applicant about the site and its existing and proposed landscaping. • Site area = 5025.5 sqm • Developed footprint area (all buildings and indicated hard landscaping for people and vehicles) = 758.6 sqm

	Undeveloped footprint area (Site area – Developed footprint area) = 4266.9 sqm As the site is subject to many designations, including historic and natural environment designations, the planning authority requires a Site Appraisal of the site in line with paragraphs 2.10 – 2.12 of SG1 (Part 1). The supporting information shows that the existing and proposed landscape and ecology of the site were not considered in the design of the proposed development, and this is contrary to paragraphs 2.10 and 2.11 criteria c) of SG1 (Part 1) and paragraph 2.40 of SG1 (Part 2).
ACCESS AND PARKING	As described in the Design and Materials section of this report, the submitted drawings provide very little information on the detailed design and material finishes of the development, and this includes the proposed access, driveway, car parking and turning area. The submitted Site Plan as Proposed drawing (dwg no. 31106/2) shows the location within the site and the general dimensions of these works. The car parking and turning area is sited in front of and to the side of the dwellinghouse and is overlooked by two habitable rooms – the games room and the study – and the integral garage. The application form (3 March 2025) states that 4 vehicle parking spaces will be provided. As stated in the Design and Materials section, the width of the driveway at its narrowest point is 3m. The siting of the car parking and turning area and the width of the driveway is contrary to page 38 section Housing Layout, Plot and Garden Size in the Design Guide New Residential Areas planning guidance which requires that <i>“Housing layouts should have: ... car parking spaces located to the side or rear of the house or in a private rear parking court with no vehicle parking spaces immediately in front of habitable rooms”</i>, which is repeated on page 44 in the Detached and Semi-Detached Housing section which states that <i>“Car parking should be provided in-curtilage, to the side and/or rear of the house and not in the front garden”</i> and that <i>“Driveway dimensions should be a minimum of 6 x 3.5 metres with garages at least 3 x 6 x 2.3 (H) metres. In larger detached house plots, it may be possible to set the house more than 4 metres from the street as long as the garage and driveway are to the side of the house. This ensures an adequate amount of landscaped space to the front of the house which can contribute positively to the streetscape.”</i> The private access road which provides access to the existing field access and the proposed widened access to the application site is also designated as a Core Path (reference C145). This Core Path provides a continuous shared route from Pollokshaws Road to Pollok House and the wider Core Paths network within Pollok Country Park at this location. Under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003, Core Paths have legal status which means that they cannot be diverted or ‘stopped-up’ (closed) without going through a legal process. This includes temporary closure for development work. Core Paths are available for all non-motorised users and for those with mobility impairments using motorised wheelchairs or scooters. The private access road and Core Path are a historic entrance to Pollok Park, as: - shown on the Ordnance Survey First Edition six-inch series map, 1863 on page 14 of the Pollok Park Conservation Area Appraisal, - described in the Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape – Pollok Park (Nether Pollok) listing as <i>“A further entrance route from Sheeppark Farm is also no longer open”</i> as a historic route within the network of roads into and around Pollok Park; and, - underscored by the Pollokshaws Road, Railway Underbridge to South of Pollockshaws West Station (LB33960) which is a Category B Listed Building which was built circa 1847 to maintain this access connection from Pollokshaws Road to Pollok House. While the proposed increase use by vehicles in accessing and parking within the application site is not an inherent issue, the insufficient level of information submitted about the works is contrary to the following relevant Development Plan policies – SG1 (Part 2) paragraphs 2.40 and 2.42 criteria (b); SG6 paragraphs 2.8, 2.11 and Table 3: Access; and SG11 paragraphs 3.5, 3.6 and 3.8.

SITE CONSTRAINTS	The site is subject to the following site constraints, which include historic and natural environment designations. • Green Belt • Pollok Park Conservation Area • Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape – Pollok Park (Nether Pollok) (HES reference GDL00317) • Pollok Country Park and Pollock Estate City-Wide Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) • Pollok Country Park Site of Special Landscape Importance (SSLI) • Coal Authority – Low Risk Area The site is adjacent to the following site constraints, which include designations: • Within 10m of Adopted Core Path (reference C145) • White Cart Water Green Corridor • White Cart Water City-Wide Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
OTHER COMMENTS	Sections 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. Under the terms of Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, the Council is required to have special regard to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area, including the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be: a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; b) whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; c) whether any other material considerations (including objections and supplementary guidance) have been satisfactorily addressed. Each development proposal will be considered on its individual merits and must respond to its setting appropriately to ensure protection and enhancement of amenity in the area. In respect of (a) and (b), the Development Plan comprises the National Planning Framework 4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted on the 29th March 2017. <u>Policies 1 and 2 of NPF4 and CDP5 and SG5 of the CDP</u> <u>Policy 1. Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises</u> <i>When considering all development proposals significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises.</i> <u>Policy 2. Climate Mitigation and Adaptation</u> a) <i>Development proposals will be sited and designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible.</i> b) <i>Development proposals will be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.</i> c) <i>Development proposals to retrofit measures to existing developments that reduce emissions or support adaptation to climate change will be supported.</i> <u>CDP5 and SG5: Resource Management</u>

Policy CDP5 states that *“The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended by the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, requires Local Planning Authorities to include policies which require buildings in new developments to be designed to avoid a specified and rising proportion of projected greenhouse emissions from their use through the installation of low and zero carbon generating technologies.”*

It requires *“New buildings should also include low and zero-carbon generating technologies (LZCGT) to offset a proportion of emissions arising from the use of the buildings, as specified in the table below. All buildings must receive an appropriate sustainability label as per the Building Standards Technical Handbook Section 7: Sustainability. As a minimum, the specified level of sustainability for a dwelling or non-domestic property, at the planning application submission date, should be as set out in Table 3.”* As of 2018, the standard required is Gold level.

SG5 further requires in paragraphs 4.6, 7.1 – 7.3 and Table 3 that *“A Statement on Energy will be required to support all applications”*. This includes applications for one new dwellinghouse.

Officer Assessment:

Policies 1 and 2 requires planning authorities to give significant weight to the climate and nature crises when assessing all development proposals against the Development Plan and material considerations.

Under the Local Development Plans heading within Policy 2, it specifically states that *“The LDP spatial strategy should be designed to reduce, minimise or avoid greenhouse gas emissions. The six spatial principles should form the basis of the spatial strategy, helping to guide development to, and create, sustainable locations. ... LDPs should support adaptation to the current and future impacts of climate change by taking into account climate risks, guiding development away from vulnerable areas, and enabling places to adapt to those risks.”*

As stated in the Siting and the Site Constraints sections of this report, the application site is subject to a number of Development Plan, historic environment and natural environment designations. The application site is within these designations as it has been rigorously assessed and determined to have qualities that are valued and worth protecting by them. The designations are taken into consideration in this assessment and given significant weight, in line with Policies 1 and 2.

As demonstrated in the rest of this report, the proposed development is contrary to Policies 1 and 2 of NPF4. The principle of the proposed new dwellinghouse on this site:

- in the Green Belt;
- on greenfield land;
- in Pollok Country Park;
- in the Pollok Park Conservation Area and Garden and Designed Landscape;
- with no reasonable justification and with no detailed design or materials information; and
- no consideration for protecting or enhancing the existing natural environment of the site itself or the natural environment and landscape character of the surrounding area in line with the SINCL and SSLI designations which also make the site within the Green Network;

cannot be supported as it is significantly contrary to the Policies' aims to create sustainable places and direct development away from vulnerable areas in line with the spatial strategy set out in the adopted CDP (i.e. the LDP for Glasgow City Council).

Moreover, a Statement of Energy is required to be submitted for all new residential development, including single dwellinghouses, in line with SG5 section 7 paragraph 7.3 and with CDP5. The submitted drawings do not show or describe or state that any LZCGT measures or any other design or materials are being specifically used to meet the Gold level for new domestic development in Glasgow. As this information is not provided it is not possible to assess the projected greenhouse emissions and energy needs of the proposed dwellinghouse, or to determine if they make suitable use of low

or zero carbon generating technologies in order to contribute to meeting greenhouse emissions targets.

The proposal therefore does not give significant weight to the global climate and nature crises, to the requirement for development to be sited and designed for climate mitigation and adaptation, and a competent Statement of Energy which demonstrates that the proposed development will meet the required Gold level for new domestic development in Glasgow has not been submitted.

The proposed development is significantly contrary to Policies 1 and 2 of NPF4, and to CDP5 and SG5 of the CDP.

Policies 3, 4, 6, 8 and 20 of NPF4 and CDP6, CDP7, SG6 and SG7 of the CDP

Policy 3. Biodiversity

- a) *Development proposals will contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity, including where relevant, restoring degraded habitats and building and strengthening nature networks and the connections between them. Proposals should also integrate nature-based solutions, where possible. ...*
- c) *Proposals for local development will include appropriate measures to conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity, in accordance with national and local guidance. Measures should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development. Applications for individual householder development, or which fall within scope of (b) above, are excluded from this requirement.*
- d) *Any potential adverse impacts, including cumulative impacts, of development proposals on biodiversity, nature networks and the natural environment will be minimised through careful planning and design. 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.*

Policy 4. Natural Places

- a) *Development proposals which by virtue of type, location or scale will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment, will not be supported. ...*
- d) *Development proposals that affect a site designated as a local nature conservation site or landscape area in the LDP will only be supported where:*
 - i. *Development will not have significant adverse effects on the integrity of the area or the qualities for which it has been identified; or*
 - ii. *Any significant adverse effects on the integrity of the area are clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits of at least local importance.*
- e) *The precautionary principle will be applied in accordance with relevant legislation and Scottish Government guidance.*
- f) *Development proposals that are likely to have an adverse effect on species protected by legislation will only be supported where the proposal meets the relevant statutory tests. If there is reasonable evidence to suggest that a protected species is present on a site or may be affected by a proposed development, steps must be taken to establish its presence. The level of protection required by legislation must be factored into the planning and design of development, and potential impacts must be fully considered prior to the determination of any application.*

Policy 6. Forestry, Woodland and Trees

- b) *Development proposals will not be supported where they will result in:*
 - i. *Any loss of ancient woodlands, ancient and veteran trees, or adverse impact on their ecological condition;*
 - ii. *Adverse impacts on native woodlands, hedgerows and individual trees of high biodiversity value, or identified for protection in the Forestry and Woodland Strategy;*

- iii. *Fragmenting or severing woodland habitats, unless appropriate mitigation measures are identified and implemented in line with the mitigation hierarchy; ...*

Policy 8. Green Belts

a) *Development proposals within a green belt designated within the LDP will only be supported if:*

i. *They are for:*

- *development associated with with agriculture, woodland creation, forestry and existing woodland (including community woodlands);*
- *residential accommodation required and designed for a key worker in a primary industry within the immediate vicinity of their place of employment where the presence of a worker is essential to the operation of the enterprise, or retired workers where there is no suitable alternative accommodation available;*
- *horticulture, including market gardening and directly connected retailing, as well as community growing;*
- *outdoor recreation, play and sport or leisure and tourism uses; and developments that provide opportunities for access to the open countryside (including routes for active travel and core paths);*
- *flood risk management (such as development of blue and green infrastructure within a “drainage catchment” to manage/mitigate flood risk and/or drainage issues);*
- *essential infrastructure or new cemetery provision;*
- *minerals operations and renewable energy developments;*
- *intensification of established uses, including extensions to an existing building where that is ancillary to the main use;*
- *the reuse, rehabilitation and conversion of historic environment assets; or*
- *one-for-one replacements of existing permanent homes.*

And

ii. *the following requirements are met:*

- *reasons are provided as to why a green belt location is essential and why it cannot be located on an alternative site outwith the green belt;*
- *the purpose of the green belt at that location is not undermined;*
- *the proposal is compatible with the surrounding established countryside and landscape character;*
- *the proposal has been designed to ensure it is of an appropriate scale, massing and external appearance, and uses materials that minimise visual impact on the green belt as far as possible; and*
- *there will be no significant long-term impacts on the environmental quality of the green belt.*

Policy 20. Blue and Green Infrastructure

a) *Development proposals that result in fragmentation or net loss of existing blue and green infrastructure will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not result in or exacerbate a deficit in blue or green infrastructure provision, and the overall integrity of the network will be maintained. The planning authority's Open Space Strategy should inform this. ...*

c) *Development proposals in regional and country parks will only be supported where they are compatible with the uses, natural habitats, and character of the park.*

Green Network policies

With regards to the Green Network and the application site's location in Pollok Country Park, its SINC and SSLI designations, and the adjacency of the Core Path, the following CDP6 policy wording is relevant:

"The Green Network consists of a variety of elements – from strategic hubs (e.g. parks), through connecting corridors and links (e.g. waterways or walkways/cycleways) down to small scale elements (such as local open spaces, hedgerows or green roofs). Many of these elements are protected as sites designated for their nature conservation or landscape importance (see Policy CDP 7: Natural Environment) or through inclusion in the Council's Open Space Map. All help deliver benefits for the City but, when they function together, this potential is greatly enhanced. Policy CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle sets increased importance on the health and environmental benefits of the contribution the Green Network makes to people's lives. Therefore it is critical that new development should enhance, wherever possible, the functionality, quality, connectivity and accessibility of the Green Network, and its role as green infrastructure." (page 69)

"Development plans are required, through Scottish Planning Policy, to protect core and other important routes and access rights (see Policy CDP 11: Sustainable Transport)..." (page 69)

Furthermore, SG6 Table 2: Glasgow's Green Networks shows that the application site is firmly within the Green Network as it falls within category 2 *"Sites subject to environmental designations as protected by policy CDP7/SG7 (and CDP6 in relation to Green Corridors)"* as it is an in a SINC and a SSLI and category 3 *"Those parts of the Green Belt (including Pollok Country Park that aren't developed)"*.

SG6 paragraph 2.9 states that *"Whilst new development should not have an adverse impact on the Green Network, there may be instances when other development plan considerations are accorded greater weight. In such circumstances, it is important that suitable mitigation is provided, in addition to measures to enhance biodiversity in line with NPF4 Policy 3"*.

SG6 continues in paragraph 2.11 that *"Development proposals that affect Country Parks must have regard to their statutory purpose of providing recreational access to the countryside close to centres of population and should take account of their wider objectives as set out in their management plans and strategies."*

SG6 Table 3: Considerations for Development Design sets out what all proposed developments should consider and reflect in the detailed design, but especially proposed developments that are within the Green Network. Table 3 is robust in its design information and clear in what opportunities must be addressed.

Green Belt policies

With regards to the Green Belt, which the application site is within, the following CDP6 policy wording is relevant:

"The Green Belt is a key element in the Green Network, linking the elements within the urban area to the wider countryside beyond. It also has an important role to play in achieving other environmental objectives, including: supporting regeneration; protecting the identity, character and landscape setting of the City; and protecting the natural roles of the environment (such as floodplain capacity)." (page 70)

"The City's Green Belt has contracted significantly in recent years, particularly following the release of land for development in City Plans 1 and 2. The Green Belt Review concluded that there is little scope for any further contraction of Glasgow's Green Belt if it is to continue to meet environmental objectives." (page 70)

"The Council will not support development that would adversely affect the function and integrity of the Green Belt. Some forms of development (as set out in Supplementary Guidance) may be acceptable in the Green Belt provided other considerations can be satisfactorily addressed." (page 72)

SG6 paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 states that:

Paragraph 3.2 *"[I]t is important that the Council continues to exercise a strong presumption against development that would adversely affect the function or integrity*

of the remaining Green Belt. Exceptions to this general presumption will be considered where the proposal is for:

- (i) development associated with agriculture, woodland creation, forestry and existing woodland (including community woodlands);
- (ii) residential accommodation required and designed for a key worker in a primary industry within the immediate vicinity of their place of employment where the presence of a worker is essential to the operation of the enterprise, or retired workers where there is no suitable alternative accommodation available;
- (iii) horticulture, including market gardening and directly connected retailing, as well as community growing;
- (iv) outdoor recreation, play and sport or leisure and tourism uses of a scale and form appropriate to a countryside location; and developments that provide opportunities for access to the open countryside (including routes for active travel and core paths);
- (v) development previously accepted as consistent with a green belt location (such as dog or cat kennels);
- (vi) flood risk management (such as development of blue and green infrastructure within a "drainage catchment" to manage/mitigate flood risk and/or drainage issues);
- (vii) essential infrastructure or new cemetery provision;
- (viii) minerals operations;
- (ix) the generation of renewable energy/heat;
- (x) intensification of established uses, including extensions to an existing building where that is ancillary to the main use;
- (xi) the reuse, rehabilitation and conversion of historic environment assets; or
- (xii) a one-for-one replacement of an existing permanent home or recently vacated permanent home."

Paragraph 3.3 "and all of the following requirements are met:

- (i) reasons are provided as to why a green belt location is essential and why it cannot be located on an alternative site outwith the green belt;
- (ii) the purpose of the green belt at that location is not undermined;
- (iii) the proposal is compatible with the surrounding established countryside and landscape character;
- (iv) the proposal has been designed to ensure it is of an appropriate scale, massing and external appearance, and uses materials that minimise visual impact on the green belt as far as possible;
- (v) there will be no significant long-term impacts on the environmental quality of the green belt;
- (vi) in relation to 3.2 viii), all development proposals need to be assessed against the policy criteria within policy 33 d) and e) of NPF4;
- (vii) in relation to 3.2 ix), the proposal should provide for sustainable restoration and aftercare to return the land in question to its former status, or an enhanced status on previously degraded/brownfield sites, should/when the use cease;
- (viii) in relation to 3.2 xii), a completed conversion or redevelopment should be contained substantially within the footprint of the original dwelling(s) and not compromise the character or appearance of the green belt. The curtilage of any such development should not exceed that of the original dwelling(s); and
- (ix) the proposal is justifiable against other policies of the development plan and associated SG."

CDP7 and SG7: Natural Environment

Policy CDP7 states that on page 79 under the Impact of New Development that:

“New development should not have an unacceptable effect, either directly, indirectly, or cumulatively, on:

- 1. the purpose, integrity or character of areas designated for their landscape importance;*
- 2. sites, habitats, species or ecosystems protected by law or which are designated as important for their nature conservation value;*
- 3. sites designated as important for their geodiversity value;*
- 4. trees, woodlands or hedgerows that are of importance.*

Where development, which may have an impact on such assets, is permitted, it should be designed to minimise adverse impacts and, where these cannot be avoided, suitable mitigation should be provided. The Council may require the developer to undertake surveys, prior to planning applications being determined. ...

New development should not further fragment habitats, networks or isolate habitats or species, but should enhance the natural and landscape assets listed above wherever possible, including by:

- 1. helping to develop linkages between habitats;*
- 2. restoring degraded habitats;*
- 3. maintaining and enhancing the health and function of ecosystems; and*
- 4. promoting resilience and adaptation to climate change.”*

SG7 requires in paragraph 2.1 that *“The Council expects all development proposals shall be based on an understanding of the characteristics of the site, including any possible geodiversity, wildlife or habitat significance. This should be done as part and parcel of a wider placemaking approach...”*. It continues in paragraph 2.2 *“A typical site appraisal should:*

- a) highlight any designations (including Local Geodiversity Sites) on or near to the site;*
- b) identify potential important habitats (mature trees, woodland, hedgerows, ponds or watercourses);*
- c) identify if protected species are likely to be in, or near, the site;*
- d) give an indication of the ecological data required for progressing a planning application; and*
- e) recommend if more detailed surveys will be necessary.”*

Paragraph 2.4 requires that *“Where a protected or otherwise important (eg identified in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan or the accompanying LBAP Implementation Plan) species or habitat has been identified on, or adjacent to, the site, planning applications shall be supported by an appropriate level of information. At the time of submitting a planning application, applicants need to provide the following, as appropriate:*

- a) Information on specific habitats, plants, animals (including how the site is used by them) and geology and the surrounding area, including its sensitivity, significance and value.*
- b) An assessment of any potential effect of the development on these features. If adverse effects are expected, the details of proposed mitigation measures by the developer to avoid or minimise these effects.*
- c) Where there is likely to be unavoidable damage or disturbance, then proposals which would compensate for the loss.*
- d) A statement of whether there may be licensing requirements and, with reference to the relevant licence tests, a demonstration that a future species licence is likely to be granted (see Annex D of this SG).”*

Regarding designated SINCs, SG7 paragraph 3.8 states *“There is a presumption against development which would have an adverse effect, directly, indirectly or cumulatively, on an LNR or a SINC, unless it can be clearly shown that:*

- a) the objectives and integrity of the area will not be compromised, including, where appropriate, objectives for water quality. ...; or*
- b) there are social or economic benefits to be gained from the development that are of city-wide importance and clearly and significantly outweigh the conservation interest of the site – in such circumstances, suitable mitigation (see Section 6) shall be provided in the form of compensatory nature conservation and water environment/quality measures.”*

Due the habitat of the site – grassland surrounded by mature trees and in proximity to the White Cart Water, and set within Pollok Country Park – there is the potential for protected species to utilise the application site. As set out in Table 2. Protected Species and Development Activities, and the included Examples of Development Activities on specified protected habitats (which includes grassland habitats as set out in the Glasgow City Council Local Biodiversity Action Plan), development which could affect woodland, lines of trees, mature trees, grasslands and grasslands in parks has the potential to damage habitat for the following protected species: otter, bats, badger, and breeding birds. SG7 paragraph 4.3 states that *“There is a presumption against development which would have an adverse effect on a protected species, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. This may include impact on the habitat of a protected species... including fragmentation or isolation, or other activities that result in disturbance. Examples of development activities that could have an impact on protected species commonly found in Glasgow are shown on Table 2.”* Paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5 qualify the policy presumption stating that appropriate mitigation could be used to ensure no adverse effects on protected species, but that the mitigation must be well designed, implemented, and should form part of the proposed development prior to determination of the planning application.

Regarding biodiversity enhancement and protection, SG7 paragraph 5.2 states that *“Development shall not result in a loss of biodiversity or habitat connectivity. Wherever possible, development shall enhance biodiversity and/or habitat connectivity. New developments shall aim to incorporate existing habitats, enhance and expand them and/or help create new habitats as well as enhancing the ecosystem services that the development site currently supports, or could support. This can involve protecting and incorporating existing habitat features such as hedges, trees, ponds, streams, wetlands and even derelict areas into plans. These can be expanded and enhanced (such as by provision of bat and bird boxes, planting native species, green roofs etc) as part of the development proposal. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) require to be provided to support most new developments, and SG8: Water Environment indicates that SuDS features shall be designed with a view to helping meet the CDP’s requirements for enhancing biodiversity, access to open space and the provision of sustainable travel routes as part of a multifunctional green network. SuDS ponds, planted with native vegetation, can, for example, provide a habitat for a number of species as well as attractive open space. Habitat and species surveys shall be carried out prior to any form of site disturbance including ground investigation works.”*

Lastly, SG7 paragraph 7.3 states that *“The Council will not support development proposals that would have a significant adverse impact on the special character or qualities of a local landscape site unless applicants can demonstrate that the proposed development will enhance the character or qualities of the site.”*

Officer Assessment:

There is extensive planning policy in both NPF4 and the CDP which requires that Glasgow City Council as the planning authority give significant weight in the assessment and determination of planning applications to ensure that all proposed development at a minimum protects and wherever possible enhances the natural environment (inclusive of the landscape) and the designated Green Belt. This is particularly important where the application site is located within designated sites, as is the case here. I'll take each designation in turn.

The application site is within the designated Green Belt. The proposed development, in both principle and detail, is significantly contrary to Policy 8 of NPF4 and to CDP6 and SG6 of the CDP.

The applicant's justification for the proposed development (as taken from the submitted Planning Statement on page 1) is *"that the applicant wishes to erect a fully detached dwelling which will more ably [sic] satisfy his families changing requirements."* This justification does not meet any of the clearly stated exclusion criteria set out in Policy 8 (a)(i) and in SG6 paragraph 3.2 criteria (i) – (xii), and it does not meet all of the required criteria set out in Policy 8 (a)(ii) and in SG6 paragraph 3.3 criteria (i) – (ix). And the secondary points briefly stated in the Planning Statement about the *"traditional design"* and *"aim of delivering a building which will be as carbon neutral as possible"* do not outweigh the requirement to strictly comply with Policy 8, CDP6 and SG6 and certainly are not robustly demonstrated in the submitted supporting drawings which are lacking the basic information of detailed design and material finishes to allow for a meaningful assessment on that basis. The role of the Green Belt designation for Pollok Country Park, which covers the application site, is to both protect the identity, character and landscape setting of the City and to protect the natural roles of the environment as set out in CDP6 on page 70 of the CDP.

The application site is within the following Green Network designations: the Pollok Country Park and Pollok Estate City-Wide SIN; the Pollok Country Park SSL; and, the Green Belt. The proposed development, in its detail, is significantly contrary to Policies 3, 4, 6 and 20 of NPF4 and to CDP6, CDP7, SG6 and SG7 of the CDP.

The applicant has not submitted a site appraisal or any technical site surveys to establish the existing characteristics of the application site, *"including any geodiversity, wildlife or habitat significance"* as required by SG7 paragraphs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4. As stated above, this includes technical surveys such as a PEA, a Tree Survey, and a topographical survey at a minimum given the observed and known characteristics and designations. Furthermore, the applicant has not submitted any supporting information, reports or drawings which demonstrate that the proposed development incorporates biodiversity enhancement, hard and soft landscaping, and water management into its detailed design, nor that the proposed development protects existing trees, habitats, wildlife, and landscape setting through appropriate and designed in mitigation. This lack of information is significantly contrary to the following relevant policies as the Development Plan and specifically Policy 4 (e) requires planning authorities to apply the precautionary principle in accordance with relevant legislation and Scottish Government guidance: Policy 3 criteria (a), (c) and (d); Policy 4 criteria (a), (d), (e), and (f); Policy 6 (b); Policy 20 (a) and (c); CDP6 page 69; CDP7 page 79 under Impact of New Development as summarised above; SG6 paragraphs 2.9, 2.11 and Table 3; and, SG7 paragraphs 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.8, 4.3 – 4.5, 5.2, and 7.3.

Policies 7, 14, and 16 of NPF4 and CDP1, CDP2, CDP9, SG1 (Part 1), SG1 (Part 2), and SG9 of the CDP

Policy 7. Historic Assets and Places

- d) *Development proposals in or affecting conservation areas will only be supported where the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced. Relevant considerations include the:*
 - i. *Architectural and historic character of the area;*
 - ii. *Existing density, built form and layout; and*
 - iii. *Context and siting, quality of design and suitable materials.*
- e) *Development proposals in conservation areas will ensure that existing natural and built features which contribute to the character of the conservation area and its setting, including structures, boundary walls, railings, trees and hedges, are retained. ...*
- i) *Development proposals affecting nationally important Gardens and Designed Landscapes will be supported where they protect, preserve or enhance their cultural significance, character and integrity and where proposals will not significantly impact on important views to, from and within the site, or its setting.*

Policy 14. Design, Quality and Place

- a) *Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale.*
- b) *Development proposals will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places:*

Health: *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*

- c) *Development 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.*

Policy 16. Quality Homes

- f) *Development proposals for new homes on land not allocated for housing in the LDP will only be supported in limited circumstances where:*
 - i. *The proposal is supported by an agreed timescale for build-out; and*
 - ii. *The proposal is otherwise consistent with the plan spatial strategy and other relevant policies including local living and 20 minute neighbourhoods;*
 - iii. *And either:*
 - *delivery of sites is happening earlier than identified in the deliverable housing land pipeline. This will be determined by reference to two consecutive years of the Housing Land Audit evidencing substantial delivery earlier than pipeline timescales and that general trend being sustained; or*
 - *the proposal is consistent with policy on rural homes; or*
 - *the proposal is for smaller scale opportunities within an existing settlement boundary; or*
 - *the proposal is for the delivery of less than 50 affordable homes as part of a local authority supported affordable housing plan.*

CDP1, SG1 (Part 1) and SG1 (Part 2): The Placemaking Principle

CDP1 requires that all proposed development should aspire to achieve the six qualities of place, as stated on page 32, "The Council will also expect new development to be design-led, to contribute towards making the City a better and healthier environment to live in and aspire towards the highest standards of design while protecting the City's heritage, by achieving the following: ...

- 4. *Delivering sustainable buildings, areas and spaces that are attractive and enhance the quality of life for everyone; ...*
- 8. *Respecting the historic and natural environment by responding to its qualities and character and encouraging their appropriate use;*
- 9. *Providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents in the City;"*

SG1 (Part 1) paragraph 2.3 states that *“The onus will be on developers and applicants to fully consider, evaluate and apply the principles of placemaking to individual schemes, as appropriate. Applicants must be able to show how their proposals meet placemaking requirements and how they have responded to relevant local development plan policies and associated Supplementary Guidance.”*

Furthermore, SG1 (Part 1) paragraphs 2.10 – 2.12 requires that *“The Council will expect to see a site appraisal prepared to support all new major residential, leisure, educational, social and commercial developments. In addition, a site appraisal should be undertaken for any other smaller scale but ‘sensitive’ planning applications, including those affecting Conservation Areas. These will be determined on a case by case basis. The Site Appraisal shall fully research and consider the site itself and the wider context.”*

SG1 (Part 2) paragraphs 2.39 – 2.42 set out the criteria for assessing the detail of all new residential development layouts.

Paragraph 2.39 states that *“In order to meet placemaking principles, the Council seeks to promote the delivery of high quality residential environments that:*

- a) Are informed by a design-led approach that promotes sustainable development objectives; ...*
- c) Encourage overall quality and provide distinctiveness in new developments.”*

Paragraph 2.40 requires that *“All residential developments must take into account the Placemaking Principles set out in SG1 - Placemaking, Part 1, as well as the guidance and standards set out in the Residential Design Guide (RDG). These criteria should be read in conjunction with the RDG and SG9 - The Historic Environment, where appropriate.”*

Paragraph 2.41 states that *“Residential Layouts should:*

- a) a design-led approach towards aspect and orientation to maximise daylight and sunlight, reduce energy use, and prevent overlooking and loss of privacy, particularly when providing balcony and/or garden spaces (see RDG, Page 60 and the BRE 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight);*
- b) make appropriate provision for refuse and recycling storage areas (see also SG1 - Placemaking, Part 2, Detailed Guidance - Waste Storage, Recycling and Collection and RDG, page 64);*
- c) wherever possible, retain all significant trees on sites, unless removal is necessary, e.g. for good arboricultural reasons (see SG7 - Natural Environment, Section 8);*
- d) have roads designed to the standards set out in RDG (see SG11 - Sustainable Transport);*
- e) incorporate a SUDS strategy to take account of the space and design requirements of the required SUDS scheme (See RDG, pages 16, 24, 46 and Appendix 3, SG -7 Resource Management and SG - 8 Water Environment); and*
- f) ensure that all new homes do not have upper rooms, balconies etc which directly overlook adjacent private gardens/backcourts.*
- g) ensure sufficient permeability through the provision of walking/cycling routes and open spaces connected to the wider paths network and other community facilities. Off road paths should be located centrally and be overlooked in order to promote public safety, see also SG1 - Placemaking, Part 1 and SG1 - Placemaking, Part 2, Detailed Guidance - Active Travel and SG6 - Green belt and Green Network.”*

Paragraph 2.42 continues, requiring that *“Houses should provide:*

- a) useable private garden space large enough to serve various domestic functions (see Note);*

- b) *parking provision to satisfy SG11 - Sustainable Transport and Car Parking Provision and Car Parking Layout guidance in the RDG and garages and/or driveways sufficient for household needs: and*
- c) *adequate privacy for residents. Habitable rooms should be protected from public areas by privacy zones as required in the RDG. Habitable windows should be suitably separated from habitable windows in other properties to protect privacy while respecting development context.*

Note: As a general indication, in relation to usable garden space, mid-terraced housing might be expected to deliver around 50 sqm; end-terraced or semi-detached 80 sqm; and, detached 120 sqm or 1.5 times the footprint area (whichever is greater)."

CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy

CDP2 states on pages 40 and 41 that *"The Council will continue to focus on the regeneration and redevelopment of the existing urban area to create a sustainable City. In doing so, the Council will support new development proposals that:*

- 1. *Accord with the current National Planning Framework and Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan's Spatial Development Strategy; ...*
- 7. *Utilise brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites; ...*
- 12. *Protect and enhance the function and integrity of the Green Belt and contribute towards the development of an integrated green infrastructure; ...*
- 15. *Protect open space and provide for the development and expansion of the multi-functional green/blue network;"*

CDP9 and SG9: Historic Environment

CDP9 states on page 95 that *"The Council will protect, preserve and, where appropriate, conserve and/or enhance the historic environment, in line with Scottish Planning Policy, Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement, and this policy together with associated supplementary guidance (SG), for the benefit of our own and future generations."* This includes designated Conservation Areas and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes. *"The Council will assess the impact of proposed developments that affect historic environment features and/or their settings according to the principles set out in relevant SG. The Council will not support development that would have an adverse impact on the historic environment, unless SG criteria are fully satisfied."*

With regards to the application site's location within the Pollok Park Conservation Area, SG9 paragraph 2.16 states that *"All proposals for new development in, or affecting the setting of Conservation Areas, must:*

- a) *preserve and enhance the special character and appearance of the area and respect its historic context;*
- b) *be of a high standard of design, respecting the local architectural and historic context and use materials appropriate to the historic environment;*
- c) *protect significant views into, and out of, the area;*
- d) *retain all existing open space, whether public or private, which contributes positively to the historic character of the area; and*
- e) *retain trees which contribute positively to the historic character of the area."*

With regards to the application site's location within the Pollok Park (Nether Pollok Park) Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape designation, SG9 paragraph 6.8 states that *"New structures or landscape works, which affect Gardens and Designed Landscapes will not be supported, unless HES, SNH and the Council are satisfied that the works are absolutely necessary."*

Officer Assessment:

Policies 7, 14 and 16 of NPF4 are similar in their intent as CDP1, CDP2, CDP9, SG1 (Part 1), SG1 (Part 2) and SG9 of the CDP in that these policies intend to protect and enhance the historic environment assets and places, to enable positive change as a catalyst for the regeneration of places, and to require all proposals including

development for new housing in historic environment places to be plan-led and design-led through the application of the Place Principles.

The proposed development by virtue of its siting is significantly contrary to Policy 16 criteria (f) and to CDP2 points 1, 7, 12, and 15. The application site is a greenfield site, within the Green Belt and Green Network, and its change of use to a residential property would be detrimental to the function and integrity of the Green Belt and the Green Network at this location. It is on land not allocated for housing. There is no agreed timescale for build-out, and as above is not in accordance with CDP2 which is the spatial strategy for the CDP or with other relevant CDP policies.

As stated and demonstrated above in the Design and Materials section, Daylight section, Aspect section, Privacy section, Adjacent Levels section, Landscaping (Including Garden Ground) section, and the Access and Parking section of this report, the application has been submitted with very little supporting information.

The proposed development is significantly contrary to Policy 14 criteria (a) – (c), to CDP1 points 4 and 9, to SG1 (Part 1) paragraphs 2.3 and 2.10 – 2.12, and to SG1 (Part 2) 2.39 – 2.42 as it is poorly designed, inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, and is detrimental the amenity of the surrounding area by virtue of its siting and poor design.

The applicant and agent have not submitted a site appraisal for the proposed development, or any other information that demonstrates that they have fully considered, evaluated and applied the principles of placemaking to this development, i.e. taken a design-led approach. Moreover, they have not submitted information to show how the development complies with the relevant CDP policies, i.e. taken a plan-led approach. The onus of justifying a proposed development is on the applicant, not on the planning authority as per SG1 (Part 1) paragraphs 2.3 and 2.10 – 2.12.

The submitted proposed site plan shows only the footprint of the proposed dwellinghouse and integrated garage, the indicative dimensions and location of the access, driveway and car parking and turning area, and the indicative location of hard landscaping and groundworks surrounding the immediate footprint of the dwellinghouse showing a patio, walkway and siting for waste and storage bins. It is missing important information such as the proposed soft landscaping for the site, the proposed boundary works (if any), water management on the site including drainage, and the detailed design and material finishes of the development. The proposed layout within the site is contrary to SG1 (Part 2) paragraphs 2.39 criteria (a) and (c), 2.40, 2.41 criteria (a), (c) and (f), and 2.42 criteria (b) and (c).

The submitted elevations drawings do not show the detailed design and either show or state on the drawing the material finishes of the development. For example, it is missing the following essential information – gutter material and colour, there are no rainwater downpipes shown, the roof covering and flashing materials are not shown or stated, the external wall materials are not shown or stated, the window and door design / materials / colours are not shown or stated, etc.

Finally, the proposed development is significantly contrary to Policy 7 and to CDP9 and SG9 paragraphs 2.16 and 6.8.

The proposed development will not preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the Pollok Park Conservation Area. The lack of information submitted regarding detailed design and material finishes shows that the proposal is not design-led and that it hasn't taken due consideration of the architectural and historic character of the area, the existing built forms, the context and siting of the existing residential properties in the converted Sheeppark Farm steading buildings, or for the required high quality of design and suitable materials for all development. This is contrary to Policy 7 criteria (d) and the SG9 paragraph 2.16 criteria (a) and (b).

The proposed development does not demonstrate that it will preserve the existing natural and built features that contribute to the character and appearance of the Pollok Park Conservation Area at this location, such as the mature trees to the south. This is contrary to Policy 7 criteria (e) and to SG9 paragraph 2.16 criteria (d) and (e).

The application does not have any supporting information which considers the Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes designation, or which shows that the proposal will not significantly impact on cultural significance, character and integrity of

that designation at this location within Pollok Country Park. No reasonable justification has been submitted to prove that the development is necessary at this site. This is contrary to Policy 7 criteria (i) and to SG9 paragraph 6.8.

Remaining Policies – Policies 13 and 22 of NPF4 and CDP8, CDP11, SG8 and SG11 of the CDP

Policy 13. Sustainable Transport

- 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.*

Policy 22. Flood Risk and Water Management

- c) *Development proposals will:*
- 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.*
- d) *Development proposals will be supported if they can be connected to the public water mains. If connection is not feasible, the applicant will need to demonstrate that water for drinking water purposes will be sourced from a sustainable water source that is resilient to periods of water scarcity.*

CDP8 and SG8: Water Environment

Policy CDP8 states that for all new development “*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.*

... There is a strong presumption against development likely to have an adverse effect on the water environment. Developers are required to ensure that natural physical characteristics, as well as water quality, are protected, wherever possible.

Development proposals requiring foul drainage should be connected to the public

sewerage system.” It states that proposals from single dwellings are excluded from the requirement to provide on-site SUDS.

SG8 provides detailed policy criteria on the following relevant topics: when flood risk screening, flood risk assessment and drainage impact assessment may be required; surface water drainage strategies and SUDS; and the role of Scottish Water.

This proposal – a single dwellinghouse – is not required to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment or a Surface Water Drainage Strategy as it does not meet the minimum requirements set out in paragraphs 5.1 and 8.1.

Still, SG8 requires in paragraphs 9.6 that *“To demonstrate that the development can be effectively drained the applicant will be required to provide: a) Approval in principle”* from Scottish Water for surface water drainage discharge prior to the determination of the planning application. Paragraphs 9.2 and 9.5 further state that prior to the commencement of construction works that the applicant will be required to provide evidence to the planning authority that an Offer of Connection has been made by Scottish Water for a public water connection, and that Scottish Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the public sewerage system for a foul drainage connection. The application form dated 19 January 2025 states in the Water Supply and Drainage Arrangements section that *“Yes – connecting to the public drainage network”* and *“Yes”* to connecting to the public water supply network.

CDP11 and SG11: Sustainable Transport

Policy CDP11 states that for all new development, *“The Council will:*

3. *expect parking in residential developments to minimise routine on-street parking of residents’ cars”*

It also requires *“Wherever possible, opportunities offered by the development of the Green Network ... should be utilised to deliver enhancements to active travel infrastructure. Development proposals should protect / enhance the quality and continuity of cycle routes and core paths and take account of rights of way and other significant paths. ... New developments should take account of access rights (as defined by the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003).”*

SG11 paragraph 3.5 states that *“Development should not:*

- a) *prejudice the continuity of Core Paths, as defined by the Glasgow Core Paths Plan, or impact adversely on the existing walking/cycling network (including the Cycle Network that will emerge from the refresh of the Strategic Plan for Cycling), particularly routes that are part of the National Walking and Cycling Network; or*
- b) *obstruct or adversely affect a public right of way (including paths that meet the criteria for a right of way at Common Law) unless satisfactory provision is made for its replacement.”*

And continues in paragraph 3.6 that *“Where such routes are affected by a development during construction and upon completion, the developer should incorporate appropriate alternative or modified public access provision, approved in advance by the Council. It is expected that a replacement route will provide an equivalent, if not better, route alignment and quality of provision than the original. In some cases, a diversion or stopping up order may be required which will be subject to public consultation. The continuing integrity of the route/path should be maintained throughout the construction process.”* Paragraph 3.8 states that *“The Core Paths Plan and access rights will be material considerations in considering applications. The Council will seek reasonable opportunities from developers to create, manage, maintain and improve access through conditions or legal agreements.”*

SG11 paragraph 4.3 and Table 2.1: Residential require that a minimum level of 1 cycle parking space is provided to serve the proposed single dwellinghouse. As an integrated garage is also proposed, this requirement is met within the design.

SG11 paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5 require that the parking provision in residential development should be assessed against the standards set out in Table 3.1: Residential, and that every effort should be made to minimise the impact of on-street parking for safety reasons and to reduce visual impact. The vehicle parking provision is a maximum standard. Vehicle parking, access, and driveway design must also comply

with the standards set out in the Design Guide for New Residential Areas as per Table 3.1 Note N3.15 Layout which states that *“the design and layout of car parking in new residential development should accord with the Design Guide for New Residential Areas”*. Table 3.1: Residential Parking, Part A: Mainstream Housing for Sale / Rent (private, social and shared) requires that a basic minimum standard for parking provision is 1 allocated space and an addition 0.25 unallocated spaces per dwelling. As this is a single dwellinghouse in a quasi-rural setting, the requirement would be for 2 off-street vehicle parking spaces. Table 3.1 includes a *“Variation, above or below these basic standards shall be justified”* and provides a bullet point list of contextual considerations.

The application site is within an area of High Accessibility for Public Transport.

Officer Assessment:

I take each topic area in turn.

Sustainable Transport

The proposed development complies with Policy 13 criteria (b)(i), (b)(ii) and (b)(v) and with SG11 paragraph 4.3 and Table 2.1 due to: its location within a High Accessibility area for Public Transport and adjacent to a Core Path, and, the design showing that there will be safe and secure cycle parking provision possible within the garage. Due to its scale, the proposal is generally compliant with Policy 13 criteria (b)(iii) and (b)(iv) and with SG11 paragraph.

However, due to the lack of submitted supporting technical site surveys, a competent site appraisal, and detailed design and materials shown and stated on the submitted drawings, the proposed development is significantly contrary to Policy 13 criteria (b)(vi) – (b)(viii) and to CDP11 and SG11 paragraphs 3.5, 3.6 and 3.8 as it doesn't demonstrate that the proposed access works to widen and pave the existing access gate entrance to the site will adequately mitigate any impact on the local public access routes and the Core Path including designing in the transport needs of all users during and after construction. This is underscored by the assessment provided in the Design and Materials section and Access and Parking section of this report.

Furthermore, and on balance, the proposed development is contrary to SG11 paragraphs 6.4, 6.5 and Table 3.1 as the proposed 4no. vehicle parking spaces on the site and exceed the 2no. stated in Table 3.1 and no justification has been provided by the applicant or the agent for the need for two additional spaces in line with the bullet points in Table 3.1. As stated above, the vehicle parking provision is a maximum standard not a minimum standard. The application site is in a High Accessibility location for Public Transport. It is noted that the proposed vehicle parking is off-street and that this is compliant with policy wording in CDP11.

The proposal is also contrary to Table 3.1 and specifically Note N3.15 regarding Layout because, as assessed in the Access and Parking section of this report, the siting and dimensions of the driveway as shown on the submitted drawings do not meet the minimum dimension requirements set out in the Design Guide for New Residential Areas on pages 38 and 44.

Flood Risk Management and Connections

The application form dated 19 January 2025 states in the Water Supply and Drainage Arrangements section that *“Yes – connecting to the public drainage network”*, *“Yes”* to connecting to the public water supply network, and *“No”* to the proposals making provision for the sustainable drainage of surface water (SUDS).

The proposal is contrary to Policy 22 criteria (c)(i), (c)(ii) and (d) of NPF4 and to CDP8 and SG8 paragraphs 9.2, 9.5 and 9.6 as the it does not provide any information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not increase the risk of surface water flooding to others or itself be at risk, and it does not show any infrastructure on the site to manage all rain and surface water on the site through SUDS. Both Policy 22 and SG8 state that all proposals should presume no surface water connection to the Scottish Water combined sewer to drain rain and surface water runoff. Moreover, the applicant has not submitted information or communication from Scottish Water regarding the proposed public water and foul drainage connections to their assets and whether they are likely to be approved. Again, Both Policy 22 and SG8 require this

	information prior to the determination of the application (public water connection) or to the commencement of construction works (foul drainage connection). <u>Officer Conclusion</u> In respect of (a), the proposed development is significantly contrary to the statutory Development Plan and the principle of the development of a house at this location would not be supportable. Furthermore, with respect to (b), the proposed development is would not to preserve the character and appearance of the Pollok Park Conservation Area. With respect to part (c), five representations were received, the material points of objection raised in those representations have been considered within the assessment of the proposed development, and there are no further material considerations which would outweigh the proposal's discordance with the statutory Development Plan. It is recommended that this full planning permission application be refused.
RECOMMENDATION	Refuse

Date	2 June 2025	DM Officer	Lauren Springfield
Date	06/06/2025	DM Manager	Ross Middleton

Reasons

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 proposed development is contrary to the following National Planning Framework 4 policies and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom: Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises; Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation; Policy 3: Biodiversity; Policy 4: Natural Places; Policy 6: Forestry, Woodland and Trees; Policy 7: Historic Assets and Place; Policy 8: Green Belts; Policy 13: Sustainable Transport; Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place; Policy 16: Quality Homes; Policy 20: Blue and Green Infrastructure; and, Policy 22: Health and Safety.
03. The proposed development is contrary to the following City Development Plan policies and associated supplementary guidance documents and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom: CDP1, SG1 (Part 1) and SG1 (Part 2): The Placemaking Principle; CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy; CDP5 and SG5: Resource Management; CDP6 and SG6: Green Belt and Green Network; CDP7 and SG7: Natural Environment; CDP8 and SG8: Water Environment; CDP9 and SG9: Historic Environment; and, CDP11 and SG11: Sustainable Transport.
04. The proposed development is significantly contrary to NPF4 Policies 1 and 2 and to CDP policies CDP5 and SG5 in that the proposal is located in a "vulnerable area" as defined in Policy 2 and by its several historic environment and natural environment designations, on greenfield land, and principally its designation as Green Belt within the CDP. The proposal has not taken due accord of the requirement for climate mitigation and adaption or given significant weight to the global climate and nature crises. The proposal is not located and designed to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from the occupation and use of the dwellinghouse and site as no Statement on Energy is submitted and there is no evidence that the requirement of the Gold Standard has been incorporated into the detailed design and materiality of the residential development.
05. The proposed development is significantly contrary in both principle and detail to Policy 8 of NPF4 and to CDP6 and SG6 of the CDP as the written justification submitted within the Planning Statement for developing on land designated as Green Belt does not meet any of the clearly stated exclusion criteria set out in Policy 8 (a)(i) and SG6 paragraph 3.2, and it does not meet all of the required criteria set out in Policy 8 (a)(ii) and SG6 paragraph 3.3. The change of use to a residential property would be detrimental to the function and integrity of the Green Belt and the Green Network at this location. The submitted supporting drawings are lacking the basic information of detailed design and material finishes and certainly do not outweigh the strong policy presumption against unjustified development in, and loss of land within, the Green Belt.

06. The proposed development is significantly contrary to NPF4 Policies 3, 4, 6 and 20 and to CDP policies CDP6, CDP7, SG6 and SG7. The application is not supported by a site appraisal or any technical site surveys to assess the existing character and value of the site. Furthermore, the application is not supported by any reports or drawings which demonstrate that the proposed development incorporates biodiversity enhancement, hard and soft landscaping, and water management into its detailed design, nor that the proposed development at a minimum protects the existing mature trees, habitats, wildlife, and landscape setting through appropriate and designed in mitigation. This lack of information is significantly contrary to the relevant policies and specifically to Policy 4 (e) requires planning authorities to apply the precautionary principle in accordance with relevant legislation and Scottish Government guidance.
07. The proposed development is significantly contrary to NPF4 Policy 16 and to CDP policy CDP2. Specifically, it is contrary to Policy 16 criteria (f) and to CDP2 points 1, 7, 12 and 15 by virtue of its location and character as greenfield land within the Green Belt and Green Network. The change of use to a residential property would be detrimental to the function and integrity of the Green Belt and the Green Network at this location, the land is not allocated for housing, there is no agreed time-scale for build out, and it is not in accordance with the aim of CDP2 to create a compact city form which supports sustainable development which is the overall spatial strategy for the CDP, or with the other relevant CDP Policies.
08. The proposed development is significantly contrary to NPF4 Policy 14 and to CDP policies CDP1, SG1 (Part 1), and SG1 (Part 2) as the proposal is poorly designed, inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, and is detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area by virtue of its poor siting and design. The proposed development is not supported by a submitted site appraisal to demonstrate that the principles of placemaking have been applied. The proposed layout and the proposed elevation drawings are lacking the basic information of detailed design and material finishes to undertake a robust assessment against the relevant planning policies.
09. The proposed development is significantly contrary to NPF4 Policy 7 and to CDP policies CDP9 and SG9. It will not preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the Pollok Park Conservation Area. Insufficient detailed design and no material finishes information was submitted which shows that the proposal is not design-led and has not taken due consideration of the architectural and historic character of the area, the existing built forms, the context and siting of the existing residential properties in the converted Sheeppark Farm steading buildings, or for the required high quality of design and suitable materials for all development. The proposal does not demonstrate that it will preserve the existing natural and built features that contribute to the character and appearance of the Pollok Park Conservation Area at this location, such as the mature trees lining the Core Path on the southern boundary. The application does not have any supporting information which considers the Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes designation, or which shows that the proposal will not significantly impact on cultural significance, character and integrity of that designation at this location within Pollok Country Park and no reasonable justification has been submitted to prove that this development is necessary at this site within the designated Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscape.
010. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 13 and CDP policy CDP11 and SG11 as no information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed access works to the existing access gate entrance to the site will adequately mitigate against detrimental impacts on the local public access route, i.e. the private access road, and the Core Path including designing in the transport needs of all users during and after construction and the legislative requirement to ensure the Core Path is safe, open and to a minimum standard or appropriately and temporarily stopped up or diverted. The proposed 4no. vehicle parking spaces on the site exceed the 2no. spaces maximum standard set out in Table 3.1 for a single dwellinghouse and no justification has been submitted on the need for two additional spaces. The proposal is also contrary to Table 3.1 and specifically Note N3.15 regarding Layout because the siting and dimensions of the driveway as shown on the submitted drawings do not meet the minimum width of 3.5m as set out in the Design Guide for New Residential Areas on pages 38 and 44.
011. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 22 and CDP policies CDP8 and SG8 in that the submitted information does not demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Council that the proposal will not increase the risk of surface water flooding to the site or to other sites, that all rain and surface water will be managed through SUDS and not via a surface water connection to a Scottish Water combined sewer, or that the development can connect to the Scottish Water public water and foul drainage networks.

Refused Drawings

The development has been refused in relation to the following drawing(s):

01. 31106/LC LOCATION PLAN Received 18 March 2025
02. 31106/1 SITE PLAN AS PROPOSED Received 3 March 2025

- 03. 31106/2 SITE PLAN AS PROPOSED Received 3 March 2025
- 04. 31106/3A GROUND FLOOR PLAN Received 3 March 2025
- 05. 31106/4A FIRST FLOOR PLAN Received 3 March 2025
- 06. 31106/5 ELEVATIONS Received 3 March 2025

As qualified by the above reason(s), or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.