



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods,
Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

Item 1

28th October 2025

**25/00059/LOCAL – Site to the West Of 2114E Pollokshaws Road
Erection of 1No. dwellinghouse (Contrary to CDP)**

Purpose of Report:

To provide the Committee with a summary of the relevant considerations in the above review.

Recommendations:

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

Ward No(s): 2

Citywide: n/a

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

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

Any Ordnance Survey mapping included within this Report is provided by Glasgow City Council under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to make available Council-held public domain information. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey Copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. The OS web site can be found at <http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk> "

If accessing this Report via the Internet, please note that any mapping is for illustrative purposes only and is not true to any marked scale

1 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS

- 1.1 The 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. The application site area is approximately 5025.5 sqm or 0.5 hectares.
- 1.2 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.
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 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 environmental designations.
- 1.5 Furthermore, it is adjacent to the designations which cover the woodland on the northern and western boundaries of the application site:
 - Green belt
 - White Cart Water Green Corridor
 - White Cart Water City-Wide Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- 1.6 The proposed development comprises the erection of one dwellinghouse, the formation of an access and associated ground and landscaping works.
- 1.7 The existing field access is proposed to be upgraded. 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.

- 1.8 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.
- 1.9 The proposed dwellinghouse would have two storeys and an integrated double garage. It would have a footprint area of approximately 273 sqm.

Report Summary:

The proposed development is **contrary to the Development Plan** and associated guidance for the following reasons:

1. **Green Belt and Land Use** – The site is a greenfield location within the Green Belt and Green Network where new residential development is not supported. The proposal would erode the character, function, and integrity of the Green Belt, contrary to **NPF4 Policy 8, CDP6, and SG6**.
2. **Heritage and Conservation Area** – The site lies within the **Pollok Park Conservation Area** and the **Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (Pollok Park, Nether Pollok)**. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the scale, design, materials, and siting of the dwelling would preserve or enhance the character, appearance, and historic integrity of these designations, contrary to **NPF4 Policies 14 and 20, CDP7, and SG7**.
3. **Design, Layout and Materials** – Insufficient information has been submitted regarding the design, layout, scale, and materials of the proposed dwelling. The development is not design-led and fails to demonstrate compatibility with the architectural and historic character of the area, contrary to **NPF4 Policy 14, CDP1, and SG1**.
4. **Residential Amenity** – Due to the limited information provided and lack of appropriate screening or boundary treatments, the proposal would likely result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy affecting both neighbouring properties and the proposed dwelling, contrary to **CDP1 and SG1**.
5. **Access, Parking and Transport** – The proposal fails to demonstrate that the access widening, and driveway layout can be achieved without harm to adjacent protected trees or the Core Path network. The proposed four parking spaces exceed the maximum standards for a high public transport accessibility area, contrary to **NPF4 Policy 13, CDP11, and SG11**.
6. **Drainage and Flooding** – No information has been provided on surface water management, flood risk, or Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS), nor has confirmation been obtained from Scottish Water regarding drainage connections, contrary to **NPF4 Policy 22, CDP8, and SG8**.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

Policy 1	Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises
Policy 2	Climate Mitigation and 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

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

CDP 1	The Placemaking Principle
CDP 2	Sustainable Spatial Strategy
CDP 5	Resource management
CDP 6	Green belt and Green network
CDP 7	Natural Environment
CDP 8	Water Environment
CDP 9	Historic Environment
CDP 11	Sustainable Transport
SG 1	Placemaking (part 1 & 2)
SG 5	Resource Management
SG 6	Green belt and Green network
SG 7	Natural Environment
SG 8	Water Environment
SG 9	Historic Environment
SG 11	Sustainable Transport

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

- 1) 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.
- 2) 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.

- 3) 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.
- 4) 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.
- 5) 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.
- 6) 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.

- 7) 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.
- 8) 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.
- 9) 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.
- 10) 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.

- 11) 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.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

1. The appeal site has always been part of Sheeppark Farm and used for grazing. The surrounding area, once agricultural, has gradually become residential. It is difficult to understand how recent development (2114F) was permitted in the green belt, as it doesn't appear to meet green belt policy exceptions. The Report of Handling (ROH) claims the development would harm Pollok Park, but simply being within the park does not prove any negative impact, and no supporting evidence has been provided.
2. Given the nearby approval and the appellant's need for a larger home, a pre-application was submitted, but the response focused on green belt impact and cited policies the appellant considered irrelevant.
3. The length of the ROH and its exaggerated claims about impacts on the green belt and Pollok House and Gardens, which are not visible from the site. It is important to consider the proposal itself to allow a balanced view. The ROH shows little analysis, appearing as a box-ticking exercise rather than a proper assessment.
4. The application proposed a modest detached dwelling with garage and driveway on a triangular field owned by the appellant, adjacent to their existing home. The house would use natural stone, slate roofs, and timber windows and doors, matching nearby buildings. The field is overgrown, private, not visible from Pollok Park or Pollok House, and separated from the park by established tree belts. The ROH's claims of insufficient information and poor design are incorrect; the proposal's scale and style match the adjacent steadings.

5. Representations raised no valid issues. Claims that the field is publicly accessible or that the proposal would affect Pollok House and its gardens are incorrect, as the field is private and the OS map confirms no visibility to the house or gardens
6. It has been ignored in the ROH that in 2013 planning permission was granted on appeal for a new dwelling on 2114E's land, also in the green belt. The house uses inappropriate materials and suffers major structural flaws. The appellant cites this not to criticise the owners, but to highlight inconsistencies in the council's policy application.
7. Although the dwelling is set back from the nearest neighbour, claims of significant overlooking of own site or neighbouring buildings are unsubstantiated.
8. The officer appears confused between the site and the proposed development. Claims about fencing and privacy are inconsistent; the dwelling, set back on the highest part of the field, will cause no overlooking or loss of amenity.
9. The ROH notes the absence of a Tree or Biodiversity Survey, but these were unnecessary as the trees lie outside the site and no notable flora or fauna exist.
10. The ROH criticises parking and potential Core Path impacts, but the site has ample space, and parking on designated areas is preferable to grass. The proposed driveway on the appellant's private road will not affect access to the Core Path, making these concerns largely irrelevant. The dwelling will occupy a field, not a street, so concerns about layout and parking are irrelevant.
11. The ROH cites NPF4 Policies 8 without justification. The proposed single dwelling, on the appellant's land and next to existing homes, is separated from the wider green belt, matches nearby buildings in character, and would cause no harm. Urban placemaking policies (CDP1, SG1, NPF4 Policy 14) are irrelevant to this rural dwelling, and many requested reports are unnecessary, showing the ROH applies policies indiscriminately.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The previous planning application history for the property includes the following:

- 24/02087/PRE – Erection of 1no. dwellinghouse. Advice given.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Five representations were received to the planning application – 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 objected to the proposal. A summary of the points raised is below:

- The proposed dwellinghouse conflicts with the Green Belt Development Plan.
- The site is a field unrelated to Sheeppark Farm's historic buildings, with only a minor former steading that appeared briefly on maps between 1944 and 1974.
- The site lies within Pollok Country Park and associated heritage and natural designations (Conservation Area, Inventory Garden & Designed Landscape, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), Site of Special Landscape Importance (SSLI).
- No technical surveys or reports were submitted to assess or mitigate the development's impact on the site, heritage/natural designations, or neighbouring properties, including sustainability, topography, ecology, trees, environment, building design, materials, or landscaping.
- The proposed siting and design may harm the amenity of neighbouring properties.

6.2 There were 4 representations to the review which reconfirmed the representee's objections to the proposal. No consultations were undertaken.

7 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The key issues for Committee to consider are:

7.2 Natural Environment

NPF4 Policy 3: Biodiversity, Policy 4: Natural places, Policy 6: Forestry, Woodland and Trees, Policy 8: Green belt, Policy 20: Blue and Green Infrastructure, CDP 6/SG 6: Green belt and Green Environment and CDP 7/SG 7: Natural Environment

Policy 3 states:

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 states:

- 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 states:

- 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 states:

- a) Development proposals within a green belt designated within the LDP will only be supported if:
 - i. They are for:
 - development associated 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 states:

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); essential infrastructure or new cemetery provision;*
- vii. minerals operations;*
- viii. the generation of renewable energy/heat;*
- ix. intensification of established uses, including extensions to an existing building where that is ancillary to the main use;*
- x. the reuse, rehabilitation and conversion of historic environment assets; or*
- xi. a one-for-one replacement of an existing permanent home or recently vacated permanent home.”*
- 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 ecosystem; 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 SINC, 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.”*

Committee should note that:

- The application site is within the designated Green Belt and does not fall within any of the permitted exceptions. Contrary to Policy 8 of NPF4 and to CDP6 and SG6 of the CDP.
- The application site is subject to a number of Development Plan, historic environment 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)
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; and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA), a Tree Survey, and a topographical survey.
 - No information submitted with regards to 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.
 - No information has been provided on landscaping or how the development will protect or enhance existing trees and biodiversity.
- Committee should consider whether:
- the principle of development within the designated Green Belt and associated Green Network designations is acceptable in this location, given it does not meet any exception?
 - the absence of site appraisals and technical surveys provides sufficient information to properly assess the proposal's impact on biodiversity, landscape, and natural features?
 - the proposal adequately demonstrates measures to protect, mitigate, or enhance the site's existing natural environment and landscape setting?

7.3 Climate

NPF4 Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature crisis, Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaption, CDP 5/SG 5: Resource Management

Policy 1 states that development proposals are required to contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and to ensure that they are designed and located in a way that supports a sustainable future.

Policy 2 requires development proposals to be sited and designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible and be designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.

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.

Committee should note that:

- No measures address the protection or enhancement of the site’s natural environment or surrounding landscape within the SINC, SSLI, and Green Network designations.
- No Statement of Energy is submitted, 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.
- Without LZCGT information, the dwelling’s emissions, energy use, and low-carbon measures cannot be assessed.

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposal adequately demonstrates the use of low or zero-carbon technologies and meets the Gold standard for new domestic development?

7.4 Historic Environment

NPF4 Policy 7: Historic Assets and CDP9/SG9: Historic Environment

Policy 7 states:

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.

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.*”

Committee should note that:

- The application site is a greenfield site and lies within the Green Belt and Green Network, and its residential use would harm their function and integrity.
- The application site area is approximately 5025.5 sqm or 0.50245 hectares.
- While the drawings do not specify materials, the Planning Statement states the dwelling will follow a traditional design using stone, slate, and timber, with high insulation and eco-friendly features, including a ground-source heat pump, aiming for near carbon neutrality.
- There is an absence of detailed design and material information.

Committee should consider whether:

- the absence of detailed design, material specifications, and technical surveys provides sufficient information to properly assess impacts on the site, heritage, trees, and neighbouring amenity?

7.5 **Housing Need**

NPF4 Policy 16: Quality homes / CDP2/SG2 Sustainable Spatial Strategy

Policy 16 states:

- 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.

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;”

Committee should note that:

- It is on land not allocated for housing and does not meet any other criteria in Policy 16 f.
- There is no confirmed build-out timescale, and the proposal does not accord with CDP2 or other relevant CDP policies.

Committee should consider whether:

- the principle of residential development on this unallocated site is acceptable?
- the proposal is consistent with a preference for brownfield sites?

7.6 Design and Placemaking

NPF4 Policy 14: Design, quality and place, CDP1/SG1 (part 1&part 2): Placemaking

Policy 14 states:

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.

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).”

Committee should note that:

- The application site is a greenfield site and lies within the Green Belt and Green Network, and its residential use would harm their function and integrity.
- The existing field access is proposed to be upgraded and widened by approximately 0.5 m to the west, giving a total gate width of about 5.9 m, as shown on the submitted Site Plan.
- The drawing does not show the historic, protected mature tree belt which currently exists along this boundary.
- No technical information, such as a Tree Survey or detailed drawing, has been submitted to show that widening the field access will not harm the adjacent mature trees.
- A 51 m driveway runs north from the field access to the car parking and turning area on the eastern third of the site, measuring about 3 m wide for 33 m and widening to 5.9 m at the upgraded access.
- The proposed two-storey dwelling and integrated garage have a footprint of approximately 273 sqm and include 5 bedrooms, 5 bathrooms, a study, games room, open-plan lounge/kitchen/dining/family area, utility room, and double garage.
- The dwelling is surrounded by a patio, walkway, and car parking/turning area: the patio is on the southwestern corner, parking/turning on the southeastern corner, and a walkway and rear patio on the northern side, with bin storage indicated on the northeastern corner.
- Because of the site's location within the Green Belt, Pollok Park Conservation Area, and Inventory of Garden and Designed Landscape, detailed design and material specifications are required for proper assessment against Development Plan policies.
- The proposed development will not impact daylight or sunlight to neighbouring land or dwellinghouses.
- The drawings do not clarify whether the existing post-and-wire fences will be retained or replaced; if retained, they provide no screening and would not prevent overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- Based on the limited information submitted, the development is likely to harm the residential amenity of both neighbouring properties and the new dwelling due to unmitigated overlooking and loss of privacy.
- No information is provided related to proposed access, driveway, car parking and turning area.
- The application form (3 March 2025) states that 4 vehicle parking spaces will be provided and the width of the driveway at its narrowest point is 3m.

Committee should consider whether:

- the principle of a residential development on this greenfield site within the Green Belt and Green Network is acceptable?
- the proposal demonstrates appropriate design quality, respecting the character of the area, existing buildings, and Development Plan requirements?
- the proposed access, driveway, and parking arrangements are acceptable given the potential impact on mature trees?
- the development adequately mitigates overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties and the new dwelling?

7.7 Transport

NPF4 Policy 13: Sustainable Transport and CDP 11/SG 11: Sustainable transport

Policy 13 states:

- 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

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 OFFICIAL 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.

Committee should note that:

- The application site is within an area of High Accessibility for Public Transport.
- Due to the lack of technical surveys, site appraisal, and detailed design, the development fails to demonstrate that widening and paving the access will mitigate impacts on public access and the Core Path, contrary to Policy 13, CDP11, and SG11.
- The proposed four parking spaces exceed the two-space maximum in SG11 Table 3.1 without justification, despite the site’s high public transport accessibility, though off-street parking aligns with CDP11.
- The proposal also conflicts with Table 3.1 and Note N3.15 on layout, as the driveway’s siting and dimensions do not meet the minimum standards in the Design Guide for New Residential Areas (pages 38 and 44).

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposed access works adequately mitigate impacts on public access routes and the Core Path, given the lack of technical surveys and site appraisal?
- the proposed parking provision and driveway layout comply with SG11 and the Design Guide for New Residential Areas?

7.8 Water Management

NPF4 Policy 22: Flood risk and Water management, CDP 8/SG 8: Water management

Policy 22 states:

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 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.

Committee should note that:

- The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 22 (c)(i–ii, d), CDP8, and SG8 (9.2, 9.5–9.6), as it provides no information on surface water flood risk or SUDS infrastructure.
- The applicant has not provided information or confirmation from Scottish Water regarding public water and foul drainage connections or their likely approval.

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposal adequately addresses surface water management and flood risk, including SUDS, and demonstrates acceptable connections to public water and foul drainage?

8 COMMITTEE DECISION

8.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with or without conditions;
- b. Refuse planning permission; or
- c. Continue the application for further information.

8.2 Section 43A(12)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that reasoning behind why the local review body has been decided be supplied in the decision notice. Should committee be minded to grant planning permission, material considerations that justify a departure from the plan would require to be identified.

9 Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

Financial: n/a

Legal: n/a

Personnel: n/a

Procurement: n/a

Council Strategic Plan: n/a

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2021-25? Please specify.

n/a

What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?

no significant impact

Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio-economic disadvantage.

n/a

Climate Impacts:

Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions? Please specify:

n/a

What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?

n/a

Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?

n/a

Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:

Are there any potential data protection impacts as a result of this report
N

If Yes, please confirm that a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) has been carried out

10 RECOMMENDATIONS

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