



Planning Applications Committee

Report by
Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Alan Shand Phone: Alan.Shand@glasgow.gov.uk

Item 1a

18th November 2025

Application Type Full Planning Permission

Recommendation Refuse

Application	25/01124/FUL	Date Valid	16.05.2025
Site Address	86 - 90 Maxwell Street/40 Fox Street Glasgow		
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of hotel (Class 7)/apart-hotel (Sui Generis) with bar/restaurant with associated facilities.		
Applicant	Regent Property Ltd Mr Jay Singh 39 St Vincent Place Glasgow G1 2ER	Agent	Porter Planning Ltd. Teri Porter 39 St Vincent Street Glasgow G1 2ER
Ward No(s)	10, Anderston/City/Yorkhill	Community Council	02_120, Merchant City & Trongate
Conservation Area	Central	Listed	B-listed building at 90 Maxwell Street
Advert Type	Affecting a Conservation Area/Listed Building Bad Neighbour Development	Published	13 June 2025
City Plan			

Representations/Consultations

Representations

A total of 61 objections were received including representation from Merchant City and Trongate Community Council and Paul Sweeney MSP.

The principal matters raised by the objections can be summarised as:

- *The applicant's justification for complete demolition—that the stonework is degraded beyond reasonable repair—is neither credible nor consistent with best practice in conservation-led redevelopment;*
- *£300,000 for specialist stone repairs is not disproportionate in the context of the likely total development value of a substantial city centre site;*
- *the applicant has not demonstrated that any serious efforts have been made to address this conservation deficit through the range of grant funding opportunities available;*
- *By failing to properly explore grant funding options and proven engineering methods, the*

applicant cannot credibly argue that all reasonable efforts to retain the building have been made. This failure to exhaust reasonable alternatives means the proposal does not meet the stringent policy tests for listed building demolition under NPF4 Policy 7, and it also breaches Glasgow City Development Plan Policy 9, which seeks to protect and enhance the city's historic environment;

- *Demolishing this distinctive façade (of the Listed Building) would result in the permanent loss of important architectural character and would erode the identity of the area*
- *Embodied carbon within the existing buildings;*
- *This design goes against the principles of #retrofirst, the Architects' Journal campaign to prioritise retrofit over demolition and rebuild, for the greenest building already exists;*
- *The proposed replacement building is bland and lacks a distinctiveness that relates it to Glasgow*
- *Loss of privacy for adjacent dwellings;*
- *Loss of daylight for adjacent dwellings;*
- *Detrimental impact on traffic safety and parking as a result of increased traffic in an already busy one-way system;*
- *Demolition would likely threaten the attractive and unusual curved corner tenement adjoining the site.*

A total of 30 letters of support were also received

The principal matters raised by the letters of support can be summarised as:

- *Opportunity to develop a long-term derelict site into a vibrant, contextually sensitive, and economically resilient destination that will bring lasting benefit to the city centre at a crucial time for City-Centre recovery;*
- *The development introduces a contemporary yet respectful architectural language that complements the area's heritage without competing with it;*
- *The design respects the surrounding conservation area, with careful attention to scale, materials, and architectural character to ensure the new building complements its historic context;*
- *The development repairs a long-standing visual and functional gap in the urban landscape which presently diminishes the character and experience of adjacent historic assets;*
- *the involvement of a major international hotel brand adds credibility, financial strength, and a long-term commitment to Glasgow's city centre economy;*
- *The proposal demonstrates strong alignment with the city's economic strategy. By offering both standard hotel rooms and serviced apartments, it caters to a wide range of visitor types and supports midweek and off-season occupancy. Its inclusion of public amenities such as a publicly accessible rooftop bar, gym, and business facilities makes it a versatile, future-proofed asset for Glasgow's hospitality infrastructure;*
- *the development provides a regulated and sustainable alternative to short-term lets, reducing pressure on local housing and reinforcing the city's ability to host large-scale events without displacing residents.*
- *This development would also support the regeneration of the Clyde. The proposals create an important piece between the city centre and the Clyde creating a safer more attractive route and adding footfall and vibrancy to the area. The rooftop restaurant bar will afford views of the river and add to a growing range of options and spaces that are celebrating the river;*
- *By offering serviced apartments, the development reduces short-term let pressure on residential housing stock (e.g. Airbnb units in traditional tenements), especially during major events;*
- *Car free development which helps to reinforce sustainable transport aspirations.*

Consultations

Scottish Water - No objection. However, it is noted that the following comments were provided:

"For reasons of sustainability and to protect our customers from potential future sewer flooding, Scottish Water will not accept any surface water connections into our combined sewer system. There may be limited exceptional circumstances where we would allow such a connection for brownfield sites only, however this will require significant justification from the customer taking account of various factors including legal, physical, and technical challenges."

Under the Terms of National Planning Framework 4 (National Developments – 13 Clyde Mission), the application requires to be determined by the Planning Applications Committee in the form of a pre-determination hearing, as a National development.

Site and Description

The site subject of this application for full planning permission comprises two existing buildings, an unlisted 2 storey traditional blonde sandstone building at 40 Fox Street and the adjoining Category 'B' listed 4-storey blonde sandstone building at 86-90 Maxwell Street, subject of separate applications seeking conservation area consent for demolition (25/01127/CON) and listed building consent for demolition (25/01128/LBA) respectively. Together, these two buildings form a larger site which is subject of an associated application for full planning permission for the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of a 19 storey hotel/apart-hotel, with bar/restaurant and associated facilities (25/01124/FUL), which is subject of this separate but related report.

The site forms part of a homogenous block of mid-19th century tenement style buildings located to the south of the City Centre, just north of the River Clyde and are within the Central Conservation Area. The buildings range from 2-storeys with attic on the corner of Fox Street/Maxwell Street to 6 storeys on corner of Dixon and Fox Streets. Totalling 19.3m in height along its main facade on Maxwell Street, the building continues the datums of the existing block along Howard Street, with the unlisted building at 40 Fox Street sitting lower at 13.2m in height.

The majority of buildings on the street block are traditional 4 storey tenements, with a varied typology on the streets beyond, characterised by a mixture of modern and traditional buildings, including the St Enoch Centre to the north, a multi-storey car park to the east and residential and hotel towers fronting Clyde Street, as well as traditional listed and unlisted sandstone buildings, mainly constructed of blonde sandstone, such as St Andrews Cathedral on Clyde Street.

The site sits within the Central Conservation Area and Ward 10 – Anderston/City/Yorkhill.

Planning History

The application site has extensive planning history but very limited recent history. Only the following applications are of any particular relevance:

03/00582/DC (86-90 Maxwell Street) - Conversion of warehouse to form sixteen flats and erection of single storey rooftop extension. GC.

18/00666/FUL – (40 Fox Street) - Change of use of ground and basement floors from bar/nightclub to Class 1 (Shop) and associated storage and part change of use of first and second floors from Class 11 (Assembly and Leisure) to Class 11 (Assembly and Leisure) and Class 4 (Business). GC.

Pre-Application Engagement

The applicant has engaged in pre-application discussions consisting of a number of meetings with the Planning Service, including City Design. Matters raised through the process included justification for demolition of listed and unlisted buildings and the principles of development; scale and massing. On the basis of these discussions, the applicant was advised that the development as proposed was not likely to be supported by the Planning Service on the basis of overdevelopment of the site and in particular an inappropriate scale and massing.

Notwithstanding the concerns of the Planning Service, the planning application was submitted with no substantive changes made, despite ongoing efforts to reduce the scale of the proposal.

Proposed Development

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of existing listed and unlisted buildings and the erection of a 19-storey hotel (Class 7)/apart-hotel (Sui Generis) building with bar/restaurant and associated facilities.

The hotel/apart-hotel would have 236 rooms in total, with a mix of hotel rooms (67%) and serviced apartments (33%), and would be managed by a single hotel operator. The building would have a basement level to house plant, back of house and cycle storage. A bar/restaurant would be located on the 18th floor with plant on the roof above.

The Basement Level is comprised primarily of Mechanical & Electrical Plant and Back-of-House spaces. This level also houses a 52nr. Cycle Store.

At ground floor the building meets the street edge and corner of Maxwell Street and Fox street, and the recessed entrance opens up to the street corner. This level consists of reception, front of house amenity areas, lifts for travel to the upper floors, and a variety of back of house and plant areas.

Refuse collection and servicing is proposed directly off Fox Street. Vertical circulation throughout the building is provided by a central core, which provides:

- A dedicated, smoke vented fire-fighting lobby with direct access to the fire-fighting stair and fire-fighting lift.
- An additional three lifts, separated from the fire-fighting lobby to satisfy the volume of occupants for the building.

Levels 1&2 host a mix of serviced apartments and hotel rooms, laundry stores and a fitness suite.

Levels 3 to 8 continue the mix of serviced apartments and hotel rooms. At level 5 the first massing set back is introduced along Maxwell Street, with a further set back at level 8. At this level the building is further set back from the primary facade on the North, East and Western edges of the building.

Levels 9 &10 continue a mix of serviced apartments and hotels rooms.

Level 11 introduces the last massing offset along the North Elevation. Levels 11-16 continue a mix of serviced apartments and hotel rooms.

Level 17 houses serviced apartments and hotel rooms, and the primary Kitchen servicing the level above.

Level 18 features the Restaurant & Bar and Service Kitchen.

The Roof Level houses external plant and can be accessed via the primary core.

The proposed materials utilise various concrete cladding panels, with differing colours and textures. The lower floors of the facade feature a highly textured pre-cast cladding, with a contrasting white smoother finished GRC cladding to define the entrance and to emphasise the verticality of the primary façades.

Specified Matters

Planning legislation requires the planning register to include information on the processing of each planning application (a Report of Handling) and identifies a range of information that must be included. This obligation is aimed at informing interested parties of factors that might have had a bearing on the processing of the application. Some of the required information relates to consultations and representations that have been received and is provided elsewhere in this Committee report. The remainder of the information, and a response to each of the points to be addressed, is detailed below.

A. Summary of the main issues raised where the following were submitted or carried out

i. an environmental statement

An EIA is not required for the proposal because it has been determined that the proposal is unlikely to cause a significant effect on the environment and therefore, it is not an EIA development as defined in regulation 2 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. For full details, please refer to Screening Opinion ref 25/00372/SCR.

ii. an appropriate assessment under the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations 1994

Not applicable

iii. a design statement or a design and access statement

A Design and Access Statement has been submitted with the proposal, covering the context; proposed uses; proposed building designs; amenity; landscape; and sustainability.

iv. any report on the impact or potential impact of the proposed development (for example the retail impact, transport impact, noise impact or risk of flooding)

The following documents have been submitted in support of the application:

Planning Statement; Pre-Application Consultation Report; Transport Statement; Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Nocturnal Survey report; Air Quality Assessment; Energy Strategy Report; Flooding, Drainage and Surface Water Strategy; Noise Impact Assessment; Desk Top Study and Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report; Sustainability Statement; Circular Economy Statement; Heritage Statement; Archaeological Desk Based Assessment; Whole Life Carbon Assessment

B. Summary of the terms of any Section 75 planning agreement

Not applicable

C. Details of directions by Scottish Ministers under Regulation 30, 31 or 32

These Regulations enable Scottish Ministers to give directions.

i. with regard to Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (Regulation 30)

Not applicable

ii.

1. requiring the Council to give information as to the manner in which an application has been dealt with (Regulation 31)

Not applicable

2. requiring the Council not to grant planning permission without satisfying Scottish Ministers that the Council has considered to the condition and that it will either imposed or need not be imposed.

Not applicable

Policies

National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) was adopted on 13th February 2023. NPF4 is the national spatial strategy for Scotland. It sets out spatial principles, regional priorities, national developments and national planning policy for Scotland. Due to the scale, nature and location of the proposed development, the following policies are considered relevant:

Policy 1 - Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises

Policy 2 - Climate Mitigation and Adaptation

Policy 3 - Biodiversity

Policy 7 - Historic Assets and Places

Policy 9 - Brownfield, Vacant and Derelict Land and Empty Buildings

Policy 12 - Zero Waste

Policy 13 - Sustainable transport

Policy 14 - Design, Quality and Place

Policy 19 - Heating and Cooling

Policy 20 - Blue and Green Infrastructure

Policy 22 - Flood Risk and Water Management

Policy 23 - Health and Safety

Policy 30 – Tourism

The Glasgow City Development Plan (CDP) was adopted on 29 March 2017. The City Development Plan contains two overarching policies: CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle and CDP 2 Sustainable Spatial Strategy, which must be considered in relation to all development proposals. Other policies and associated supplementary guidance provide more details on specific land uses or environments which contribute to meeting the requirements of the overarching policies.

CDP 1 / SG 1 The Placemaking Principle

CDP 2 / SG 2 Sustainable Spatial Development

CDP 4 / SG 4 Network of Centres

CDP 5 / SG 5	Resource Management
CDP 6 / SG 6	Green Belt and Green Network
CDP 8 / SG 8	Water Environment
CDP 9 / SG 9	Historic Environment
CDP 10 / SG 10	Meeting Housing Needs
CDP 11 / SG 11	Sustainable Transport
CDP 12 / IPG 12	Delivering Development

Assessment and Conclusions

Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that where an application is made under the Planning Act, the determination shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In dealing with an application, the Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan so far as material to the application and to any other considerations.

Section 59 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 64 of the same act requires, with respect to any building or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to 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 considered to be:

- a) Whether the proposal accords with the relevant provisions of the Development Plan;
- b) Whether the proposal is appropriate having regard to the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act with respect to the proposed development and its impact on listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Central Conservation Area;
- c) Whether any other material considerations, such as consultations or representations, have been addressed satisfactorily in the assessment of this proposal.

In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises NPF4 adopted on the 13th of February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted on the 29th March 2017.

National Planning Framework 4

National Planning Framework 4 was adopted on 13 February 2023. In the case of this application, there is considered to be significant conflict between the proposals and the policies of NPF4 and it is considered that the proposals fail to comply with the overall aims and intentions of NPF4.

The application has been assessed against the relevant policies below.

Policy 1 Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises is an overarching policy which encourages, promotes and facilitates development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crises. When considering all development proposals, significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises.

Policy 2 Climate Mitigation and Adaptation is another overarching policy which encourages, promotes and facilitates development that minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change. Developments should 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. Retrofit measures to existing developments for emissions reduction or climate change adaptation will be supported.

Comment: The application site comprises vacant and underutilised buildings and thus the development of the site would, in principle, recycle and optimise the existing land asset by redeveloping the site. An Energy Strategy Report has been provided demonstrating that the CDP5 requirement can be met by the replacement building. The strategy identifies that the proposed development will meet Platinum Standard requirements and the 20% abatement of carbon emissions are met through the inclusion of Low and Zero Carbon Generating Technologies and implementing heating systems with zero direct emissions. The report also identifies that the heating system must be designed to be able to connect to any future district heating system.

A Whole Life Carbon Assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal. However, it relies solely on the assumed demolition of the existing buildings on the site and fails to provide any optioneering in terms of building retention in whole or in part, thus failing to demonstrate that the proposed redevelopment of the site minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change.

Therefore, the proposed development fails to comply with the requirements of Policy 2.

Policy 3 Biodiversity intends to protect biodiversity, reverse biodiversity loss, deliver positive effects from development and strengthen nature networks. Major developments will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal will conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity. To inform this, best practice assessment methods should be used. Proposals within these categories will demonstrate how they have met all of the following criteria:

- i. the proposal is based on an understanding of the existing characteristics of the site and its local, regional and national ecological context prior to development, including the presence of any irreplaceable habitats;
- ii. wherever feasible, nature-based solutions have been integrated and made best use of;
- iii. an assessment of potential negative effects which should be fully mitigated in line with the mitigation hierarchy prior to identifying enhancements;
- iv. significant biodiversity enhancements are provided, in addition to any proposed mitigation. This should include nature networks, linking to and strengthening habitat connectivity within and beyond the development, secured within a reasonable timescale and with reasonable certainty. Management arrangements for their long-term retention and monitoring should be included, wherever appropriate; and
- v. local community benefits of the biodiversity and/or nature networks have been considered.

Comment: The proposal makes little reference to biodiversity, landscape, or public realm and makes no attempt to include any green elements on roofs, green walls or any other green infrastructure. The proposal therefore fails to meet the aims and objectives of Policy 3 on account of failing to demonstrate where it can conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity.

Policy 7 Historic Assets and Places seeks to protect and enhance historic environment assets and places, and to enable positive change as a catalyst for the regeneration of places. Development proposals with a potentially significant impact on historic assets or places should be accompanied by an assessment which is based on an understanding of the cultural significance of the historic asset and/or place. The assessment should identify the likely visual or physical impact of any proposals for change, including cumulative effects and provide a sound basis for managing the impacts of change.

Comment: The proposed development site is located within the Central Conservation Area and forms part of a homogenous block of mid-19th century tenement style buildings. The majority of buildings are traditional 4 storey tenements. These building heights represent the established character of this part of the conservation area. By virtue of its scale and height, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character of this part of the conservation area and is therefore contrary to Policy 7 in that it has a significant negative impact.

Policy 9 Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate the reuse of brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings, reducing the need for greenfield development. Development proposals that will result in the sustainable reuse of brownfield land including vacant and derelict land and buildings will be supported. Development proposals for the reuse of existing buildings will be supported. Given the need to conserve embodied energy, demolition will be regarded as the least preferred option.

Comment: The site consists of buildings which have become partially vacant and poorly maintained. However, the intention is to demolish both buildings currently on the site. A Whole Life Carbon Assessment has been completed for the proposed development, but this does not include optioneering for retention or partial retention and retrofit of the existing buildings. As such, the proposal does not comply with the aims of Policy 9.

Policy 12 Zero Waste aims to encourage, promote and facilitate development that is consistent with the waste hierarchy.

- a) Development proposals should seek to reduce, reuse, or recycle materials in line with the waste hierarchy;
- b) Development proposals will be supported where they:
 - i) reuse existing buildings and infrastructure;

- ii) minimise demolition and salvage materials for reuse;
- iii) minimise waste, reduce pressure on virgin resources and enable building materials, components and products to be disassembled, and reused at the end of their useful life;
- iv) use materials with the lowest forms of embodied emissions; and use materials that are suitable for reuse with minimal reprocessing.

Comment: The proposed development involves the demolition of 2 no. existing buildings and a Circular Economy Statement has been submitted which identifies measures to reuse materials from the demolished buildings. In this regard the proposal complies with Policy 12, although it is noted elsewhere in this report that the submitted Whole Life Carbon Assessment is predicated on demolition of the existing buildings and does not consider the potential carbon savings of retaining and reusing the existing buildings. The proposal does not, therefore, adequately address the requirements of Policy 12.

Policy 13 - Sustainable Transport encourages, promotes and facilitates developments that prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport for everyday travel and reduce the need to travel unsustainably. 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 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 adequately mitigate any impact on local public access routes.

Comment: The application site is in a highly sustainable location within the City Centre and has good access to a range of public transport options, and the proposed development is car free with ample provision for cycle parking. The proposed development therefore raises no conflict with Policy 13.

Policy 14 Design, Quality and Place encourages well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the Place Principle. Development proposals will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places: healthy; pleasant; connected; distinctive; sustainable; and adaptable.

Comment: The detailed design of the development is considered elsewhere within the report and based on this assessment, the proposal does not represent successful placemaking in this location. Therefore, the proposal is not in accordance with Policy 14.

Policy 19 Heating and Cooling seeks to ensure that proposals in close proximity to a Heat Network Zone are designed and constructed to connect to a heat network or can be retrofitted to provide a connection. The policy also offers support for development proposals with buildings that will be occupied by people, where they are designed to promote sustainable temperature management, for example by prioritising natural or passive solutions such as siting, orientation, and materials.

Comment: The proposed development is not located within a proposed or committed heat network. As the building is for occupation by people, it has been sustainably designed in terms of its thermal values and heating requirements and controls. It is therefore considered that the completed building has the potential to comply with the intentions of Policy 19.

Policy 20 Blue Green Infrastructure aims to protect and enhance blue and green infrastructure and their networks. 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.

Proposals incorporating new or enhanced blue and/or green infrastructure are expected to provide effective management and maintenance plans covering the funding arrangements for their long-term delivery and upkeep, and the party or parties responsible for these.

Comment: The proposal makes little reference to biodiversity, landscape, or public realm and makes no attempt to include any green elements on roofs, green walls or any other green infrastructure, and fails to act upon the recommendations of the ecological appraisal. The proposal therefore fails to enhance blue and green infrastructure and is not in accordance with Policy 20.

Policy 22 Flood Risk and Water Management aims to strengthen resilience to flood risk by promoting avoidance as a first principle and reducing the vulnerability of existing and future development to flooding. Exceptions to this apply, including the redevelopment of previously used sites in built up areas where the LDP has identified a need to bring these into positive use and where proposals demonstrate that long-term safety and resilience can be secured in accordance with relevant SEPA advice (part iv of part a).

Additionally, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that;

- all risks of flooding are understood and addressed;
- there is no reduction in floodplain capacity, increased risk for others, or a need for future flood protection schemes;
- the development remains safe and operational during floods;
- flood resistant and resilient materials and construction methods are used; and
- future adaptations can be made to accommodate the effects of climate change.

Furthermore, where flood risk is managed at the site rather than avoided, development proposals will also require:

- the first occupied/utilised floor, and the underside of the development if relevant, to be above the flood risk level and have an additional allowance for freeboard; and
- that the proposal does not create an island of development and that safe access/egress can be achieved

Development proposals should not increase the risk of surface water flooding to others, or itself be at risk. All rain and surface water shall be managed through sustainable urban drainage systems which should form part of and integrate with proposed and existing blue-green infrastructure.

Comment: Comment: A Flooding, Drainage and Surface Water Strategy Report incorporating a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as part of the application. Subject to provision of clarification on a number of points raised by the Council's Flood Risk Management, and provision of the required certifications, it is considered that the proposed development is capable of compliance with Policy 22.

Policy 23 Health and safety aims to protect people and places from environmental harm, mitigate risks arising from safety hazards and encourage, promote and facilitate development that improves health and wellbeing.

Comment: The proposal is not considered to raise health and safety issues. The application is accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment which has considered the air quality impact on the local environment from both the construction and operational phases of the proposed development. Whilst there is a risk of impact during construction works, the implementation of suitable mitigation measures can significantly reduce the effect of dust and particulate matter released and the effects on air quality can be considered 'not significant' when these mitigation measures are in place.

The Air Quality Assessment considers the site suitability for residents and concludes that the operational phase of the development will not have a significant impact upon the existing air quality and future occupants are not predicted to be exposed to poor air quality.

A Noise Impact Assessment has been submitted which demonstrates that the development can achieve suitable indoor ambient noise levels with appropriate design features and mitigation measures.

Policy 30 Tourism seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate sustainable tourism development which benefits local people, is consistent with our net zero and nature commitments, and inspires people to visit Scotland. The outcome of Policy 30 is for communities and places to enjoy economic, social and cultural benefits from tourism, supporting resilience and stimulating job creation.

Policy 30 sets out in criteria a) development proposals for new or extended tourist facilities or accommodation, including caravan and camping sites, in locations identified in the LDP, will be supported. Criteria b) of Policy 30 goes on to require proposals for tourism related development will take into account:

- The contribution made to the local economy.
- Compatibility with the surrounding area in terms of the nature and scale of the activity and impacts of increased visitors.
- Impacts on communities, for example by hindering the provision of homes and services for local people.
- Opportunities for sustainable travel and appropriate management of parking and traffic generation and scope for sustaining public transport services particularly in rural areas.
- Accessibility for disabled people.
- Measures taken to minimise carbon emissions.
- Opportunities to provide access to the natural environment

Comment: The proposed use of the site as a hotel/apart hotel raises no conflict in principle with Policy 30.

Glasgow City Development Plan

With regards to the Glasgow City Development Plan, the relevant Policy and Supplementary Guidance are listed below.

The City Development Plan contains two overarching policies: CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle and CDP 2 Sustainable Spatial Strategy, which must be considered in relation to all development proposals. Other policies and associated supplementary guidance provide more details on specific land uses or environments which contribute to meeting the requirements of the overarching policies.

The following policies are considered particularly relevant to the application assessment:

Policy CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle and Supplementary Guidance SG 1 The Placemaking Principle

Placemaking is underpinned by a design-led approach to planning. This approach is not restricted to influencing the appearance of a building, street or place; rather it is a holistic approach that considers the area's context and balances the range of interests and opportunities to create multiple interconnected benefits through a collaborative process.

This Policy aims to contribute towards protecting and improving the quality of the environment, improving health and reducing health inequality, making the planning process as inclusive as possible and ensuring that new development attains the highest sustainability levels.

The scope of The Placemaking Principle is intentionally wide to ensure that it becomes embedded in all new development and not just large-scale regeneration. Engagement should be proportionate to the development that will take place. This approach will enable Glasgow to ensure that new development contributes towards the creation of new and improved places which are fit for people.

In order to be successful, new development should 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.

SG 1 'Placemaking' supports the above policy by providing guidance to promote the overarching Placemaking Principle being applied to all development types in the city. This comprises two parts - Part 1 provides the context and approach of Placemaking established in Policy CDP1 and Part 2 contains detailed assessment criteria relating to physical design.

Part 1 explains the 'placemaking principle' concept and how it will apply to new development in the City, stipulating that the onus will be on developers 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.

Comment: A Design and Access Statement and Planning Statement have been submitted in support of the application proposals, which conclude that the proposed development meets placemaking requirements and responds to relevant local development plan policies and associated supplementary guidance. The detailed assessment below challenges these findings.

SG1, Part 2 provides detailed assessment criteria for development. In particular, it provides guidance for residential developments and on matters relating to detailed design, layout, building materials, amenity provision, waste and recycling storage and energy efficient buildings. All new development in

Glasgow should be primarily design led and should be determined by the nature of a site, the wider site context and the City's broad urban design objectives.

Sustainable Development

SG 1 Part 2, Section 1 '*Sustainable Development – Energy Efficient Buildings*' identifies that resource efficient design is a key contributor in the placemaking approach, and that all new development will be expected to incorporate a range of measures to minimise energy consumption, reduce CO2 emissions and make best use of the City's natural resources.

Comment: A range of measures to achieve energy efficiency aims are proposed and are further elaborated on in reference to policy CDP5 and SG5.

Amenity

SG 1, Part 2, Section 4 'Amenity' addresses issues of 'Air Quality', 'Noise' and 'Community Safety'.

With regard to air quality, guidance states that new development should not result in the deterioration of air quality, particularly in (or adjacent to) Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA's).

In relation to noise, SG1 encourages consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Service to help applicants understand the impact not only of noise but also vibration on the community and realise the role they can play in mitigating the intrusion of such nuisance on a development's surroundings, in order to reduce the loss of any public amenity.

Referring to community safety, it is expected that new development will incorporate crime prevention and community safety measures within their layout and design, based on the principles of "Secure by Design". The Placemaking Principles should take precedence over secure by design principles where there are contradictions, and all security measures should be designed sympathetically with regards to the surrounding context and integrated within the overall design.

Comment: The proposal has the potential to cause air quality impacts as a result of fugitive dust emissions during construction and road traffic exhaust emissions associated with vehicles travelling to and from the site during operation. The development may also lead to the exposure of future occupants to any existing air quality issues at the site. As such, an Air Quality Assessment was undertaken in order to determine baseline conditions and consider potential effects as a result of the scheme.

The assessment concludes that off-site impacts from dust emissions during the construction phase would not be significant with appropriate mitigation measures in place. Due to the low number of anticipated vehicle trips associated with the proposal, the operational phase is considered to have air quality impacts that are 'not significant'.

The assessment also considers the air quality effects in relation to the development's operational phase, concluding that the impact on local air quality from increased traffic flows would also be 'not significant'.

A Noise Impact Assessment has been submitted which concludes that further details of specifications, including plant, would be required to ensure that the proposed development was able to meet requisite standards for both guests and neighbouring residents.

Therefore, the site is considered suitable for the proposed use with respect to the above criteria.

Detailed Design

SG 1, Part 2, Section 5 'Detailed Design' – 'Building Materials' stipulates that all new development, depending on the nature and scale of the development, will be expected to:

- a) Employ high quality facing and roofing materials that complement and, where appropriate, enhance the architectural character and townscape quality of the surrounding area;
- b) Use robust and durable materials that fit their context and are capable of retaining their appearance over time and in Glasgow's climate; and
- c) Acknowledge the local architectural and historic context through the use of appropriate materials.

When specifying cladding materials, consideration must be paid to the overall visual effect of the façade and its impact on the surrounding context. Poorly specified facades can appear flat and dull in

comparison to Glasgow's well-articulated historic architecture. As such, a high level of design sophistication will be expected. Proposals should:

- a) avoid flat and visually dull facades, especially in areas of sensitive architectural urban form;
- b) acknowledge and respond to the existing datums, courses and proportions found in the surrounding built environment; and
- c) acknowledge and harmonise with the range of textures and tones in the surrounding buildings and streetscape.

Comment: The proposal has been developed to deliver high quality materiality commensurate with the sensitivity of the location but this would be subject of post approval testing in the event that planning permission was granted.

Tall Buildings

Section 5 'Detailed Design' also provides guidance on 'Tall Buildings'. The application proposal is for a "tall building" – being defined within SG 1 Part 2 as a building that significantly exceeds general building heights in the immediate vicinity and which alters the skyline.

In response to increasing demand for development of taller buildings, Tall Building Design Guidance has been prepared and approved by the Council. This guidance is intended to assist in directing tall buildings to appropriate locations of the city centre. In consideration of numerous factors including policy; transport; heritage; views; and topography, the draft guidance identifies the area in which the application site is located as being **generally unsuitable** for a tall building.

Existing adopted general tall building policy within supplementary guidance acknowledges that tall buildings in particular present major economic, design and environmental challenges and opportunities. It is an absolute prerequisite that tall buildings are restricted to locations that can accommodate their dominant built form, that protect areas of sensitive urban character, achieve excellent design quality, and enhance the City's image.

As per the guidance, tall buildings should be located:

- a) within sustainable areas (e.g. the City Centre Western and Northern Fringes, the International Financial Services District, selected parts of the River Frontage from the Clyde Gateway westwards to the Clyde Tunnel and south of the Clydeside Expressway) and in areas with appropriate above and below ground infrastructure, public transport links and pedestrian accessibility;
- b) to avoid areas of Sensitive Urban Character unless it is demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Council, that the particular qualities of the area would be retained;
- c) To avoid interruption of strategic views or competition with views of established landmarks and other significant or prominent listed buildings;
- d) In a way that sensitively responds to local street conditions, recognising street hierarchies, building datums and in locations where tall building material choices will be appropriate;
- e) In a manner that is not detrimental to local microclimate, public realm and local views; In areas which are financially viable for long term adaptability of alternative uses.

Comment:

With regard to a), the application site is not located in a position where significant height would have a positive impact on its context or on the skyline, such as on a riverfront location, an arterial route or on a significant urban node. While there are tall buildings nearby, these principally present to the riverfront along Clyde Street, whereas the application site is set back from the River within a compact block with a cohesive datum, with part of the 19 storey buildings main frontage onto Fox Street is grounded directly on a narrow path commensurate with a lane condition.

In relation to b), the site is located within an area considered to be of 'Sensitive Urban Character' where the remaining listed and unlisted buildings are critical to retaining the remaining traditional urban morphology. Within such areas, should development or redevelopment opportunities arise, these should seek to repair and regenerate the urban fabric in a manner that does not overwhelm, over-dominate or undermine the character of that area. It is considered that the application proposal, due to its scale and massing would result in these negative impacts.

With respect to c), the position height and mass of the proposed building is such that it would negatively impact on strategic views, particularly when viewed from southern areas towards the City Centre, where the building would create the impression of a wall of development when viewed against adjacent tall buildings fronting the River.

In terms of criteria d), the proposal fails to sensitively respond to local street conditions, recognising street hierarchies, particularly as the Fox Street frontage of the 19 storey building meets the ground in what is arguably a lane condition, with restricted space for a building of this scale and significance to have any meaningful setting. In addition, the strong legible datum of this block is not meaningfully acknowledged in the building design, which appears as an unsympathetic and overbearing vertical insertion into a generally low rise horizontal block.

Finally, in relation to e) a wind analysis has not been submitted to explain the impact of the building height and mass on the effects of wind on adjacent buildings or at street level and, as such, there has been no opportunity to design in wind mitigation measures as part of the building design. This is a pre-requisite of the design development of tall buildings, as further explained in the Tall Buildings Design Guidance. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the constraints of the site are such that the building frontages and entrance place significant pressure on the immediate public footways and, whilst maintaining traditional building lines there is no scope to provide additional public realm to act as a meaningful setting for a tall building in this location.

In addition to the general Placemaking design principles outlined in SG1, Part 1, the design of tall buildings should take specific cognisance of:

- a) the urban morphology of their context, in terms of height, datums, urban grain, roofscapes, scale and massing;
- b) the design of the building 'in the round' creating articulated elevations that respond to wider as well as local views. Generally avoiding large, blank or inactive gables;
- c) how a building's design responds to and enhances the character of the skyline, as well as avoiding slab-like forms that over-dominate, and carefully designing and controlling any rooftop plant;
- d) the creation of a lively, engaging and activated public realm, that specifically considers and mitigates a building's impacts in terms of wind, overshadowing, and servicing requirements at ground floor;
- e) the townscape character of the specific street(s) that they are located on (especially in relation to datums, urban grain and massing);
- f) creating an appropriately scaled 'base' in relation to the building's height;
- g) the use of robust materials, carefully considered to ensure that the constraints of tall building construction are appropriate within the local context;
- h) adaptability to future uses, particularly given the servicing and structural constraints of tall buildings;
- i) issues of microclimate, with wind studies informing massing and design mitigation measures; and
- j) the potential to offer something of additional and unique benefit to the city, such as rooftop access to the public (with a clearly defined public entrance), enhanced public realm as well as outstanding, and distinctive architectural character that imaginatively responds to its Glasgow context.

Comment: The economic narrative describes a scenario where a hotel/aparthotel hybrid at the quantum presented is the only viable development option. However, the proposed development remains significantly over scaled and unsupportable for this site. In particular, the proposed building does not take cognisance of the urban morphology of its context, in terms of height, datums, urban grain, roofscapes or scale and massing.

Whilst the setbacks from adjacent buildings have been increased to varying degrees during the pre-application discussion in order to create a building in the round, these generally remain too small to be meaningful given the context and the scale of the proposed building. Particularly, the offsets of approximately 2.8m from the north boundary (up to level 11) and approximately 5m to the west boundary (level 8 to roof) are not sufficient and do not acknowledge the particular characteristics and context of the site and due to their proximity to adjacent property boundaries result in the building borrowing amenity from these sites.

While the building cannot be categorised as 'slab like', its close proximity to other frontline tall buildings will in some views create an impermeable wall of development which would detract from views and from the City skyline.

It is considered that the building does not take cognisance of the townscape character of the specific street(s) that they are located on, where Fox Street holds the characteristics of a lane, particularly insofar as the proposed building meets the ground at the heel of very narrow pavements on Fox Street and Maxwell Streets and fails to provide suitable breathing space for a building of this scale.

While the base can be considered to be appropriately scaled in relation to the building's height, this particular response may be appropriate on a larger vacant site where it would not be directly abutted by a consistent and relatively low rise traditional datum, with attempts to integrate the building into the block by the introduction of minimal setbacks resulting in an unsuccessful visual relationship.

The “infill” development nature of the specific proposal creates objective constraints to development of a building of substantive scale. As proposed, the lack of meaningful setback/offsets from the site boundary, in association to the proposed scale, results into the building:

- a) borrowing amenity from the neighbouring sites;
- b) restricting the future development potential of neighbouring buildings/sites;
- c) creating substandard environmental conditions within the site and within the immediate context;
- d) affecting the overall quality of the townscape in the locale; and
- e) failing to preserve or enhance the character of the Central Conservation Area or protect the setting of nearby listed buildings.

A daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal which concludes that the proposed building would not have an unreasonable impact on the daylight received by residential windows at 66-70 Howard Street, particularly given the low baseline daylight levels as existing. However, it is noted that the development as proposed would result in 47 windows (65%) serving 32 habitable rooms, experiencing reductions in VSC that could be noticeable to the room occupants. Noting the unsupportive stance taken in the assessment above in relation to the scale and massing of the proposed building, it is considered that a revised proposal which addresses these concerns would present an opportunity to improve the daylight prospects for neighbouring buildings.

As noted above, no wind analysis has been submitted in support of the development which is considered to be a fundamental requirement.

As such, the proposed building has an overall negative effect on the surrounding immediate and wider townscape and environmental performances of the city fabric. For instance, clear evidence is provided by the as proposed views in the Visual Impact Assessment (yet not exclusively as there are other negative effects) where it is clear that the scale and massing of the proposal results in closing of the visual gap from the river towards St Enoch between 236-246 Clyde St and the consented development at 222 Clyde St, creating a visually impermeable built wall as backdrop of the River Clyde. A further example is the overdominance of the proposed scale on the setting of the listed building to the north.

The building height as proposed disregards the established principle of varied townscape and scale transitions. An analysis of the AOD layer in VU-City provides a significant insight into the building's scale in its context, with only 4 buildings (built or consented) in the wider locality rising only marginally higher than the proposed development, each of which can be convincingly justified relative to the adopted Tall Buildings Guidance for Glasgow.

Furthermore, this site is not on a significant movement artery and the proposed building is neither signalling the presence of key transport infrastructure nor episodes of significant civic nature (in its immediate context and in the proposed use). For the reasons above, the proposed scale is difficult to justify in the context of the Council's Placemaking policies and guidance, and the Tall Buildings Design Guide for Glasgow.

Waste Storage, Recycling & Collection

Part 2, Section 7 '*Waste Storage, Recycling and Collection*' stipulates that all new developments must include appropriate and well-designed provision for waste storage, recycling and collection which meets the City's wider placemaking objectives. All waste/recycling areas must be located discreetly, so as to have no adverse visual impact or cause traffic/noise nuisance to neighbours. Applicants must provide full details of the provision for waste storage, recycling and collection in the initial submission for planning permission.

Comment: The proposal includes dedicated internal space for waste and recycling storage and does not conflict with the guidance in this regard.

Comment: Given the above, the proposed development fails to accord with the full suite of requirements of **CDP 1** and **SG 1**.

Policy CDP 2 Sustainable Spatial Development and Supplementary Guidance SG 2 Sustainable Spatial Strategy

This policy aims to influence the location and form of development to create a 'compact city' form

which supports sustainable development. It will also help to ensure that the City is well-positioned to meet the challenges of a changing climate and economy, and to build a resilient physical and social environment which helps attract and retain investment and promotes an improved quality of life. The policy seeks to utilise brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites.

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 utilise brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites and prioritises the remediation and reuse of vacant and derelict land.

CDP 2 supports new development proposals that meet the requirements of relevant Spatial Supplementary Guidance that supports the Development Plan. Of relevance is the City Centre Strategic Development Framework (SDF). This SDF supports a vibrant, attractive centre driving a growing economy which includes repopulating the centre, ensuring a mix of uses and round the clock activity, whilst improving the quality of the urban environment to help attract more residents, businesses and visitors.

This City Centre SDF proposes a number of strategic interventions under the four themes of the City Development Plan (CDP); to make the centre more Vibrant, Liveable, Connected and Green and Resilient. It proposes six Strategic Place Ambitions in response to priority issues raised by city stakeholders for the improvement of the City Centre, which seek to:

- Reinforce the Centre's economic competitiveness and boost vibrancy to grow prosperity for all
- Re-populate the Centre and improve liveability to ensure sustainable neighbourhoods that promote health, wellbeing and social cohesion
- Reconnect the Centre with surrounding communities and its riverside
- Reduce traffic dominance and create a pedestrian and cycle friendly centre, with improved public transport, that is healthier and cleaner
- Green the Centre and make it climate resilient with a network of high-quality public spaces and green-blue infrastructure that caters for a variety of human and climatic needs
- Repair, restore and enhance the urban fabric to reinforce the City's distinctive character and celebrate its heritage.

In terms of 'Priorities & Place Ambitions' the SDF supports a transformation of the City Centre that focusses on people, place and planet to ensure its future social, economic and environmental resilience. It recognises that bold interventions are required to radically adapt the City Centre's urban environment to meet the demands of climate change and to increase the Centre's appeal and attractiveness to future residents, investors, workers and visitors. Therefore, the SDF prioritises the following:

- Priority 1 - Accelerate transformation of the urban environment to ensure climate resilience, improved liveability and place quality
- Priority 2 - Increase activity and diversity in the centre to support its continued prosperity at the heart of the City region and as a key contributor to the national economy.
- Priority 3 - Define placemaking ambitions for the City Centre to provide a framework around which multi -sectoral policies, plans and projects can be aligned and partnership working can be galvanised towards their delivery.

Comment: The proposal accords with aspects of CDP 2 and SG 2, but as described in detail elsewhere in this report, fails to fully deliver a suitable response to climate change and placemaking requirements and ambitions.

Policy CDP 4 Network of Centres and Supplementary Guidance SG 4 Network of Centres

Policy CDP 4 aims to ensure that all of Glasgow's residents and visitors have good access to a network of centres which are vibrant, multi-functional and sustainable destinations providing a range of goods and services. This will be achieved by:

- maintaining and strengthening the role of Glasgow City Centre as the key economic driver in the West of Scotland;
- protecting and revitalising all Town Centres within the Network;
- supporting the 'Town Centres First' principle by directing appropriate footfall generating uses to Town Centres;
- supporting the role that Town Centres play as integrated transport hubs and encouraging travel by sustainable means to and between Centres; and
- embracing the principles of placemaking, and building on the strengths of each Centre.

The City Centre is the primary location for retail, office, commercial, leisure, tourism and civic uses servicing the city region as well as a national transport hub. Accordingly, the Council will favour proposals that support the primary retail, office and leisure functions of the City Centre.

Associated SG 4 details that the City Centre sits at the top of the Town Centre hierarchy by virtue of the scale and diversity of its retail, employment, commercial leisure, education, and tourism functions. SG 4 aims to support the primary retail function of the City Centre by promoting development opportunities for retail and commercial development and supporting a diversity of land uses and distinctive character areas.

Comment: The proposal for tourist accommodation aligns in principle with the aims and objectives of CDP 4 & SG 4 in relation to the City Centre.

Policy CDP 5 Resource Management and Supplementary Guidance SG 5 Resource Management

Policy CDP 5 Resource Management requires all new developments to be designed to reduce the need for energy from the outset. This can be done through careful siting, layout and design and should make the best use of energy efficiency techniques and materials.

All new domestic and non-domestic developments are required to make use of low and zero carbon generating technologies in order to contribute to meeting greenhouse emission targets and to meet the appropriate sustainability level. In order to achieve this, a range of low and zero carbon generating technologies may be implemented. A Statement on Energy is required to support all applications to which this policy applies.

Comment: An Energy Strategy Report has been provided demonstrating that the CDP5 requirement will be met. The strategy identifies that the proposed development will meet Platinum Standard requirements and the 20% abatement of carbon emissions are met through the inclusion of Low and Zero Carbon Generating Technologies and implementing heating systems with zero direct emissions. The report also identifies that the heating system must be designed to be able to connect to any future district heating system.

Comment: The proposal would therefore accord with CDP 5 and SG 5.

Policy CDP 6 & Supplementary Guidance SG 6 Green Belt and Green Network Green Roofs

CDP6 states that SG6 will include advice on “the enhancement and extension of the green network in new development (including the role of green roofs) to deliver improved links and multifunctional benefits”. The Council’s Climate Plan recognises that green roofs and walls can deliver multiple benefits, helping address, amongst other things, development plan requirements for enhanced biodiversity, sustainable drainage and urban heat mitigation. There are other demands on roof space, including for plant, renewables (such as solar photovoltaics), food growing and amenity space however, with good design, these should not be mutually exclusive. The following provides guidance on the circumstances under which the Council will expect a roof on a new development to provide green network functionality for biodiversity and SUDS.

NPF4 emphasises the need to adapt to and mitigate the climate crisis and to address the ecological crisis with:

- NPF4 Policy 1 requiring significant weight to be given to the climate and nature crises when considering all development proposals;
- Policy 3 requiring development proposals to contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity; and
- Policy 22 requiring new development to manage all rain and surface water through sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS), which should form part of, and integrate with, proposed and existing blue-green infrastructure.

To achieve these policy ambitions, it is expected that many new developments will need to include green roofs, particularly:

- developments in the city centre, where they may form the best and most realistic option for delivering biodiversity enhancements and SUDS;

The Council’s expectation is that the following developments (including extensions above the specified thresholds) will provide a green roof that delivers both significant biodiversity benefits (including, where appropriate, a variety of habitats to support nature) and SUDS benefits:

- **non-residential developments of 2000sqm or more gross floor area;**

Where SUDS and biodiversity requirements can be satisfactorily met on site, without the need for a biodiverse green roof and where consistent with other development plan considerations, then a green roof will not be required

The use of green roofs on other types of development is encouraged, particularly where this would contribute to meeting requirements of NPF4 policy 3.

It is expected that a minimum of 30% of the roof space in new development will be utilised for nature and water management but that a greater percentage may be required in larger developments and where this is necessary to meet the requirements of NPF4 Policy 3. Where roof space is to be used for other purposes (eg solar photovoltaics), this should be designed to also incorporate benefits for nature and water management. Where parts of the roof are to be used for amenity, it will be important that the purpose of the green roof is clear, to avoid conflict and potential misuse/mismanagement.

Where it can be shown that there are technical or financial reasons why this cannot be achieved, consideration will be given to reducing these requirements. However, the Council's view is that for many developments, development plan policy on biodiversity enhancement and SUDS means green roofs are likely to be required.

Whilst green roofs can be long-lasting, they need maintaining. Provision for ongoing maintenance, including safe means of accessing the roof with any necessary equipment, will be a requirement of any planning consent.

The best type of green roof for meeting the needs of the development and NPF4 policies 3 and 22 might be intensive, semi-intensive, extensive, blue-green or biosolar, depending on the policy requirements and the development design. CIRIA guidance C644 - Building Greener: Guidance on the use of green roofs, green walls and complementary features on buildings provides useful guidance on the design, construction and operation of green roof and walls as does the Living Roofs Code of Practice for Green Roofs.

Comment: No attempt has been made to incorporate green roofs into the proposed development. As opportunities for SUDS biodiversity enhancement are relatively limited by the constraints of the site, a green roof is considered an opportunity to address such shortcomings in this development. This relates to the proposal's intent to attenuate surface water in a tank prior to discharge to the Scottish Water combined sewer network, which could potentially be resisted by Scottish Water, unless suitable justification can be made. It is noted that the proposal would deliver a 60% betterment on the existing drainage from the site, which discharges unattenuated to the combined sewer.

The proposal is therefore contrary to CDP 6/SG 6.

Policy CDP7 Natural Environment and Supplementary Guidance SG7 Natural Environment

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

The application site is not subject to any specific designation within SG7 though the Development Plan takes a broad approach to conserving and enhancing nature. Wherever possible, development shall enhance biodiversity. New developments shall aim to enhance and/or help create new habitats. Within the city centre, opportunities for enhancing habitat and wildlife interests include green roofs; green/living walls; planting of street trees; and incorporation of bat and bird boxes in the design.

New development should not have an unacceptable effect, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively on biodiversity.

Comment: A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been provided in support of the proposed development. This identifies a series of key recommendations, including, due to the identified potential for bat roosting, the requirement for a species protection plan along with appropriate mitigation and compensation, including bat roost provision built into the new development.

The proposal makes little reference to biodiversity, landscape, or public realm and makes no attempt to include any green elements on roofs, green walls or any other green infrastructure, and fails to act upon the recommendations of the ecological appraisal. The proposal therefore fails to meet the aims and objectives of CDP7 and SG7 on account of failing to demonstrate where it can conserve or enhance biodiversity.

Policy CDP8 Water Environment and Supplementary Guidance SG8 Water Environment

CDP8 clarifies that local authorities are required by The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 to manage and reduce flood risk and promote sustainable flood risk management, which will entail working with responsible authorities and stakeholders, such as SEPA, to meet legislative requirements.

This will require action to assess and address flood risk in new development, including restricting development in certain areas of flood risk and designing new development to reduce flood risk at the development site and impact elsewhere. It also entails an assessment of flood risk across the City, as a basis for the identification and implementation of flood risk management measures.

All proposals are required to make satisfactory provision for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and to safeguard the development from the risk of flooding. In addition, proposals for new development should ensure that it does not adversely impact on the water environment, does not increase the probability of flooding elsewhere and does not interfere with the storage capacity of the flood plain.

SG8, Section 6 confirms that where flood risks are identified as part of the screening of development proposals, a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required.

The FRA must clearly identify specific flood risks and quantify issues that need to be addressed. It must demonstrate that the flood mitigation strategy can be delivered, taking on board the relevant legislative requirements of Scottish Planning Policy, the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 and SEPA.

All development identified to be at risk of flooding using the Council Flood Risk Framework, must incorporate a 'freeboard allowance' and/or the use of water-resistant materials and forms of construction which must be appropriate to its function, location and planned lifetime.

SG8, Section 7 confirms the Scottish Planning Policy presumption against land raising within a functional flood plain. Any proposed development within a functional flood plain should be designed to be commensurate with the potential flood risk, in line with Section 6, without the need to raise or defend land. Consequently, the majority of development proposed within a functional flood plain (inclusive of fluvial and pluvial flooding) is likely to be inappropriate.

Only in exceptional circumstances will land raising or defence of a functional flood plain be considered for new development. Where land raising or land defending is to be accepted, equivalent compensatory storage plus 10% must be provided and a drainage impact assessment will be required to demonstrate that there will be no increase in water level of the relevant watercourse. To ensure safe means of access and egress, land raising should not create islands of development.

The exceptional circumstances in which the Council may consider land raising or defence of a functional flood plain, in support of new development, include:

- Critical infrastructure
- Major regeneration projects
- Recreational facilities (sports fields, golf courses, cycleways etc.)
- Where this would have a neutral or positive effect on the probability of flooding elsewhere.

Comment: A Flooding, Drainage and Surface Water Strategy Report incorporating a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as part of the application. Subject to provision of clarification on a number of points raised by the Council's Flood Risk Management, and provision of the required certifications, it is considered that the proposed development is capable of compliance with CDP 8 & SG 8.

Policy CDP9 & Supplementary Guidance SG9: Historic Environment

Policy CDP 9 aims to ensure the appropriate protection, enhancement and management of Glasgow's heritage assets by providing clear guidance to applicants. The Council will protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment in line with Scottish Planning Policy/Scottish Historic Environment Policy for the benefit of our own and future generations. The Council will assess the impact of proposed development and support high quality design that respects and complements the character and appearance of the historic environment and the special architectural or historic interest of its listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, archaeology, historic gardens and designed landscapes and their settings. The Council is unlikely to support development that would have a negative impact on the historic environment.

SG 9 supports CDP 9 by providing detailed design guidance. With regard to demolition, SG 9 notes

that proposals for demolition of an unlisted building, which contributes to the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, will require to demonstrate that:

- a) The existing building is incapable of viable repair and re-use; and
- b) The proposed replacement will preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

In order to protect townscape quality, consent for redevelopment will require the retention of existing buildings until the replacement development commences.

The character of Glasgow's Conservation Areas consists of a variety of elements including a rich mix of architectural styles, dense groupings of buildings, distinctive street patterns interspersed with landmark buildings and historic landscape features. Guidance requires that proposals for infill development in Conservation Areas should maintain or enhance the character and appearance of their historic context by using high quality design and materials. Proposals should reinforce local distinctiveness and historic character and seek to:

- a) Respect the established building lines of the street where this is an identified feature;
- b) Ensure that the scale and massing respects and responds to the existing adjacent properties; and
- c) Harmonise external finishes with those of existing adjacent properties (while natural stone is the preferred option in areas of traditional construction, alternative materials may be acceptable dependent on the quality of the architectural design and the context of its setting).

Within the Central Conservation Area in particular, SG 9 notes that in assessing new development within the city centre, the following, along with other policy considerations, should be taken into account. Development should:

- a) Respect the built form, maintain (or re-instate) continuity of building lines, street containment, street pattern and elevational proportions;
- b) Maintain variation of plot width and grid-iron street pattern in the Victorian business area;
- c) Design roofscapes which do not compete with the original building design; and
- d) Use high quality materials and utilise sandstone on prominent elevations.

Comment: The site forms part of a homogenous block of mid-19th century tenement style buildings. These range from 2 storeys on corner of Fox Street/Maxwell Street to 6 storeys on corner of Dixon and Fox Streets. The majority of buildings are traditional 4 storey tenements. The Heritage Statement places emphasis on the 'emerging character' of the conservation area to justify a 19-storey building. This is not a relevant consideration, since the conservation area designation is intended to protect the established historic character of the townscape. These building heights form and contribute to the established character and appearance of this part of the conservation area and it is essential that this character is not degraded further by the introduction of inappropriate development interventions, such as proposed in this case.

By virtue of its scale, massing and overall height, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Central Conservation Area and would have a harmful impact on the setting of and views in and out of, this part of the conservation area. Furthermore, the overbearing presence of the proposed building would have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the Category 'B' listed building immediately to the north (72-82 Howard Street) and is therefore contrary to CDP 9 and SG 9.

Policy CDP 10 & Supplementary Guidance SG 10: Meeting Housing Needs

Policy CDP 10 aims to ensure that the City's growing and diverse population has access to a choice of housing of appropriate quality and affordability across all tenures. Associated supplementary guidance SG10 supports the above policy by providing guidance on the locational and residential amenity implications of development proposals for residential and visitor accommodation.

Accordingly, SG10 includes detailed advice and guidance on development of short stay and tourist accommodation.

SG10 states that tourist accommodation such as hotels and serviced apartments can bring positive economic benefits to the City. However, there is a need to preserve the character and amenity of Conservation Areas and careful consideration should be given to site, location and design.

Comment: The proposal complies with elements of the above policy CDP10 and supplementary guidance SG10: Meeting Housing Needs insofar as the application site is in a highly accessible location, accustomed to accommodating a large influx of people on a regular basis, and will not place substantial additional pressure on local amenities.

Notwithstanding the above, due its height and mass, and its over-dominant presence within this relatively low-level block, it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Central Conservation Area in this location, thereby failing to fully comply with CDP 10 and SG 10.

Policy CDP 11 & Supplementary Guidance SG 11: Sustainable Transport

Policy CDP 11 Sustainable Transport aims to ensure that Glasgow is a connected City, characterised by sustainable active travel by supporting better connectivity by public transport; discouraging non-essential car journeys; and encouraging opportunities for active travel.

Supplementary Guidance SG 11: Sustainable Transport supports the above policy by providing guidance on how development proposals will be expected to address the transport implications that they give rise to.

To encourage the use of non-car transport modes, the guidance sets out maximum car parking standards for certain types of development, including retailing, leisure and commercial uses. These restraint based maximum parking standards are related to public transport accessibility. Due to its high accessibility, and to discourage vehicle borne journeys, there is no minimum car parking standards for developments in the City Centre. Parking provided for development in the City Centre should be primarily for operational purposes, i.e. restricted to vehicles required for the operation of a business.

To encourage cycling, the Council shall require the provision of cycle parking in new development and redevelopment proposals in line with the minimum cycle parking standards specified in Tables 2.1 – 2.6.

Comment: In line with the aims of policy CDP 11 and supplementary guidance SG 11, the proposal does not include any vehicular parking. Cycle parking has been provided for users of the in accordance with the standards set out in Table 2.3 in relation to 'Retail and Commercial' uses, which include 1 space per 10 staff and 1 space per 10 bed spaces, although there is a lack of clarity on access arrangements given the basement location. The proposed development is considered capable of full compliance with CDP11 and SG11 subject to further clarification and consideration of design.

With regard to a) Whether the proposal accords with the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, it is concluded that the proposed building, by virtue of its scale, massing and design, as well as shortfalls in testing and specific policy requirements does not comply with the provisions, policy aims and detailed guidance of the Development Plan.

With regard to b) Whether the proposal is appropriate having regard to the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act with respect to the proposed development and its impact on listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Central Conservation Area, it is concluded that the proposed building will have significant adverse effects on both the character and appearance of the conservation area in this location (Broomielaw, St Enoch and River Clyde Character Area of Glasgow Central Conservation Area) as well as on the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

Material Considerations

In respect of c), with regard to material considerations:

Glasgow City Council's Tall Buildings Design Guide (May 2025)

The Tall Buildings Design Guide builds on and interprets the guidance set out in City Development Plan's Supplementary Guidance SG1 The Placemaking Principle, taking cognisance of the City's physical context and policy requirements, to assist in the design, planning and delivery of better designed buildings of scale.

The Guide draws together the Council's key quality aspirations on location and design, offers clarity on the required planning process and establish a methodological reference baseline for relevant technical aspects of design.

It states that *"tall buildings in portions of the city fabric characterised by a very established historical townscape (such as conservation areas) are discouraged if they fail to add value to the experience of the place, undermining its clarity and legibility"*.

As explained in detail under the SG1 'Tall Buildings' assessment earlier in this report, the site is considered to be in a sensitive location, generally unsuited to tall buildings, and the proposed development runs contrary to this guidance in this regard. This site is not on a significant movement

artery and the proposed building is neither signalling the presence of key transport infrastructure nor episodes of significant civic nature (in its immediate context and in the proposed use).

Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed building has been driven by commercial factors rather than following the methodical approach promoted and supported by the Tall Building Design Guide and this has led to a number of shortcomings in the design development process, particularly with regard to responding to the townscape context and urban form and respecting the presence of built heritage resources.

In addition, microclimate testing has been limited to a Daylight Assessment which demonstrates a negative impact on 47 windows (65%) serving 32 habitable rooms, resulting in reductions in VSC (Vertical Sky Component) that could be noticeable to the room occupants. The lack of a wind analysis is a pre-requisite for the testing and design development of tall buildings insofar as building design can incorporate measures for wind mitigation if it is known that wind comfort levels will be adversely affected. There has been no opportunity for testing and incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures as part of the planning application process.

For these reasons, the proposed building is contrary to the Glasgow Tall Building Design Guide.

Representations

A total of 61 objections were received including representation from Merchant City and Trongate Community Council.

The principal matters raised by the objections can be summarised as:

- *The applicant's justification for complete demolition—that the stonework is degraded beyond reasonable repair—is neither credible nor consistent with best practice in conservation-led redevelopment;*
- *£300,000 for specialist stone repairs is not disproportionate in the context of the likely total development value of a substantial city centre site;*
- *the applicant has not demonstrated that any serious efforts have been made to address this conservation deficit through the range of grant funding opportunities available;*
- *By failing to properly explore grant funding options and proven engineering methods, the applicant cannot credibly argue that all reasonable efforts to retain the building have been made. This failure to exhaust reasonable alternatives means the proposal does not meet the stringent policy tests for listed building demolition under NPF4 Policy 7, and it also breaches Glasgow City Development Plan Policy 9, which seeks to protect and enhance the city's historic environment;*
- *Demolishing this distinctive façade (of the Listed Building) would result in the permanent loss of important architectural character and would erode the identity of the area.*

Comment: The matters above, all relating to the case for demolishing the listed and unlisted buildings on site, are covered in further detail in the reports for the applications for Conservation Area and Listed Building Consents, being more closely related to these. Overall, this assessment concludes that the case for demolition of the listed and unlisted buildings on site has not been fully justified.

- *The proposed replacement building is bland and lacks a distinctiveness that relates it to Glasgow;*

Comment: The architectural language as proposed is not in itself considered to be a reason for refusing this application, however, the assessment above does reach the conclusion that the overall design of the building does not adequately respond and relate to its context.

- *Embodied carbon within the existing buildings:*

Comment: A Whole Life Carbon Assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal. However, it is acknowledged that this fails to provide suitable optioneering and relies solely on the assumed demolition of the existing buildings on the site.

- *Loss of privacy for adjacent dwellings;*

Comment: The proposed development would achieve 18m window to window distances relative to adjacent dwellings, and no immediate privacy concerns are raised with regard to existing buildings. However, as noted in the assessment under SG1 earlier in this report, the proximity of active facades to the site boundaries to the north and west does borrow amenity from the adjacent sites, limiting their future development potential, including for residential use.

- *Loss of daylight for adjacent dwellings in the Pacific Apartments Building (66-70 Howard Street);*

Comment: A daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal which concludes that the proposed building would not have an unreasonable impact on the daylight received by residential windows at 66-70 Howard Street, particularly given the low baseline daylight levels as existing. However, it is noted that the development as proposed would result in 47 windows (65%) serving 32 habitable rooms, experiencing reductions in VSC that could be noticeable to the room occupants. Noting the unsupportive stance taken in the assessment above in relation to the scale and massing of the proposed building, it is considered that a revised proposal which addresses these concerns would present an opportunity to improve the daylight prospects for neighbouring buildings.

- *Detrimental impact on traffic safety and parking as a result of increased traffic in an already busy one-way system;*

Comment: The proposed use as hotel/aparthotel, with no dedicated car park, in a highly accessible city-centre location is not considered likely to generate a significant increase in vehicular traffic.

A total of 30 letters of support were also received. The principal matters raised by the letters of support can be summarised as:

- *The development introduces a contemporary yet respectful architectural language that complements the area's heritage without competing with it;*

Comment: The architectural language is not considered to be inherently problematic in itself and could be suitably refined, should a more appropriate scale and massing be developed. However, as described in the policy assessment above, the current proposal aggressively overdevelops the site to the significant detriment of the character of this part of the conservation area.

- *The development repairs a long-standing visual and functional gap in the urban landscape which presently diminishes the character and experience of adjacent historic assets;*

Comment: Whilst the site is underutilised and suffers from a degree of disrepair, it is not a gap site in either sense.

- *Opportunity to develop a long-term derelict site into a vibrant, contextually sensitive, and economically resilient destination that will bring lasting benefit to the city centre at a crucial time;*
- *the involvement of a major international hotel brand adds credibility, financial strength, and a long-term commitment to Glasgow's city centre economy;*
- *The proposal demonstrates strong alignment with the city's economic strategy. By offering both standard hotel rooms and serviced apartments, it caters to a wide range of visitor types and supports midweek and off-season occupancy. Its inclusion of public amenities such as a publicly accessible rooftop bar, gym, and business facilities makes it a versatile, future-proofed asset for Glasgow's hospitality infrastructure;*
- *the development provides a regulated and sustainable alternative to short-term lets, reducing pressure on local housing and reinforcing the city's ability to host large-scale events without displacing residents.*

Comment: The proposed use as a hotel/aparthotel is considered to be acceptable in principle in this location. The economic benefits of the proposal are recognised but are not considered to outweigh this Authority's concerns regarding the height, overall scale and massing of the proposed building.

With regard to c) material considerations, it is concluded that failure to follow the guidance of the Tall Buildings Design Guide is a determining factor in consideration of the application proposal. In addition, aspects of the objections raised are material consideration which have weight in the assessment of the application as explained in the report above.

Conclusion

Taking full account of the policy assessment above, and other relevant material considerations, it is recommended that full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a hotel/apart-hotel with bar/restaurant with associated facilities is refused. Whilst the principle of a hotel/aparthotel at this location accords with the relevant policies of the Development Plan, and there may be scope for this service to support the principle of demolition should a more robust case be presented, the building's design, scale and overall height, and massing fails to comply with the Council's Placemaking and Heritage policies and guidance, and the Tall Buildings Design Guide for Glasgow, and would result in a significant overdevelopment of the site at a sensitive location. The

proposal also fails to address the Development Plan's climate change, natural environment and biodiversity requirements.

The economic viability challenges of the site are noted and understood, as are the benefits of redeveloping an underutilised and somewhat neglected site, but in this instance these are not considered to outweigh the negative townscape, heritage and environmental effects of the proposed building.

Reasons for Refusal

01. The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.
02. The proposal is contrary to Glasgow City Development Plan Policy CDP 1 - The Placemaking Principle and its accompanying supplementary guidance SG 1 - Placemaking Parts 1&2, and the Tall Buildings Design Guide for Glasgow due to the buildings overall scale, height and massing, which fails to respect its context by borrowing amenity from the neighbouring sites; restricting its neighbour's development potential; creating substandard environmental conditions within the site and within the due context and; affecting the overall quality of the townscape in the locale.
03. The proposal is contrary to Glasgow City Development Plan Policy CDP 1 - The Placemaking Principle and its accompanying supplementary guidance SG 1 - Placemaking Parts 1&2, and the Tall Buildings Design Guide for Glasgow as the site is located in a sensitive area generally unsuitable for tall buildings, and is not on a significant movement artery and the proposed building is neither signalling the presence of key transport infrastructure nor episodes of significant civic nature.
04. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 7 - Historic Assets and Places, and Glasgow City Development Plan policy SG9 - Historic Environment and its accompanying supplementary guidance SG 9 - Historic Environment as the proposed replacement building is considered to have a harmful impact upon the setting of, and views into and out of, the Central Conservation Area, would fail to enhance the Central Conservation Area and would have an over-dominant impact upon the setting of nearby listed buildings.
05. The proposal is contrary to Glasgow City Development Plan Policy CDP 6 - Green Belt and Green Network and its accompanying supplementary guidance SG6 Green Belt and Green Network due to its failure to incorporate green roofs into the proposed development.
06. The proposal is contrary to Glasgow City Development Plan Policy CDP 7 - Natural Environment and its accompanying supplementary guidance SG7 Natural Environment due to its failure to incorporate green elements on roofs, green walls or any other green infrastructure, thereby failing to demonstrate where it can conserve or enhance biodiversity.
07. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 2 - Climate Mitigation and Adaptation on account of failing to provide any carbon optioneering for the redevelopment of the site, and relying solely on the assumed demolition of the existing buildings on the site, thus failing to demonstrate that the proposed redevelopment of the site minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change.

for Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

DC/ALS/13/08/2025

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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 license Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. The OS website can be found at **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.