



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration
and Sustainability

Item 1

10th December 2024

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

24/00156/LOCAL – Site at Nitshill Road/Corselet Road

Part use of car park for siting of two steel container units for use as hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) and ancillary storage, alterations to units including installation of flue extract (part retrospective)

Purpose of Report:

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

Recommendations:

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

Ward No(s): 03 – Greater Pollok

Citywide: N/A

Local member(s) advised: Yes ☐ No ☐

consulted: Yes ☐ No ☐

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

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

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

1 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS

- 1.1 The proposal site is an area of asphalt car park to the south of Nitshill Road and the east of Corselet Road.
- 1.2 The site lies to the north east of the Dams to Darnley Country Park, which itself is a designated Local Nature Reserve (LNR), two local Sites of Important Nature Conservation (SINCs), a Green Corridor, and is part of the designated Green Belt for Glasgow.
- 1.3 The property is not located within a Conservation Area but is in close proximity to, and within the curtilage of, the Category 'B' Listed former Darnley Mill at 500 Corselet Road, which it formerly served, and includes the driveway from the vehicular access off Corselet Road.
- 1.4 The site is brownfield land but is not vacant or derelict.
- 1.5 The site is located within an area of Below Base Public Transport Accessibility.
- 1.6 The proposal seeks consent for the following:
 - change of use of the site from car parking associated with the Category 'B' Listed Darnley Mill building, which is currently in Class 1A use to a hot food takeaway (Sui Generis);
 - The erection of two steel containers on the site (retrospective);
 - External alterations to the steel containers to form the hot food takeaway premises with the associated erection of a raised access ramp and staircase to the front elevation, and the erection of a raised walkway/deck and staircase between containers; and
 - Associated works to the car park.
- 1.7 The steel containers measure approximately 12.3m x 3m and 2.9m in height and would be set on raised foundations measuring approximately 1m in height (total height approximately 3.9m). The western container would serve as the kitchen area and would include the proposed flue on the southeastern corner. The western (front) elevation of this container would be finished using vertical timber slats painted black and would include nine light fixtures to illuminate the raised platform.
- 1.8 The planning statement notes that the car park "currently has the benefit of lighting, delineated parking spaces and landscaping though the latter will be the subject of restoration and improvement" and that "cycle parking will be provided as will litter receptacles". No plans or further details have been provided to show the scope or extent of development on the site for new lighting, landscaping, cycle parking, or waste bin provision.

1.9 The proposed hours of operation are 8am – 8pm.

1.10 There would be 4-5 members of staff.

2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

In this case, the relevant policies from NPF4 are:

- Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises
- Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation
- Policy 3: Biodiversity
- Policy 4: Natural Places
- Policy 7: Historic Assets and Places
- Policy 12: Zero Waste
- Policy 13: Sustainable Transport
- Policy 14: Design, quality and place
- Policy 23: Health and Safety
- Policy 26: Business and industry
- Policy 27: City, Town, Local and Commercial Centres

2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies are:

- CDP1: The Placemaking Principle
- CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy
- CDP4: Network of Centres
- CDP5: Resource Management
- CDP6: Green Belt and Green Network
- CDP7: Natural Environment
- CDP9: Historic Environment
- CDP11: Sustainable Transport

2.3 The relevant Supplementary Guidance is:

- SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Parts 1 & 2)
- SG4: Network of Centres
- SG5: Resource Management
- SG6: Green Belt and Green Network
- SG7: Natural Environment
- SG9: Historic Environment
- SG11: Sustainable Transport

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

01. The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.
02. For the reasons noted below, the proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises, Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation, Policy 3: Biodiversity, Policy 4: Natural Places, 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 23: Health and Safety, and Policy 27: City, Town, Local and Commercial Centres. It is also contrary to City Development Plan Policies CDP1 and SG1 Part 2: The Placemaking Principle, CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy, CDP4 and SG4: Network of Centres, CDP5 and SG5: Resource Management, CDP6 and IPG6: Green Belt and Green Network, CDP7 and SG7: Natural Environment, CDP9 and SG9: Historic Environment, and CDP11 and SG11: Sustainable Transport.
03. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises, NPF4 Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation as well as CDP5 and SG5: Resource Management of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) in that the development does not demonstrate that it has been sited and designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible. A Statement of Energy has not been submitted in support of the application and does not provide evidence that the proposal achieves the Gold Standard as required by CDP5 and SG5. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate a commitment to achieve the required energy efficient design, practice and technologies to make energy and CO2 savings for new development.
04. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 3 (a) and (c), NPF4 Policy 4 (a) and (d) as well as CDP6 and IPG6, CDP7 and SG7 of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) in that the development does not demonstrate that it will conserve, restore or enhance the existing biodiversity and habitat connectivity of the site and the area or that it will protect the designated nature sites within and adjacent to the site.
05. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 7, NPF4 Policy 14, and CDP1 and SG1 Part 2: The Placemaking Principle of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) in that the proposal uses inappropriate, poor quality building materials which would significantly detract from the character, special architectural or historic interest, and setting of the category B Darnley Mill Listed Building (LB33589) and the surrounding area.
06. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 7 and CDP9 and SG9: Historic Environment of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) in that the proposal, by virtue of its siting, detailed design and materials,

would be significantly detrimental to the special architectural and historic interest of the category B Darnley Mill Listed Building (LB33589). The proposal would result in development within the listed building's curtilage that would crowd and obscure significant views of the principal elevations of the Listed Building and compromise the historical context of its position in the landscape and the built environment. The proposal does not relate to the main building in terms of materials or design and would therefore significantly detract from its character, special architectural or historic interest, and setting.

07. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 12, NPF4 Policy 27, CDP1 and SG1 Part 2: The Placemaking Principle, and CDP4 and SG4: Network of Centres specifically Assessment Guideline 14: Waste Management and Disposal of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) in that the proposal does not demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Council that waste storage, recycling and collection will be sufficiently managed on the site, and that it will not create public amenity (noise, visual, traffic, littering) issues for visitors and residential neighbours.
08. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 13, and to CDP11 and SG11: Sustainable Transport of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) in that the maximum vehicle parking standard is exceeded by 17 bays, and the minimum cycle parking standard is not met and does not demonstrate where, and what type of, safe, sheltered, and secure provision can be provided on site.
09. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 23 and CDP1 of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) in that the change of use to hot food takeaway in this location will directly result in an increase in vehicle trips to and from the site and will likely cause an increase in air, noise and light pollution in a principally residential area, and as such will negatively affect the existing public and residential amenity of the site and the surrounding area. No information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development is seeking to mitigate these issues.
10. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 27, CDP4 and SG4: Network of Centres of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) as it does not meet the requirements of Assessment Guideline 12: Treatment and Disposal of Cooking/Heating Fumes in that the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Council that suitable arrangements for the dispersal of cooking/heating fumes are in place to the detriment of public and residential amenity.
11. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 27, CDP4 and SG4: Network of Centres of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017) as it does not meet Assessment Guideline 13: Parking and Servicing Requirements in that the proposal does not comply with the parking standards associated with proposed food uses as required by SG11.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

01. This car park area is surplus to requirements, is rapidly becoming overgrown with weeds and is beginning to look like a derelict open space.
02. Throughout the ROH, the planning officer has laboured heavily on NPF4 and the policies therein. While NPF4 now has statutory status it is none the less, guidance to be applied judiciously and not simply imposed on all developments which seems to be the case in this instance. Not only have they been applied in blanket fashion but I suspect without any understanding of what they mean. The policies seem to focus heavily on the green agenda, climate and eco measures, to the detriment of all other considerations and this is unacceptable. Whilst it may not be fashionable to criticise this approach, I confess to finding much of what is said and asked for, to be fanciful and unrealistic and that has to be a consideration when applying these policies.
03. NPF4 policies 1,2,3 and 4 are essentially irrelevant, though in terms of climate mitigation which is a component of Policy 1 the facility will be powered by electricity so there will be no co2 emissions. Equally under policy 3 the site is not within the green belt, or on any wildlife trail, so is irrelevant. It is also noted however that under the banner of biodiversity/greenspace, the planning officer has made a pointed comment about the suitability of a hot food takeaway close to a health centre as being problematic. The reality is that it is not a health centre but a GP surgery and GP/dental surgeries adjacent to hot food takeaways can be found on most high streets and has never been a problem.

This a case of the wholly inappropriate application of policies in a scatter gun approach in the hope that some may be relevant. Even the use of language such as biodiversity and habitat connectivity is confusing and contrived. The site is a vacant car park, an area of overgrown hardstanding, which has the potential to make a contribution to the area.

04. In relation to NPF4 Policy 7, in locating the containers on this part of the site, the appellant was mindful of the listed building and the need to retain unobstructed views of the elevations, in this case the side elevation, and this has been achieved, so to suggest that the proposed development will impact on the listed building is without foundation.
05. In regard to Policy 9, the proposed development, given that it is located on an abandoned car park site is the very essence of the desire to recycle, to create sustainable developments, to re-use land which no longer fulfils its original purpose. In this regard it clearly fulfils the ideals enshrined in the policy. The fact that it was designed to cater for vehicle

movements and parking means that cars can move safely with minimum manoeuvring, so there should be little if any issues with residential amenity being affected. Not only does the proposal utilize the existing car park but the existing lighting is also being used, and both were approved as elements within the restaurant consent, so presumably they are deemed to satisfy.

06. In regard to Policy 12, the appellant is fully aware of the need to manage waste efficiently, particularly as in this case it will be mainly foodstuffs. The Planning Statement clearly states that waste will be stored within a dedicated facility and only placed outside at the appropriate time for uplift by the appointed contractor.
07. In regard to Policy 13, given that the proposed development is located within an abandoned car park, parking space is not an issue.
08. In regard to Policy 14, the proposed development comprises two metal shipping containers. One will be the hot food takeaway kiosk and the other storage. Given the nature of the site, rather than be inappropriate the use of containers is positive and bold. The ROH refers to them as being inferior and not acceptable, yet shipping containers are the most versatile and most desired items, being so adaptable, capable of being used for housing purposes, shops, offices, stores, clinics, studios, schools.. The list is endless. They now feature regularly in architectural design programmes and magazines and represent the ultimate in recycling.
09. In regard to Policy 23, there are no health and safety issues. The containers will be securely placed on the site, the access and stairs to the kiosk will comply with the appropriate building standards and will provide easy access for both able bodied and disabled persons. Reference has been made to the Gold Standard and to a Statement of Energy. This is yet another example of the inappropriate interpretation of policy. The introduction of these standards were not intended to be applied to a kiosk, but to restaurant establishments. The proposed kiosk will be electrically powered and will meet all the appropriate health and safety standards.

It is claimed in the ROH that the proposed use will greatly increase vehicle movements. This is untrue, as the previous use as an international buffet restaurant generated substantial volumes of customers due to its popularity and to suggest that the new use will have an impact on air quality, noise and light pollution lacks any foundation.

10. In regard to Policy 27, the ROH claims that the proposal does not address issues of cooking fumes, odours and heat. This is untrue, the planning statements notes that an extraction system will be installed to address these issues. It is standard practice to include a condition requiring a specification for the proposed system, so it is unclear as to why that would not have sufficed in this instance.

11. The proposed development is a bold venture on this vacant car park site which was nothing more than a large area of tarmac with strips of what once would have been grass verges but are now wild and overgrown. The preferred building form was equally bold, utilizing old shipping containers reworked to form a hot food takeaway kiosk. Contrary to the view expressed by the planning officer, these are not an inappropriate form of structure but a clever and skillful recycling of an industrial product to create another useful purpose for the product. Old shipping containers are now the go to product for the creation of a multitude of diverse purposes and are celebrated as an architectural form. Mindful of the need to address climate issues, all cooking will be by electricity so there will be no co2 emissions.

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

5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

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

- The application site is within the curtilage of the Category 'B' Listed Darnley Mill (LB33589) and would be detrimental to its historic character and setting.
- Darnley Mill is a designated Local Nature Reserve. The use of the site as a hot food takeaway would adversely affect the surrounding area and local wildlife through an increase in waste pollution.
- The proposed use as a hot food takeaway within the car park for the current Darnley Mill, which is in use as a doctors surgery, is inappropriate and visitors could be impacted.
- The community is already well served by a range of fast food and hot food takeaway providers.
- The proposal could be sited in one of the existing nearby commercial locations.
- Concern from neighbouring residents regarding the potential increase in vehicle traffic to and from the site in an already significantly overburdened area.
- Concern from neighbouring residents regarding air and noise pollution related to vehicle trips, customers waiting for food, and customers using the site to eat.
- Concern from neighbouring residents regarding the proposal negatively affecting their residential amenity, such as an introduction of odour pollution, an increase in noise, air and light pollution from vehicles and customers, and waste pollution from food packaging.
- Concern regarding potential increase in rodent, seagull, and fox presence in surrounding area.

- 5.2 No representations were received to this review.

- 5.3 The following external statutory parties were consulted as part of the application process and a summary of their advice is given below:

Scottish Water – no objection, “however, the applicant should be aware that this does not confirm that the proposed development can currently be serviced.” Additionally, “Scottish Water will not accept any surface water connections into our combined sewer system.”

West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS) - “The two container units that would be installed under this application would be located within an archaeological consultation trigger, which in this instance has been defined in relation to the former Darnley Corn Mill, which lies around 30m to the south-west. The former mill is category B-listed, and contains a date stone marked 16(44?). Although Historic Environment Scotland’s listed buildings description suggests that this stone may have been re-set, it appears probable that elements of the extant structure may date from the 17th century. However, it is likely that the origins of the mill may predate this period, as the earliest known reference to a mill at Darnley is from a document dating from 1553.

In terms of the current application, the two container units would sit on an area of existing hardstanding to the north-east of the former mill building. It does not appear that they would directly overlie any of the buildings shown on available historic maps back to the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map of 1864, though a section of a mineral railway line running to the Darnley Lime Works was shown as running through the area on the 2nd edition of 1898; however, it is likely that this feature will have been removed by construction of the existing car park. The units would not overlie the line of the lade that provided water to power the mill, as this was shown on the 1st edition running from a sluice on the Brock Burn around 260m south-west of the mill itself, before returning to the burn in the area to the east of the mill complex. This would suggest that construction of the proposed restaurant is unlikely to encounter sub-surface remains associated with the former mill, at least as this was represented on 19th century maps. While it is possible that earlier structures could have been present in the vicinity of the mill, the fact that the site has already been disturbed by its use as a car park suggests that the potential for the current application to encounter material of this type is likely to be limited. In addition, the supplied plans indicate that the two container units would be supported above the surface of the current car park, without the need to excavate substantial foundations; this would also serve to limit the potential for the development to encounter or remove sub-surface archaeological features, deposits or artefacts. As a result of these factors, I can confirm that I would not consider archaeological work to be required in relation to this application.”

The Coal Authority - “The application site does fall within the defined Development High Risk Area; however, I can confirm that the nature of development is listed as exempt from Version 7, January 2023 of the Coal Authority’s Guidance for Local Planning Authorities. Accordingly, there is no requirement under the risk-based approach that has been agreed with the LPA

for a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be submitted with any planning application or for the Coal Authority to be consulted on this proposal.”

- 5.4 The following internal GCC departments / teams were consulted and a summary of their advice is given below:

NRS Heritage –

Recommendation: “Refuse.”

Conclusions: “A Design and Access statement has not been submitted and the Planning Statement does not consider the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the listed building.

The B listed, former Darnley Mill Farm occupies a prominent location close to the junction of Nitshill Road (A726), Corselet Road and Kennishead Road. Although altered and extended, the listed group of buildings is a prominent and valuable historic feature in the landscape, which is not encroached by neighbouring development but has an open setting, particularly to the north.

Thus, a key vista of the historic asset is from Nitshill Road, across the application site, towards the north range of the listed buildings, with its pitched slate roofs, conical roofed circular turret and crow-stepped gable of the house on its west side, framed by trees to the south and east.

It is observed that the scale bars on the submitted plans and elevations do not match the scales stated on the drawings. Consequently, the sizes of the proposed cabins are not clear because measurements taken using the stated scales are significantly different from measurements produced by using the scale bars, e.g., cabins’ length with 1:50 scale is approx. 18.6m but using the scale bar the length is approx. 12.4m. Assuming the smaller dimensions are correct, the following comments are made.

On balance, it is considered that the proposed siting of large steel containers, which would be highly visible from the main road and more so in winter months when trees and shrubs are not in full leaf, would detract from the setting of the listed buildings. The industrial character of the containers is considered unsympathetic to the setting of the listed buildings and would not be mitigated by the proposed timber cladding.”

Suggested Conditions with Reasons / Reasons for Refusal: “Due to the location, design and materials of the proposed steel container units, the part use of car park for siting of two steel container units for use as hot food takeaway (Sui generis) and ancillary storage, alterations to units include installation of flue extract (part retrospective) would unacceptably harm the setting of the B listed Darnley Mill Farm group of buildings and is contrary to Policy 7 Historic Assets and Places of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) and to policies CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle and CDP 9 Historic Environment and to Supplementary Guidance SG 1 Placemaking and SG 9 Historic Environment of the Glasgow City Development Plan and there a no

material which outweigh the proposal's variance with the adopted Development Plan.”

NRS Landscape

Recommendation: “Changes required, refusal at present.”

Application of Policies: “There appears to be no fence or other boundary to the site. This could lead to a lot of litter, etc. entering the planting areas, especially towards the Brock Burn. We would want to see a fence (2m+) especially on the eastern boundary, which will require the trees there to be trimmed back (crown raised) to the car-park edge up to 2.5m from ground level. Any vegetation overhanging the units will be damaged by the installation of the units and could be affected by the vent/flue from the kitchen unit. Best option may be to move units further from the carpark boundary.

There is also no indication of how this unit will be serviced, (electric, gas, water, sewerage, etc.) again leading to concerns over pollution, emissions, etc. ending up in the Brock Burn. If the storage unit is to be refrigerated there is a possibility of constant noise from a generator or other power source.

In terms of landscape, we would want to see the boundaries of the car park improved especially to Nitshill Road. At present the site gives a poor abandoned impression to Nitshill Road and Corselet Road with vegetation encroaching on the public footway.”

Conclusions: “We need to see a complete tree survey of all trees on site and adjacent to the site that could extend their crowns or root zones in to the site. This includes the large overgrown hedge to Corselet Road and the vegetation just outside the eastern boundary of the site. We also want to see a complete landscape scheme for the boundaries of the site and the maintenance/management plan of the site.”

NRS Biodiversity / Greenspace

“Greenspace and Biodiversity find the siting of a hot food takeaway outside an Health Centre an unusual and perhaps inappropriate request that should also be raised with NHS given potential conflicts with the improvement of public health in Glasgow.

From a Greenspace and Biodiversity perspective we would request that if the proposal is determined then consideration is given to the provision of litter bins, given the proximity of the proposal to the Local Nature Reserve and Country Park adjacent to the car park, and that also, given the proximity of this nature conservation area, an enhancement of the car park area for biodiversity is included through the inclusion of hedging or planters. Note that the latter would also assist in fulfilling NPF4 (Policy 3 Biodiversity) requirements for the proposal.”

NRS Transport Planning

Recommendation: "Interim"

Comments / Conclusions: "The site is within a below base accessibility area."

It is proposed that the existing vehicular access is to be used, shared with another user. This from Corselet Road.

The application states there are 43 existing parking spaces, of which 38 are proposed for this land use. The Site Plan shows 27 spaces within the redline boundary. SG11 policy sets vehicle parking thresholds as a maximum. The nearest use class would be between vehicle parking for Restaurants, Cafes, Social Clubs, Licensed Clubs and Function Rooms Base Accessibility at 4 spaces per 100 sqm PFA and for Drive Through Restaurants Base Accessibility 10 spaces per 100 sqm PFA. It is estimated that even for the higher allowance under a drive through the parking is significantly above Supplementary Guidance threshold 11.

For Cycle parking the nearest use is considered to be Public Houses, Restaurants, Cafes, Social Clubs, Licensed Clubs and Function Rooms 1 space per 50 sqm public floor area 1 space per 10 staff.

Cycle parking is a minimum SG11 threshold and has to be demonstrated as safe secure and sheltered with trip end facilities for employees."

Suggested Conditions with Reasons / Reasons for Refusal: "The development as proposed does not reflect the City Development Plan SG11 in terms of parking thresholds both for cycles, and vehicles and as it currently stands the proposed development cannot be conditioned to City Development Plan Supplementary Guidance 11. As such it does not uphold the City Development Plan aims of sustainable development."

NRS Public Health

"I would have no grounds to object from an Environmental Health point of view."

NRS Flood Risk Management

"Due to the nature of the proposals, the Flood Risk Management team have no comment."

6 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Committee should consider if the following are in accordance with NPF4, the relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance, and if there are material considerations which outweigh the Development Plan considerations.
- 6.2 The following are relevant policy considerations:

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

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

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

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

Committee should note:

- No measures are proposed that address the climate and nature crises.
 - No evidence has been provided to show that the proposal is sited and designed to minimise greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible and to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.
- Committee should consider whether the development has a detrimental impact on a nature positive place that is resilient to climate change impacts.

6.4 **Policy 3: Biodiversity, Policy 4: Natural Places, CDP6: Green Belt and Green Network, and CDP7 Natural Environment**

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

NPF4 Policy 4 intends to protect, restore and enhance natural assets making best use of nature-based solutions. Development proposals which by virtue of type, location or scale will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment, will not be supported. Development proposals that affect a site

designated as a local nature conservation site or landscape area in the LDP will only be supported where:

- i. Development will not have significant adverse effects on the integrity of the area or the qualities for which it has been identified; or
- ii. Any significant adverse effects on the integrity of the area are clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits of at least local importance.

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

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

Committee should note:

- The site lies to the north east of the Dams to Darnley Country Park, which itself is a designated Local Nature Reserve (LNR), two local Sites of Important Nature Conservation (SINCs), a Green Corridor, and is part of the designated Green Belt for Glasgow;
- No details of landscaping works have been submitted as part of this proposal, contrary to policy;
- No design solutions have been proposed to protect and mitigate adverse impacts upon the designated areas, contrary to policy;
- The proposal does not demonstrate that it will conserve, restore or enhance the existing biodiversity and habitat connectivity of the area, contrary to policy;
- No tree survey has been provided, notably for the treeline on the eastern site boundary, contrary to policy.

Committee should consider:

- Whether the proposal will contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity;
- If the proposed development would protect and enhance green infrastructure and networks;
- If they are completely satisfied that there would be no adverse impacts upon designated areas caused by the proposed development; and
- Whether the lack of landscaping plans is acceptable in this case.

6.5 **Policy 7: Historic assets and places and CDP9: Historic Environment**

NPF4 Policy 7 intends to protect and enhance historic environment assets and places, and to enable positive change as a catalyst for the regeneration of

places. Development proposals affecting the setting of a listed building should preserve its character, and its special architectural or historic interest.

CDP9 aims to protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment. SG9 states that development affecting the setting of listed buildings should be sympathetic to the main item of listing and its ancillary development in terms of the siting, design, scale, form, density, and materials. Development should demonstrate that the proposal would not be detrimental to the building's architectural or historic character by way of a Design and Access Statement detailing the physical characteristics of the Listed Building, the material and condition of its fabric, its surroundings, and its relationship with other buildings, the historic, architectural, and landscape importance of the grounds/location, the context of the site in relation to the type of use, and an analysis of the landscape setting of the building.

Committee should note:

- The site is within the immediate setting of the Category 'B' Listed former Darnley Mill;
- No Design and Access Statement has been provided, contrary to policy;
- NRS – Heritage recommend refusal for this application due to the location, design, and materials of the containers and the impact on the character and setting of the Listed Building.

Committee should consider:

- Whether the proposal has evidenced that it will not detrimentally impact the character of the Listed Building; and
- If the siting, design, scale, form, density, and materials proposed are sympathetic to the character of the Listed Building.

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

Policy 13 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate developments that prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport for everyday travel and reduce the need to travel unsustainably.

The relevant policy guidance is:

- a) Proposals to improve, enhance or provide active travel infrastructure, public transport infrastructure or multi-modal hubs will be supported.
- b) Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the transport requirements generated have been considered in line with the sustainable travel and investment hierarchies and where appropriate they:
 - i. Provide direct, easy, segregated and safe links to local facilities via walking, wheeling and cycling networks before occupation;
 - ii. Will be accessible by public transport, ideally supporting the use of existing services;

- iii. Integrate transport modes;
 - iv. Provide low or zero-emission vehicle and cycle charging points in safe and convenient locations, in alignment with building standards;
 - v. Supply safe, secure and convenient cycle parking to meet the needs of users and which is more conveniently located than car parking;
 - vi. Are designed to incorporate safety measures including safe crossings for walking and wheeling and reducing the number and speed of vehicles;
 - vii. Have taken into account, at the earliest stage of design, the transport needs of diverse groups including users with protected characteristics to ensure the safety, ease and needs of all users; and
 - viii. Adequately mitigate any impact on local public access routes.
- c) Where a development proposal will generate a significant increase in the number of person trips, a transport assessment will be required to be undertaken in accordance with the relevant guidance.

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

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

Cycle Parking

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

- b) Wherever possible, employee cycle parking should be located within buildings or a secure compound. Where such a location is not feasible, provision should be close to areas of high activity, such as the main entrance of developments, to ensure cycling is encouraged through enhanced security provided by passive surveillance.
- c) Cycle parking should always be safe, sheltered and secure. The form of cycle parking provided should facilitate the securing of the frame of the bike to the “stand”. “Sheffield” racks are a good, and preferred, example of such provision.
- d) Employment sites shall provide on-site showers, lockers, changing and drying facilities, as a means of promoting walking and cycling to work. These are important trip-end facilities that can positively affect an individual’s decision to walk, run or cycle regularly.

Minimum standard for Restaurant/Café use:

Staff: 1 space per 10 staff

Visitor: 1 space per 50sqm public floor area

Vehicle Parking

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

Maximum standard for Restaurants/Cafés:

Base Accessibility: 4 spaces per 100sqm public floor area

Committee should note:

- The site is located within an area of Below Base Public Transport Accessibility;
- The containers have no public floor area so the maximum acceptable number of vehicle parking bays is 10 general bays and 3 disabled bays;
- The proposal includes 27 vehicle parking bays (including 2 disabled bays), above the maximum standard and contrary to policy;
- The supporting statement notes that 'cycle parking will be provided' but no further details have been provided;
- The supporting statement indicates there will be 4/5 members of staff.

Committee should consider:

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

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

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

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

Pleasant: Supporting attractive natural and built spaces.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.8 **Policy 12: Zero Waste, SG1: The Placemaking Principle – Waste Storage, Recycling and Collection, and SG4: Network of Centres**

NPF4 Policy 12 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate development that is consistent with the waste hierarchy. Development proposals that are likely to generate waste when operational, including residential, commercial, and industrial properties, will set out how much waste the proposal is expected to generate and how it will be managed including:

- i. provision to maximise waste reduction and waste separation at source, and
- ii. measures to minimise cross-contamination of materials, through appropriate segregation and storage of waste; convenient access for the collection of waste and recycling and localised waste management facilities.

SG1 requires all new developments to include appropriate and well-designed provision for waste storage, recycling and collection. All waste/recycling areas must be located discreetly, so as to have no adverse visual impact or cause traffic/noise nuisance to neighbours. Applications must provide full details of the provision for waste storage, recycling and collection in the initial submission for planning permission.

SG4 provides the following guidance:

Assessment Guideline 14: Waste Management and Disposal

Proposals for food, drink and entertainment uses will only be considered favourably if suitable arrangements for the management and disposal of waste (including recyclables) can be provided, to the complete satisfaction of the Council. Plans to show details of on-site waste storage facilities will be required.

Committee should note:

- Four large waste bins are proposed at the southeastern boundary of the site;
- The supporting statement provided as part of the application notes that waste will be placed outside for uplift at an appointed time by the approved contractor. No further details of collection and uplift have been provided;
- The supporting statement notes that litter bins will be provided on site. No further details regarding the number, size, or placement of bins have been provided;
- A written statement detailing the amount of waste the proposal is expected to generate has not been provided, contrary to policy.

Committee should consider:

- Whether they are completely satisfied with the waste/refuse management arrangements.

6.9 Policy 26: Business and industry

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

The relevant policy guidance is:

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

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

Committee should note:

- The site has not been allocated for business use.
- The site is outwith any Economic Development Area in the City Development Plan.

Committee should consider:

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

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

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

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

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

Non Residential Development Affecting Residential Areas

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

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

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

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

Committee should note:

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

Committee should consider:

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

6.12 **NPF4 Policy 27: City, town, local and commercial centres and CDP/SG4: Network of Centres**

NPF4 Policy 27 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate development in our city and town centres, recognising they are a national asset. This will be achieved by applying the Town Centre First approach to help centres adapt positively to long-term economic, environmental and societal changes, and by encouraging town centre living.

The relevant guidance is:

- a) Development proposals that enhance and improve the vitality and viability of city, town and local centres, including proposals that increase the mix of uses, will be supported.
- b) Development proposals will be consistent with the town centre first approach. Proposals for uses which will generate significant footfall, including commercial, leisure, offices, community, sport and cultural facilities, public buildings such as libraries, education and healthcare facilities, and public spaces:
 - i. will be supported in existing city, town and local centres, and
 - ii. will not be supported outwith those centres unless a town centre first assessment demonstrates that:
 - all centre and edge of centre options have been sequentially assessed and discounted as unsuitable or unavailable;
 - the scale of development cannot reasonably be altered or reduced in scale to allow it to be accommodated in a centre; and
 - the impacts on existing centres have been thoroughly assessed and there will be no significant adverse effect on the vitality and viability of the centres.

- c) Development proposals for non-retail uses will not be supported if further provision of these services will undermine the character and amenity of the area or the health and wellbeing of communities, particularly in disadvantaged areas. These uses include:
 - i. Hot food takeaways, including permanently sited vans;
 - ii. Betting offices; and
 - iii. High interest money lending premises.
- d) Drive-through developments will only be supported where they are specifically supported in the LDP.

Committee should note:

- The site is located outwith any city, town, or local centre, contrary to policy;
- No assessment has been provided to show that all centre and edge of centre options have been sequentially assessed, contrary to policy;
- Based on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD), the site is within the 21-30% most deprived areas (3rd Decile);
- The siting of a drive-through in this site is not specifically supported in the CDP.

Committee should consider:

- Whether the proposal will enhance and improve the vitality and viability of the town centre.
- Whether the introduction of a hot food takeaway in this location would undermine the character and amenity of the area or the health and wellbeing of communities.
- If the siting of the proposed development supports the town centre first approach.

SG4 provides the following detailed guidance:

Food, Drink and Entertainment Uses

This section is relevant when assessing development proposals for the following uses: Class 3 (Food and Drink), Class 11 (Assembly and Leisure) and specific Sui Generis uses (including hot food shops, public houses and composite/hybrid uses). This guidance states the Council has to strike a balance between the encouragement of uses that make the City more vibrant, and the need to preserve a reasonable level of amenity for adjoining occupiers, particularly neighbouring residents.

Assessment Guideline 10: Food, Drink and Entertainment Uses - The following criteria will be applied:

- a. City-Wide:
 - i. Proposals for food, drink and entertainment uses must not result in a detrimental effect on the amenity of residents through the effects of increased noise, activity and/or cooking fumes. No more than

20%* of the number of units in a street block frontage, containing or adjacent to residential uses, should be in use as a hot food shop, public house, composite public house/Class 3 or composite hot food shop/Class 3 use.

b. Outwith the City Centre:

- i. Public houses, Class 11 and Sui Generis uses must not be located within, or immediately adjacent to, existing residential buildings.
- ii. Applications for extensions to existing public houses, Class 11 and Sui Generis uses must not increase the floorspace for public use under residential flats, or extend into residential backcourt areas.
- iii. Hours of operation will be agreed with the Planning Authority, based on local circumstances and the impact of the proposal on residential amenity, but shall not exceed 08:00 to 24:00 hours.

* When calculating the proportion of hot food shops, the Council will include any use which incorporates a hot foot takeaway service and any unimplemented planning permissions for changes of use to hot food shop, public house, or Class 3 use, likely to include a hot food takeaway service.

Committee should note:

- The proposed hours of operation are 8am-8pm;
 - The closest residential property is located less than 10m from the site boundary.
- Committee should consider whether the proposed use, hours of operation, and proximity to residential units will have a negative impact on residential amenity.

Assessment Guideline 12: Treatment and Disposal of Cooking/Heating Fumes

- a. Proposals for a food and drink use will only be considered favourably if suitable arrangements for the dispersal of fumes can be provided, to the complete satisfaction of the Council. The following information will be required:
- i. Plans to show all proposed cooking/heating equipment, with full details of the fume dispersal method. This information must be shown on both the Plan and Elevation drawings;
 - ii. Full specifications of the proposed ventilation system, including the design, size, location and finish;
 - iii. A full maintenance schedule of the ventilation system to ensure its continued effectiveness; and
 - iv. Prior to the installation of any system for the dispersal of cooking fumes or odours, a certificate from a member of the Building Engineering Services Association (BESA) shall be submitted confirming that the proposed fume/odour treatment method will operate to its fullest specification, when fitted at the application site.

The requirement will be secured by a suspensive condition imposed on any relevant planning permission granted.

- b. Dispersal of cooking/heating fumes should be by an externally mounted flue, erected on the rear or side elevation to a height sufficient to disperse fumes above any nearby property.

Committee should note:

- The supporting statement notes that the proposal 'incorporates a state of the art ventilation system which will ensure that all smells, heat and noise will be effectively managed and have no impact on local amenity'. No further details or specifications of the proposed ventilation system have been provided, contrary to policy;
 - A full maintenance schedule of the ventilation system has not been provided, contrary to policy;
 - No certificate from a member of the BESA has been provided, contrary to policy.
- Committee should consider whether they are completely satisfied with the arrangements for the dispersal of cooking fumes.

6.13 **Policy 23: Health and Safety and CDP1: The Placemaking Principle**

NPF4 Policy 23 intends 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. Policy 23 requires:

- a) Development proposals that will have positive effects on health will be supported. This could include, for example, proposals that incorporate opportunities for exercise, community food growing or allotments.
- b) Development proposals which are likely to have a significant adverse effect on health will not be supported. A Health Impact Assessment may be required.
- d) Development proposals that are likely to have significant adverse effects on air quality will not be supported. Development proposals will consider opportunities to improve air quality and reduce exposure to poor air quality. An air quality assessment may be required where the nature of the proposal or the air quality in the location suggest significant effects are likely.
- e) Development proposals that are likely to raise unacceptable noise issues will not be supported. The agent of change principle applies to noise sensitive development. A Noise Impact Assessment may be required where the nature of the proposal or its location suggests that significant effects are likely.

CDP1 has the following aims:

1. Making the City an appealing place to live, work and visit;
2. Embedding community facilities and local shopping facilities in communities and recognising the needs of all members of society; (refer to Policy CDP4: Network of Centres);
3. Creating healthy and more equitable environments and promoting healthy lifestyle opportunities, including opportunities for communities to grow food;
4. Delivering sustainable buildings, areas and spaces that are attractive and enhance the quality of life for everyone;
5. Demonstrating efforts to responsively engage with all stakeholders;
6. Demonstrating a creative and iterative process in developing proposals;
7. Delivering highly creative, innovative, and technical standards in design of buildings, structures, infrastructures and their setting;
8. Respecting the historic and natural environment by responding to its qualities and character and encouraging their appropriate use;
9. Providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents in the City;
10. Promoting connectivity, active travel and public transport use rather than private car use;
11. Taking the opportunity to deliver an integrated approach to infrastructure delivery;
12. Bringing, where possible, vacant and derelict land back into effective use via both short term (e.g. Stalled Spaces) or long term solutions;
13. Ensuring new activity does not result in the deterioration of air quality particularly in, or adjacent to, Air Quality Management Areas (see Figure 7);
14. Ensuring new activity does not introduce unacceptable additional noise particularly in, or adjacent to, Noise Management Areas nor have an adverse effect on Quiet Areas; and
15. Assessing major developments using the Glasgow Healthy Sustainable Neighbourhood Model and demonstrating healthy outcomes have been considered (via application forms).

Committee should consider:

- Whether the proposal will have an adverse effect on health.
- If the proposal is likely to have adverse effects on air quality.
- If the proposal is likely to result in unacceptable noise issues.
- Whether the proposal supports the aims of CDP1.

6.14 **CDP5/SG5: Resource Management**

CDP5 aims to ensure that Glasgow supports energy generation from renewable and low carbon sources; promotes energy efficient design and use of low and zero carbon generation technologies in new development; helps safeguard communities from the potentially adverse impacts of energy generation or oil/gas extraction; makes efficient use of energy generation and/or industrial processes by supporting combined heat and power systems and district heating

networks; manages its waste to minimise landfill and help meet national targets; and benefits from secure supplies of low carbon energy and heat.

All applicable planning applications submitted from 1st September 2018 will be required to meet Gold Level Compliance plus 20% Low and Zero Carbon Generating Technologies (LZCGT).

SG5 sets out the following guidance:

Policy CDP5 requires that all new domestic and non-domestic developments make use of low and zero carbon generating technologies in order to contribute to meeting greenhouse emission targets.

All new developments are required to meet the appropriate sustainability level. In order to achieve this, a range of low and zero carbon generating technologies may be implemented.

New developments will be designed to contribute to a reduction in carbon emissions through the installation of onsite low or zero carbon technologies. Equipment may be mounted onto buildings or installed at an appropriate location within the red line boundary of the development site, but the overall development shall be designed to reflect the approach to placemaking and design set out in CDP1/SG1. It is expected that large developments will consider the viability of decentralised low and zero carbon sources of heat and power, with equipment sited where possible to allow low and zero carbon generating technologies to benefit more than one building and maximise energy gain.

A Statement on Energy will be required to support all applications to which this policy applies.

A Statement on Energy shall include:

- LZCGT feasibility report (including a summary of LZCGTs considered and a justification for the chosen technologies, including a consideration of design and visual impact);
- A SAP/SBEM calculation output showing a compliant DER/BER with LZCGT included;
- A SAP/SBEM calculation output indicating the DER/BER with the renewables removed allowing the percentage reduction due to renewables to be calculated;
- An explanation of key energy efficient design measures implemented, including materials;
- Reductions of CO₂ emissions through the use of renewable energy technologies;
- Details of the viability of the installation of new, or connection to existing, District Heating networks as set out in Section 5 of this guidance; and
- Where developments are unable to meet low and zero carbon targets, a clear explanation of the technical and practical constraints of the development. Economic factors alone are unlikely to be accepted as a constraint to the inclusion of low and zero carbon generating

technologies in new development. (This would not lessen the applicant's obligation to deliver the LZCGTs needed to meet the requirements of the applicable technical standards).

Committee should note:

- No Statement of Energy has been provided, contrary to policy;
- The application does not evidence that the proposal complies with the Gold Level Compliance, contrary to policy;
- The proposal does not use 20% Low and Zero Carbon Generating Technologies (LZCGT), contrary to policy;
- The proposed use does not fall within the list of exceptions to the requirement of a Statement of Energy.

Committee should consider:

- Whether the proposal promotes energy efficient design and the use of low and zero carbon generation technologies.
- If the proposal makes efficient use of energy generation processes;
- If the proposal manages its waste to minimise landfill;
- Whether the proposal adequately evidences it meets Gold Level Compliance;

6.15 **CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy**

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

The proposal is located within the Pollok Strategic Development Framework area which has the following vision for the area:

To become a flourishing, sustainable more liveable and socially inclusive city community by 2035. This will be achieved by capitalising on its connectivity to local services within a 20-minute walking distance, the wider city, neighbouring centres of opportunity and close proximity to the countryside. It will become a successful, attractive family oriented suburban destination serving the wider Southside. It will support inclusive growth and a diverse 'whole life community'. Greater Pollok will provide a range of high-quality employment opportunities for local people by unlocking their skills and potential. It will be a clean, green, well-managed, safe community, free from pollution, using its natural river valley and green space assets to tackle climate change and enhance biodiversity.

The desired outcomes within the Framework are that the area will be connected; vibrant, skilled and healthy; sustainable, well managed and liveable; and greener and resilient.

- Committee should consider whether or not this proposal supports the development of a compact city of sustainable, healthy, green and liveable places.

7 COMMITTEE DECISION

7.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with the same or different conditions from those listed below; or
- b. Refuse planning permission.
- c. Continue the review to request further information.

8 Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

Financial: n/a

Legal: n/a

Personnel: n/a

Procurement: n/a

Council Strategic Plan: n/a

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

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

What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report? no significant impact

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

Climate Impacts:

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

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

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

Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:

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

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

9 Recommendations

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