



## Planning Applications Committee

Item 1

27th January 2026

### Report by

Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Claire Hunt Phone: [claire.hunt@glasgow.gov.uk](mailto:claire.hunt@glasgow.gov.uk)

**Application Type** Full Planning Permission

**Recommendation** Refuse

**Application** 25/00500/FUL **Date Valid** 04.03.2025

**Site Address** 75 - 77  
Berkeley Street  
Glasgow

**Proposal** Use of two blocks of flatted dwellings (8 units) (Sui Generis) as short term lets  
(Sui Generis)

**Applicant** Mr Gurmit Dhaliwal  
75-77 Berkeley Street  
Glasgow  
G3 7DX **Agent** STL Solutions  
Craig Douglas  
Clockwise  
Savoy Tower  
77 Renfrew Street  
Glasgow  
G2 3BZ

**Ward No(s)** 10, Anderston/City/Yorkhill **Community Council** 02\_031, Anderston

**Conservation Area** Park **Listed** B

**Advert Type** Bad Neighbour Development **Published** 1 August 2025  
Affecting a Conservation  
Area/ Listed Building

**City Plan**

## REPRESENTATIONS/CONSULTATIONS

### REPRESENTATIONS

In total 8 representations were received to the application – 6 in support and 2 to object, including an objection from Anderston Community Council.

The grounds of objection are summarised below:

- This will exacerbate the housing crisis as these flats could be rented long-term to families.
- Anderston Community Council consistently hears reports of antisocial behaviour being reported at our public meetings such as excessive noise, violence, substance abuse, vandalism of public spaces and threatening behaviour by users of these properties. This is causing local residents' serious anxiety and disruption worrying about noise, crime, additional rubbish, litter and disruptive parking.
- Visitors driving to the property will negatively impact the current parking availability, bringing extra pressure to an area that is already on its limit. Visitors will start parking along the Berkeley Terrace Lane, impairing waste collection.
- There is the possibility more bins will be needed, and with this the possibility to have bins accumulating in the back lane area (Berkeley Terrace Lane). This lane has received investment from the Council to be renovated.
- STLs destroy the sense of community.
- These properties are in the Park designated Conservation Area which should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- The submitted report written in support of this application has provided no clear justifiable evidence that this change of designation from residential homes to a STL business is a benefit to the community or its local residents.

The grounds of support are summarised below:

- The location is appropriate for short-stay use due to its busy urban character and accessible location.
- The proposed use will integrate with the area's existing character which is already defined by commercial activity, including hostels, rather than long-term residential occupancy.
- It is unlikely that any disturbance to neighbouring amenity will result, particularly in this case where no mix of full-time and short-term accommodation in the same building is proposed and where the local area is already noisy and heavily associated with short-stay accommodation.
- The city faces a critical shortage of flexible, high-quality short-term rental options, particularly in well-connected central locations.
- A professional management system will ensure guests adhere to community standards, with clear rules on noise and behaviour.
- With only 8 units, the proposal is of a scale that will not overwhelm the existing neighbourhood character.
- Proposals which allow for buildings that might otherwise be out of use (or not attractive as full-time dwellings due to their context or location) to serve this need are preferable to authorising new building works which would come with associated carbon costs and climate consequences.

## CONSULTATIONS

None required.

## SITE AND DESCRIPTION

### SITING

The site consists of two adjoining mid-terraced four-storey blonde sandstone townhouses, located on the southern side of Berkeley Street. The properties are currently in mainstream residential use, with the townhouses converted into eight flats (four per property). The 4 properties at 77 Berkeley Street are currently being rented out. The 4 properties at 75 Berkeley Street have been refurbished for use as short term lets.

The principal elevation faces Berkeley Street to the north, and to the south there is a rear access lane with five car parking spaces. The Park area is characterised by a mix of both residential and office use, with the street block in question having a mixture of office, café/restaurant, hostel and residential uses. The properties are B-Listed and are located within the Park Conservation Area.

The site is within Ward 10 – Anderston/City/Yorkhill.

## RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS

The properties are B-Listed (Historic Environment Scotland reference LB32973);  
The site is within the Park Conservation Area;  
The site is located within the inner urban area and has high accessibility by public transport;

## PROPOSAL

It is proposed to change the use of both properties (all eight flats) from residential to short-term letting use. There is one flat per floor, with the number of bedrooms being:

### 75 Berkeley Street:

Basement Flat: 2 Bedrooms  
Ground Floor Flat: 2 Bedrooms  
First Floor Flat: 2 Bedrooms  
Attic Flat: 2 Bedrooms

The orientation of the floor plans of this property are inconsistent. There is no 'north' indication, but it is observed that the stairwell location changes between plans, with the attic/second floor level being incorrect. As this proposal relates to the entire property the plans must be consistent to allow the property to be considered as a whole, rather than as individual flats. The applicant was advised of this error and new drawings were requested, but no revised drawings have been submitted.

### 77 Berkeley Street:

Basement Flat: 2 Bedrooms  
Ground Floor Flat: 2 Bedrooms  
First Floor Flat: 2 Bedrooms  
Attic Flat: 1 Bedroom

The floor plans of this property are incorrect as there are no stairs shown to the attic property, therefore, it is unclear from the plan where the lobby/enclosure of this property is. From a site visit, the access to the attic property is via an entrance door at first floor level, with private stairs. The applicant was advised of this error and new drawings were requested, but no revised drawings have been submitted.

Five vehicle parking spaces are proposed at the rear (accessed via Berkeley Street Lane, but no block plan has been submitted showing these spaces. The applicant was advised of this error and a block plan was requested, but this was not received.

No external alterations are proposed.

## PLANNING HISTORY

The relevant planning history for this site is below:

- 22/00054/LOCAL: Use of flatted dwellings as serviced accommodation (Sui Generis) – Appeal Dismissed
- 22/01530/FUL: Use of flatted dwellings as serviced accommodation (Sui Generis) – Refuse
- 01/00751/DC: Use of attic as a self contained flat including formation of dormers – Granted Subject to Conditions
- 01/00753/DC: Internal and external alterations to listed building – Granted Subject to Conditions
- 99/01854/DC: Conversion of offices to seven residential flats, formation of amenity landscaping and six car parking spaces and external alterations – Granted Subject to Conditions
- 99/01853/DC: Demolition of rear extension and internal and external alterations associated with conversion to seven residential flats – Granted Subject to Conditions

## SPECIFIED MATTERS

Planning legislation now 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**

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

**iii. A design statement or a design and access statement**

Not applicable.

**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)**

Not applicable.

**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. Restricting the grant of planning permission**

Not applicable.

**iii.**

**1. Requiring the Council to consider imposing a condition specified by Scottish Ministers**

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 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

**Policy 30:** Tourism

The Glasgow City Development Plan (CDP) was adopted on 29 March 2017. The relevant Policies and Supplementary Guidance are listed below.

**CDP1 and SG1:** The Placemaking Principle

**CDP2:** Sustainable Spatial Strategy

**CDP3 and IPG3:** Economic Development

**CDP10 and SG10:** Meeting Housing Needs

**CDP11 and SG11:** Sustainable Transport

## ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts require that when an application is made, it shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise. In addition, under the terms of section 14(2) and section 59 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, the Council is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Section 64(1) of the same Act requires the Council to pay special regard to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area, including the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be:

- a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan;
- b) whether the proposals would impact on the setting of the listed building or nearby listed buildings;
- c) Whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or the appearance of the Conservation Area;
- d) whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed.

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

In order to assess a), b), and c), the proposal is considered against the following policies:

**NPF4 Policies 1 and 2:** These are overarching policies which should be considered for all development proposals regardless of scale, giving weight to the impact of the proposal on the climate and nature crises, and encourages development that minimises emissions.

**Comment:** There are no physical alterations to the property, but the proposed short-term letting use is generally associated with travel-related carbon emissions. Overall, it is not considered that the proposal will have a significant negative impact on either the climate or nature crises, but these policy aims are considered throughout this assessment.

**NPF4 Policy 3:** Proposals for local development should include appropriate and proportionate measures to conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity.

**Comment:** The rear of the site as existing consists of an area of hardstanding fronting the lane, which is used as both vehicle parking spaces and bin storage. There are steps down to rear garden areas for both properties, which are surfaced in monoblock-style paving, which has no biodiversity value.

NPF4 Policy 3 applies to all local development, and the individual householder exception does not apply in this case. This proposed development would be considered an opportunity to improve the biodiversity of the site and the visual amenity of the lane, but as no biodiversity measures have been proposed, this proposal is contrary to this policy.

**NPF4 Policy 9 and CDP2:** These policies seek the sustainable development of vacant and empty buildings in appropriate locations to create a compact city form. 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.

**Comment:** 75 Berkeley Street is currently unoccupied, with 77 Berkeley Street in active use as mainstream residential flats.

Due to the transitory nature of the proposed short-term letting use, it is considered the introduction of such accommodation at this location would adversely impact on the character of the area, and therefore this proposal is not in accordance with these policy aim. This is a mixed-use area, with uses ranging from restaurant and coffee shops, places of worship, offices, hostels, and residential properties, with a number of offices being converted back into residential use. There are a number of short-term letting properties nearby, including the Clyde Hostel on this street block. The introduction of further short-term letting would harm the character of the area, resulting in further commercial use in an area where residential properties are becoming more common. No supporting information has been provided demonstrating that the existing residential use is no longer sustainable, nor that there is no rental interest in these properties. As mentioned above the flats at 77 Berkeley Street are currently occupied.

**NPF4 Policy 12 and CDP1/SG1 (Part 2): Waste Storage, Recycling and Collection:** Both policies seek to ensure appropriate and well-designed provision for waste storage, recycling and collection are considered at the outset of the application process. 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.

**Comment:** The submitted Management Plan provides some information regarding waste management. This states there will be three commercially-sized bins stored at the rear of the properties to be uplifted once per week, subject to requirements. However, no block plan has been provided showing the location of these bins, or how these can be accommodated with the proposed area, which is also proposed to be used as parking spaces.

Furthermore, as this is a listed property within the Conservation Area it would be expected that a suitable bin store would be constructed to house and screen these from the lane.

**NPF4 Policy 13 and CDP11/SG11:** These policies seek to ensure all new development is delivered with consideration for active travel, promoting the use of walking, wheeling and cycling and reducing dependence on cars. SG11 provides the following guidance:

#### Cycle Parking

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

- a) Wherever possible, employee cycle parking should be located within buildings or a secure compound. Where such a location is not feasible, provision should be close to areas of high activity, such as the main entrance of developments, to ensure cycling is encouraged through enhanced security provided by passive surveillance.
- b) Visitor parking should be located at an easily accessible location close to, or within, the entrance area of the development in order to enhance security through 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.

Whilst there is no specific minimum standard provided for short-term letting accommodation, the principle of the standards for hotels/guest houses/B&Bs would be the most applicable:  
Minimum standard: 1 space per 10 bed spaces.

Vehicle Parking – Again, the standards for hotels/guest houses/B&Bs would be the most applicable. In this case, maximum standards apply. In this case, a maximum of 1 space per bedroom should be provided.

**Comment:** The applicant has not provided any information in relation to cycle parking provision, other than the Management Plan stating this available at the rear of the property. This was discussed with the applicant, but no further information has been submitted. The closest public cycle rack is located at the rear of Mitchell Library on the corner of Berkeley Street and Granville Street, but this would not be considered to be sheltered, safe and secure enough to encourage long-term or overnight use.

The property is stated to have five off-street vehicle parking spaces, located at the rear of the property, for the use of the eight apartments. As this standard is a maximum standard, the number of spaces could be appropriate. However, although the property is located within a high accessibility area, such

tourism-related uses are generally associated with car use, with groups travelling with luggage, which may potentially exacerbate local traffic and parking issues.

The submitted Management Plan states that only one space per property will be reserved, but no details of how that may be enforced is provided. In the case of more cars being present than spaces, off-street parking will be required. The properties are located within the Sandyford Restricted Parking Zone, where on-street parking pressures already exist.

Overall, as no provision has been made to support sustainable transport, this proposal is contrary to CDP/SG11.

**NPF4 Policies 14 and 23 and CDP1/SG1: NPF4 Policy 14 and CDP1** intends to encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the Place Principle. All development should contribute to placemaking standards by being well designed and appropriate to the area. Development should not introduce issues of residential or visual amenity, and should be designed so as to be in keeping with the local character of the area. This will 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 impact on placemaking and residential amenity will be discussed further below:

**NPF4 Policy 23** states that proposals that are likely to raise unacceptable noise issues will not be supported. The Agent of Change Principle applies to noise sensitive development, and a Noise Impact Assessment may be required where the nature of the proposal or its location suggests that significant effects are likely.

**SG1 (Part 2)** provides the following relevant policy guidance:

**Non-Residential Development Affecting Residential Areas:** This guidance seeks to ensure that non-residential development in proximity to residential development does not harm residential amenity or erode the character of residential neighbourhoods.

**Comment:** The transitory nature of short-term guests of the proposed use could result in increased noise or anti-social behaviour, particularly if the properties were booked by large groups.

The immediate neighbours of the proposed short-term letting properties are currently in use as a coffee shop and an office, but there are residential properties in this street block. Additionally, the future use must also be considered as it cannot be guaranteed that these neighbouring properties will always remain in commercial use, particularly as there is a general trend within the Park Conservation Area of offices being converted back into residential use. The applicant has not provided any Noise Impact Assessment to demonstrate that the potential noise generated by the proposed short-term letting use can be suitably managed or mitigated against.

Further to this, there is the potential for noise and activity created by the regular cleaning, laundry or other contractors required to service the property. There is no dedicated servicing vehicle space either within the proposed rear parking area or at the front of the property for such vehicles, which may result in overspill either within the rear lane (which may block access for others or for refuse or emergency vehicles) or to the front, which is within a Restricted Parking Zone.

Therefore, overall, this proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policies 14 and 23 and CDP1/SG1 as the applicant has not demonstrated that any risk of harm to residential amenity can be suitably mitigated.

**NPF4 Policy 30 and CDP3/IPG3 and CDP10/SG10: NPF4 Policy 30** states the following:

Proposals for tourism related development will take into account:

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

Development proposals for the reuse of existing buildings for short term holiday letting will not be supported where the proposal will result in:

- i. An unacceptable impact on local amenity or the character of a neighbourhood or area; or
- ii. The loss of residential accommodation where such loss is not outweighed by demonstrable local economic benefits.

**CDP3/IPG3** recognises the importance of tourism to the City's economy, but seeks to ensure the existing amenity of residential areas are not negatively impacted. This is further supported by **CDP10/SG10**, which seeks to ensure the City's population has access to a choice of housing of appropriate quality and affordability, whilst also considering the locational and residential amenity implications of development proposals for visitor accommodation.

**SG10** provides the following relevant guidance for this proposal:

**Locational Criteria:** The Council will generally support tourist accommodation:

- a) in locations with active travel routes and a frequent public transport service and with high accessibility;
- b) in locations with good access to shops and services, where these are not provided on site;
- c) that can demonstrate that it will not place additional pressure on local amenities and facilities;
- d) that can demonstrate there will be no adverse impact on the character and amenity of the area;
- e) that can demonstrate there will be no adverse impact on traffic congestion and parking.

**Design and Amenity Space Criteria:** Proposals for tourist accommodation will generally be supported where:

- a) it is of a size and scale in keeping with the surrounding environment;
- b) it does not introduce an incongruous or visibly intrusive addition to the surrounding area;
- c) it does not result in unacceptable intensification of activity, particularly in a predominantly residential building or area;
- d) a Management Plan for the development is provided, to the complete satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

**Detailed Criteria:** Short-stay accommodation shall be assessed against the following detailed criteria, together with the key criteria for tourist accommodation in Section 4:

In appropriate locations that satisfy the relevant key criteria relating to tourist accommodation planning permission may be granted for the change of use of entire blocks of residential flats to short-stay accommodation, or for new purpose-built developments for this type of accommodation.

To protect residential amenity in areas where there are already a significant number of non-residential uses and/or problems of parking and traffic congestion, the change of use of properties to short-stay flats will be strongly resisted in the following Conservation Areas: Crosshill; Dennistoun; Glasgow West; **Park**; St Vincent Crescent; and Strathbungo.

**Comment:** The applicant was offered the opportunity to provide supporting evidence in line with the requirements of NPF4 Policy 30 (including economic benefits), but no further information has been supplied. The properties have an established use as eight residential flats. In the context of the City's housing crisis, the loss of these flats has not been justified. Furthermore, as mentioned above, the proposal does not make arrangements to support sustainable travel, and no information regarding minimising carbon emissions has been provided.

Secondly, the Management Plan provided is not detailed enough to allow for a full assessment. This states that cleaning and laundry will be carried out between bookings, but contradictory information is stated as to the frequency (either once per week or after each booking or on demand), and there are no details as to where service vehicles will park. No information has been provided detailing how potential problematic guest behaviour or issues will be managed as there is no on-site management. The plan states a property manager will be available 24-hours a day and can attend the property within approximately 40 minutes, but if a sole person is responsible this arrangement cannot be guaranteed.

The proposal site is within a highly accessible area, with the closest local town centre (Cranstonhill/Yorkhill) approximately 200m away, and therefore this could meet part of the locational criteria. However, it is considered that a further intensification of such a commercial short-term letting use would be detrimental to the character and amenity of the area, particularly for nearby residents in an area of growing residential population. Additionally, the site is within the Park Conservation Area, where, to protect residential amenity, the change of use to short-term letting is strongly resisted, and no reason to deviate from this policy has been provided.

Therefore, based on the above, this proposal is contrary to policies NPF4 Policy 30, CDP3/IPG3 and CDP10/SG10.

## MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

In respect of d), with regard to material considerations, other material considerations include the views of statutory and other consultees and the contents of letters of objection and letters of support.

As noted above, 8 letters of representation have been received for this application.

The grounds of **objection** are summarised below:

- This will exacerbate the housing crisis as these could be rented long-term to families.

**Comment:** Agreed. The established use of the properties is eight residential flats. The applicant was offered the opportunity to address the requirements of NPF4 Policy 30 and provide information in support of this change of use proposal, but no further information was submitted.

- Anderston Community Council consistently hears reports of antisocial behaviour being reported at our public meetings such as excessive noise, violence, substance abuse, vandalism of public spaces and threatening behaviour by users of these properties. This is causing local residents' serious anxiety and disruption worrying about noise, crime, additional rubbish, litter and disruptive parking.

**Comment:** Agreed. The proposed use is not considered to be compatible with residential amenity requirements for reasons of noise and traffic and parking congestion.

- Visitors driving to the property will negatively impact the current parking availability, bringing extra pressure to an area that is already on its limit. Visitors will start parking along the Berkely Terrace Lane, impairing waste collection.

**Comment:** Agreed. Although the applicant has advised there will be five vehicle parking spaces, no block plan demonstrating these spaces has been provided and no information detailing the servicing parking requirements has been provided.

- There is the possibility more bins will be needed, and with this the possibility to have bins accumulating in the back lane area (Berkeley Terrace Lane). This lane has received investment from the Council to be renovated.

**Comment:** The applicant has provided details of the waste provision, however, no block plan has been provided showing where these bins will be located or how these relate to the parking area. Further to this, as this is a listed building within the Conservation Area, the Council would expect a suitable and appropriate bin store to be constructed to obscure the bins from the lane.

- STLs also destroy the sense of community.

**Comment:** Agreed. It is acknowledged that the transitory nature of guests can have an impact on the character of the local neighbourhood, as these guests do not necessarily have a connection to the area.

- These properties are in the Park designated Conservation Area which should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.

**Comment:** Agreed. This property is located within the Park Conservation Area where such a proposed change is strongly resisted, and no supporting evidence or justification to override this policy guidance has been provided.

- The submitted report written in support of this application has provided no clear justifiable evidence that this change of designation from residential homes to a STL business is a benefit to the community or its local residents.

**Comment:** Agreed. The established use of the properties are eight residential flats. The applicant was offered the opportunity to address the requirements of NPF4 Policy 30 and provide information in support of this change of use proposal, but no further information was submitted.

The grounds of **support** are summarised below:

- The location is appropriate for short-stay use due to its busy urban character and accessible location.

**Comment:** The site is within the inner urban area within an area of high accessibility, with local shopping facilities nearby. However, the location of such short-term tourist accommodation must be suitably balanced with the needs of local residents.

- The proposed use will integrate with the area's existing character which is already defined by commercial activity, including hostels, rather than long-term residential occupancy.

**Comment:** The street block is in mixed use, with commercial and office properties as well as residential properties. It is considered that the proposed use will intensify the commercial activity within an area with a growing residential population, and will result in a detrimental impact on residential amenity.

- It is unlikely that any disturbance to neighbouring amenity will result, particularly in this case where no mix of full-time and short-term accommodation in the same building is proposed and where the local area is already noisy and heavily associated with short-stay accommodation.

**Comment:** There are known issues of noise, anti-social behaviour and parking issues in areas where short-term letting accommodation is present, and it is expected that similar issues may arise here. Due to such issues, the change of use of such properties within the Park Conservation Area is strongly resisted.

- The city faces a critical shortage of flexible, high-quality short-term rental options, particularly in well-connected central locations.

**Comment:** The applicant has not provided any supporting information regarding the economic benefit of the proposed use, despite being offered the opportunity to do so. The City is currently experiencing a housing crisis, and the loss of eight residential flats has not been justified.

- A professional management system will ensure guests adhere to community standards, with clear rules on noise and behaviour.

**Comment:** The Management Plan provided did not address these matters, and an operational management plan with no on-site management presence is unlikely to be able to suitably address such concerns.

- With only 8 units, the proposal is of a scale that will not overwhelm the existing neighbourhood character.

**Comment:** It is considered that the proposed use will intensify the commercial activity within an area with a growing residential population. The City is currently experiencing a housing crisis, and the loss of eight residential flats has not been justified.

- Proposals which allow for buildings that might otherwise be out of use (or not attractive as full-time dwellings due to their context or location) to serve this need are preferable to authorising new building works which would come with associated carbon costs and climate consequences.

**Comment:** The Council agrees that it is preferred to re-use existing buildings. However, no evidence or justification for the existing residential use no longer being viable has been provided. The Park Conservation Area is seeing a growing trend of commercial offices and uses being converted back into residential use, and there is a growing residential population in this part of the City.

## CONCLUSION

The proposal has been assessed against the relevant Development Plan policies in detail above. The proposal would result in the unacceptable loss of 8 residential apartments, 4 of which are currently let and would introduce an intensive and incompatible commercial short-term letting accommodation into the Conservation Area, where such a change is strongly resisted in order to preserve residential amenity. The proposed use is likely to introduce issues of increased noise, disturbance and parking congestion into the area, and no justification has been provided to demonstrate significant community or economic benefits.

On this basis, it is recommended that the application for planning permission be refused for the reasons listed in the section below.

## CONDITIONS AND REASONS

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.

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy 30 of National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) insofar as the applicant has not demonstrated that the loss of mainstream residential accommodation has been outweighed by significant local economic benefit.
2. The proposal is contrary to Policy 30 of National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) and CDP1 and SG1, CDP3 and IPG3, and CDP10 and SG10 of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) insofar as the applicant has not demonstrated that any risk of harm to residential amenity through issues of noise, anti-social behaviour, or traffic and parking congestion can be addressed.
3. The proposal is contrary to Policy 23 of National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) and CDP1 and SG1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) insofar as the change of use from residential flats to the transitory nature of short-term letting accommodation is likely to raise unacceptable noise issues, which would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties.
4. The proposal is contrary to Policy CDP10 and SG10: Meeting Housing Needs as the transitory nature of the short-stay accommodation would intensify the use of the property to the detriment of the character and amenity of neighbouring properties within the Park Conservation Area.
5. The proposal is contrary to the NPF4 Policy 12 (adopted February 2023) and CDP1 and the associated supplementary guidance of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) in so far as the development has failed to include appropriate and well-designed provisions for waste and recycling facilities, and has not submitted an acceptable waste management plan.
6. The proposal is contrary to Policy 9 of National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) and CDP2 of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) insofar as the transitory nature of the short-term letting accommodation does not contribute to the vibrancy of the residential neighbourhood and the transitory and commercial nature of the proposal would adversely impact the character and amenity of the area.
7. The proposal is contrary to Policy 13 of National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) and CDP11 and SG11 of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) insofar as the proposal does not make provision for sustainable or active transport options.
8. The proposal is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) Policy 3 insofar as no biodiversity enhancement methods have been proposed.

## Drawings

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

1. A LOCATION PLAN ; Received 04 March 2025
2. BASEMENT 75 BERKELEY STREET ; Received 04 March 2025
3. BASEMENT 77 BERKELEY STREET ; Received 04 March 2025
4. FIRST FLOOR 75 BERKELEY STREET ; Received 04 March 2025
5. FIRST FLOOR 77 BERKELEY STREET ; Received 04 March 2025
6. GROUND FLOOR 75 BERKELEY STREET ; Received 04 March 2025
7. GROUND FLOOR 77 BERKELEY STREET ; Received 04 March 2025
8. SECOND FLOOR 75 BERKELEY STREET ; Received 04 March 2025
9. SECOND FLOOR 77 BERKELEY STREET ; Received 04 March 2025

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

## Advisory Notes to Applicant

## Advisory Notes to Council

## 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](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.*