



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Item 1

20th January 2026

**Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods,
Regeneration and Sustainability**

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

25/00079/LOCAL – Site Of Bishoploch Homes At Hamlet B Former Gartloch Hospital 2346 Gartloch Road Glasgow
Erection of residential development (49 units), includes earthworks and retaining walls, landscaping, car parking, infrastructure and associated works.

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): 21

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 PRE APPLICATION

- 1.1 Although no formal pre-application discussions were held, the application was advised that the red line boundary did not include parts of the wider site, such as a SUDS area, trees and other biodiversity features, that would be affected by the proposal. The applicant was asked to amend the red line boundary, but they declined to do so. It should be noted that amendment to the application boundary as requested would increase the site area beyond the 2 ha limit for a local application, and would therefore not have been able to be determined under delegated authority.
- 1.2 Committee should note the reasons for refusal, and they should consider whether the proposal can be supported with the current boundary. It is also of relevance that, as amendment of the red line boundary would constitute a relatively significant change to the proposal, with consequent implications, this would not be a valid reason to continue the case for further information.

2 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS

- 2.1 The application site appears to be a predominantly greenfield site located between Heatherbank Road and Gartloch Village, sited within a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) area and the Bishop Loch Site of Special Landscape Importance (SSLI). The site is part of the City Development Plan's Housing Land Supply and is surrounded by residential properties which are part of the wider Gartloch Hospital masterplan. The site is located within Ward 21 – North East.
- 2.2 Gartloch Village is a master planned development of the former Gartloch Hospital site originally granted master plan approval in 2001. The completion of the enabling new build Hamlets is linked to the completion of the conversion proposal for the Campus buildings.
- 2.3 The overall development was planned into key areas:
Campus: The central campus comprises the original hospital buildings, constructed in a French Renaissance style with Scottish Baronial detailing. Built in red sandstone with slate roofs, the grand buildings feature elaborate stonework, while ancillary structures are simpler. Most have been converted into residential apartments or Mews-style properties, with works ongoing to complete the remaining buildings.

Hamlets: New-build developments supporting the restoration of the hospital buildings, located in former clearings where modern hospital structures were demolished or land was used for ancillary purposes. Each Hamlet sits within woodland or tree-lined roads and is classified as A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H.

- 8 New Build Hamlets with Hamlets A, C, D, E, F, & G completed.
- Hamlet H is partially complete with a planning application currently lodged for the remaining 8 plots.
- Hamlet B will form the final phase of new build development on the overall Gartloch Village development.

The main infrastructure of the overall Village has previously been installed including the core roads, SUD's ponds and utility networks.

2.4 The application site (Hamlet B) extends to 1.94Ha. The proposal is for a residential development comprising 49 units with associated infrastructure including open space on land within the Master Planned Gartloch Village development. 8 different house types are proposed:

Type 1 (6 No.) – 2-bed (4P), semi-detached, no garage
Type 2 (6 No.) – 3-bed (5P), semi-detached, no garage
Type 3 (10 No.) – 3-bed (6P), semi-detached, no garage
Type 4 (10 No.) – 3-bed (6P), semi-detached, internal garage
Type 5 (4 No.) – 3-bed (6P), detached, no garage
Type 6 (7 No.) – 4-bed (7P), detached, internal garage
Type 7 (3 No.) – 4-bed (8P), detached, internal garage
Type 8 (3 No.) – 4-bed (8P), detached, detached 1.5 garage

2.5 The application site is approximately 3-4m lower than the surrounding core roads Heatherbank Road and Gartloch Village, and will be accessed via the core road Heatherbank Road. This is a tree lined road leading round to the existing T junction splitting to access the existing development and the proposed development.

2.6 The proposed layout is designed around a single vehicular access point on the west side of the site, creating a loop around the site. Some of the properties are located directly off the road, whilst others are located on a shared driveway with typically three properties sharing the driveway.

2.7 The proposed external finish includes the following:
Walls – Dry dash render in white (Stonepack Dolomite White Chip on White Backing) and cream (Stonepack Ashton Cream Chip on Magnolia Backing).
Walls (Plinth Course & Facing Stone) – Ibstock, Anstone Standard Black Old Weathered (Split).
Roof – Marley Duo Modern smooth grey tiles.
Cills & Window Surrounds – Plean, Caledonia (F1).
Rainwater Goods - Black Upvc Facias & Soffits - White Upvc.
Garage Doors (where applicable) – Garador, Winsor, Jet Black.
Front Doors - Composite Door in Agate Grey Glazed Side Ligh.

2.8 There is a temporary fence installed along Heatherbank Road and Gartloch Village. These fences will be removed as part of the development.

2.9 Although no existing trees are within the application boundary, minor tree removal is proposed in two areas: seven trees east of plot 44 for site levelling, and a group of young trees north of plot 10 for a link footpath. Replacement planting is proposed in line with the biodiversity and landscape designs.

3 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Policy 1 | Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises |
| Policy 2 | Climate Mitigation and Adaption |
| Policy 3 | Biodiversity |
| Policy 4 | Natural Places |
| Policy 5 | Soils |
| Policy 6 | Forestry, Woodland and Trees |
| 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 15 | Local Living and 20 Minute Neighbourhoods |
| Policy 16 | Quality Homes |
| Policy 17 | Rural Homes |
| Policy 22 | Flood Risk and Water Management |

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

| | |
|--------|----------------------------|
| CDP 1 | The Placemaking Principle |
| CDP 5 | Resource Management |
| CDP 6 | Green Belt & Green Network |
| CDP 7 | Natural Environment |
| CDP 8 | Water Environment |
| CDP 11 | Sustainable Transport |
| SG 1 | Placemaking Parts 1 & 2 |
| SG 5 | Resource Management |
| SG 6 | Green Belt & Green Network |
| SG 7 | Natural Environment |
| SG 8 | Water Environment |
| SG 11 | Sustainable Transport |

4 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

4.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

- 1) The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.
- 2) The proposal is contrary to Policy 1 'Tackling the climate and nature crises' and Policy 2 'Climate mitigation and adaption' of NPF4 and CDP 5 & SG 5: Resource Management of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that sustainability and addressing the climate crisis is not prioritised within the proposals. The proposals feature overall biodiversity loss within the site as well as discrepancies in the energy systems proposed within the submitted

information and a lack of information and clarity on flood risk, drainage and water management.

- 3) The proposal is contrary to Policy 1 'Tackling the climate and nature crises', Policy 3 'Biodiversity', Policy 4 'Natural places', Policy 6 'Forestry, woodland and trees' and Policy 14 'Design, quality and place' of NPF4 and CDP 7 & SG 7: Natural Environment of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that it is not clear from the information submitted how the development has been designed to avoid or mitigate the impact on biodiversity. There is a significant level of biodiversity loss across the site with little consideration on meaningful biodiversity enhancement, a number of the mandatory requirements and recommendations from the PEA have not been followed or proposed as part of the application, and as part of this, the layout of the proposal may have an impact on the root protection area of the adjacent ancient woodland inventory site.
- 4) The proposal is contrary to Policy 5 'Soils' and Policy 9 'Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings' of NPF4 in that the proposal has not provided updated site investigation information to demonstrate the extent of peat on site and the justification for the proposed layout in relation to this, and to demonstrate that the land is or can be made safe and suitable for development.
- 5) The proposal is contrary to Policy 13 'Sustainable transport' of NPF4 and CDP 11 & SG 11: Sustainable Transport of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that the proposal is designed around the private car and fails to provide safe, accessible and permeable routes for ease of movement in and around the site for active travel, or encourage public transport use.
- 6) The proposal is contrary to Policy 14 'Design, quality and place', Policy 15 'Local Living and 20-minute neighbourhoods', Policy 16 'Quality homes' and Policy 17 'Rural homes' of NPF4 and CDP 1 & SG 1: Placemaking of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that the red line boundary does not fully encompass all of the proposed development. The constraints of the site have not been properly considered and factored into the design, resulting in residential development that lacks permeability and connection to the wider area, a lack of functional communal landscaping for residents, significant loss of biodiversity on site, a lack of safe and supervised routes into/out of the site, and potential flood risk impacts.
- 7) The proposal is contrary to Policy 22 'Flood risk and water management' of NPF4 and CDP 8 & SG 8 'Water Environment' of the City Development Plan (adopted 2017), in that the proposal has not been adequately screened for flood risk, does not provide sufficient information on drainage and water management and does not include any above or below ground Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) or any form of attenuation within the red line boundary to limit the effects of climate change or discharge to the existing SuDS Pond/Basin.

- 8) The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 12 'Zero Waste' in that the proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate a swept path analysis for refuse collection.

5 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

1. The application site is included in the Glasgow City Development Plan (2017) Housing Land Supply and is allocated for housing, where Policies CDP10 and SG10 apply, supporting a choice of quality, affordable housing across all tenures. The principle of housing development is therefore in accordance with the Development Plan. Additionally, the SG2 Greater Easterhouse SDF identifies the site as a brownfield site with development potential. The existing Enabling Development agreement for converting Category A-listed buildings is also a material consideration.
2. Sustainability and Climate Action: The development will incorporate low and zero carbon technologies, including Air Source Heat Pumps and Wastewater Heat Recovery Systems, to minimise lifecycle emissions. Dwellings are designed with optimal southeast and southwest orientations and will meet Gold sustainability standards for CO₂ emissions. Electric vehicle charging points will be provided for all properties. The scheme reuses existing land within Gartloch Village, avoids greenfield or greenbelt development, and supports the restoration of two historic buildings.
3. Flood Risk, Drainage, and Water Management: The FRA was updated to reflect SEPA data released after the application submission, and DBA Engineers provided detailed responses explaining the proposed drainage system, which were not considered in the refusal. The refusal cited a lack of on-site SuDS or attenuation, but DBA confirmed that underground storage is not required. The development will instead use the established SuDS strategy from the wider masterplan, which has successfully managed overland flows for over 20 years.
 - Flood Risk: The site is not at risk of coastal or fluvial flooding. A small area in the northeast has potential pluvial risk due to historical works, which will be managed through Hamlet B's development, formal drainage, and local land drainage. SEPA's March 2025 flood maps show ponding along the southwestern boundary, but proposed drainage and raised site levels will mitigate this. Finished floor levels range from 83.4 mAOD to 85.4 mAOD, reducing flood risk across the site.
 - Foul Drainage: Foul flows from the proposed plots will connect to the existing Scottish Water sewer to the south. A Pre-Development Enquiry confirmed that the sewer network and wastewater treatment works have sufficient capacity to accommodate the development (DBA, 2025).

- Surface Water Drainage: The site is served by three operational SuDS sub-catchments (A, B, and C) covering the Gartloch Village masterplan. SuDS A, in place for 20 years, serves the Core Campus, Hamlets A, C, H, and the proposed Hamlet H2 and B, discharging into an existing outfall to Bishop Loch. DBA modelling confirms SuDS A will continue to manage flows, including climate change allowances, with Hamlet B discharging to the existing SuDS pond to the southwest. Central site drains will be removed, with ponding managed via road and plot drainage, supported by field drains connecting to existing land drains. Porous paving on driveways and treatment at the SuDS pond will manage runoff, while 84 new heavy standard trees will enhance sustainable drainage over time.

4. Biodiversity: The Ironside Farrar Ecology and Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan (2025) outlines on-site measures integrated with the landscape proposals, including grass mixes, wildflowers, shrubs, trees, hedges, and woodland understorey planting. Wildflower corridors, hedgerow links, and woodland clusters align with ecological greenways and movement corridors across Gartloch Village. Minor tree removals are proposed for footpaths and gardens, while surrounding trees will be retained and invasive species managed. Off-site enhancements on nearby lands further support biodiversity, with the plan confirming an overall biodiversity gain for the site.
5. Ancient Woodland: Ironside Farrar (2025) note the sensitivity of the woodland strip adjacent to Lochwood Plantation, recognised as ancient despite being fragmented, of low-to-moderate quality, and impacted by invasive rhododendron. The woodland's mapped extent across Heatherbank Road may be inaccurate, but planning policies require its protection and enhancement. A 5–10 m buffer within the site is proposed, along with compensatory planting of mature woodland specimens, phased rhododendron clearance, understorey enrichment, and long-term management to support the fragmented ancient woodland habitat.
6. Updated Site Investigation: Previous investigations by Mason Evans and GGS confirm the site is safely developable. Pre-application review by GCC Geotechnical (Nov 2023–July 2024) requested supplementary works, which could have been conditioned as part of approval. A Proposed Scope of Supplementary Investigation (Geovia, 2025) was submitted in June 2025, with Geotechnical confirming no further comments in October 2025. Detailed site investigations have since been undertaken, with the final report expected December 2025—exceeding the information normally required pre-determination.

Supplementary investigations by Geovia reconfirm the peat extent identified by Mason Evans, with an additional previously untested area also containing buried peat (draft layout in Figure 8). Regardless, site investigations confirm the land is safely developable, with any further information able to be secured by condition.

7. **Access, Transport, and Permeability:** The site lies in an Outer Urban Area with below-base public transport accessibility but benefits from nearby bus services (including the hourly 310 service) and connections to footpaths, core paths, and train stations. The proposed layout prioritises pedestrians, with four pedestrian accesses versus one vehicle access, two of which connect directly to public transport and local amenities. A network of walking and cycling routes will link the site to the wider area, with delivery secured by condition. The single loop road for vehicles minimises cul-de-sac effects, while landscape areas, link paths, and the play area are all designed to provide passive surveillance.
8. The site is allocated for housing in the CDP, completing Gartloch Village and restoring the Category A-listed hospital. The layout prioritises pedestrians and active travel, linking to bus services and the core path network. Three communal landscaped areas, including a play area, are proposed with passive surveillance from surrounding dwellings. Flood risk is managed through site design, drainage, and raised floor levels.
9. No objections were raised by GCC Waste and Refuse. The updated layout provides five bins per dwelling, converts two turning heads into shared drives, and swept path analysis confirms the internal roads can accommodate standard 11.7 m refuse trucks.

6 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 6.1 The previous planning application history for the property includes the following:
 - 97/01071/DC – Erection of housing Outline Planning Permission Granted Subject to conditions (May 2001).
 - 97/01071/DC Approval of Master Plan Approval of Master Plan (August 2001).
 - 04/00010/DC - Amendment of condition 13 of application 97/01071/DC. Grant Subject to Condition(s) (12 Feb 2004).
 - 07/01755/DC - Erection of a residential development Withdrawn after Validation June 2007.
 - 07/02013/DC - Erection of residential development. Withdrawn August 2014.
 - 24/02772/FUL - Erection of residential development (49 units), includes earthworks and retaining walls, landscaping, car parking, infrastructure and associated works Refused September 2025.

7 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

- 7.1 One representation was received to the planning application. A summary of the points raised is below:

- Neglect of existing historic buildings – new development is being prioritised instead of the restoration of the existing listed hospital buildings.
- Lack of essential amenities – local area already under significant strain and adding more housing without ensuring adequate infrastructure will only exacerbate these issues.
- Traffic and road safety issues – the surrounding roads already face high traffic volumes and safety concerns without the addition of increased traffic from the proposed development.

7.2 Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) was consulted. They advised that the application falls below the thresholds for which SEPA provides site specific advice.

8 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The key issues for Committee to consider are:

8.2 **Climate, nature and biodiversity**

NPF4 Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises, Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaption, Policy 3: Biodiversity, Policy 4: Natural Places, Policy 5: Soils, Policy 6: Forestry, Woodland and Trees; CDP6/SG6: Green Belt & Green Network and CDP7/SG7: Natural Environment

The intent of NPF4 Policy 1 is to encourage, promote and facilitate development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crisis.

The intent of Policy 2 is to encourage, promote and facilitate development that minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change.

Policy 3 seeks to protect biodiversity, reverse biodiversity loss, deliver positive effects from development and strengthen nature networks.

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

Policy 4 seeks to protect, restore and enhance natural assets making best use of nature-based solutions.

- a) Development proposals which by virtue of type, location or scale will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment, will not be supported.
- f) Development proposals that are likely to have an adverse effect on species protected by legislation will only be supported where the proposal meets the relevant statutory tests. If there is reasonable evidence to suggest that a protected species is present on a site or may be affected by a proposed development, steps must be taken to establish its presence. The level of protection required by legislation must be factored into the planning and design of development, and potential impacts must be fully considered prior to the determination of any application

Policy 5 states that: c) Development proposals on peatland, carbon rich soils and priority peatland habitat will only be supported for:

- i. Essential infrastructure and there is a specific locational need and no other suitable site;
- ii. The generation of energy from renewable sources that optimises the contribution of the area to greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets;
- iii. Small-scale development directly linked to a rural business, farm or croft;
- iv. Supporting a fragile community in a rural or island area; or
- v. Restoration of peatland habitats.

d) Where development on peatland, carbon-rich soils or priority peatland habitat is proposed, a detailed site specific assessment will be required to identify:

- i. the baseline depth, habitat condition, quality and stability of carbon rich soils;
- ii. the likely effects of the development on peatland, including on soil disturbance; and
- iii. the likely net effects of the development on climate emissions and loss of carbon.

Policy 6 states that: b) Development proposals will not be supported where they will result in:

- i. Any loss of ancient woodlands, ancient and veteran trees, or adverse impact on their ecological condition.

CDP6 & SG6 states that the contributions which may be sought from new development will reflect any requirements based on application of quality, quantity and accessibility standards, and identified local circumstances, as set out in the Open Space Strategy (OSS).

While CDP 6 establishes the requirement for development to be supported by accessible and high-quality open space, SG 6 sets the applicable standards.

SG 6 formally adopts and applies the Open Space Strategy standards for assessing development proposals as defined in the Glasgow Open Space Strategy. SG 6 confirms that planning applications will be assessed against:

- Accessibility standards
- Quality standards
- Quantity standards

SG 6 explains that development proposals must be located within an acceptable distance of an appropriate type of open space which meets the Quality Standard, as set out in the Glasgow Open Space Strategy. It further states that where open space is beyond the accessibility threshold, or the open space does not meet the Quality Standard. The development will be expected to provide on-site open space, or make appropriate mitigation or enhancement, or demonstrate why this cannot be achieved. For community open space, SG 6 applies: Accessibility standard: 400 metres walking distance and Quality standard: Must meet the Open Space Strategy Quality benchmark.

CDP7 sets the policy goal: all development in Glasgow should safeguard, protect, and enhance the natural environment, including biodiversity, habitats, ecosystems, and important landscape features. It ensures that new development does not harm species, ecological networks, or natural areas and encourages enhancement where possible.

SG 7 explains developers should:

- i. Identify ecological value on-site and nearby, including habitats, species, trees, and watercourses.
- ii. Carry out appropriate ecological surveys, with a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) being the first step for most sites. The PEA identifies protected species, priority habitats, and potential impacts of the development.
- iii. Propose mitigation, enhancement, or compensation measures to avoid or reduce harm and improve biodiversity.
- iv. Ensure that development links into wider ecological networks, such as green corridors, waterways, and connected habitats.
- v. Provide sufficient evidence for planning officers to assess compliance with CDP7, often as part of the planning application's supporting documentation.

The PEA states: 'The Site in its entirety, including the ephemeral, neutral grassland, marshy grassland, marginal vegetation and tall ruderal habitats, can be collectively described as an open mosaic habitat on previously developed land. This is a priority habitat on the U.K Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP), Scottish Biodiversity List (SBL) and Glasgow Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP). Although this habitat has no specific legal protections it is becoming more widely considered as valuable pseudo-natural habitat and *will mean that the Site has considerable ecological value despite its appearance. The loss or transformation of part of this habitat may create an ecological debt when considering the National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) policy 3, where the local planning authority will be looking to see biodiversity enhancement of the Site*'.

The PEA also notes that all habitats on site are assumed to be lost as part of the development and that due to the limited site area, it would be impossible to replace the open mosaic habitat like-for-like. The PEA provides a table showing the habitat areas removed and the habitat areas replaced. Whilst no calculations have been provided in terms of how the loss and gain equates in value and quality of each habitat, from the table it appears that most of the

significant loss is habitat areas which fall under UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP), Scottish Biodiversity List (SBL) and Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) priority habitats. The significant gains noted in the table mostly appear to be from habitats with no noted habitat priority. As the proposed tree removal is also out with the red line boundary, this will not have been taken into account within the table. The proposed landscaping on site is limited and the open spaces are not considered to significantly enhance biodiversity value. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development represents a significant loss to valuable biodiversity habitat with little consideration of how the proposed development's layout and design could facilitate meaningful biodiversity enhancement.

The PEA also states: 'Due to the proximity (c.10 metres) of the Lochwood plantation ancient woodland inventory site it is strongly recommended that works are not allowed to occur up to the limit of the red line boundary. A minimum buffer of 5 metres should function as a blanket root protection measure'.

Committee should note that:

- The proposal seeks to develop a vacant site into a residential development with a car dominated layout.
- The application site is located within a TPO and the Bishop Loch SSSI.
- Some elements of the proposal fall outside the red line boundary, including tree removal, sections of landscaping, and both onward link pathways. Large areas of perimeter grassland along the adopted road are also excluded.
- Large sections of the proposed landscaping and the existing embankments between the proposed housing and the adjacent roads are also not located within the red line boundary.
- The main section of landscaping proposed as part of the development is in the form of a link path within the site surrounded by meadow and some trees. In addition to this, grass service strips, a play area and small amenity space immediately adjacent to the play space are also proposed.
- The development proposes air source heat pumps and heat recovery systems, but gas boilers are still listed as the main heating source. Under The Scottish Government Building Standards Division – Domestic Technical Handbook (January 2025), gas boilers are no longer permitted in new builds to improve environmental sustainability.
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been submitted with the application. However, it is not clear from the information submitted how the development has been designed to avoid or mitigate the impact on biodiversity.
- A Report on Site Investigations was supplied to NRS Geotechnical and Land Remediation in 2023, before the planning application was submitted, and a number of outstanding issues were raised with the applicant. This file was not submitted for assessment as part of the planning application and it is advised in the design statement that an updated site investigation report will be provided, however this was not received.
- A Proposed Scope of Supplementary Site Investigation (June 2025) was submitted, but NRS Geotechnical noted outstanding points. An updated, comprehensive site investigation report is required to incorporate all findings.

- The site is partially underlain by peat soils, and the applicant was asked to demonstrate its extent and address NPF4 Policy 5. Minimal information was submitted, noting peat up to 6 m deep in the central site area, with further details promised in an updated Site Investigation. As this report has not been provided, the requirements of Policy 5 remain unaddressed.
- The development extends to the red line boundary, potentially affecting the root protection area of adjacent ancient woodland. The PEA notes that construction and operation could have significant effects on these features.
- The proposal is for 49 dwellings (154 bedrooms) in the outer urban area. The nearest community space, Auchinlea Park, is over 400 m away and does not meet the Quality Standard, though Ward 21 overall does.
- The development breaches the red line boundary, potentially impacting the root protection area of adjacent ancient woodland. The PEA indicates construction and operation could cause significant effects, and the layout does not follow PEA recommendations, making it unsupportable. Mandatory Great Crested Newt and recommended Invertebrate surveys have not been submitted.

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposed car-dominated layout is appropriate for this site, given sustainable transport policy and design guidance.
- the inclusion of gas boilers as the primary heating source complies with the January 2025 Technical Handbook, which no longer permits gas boilers in new builds.
- the biodiversity impacts have been adequately addressed, given that the PEA does not clearly show how the development avoids or mitigates impacts on ecological features.
- the site investigation and geotechnical information are sufficient to demonstrate that the site is safe and suitable for development, particularly with outstanding points from NRS Geotechnical and the lack of an updated comprehensive report.
- the extent and management of peat soils have been properly demonstrated in line with NPF4 Policy 5, noting the absence of a full updated Site Investigation.
- the impact on adjacent ancient woodland is acceptable, given that the development breaches the red line boundary, may affect root protection areas, and the layout does not follow PEA recommendations.
- the absence of mandatory ecological surveys, including Great Crested Newt and Initial Invertebrate Site Assessment, is acceptable?
- the provision of communal and accessible open space is adequate, considering the nearest community space is over 400 m away and does not meet the Quality Standard?

8.3 Brownfield land and waste

NPF4 Policy 9: Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings, Policy 12: Zero waste and CDP5/SG5: Resource Management

NPF4 Policy 9 states that the development proposals that will result in the sustainable reuse of brownfield land including vacant and derelict land and buildings, whether permanent or temporary, will be supported. In determining

whether the reuse is sustainable, the biodiversity value of brownfield land which has naturalised should be taken into account. Where land is known or suspected to be unstable or contaminated, development proposals will demonstrate that the land is, or can be made, safe and suitable for the proposed new use.

Policy 12 states that: Development proposals should seek to reduce, reuse, or recycle materials in line with the waste hierarchy. Development proposals will be supported where they:

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

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 the 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.

CDP5 aims to ensure that new development uses resources efficiently, minimises waste, and incorporates sustainable practices throughout its construction and operation. SG5 provides supplementary guidance on waste management, energy efficiency, and responsible use of materials to reduce environmental impact.

Committee should note that:

- The proposal involves redeveloping a vacant site for residential use. The PEA notes the site has ecological value, but the submitted information does not clearly demonstrate how potential impacts on biodiversity will be avoided or mitigated. Further detail on biodiversity management and enhancement has not been provided.
- Proposed materials include render, facing stone, concrete, and uPVC. While natural or recycled materials are limited, the palette aligns with the existing Gartloch development.
- The drawings show designated space for storing 4 refuse and recycling bins for each dwelling. However, there is a need to demonstrate 5 bins per dwelling, and in addition the swept path analysis has not been conducted with the current standard refuse truck size (11.7m).

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposal represents a sustainable reuse of the land.
- the materials proposed are appropriate for the site, particularly in terms of sustainability and zero waste.
- the refuse and recycling arrangements are sufficient, noting that 5 bins per dwelling are required and swept path analysis for the current standard 11.7 m refuse truck has not been provided.

8.4 Sustainable transport

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

NPF4 Policy 13 states that the development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the transport requirements generated have been considered in line with the sustainable travel and investment hierarchies and where appropriate they:

- i. Provide direct, easy, segregated and safe links to local facilities via walking, wheeling and cycling networks before occupation;
- ii. Will be accessible by public transport, ideally supporting the use of existing services;
- iii. Integrate transport modes;
- iv. Provide low or zero-emission vehicle and cycle charging points in safe and convenient locations, in alignment with building standards;
- v. Supply safe, secure and convenient cycle parking to meet the needs of users and which is more conveniently located than car parking;
- vi. Are designed to incorporate safety measures including safe crossings for walking and wheeling and reducing the number and speed of vehicles;
- vii. Have taken into account, at the earliest stage of design, the transport needs of diverse groups including users with protected characteristics to ensure the safety, ease and needs of all users; and
- viii. Adequately mitigate any impact on local public access routes.

CDP11 and SG11 seek to ensure all development is designed and delivered to support and accommodate sustainable and active transport options. SG11 includes details of the standards expected.

Cycle Parking – Minimum standard is one space per unit unless a dedicate storage facility is available. Cycle parking must be safe, sheltered and secure.

Vehicle Parking – Minimum standard is one space per dwelling unit. Variation above or below this may be justified by a number of factors.

Committee should note that:

- The proposed development is designed around the private car, with the road dominating the site. The proposed layout is designed around a single vehicular access point on the west side of the site, creating a loop around the site.

- Some of the properties are located directly off the road, whilst others are located on a shared driveway with typically three properties sharing the driveway.
- Sections of the proposed link pathways have very limited overlooking by housing.
- There is no pedestrian pathway on the eastern boundary of the site where the existing bus stop for number 310 is located, preventing ease of access to the limited public transport options on offer.
- There are broken hardstanding footways throughout the proposed development, where safe and continuous footpaths are required to be provided on either side of the carriageway.
- Driveway car parking is provided to each of the units, with some driveways located in front of the properties and some located to the side of the properties.
- Driveways should meet the carriageway at 90 degrees, and all visitor car parking should be parallel to the carriageway, however these design requirements have not been consistently reflected in the design, creating the potential for safety issues.
- NRS Transport Planning advise that all turning heads/spurs not included in the swept path layout should be removed, converted to private accesses, and the adopted road length reduced accordingly.
- It is not clear from the drawings if passive EV parking provision is proposed.
- The applicant has stated that bicycle parking will be accommodated within the rear gardens or garages where provided.
- The proposed development is located in an area of below base accessibility.
- Bus number 310, with stops on adjacent road Gartloch Village, is the only public transport connection in close proximity to the site. Gartcosh, the nearest train station, is located approx.1.6 miles from the proposed development.

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposed layout provides safe and convenient pedestrian and cycling access, given the lack of continuous footpaths, limited overlooking of link pathways, and absence of a pedestrian path to the nearby bus stop.
- the design adequately supports sustainable transport, considering the site's below-base public transport accessibility, the reliance on bus service 310, and distance to the nearest train station.
- Road, driveway, and parking arrangements are appropriate and safe, noting inconsistencies with design requirements for driveway angles, visitor parking, and turning heads/spurs as highlighted by NRS Transport Planning.
- The proposal for electric vehicle (EV) charging and secure bicycle parking is in line with current guidance.

8.5 Design and placemaking

NPF4 Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place, Policy 15: Local Living and 20 Minute Neighbourhoods, Policy 16: Quality Homes, Policy 17: Rural Homes and CDP1/SG1: Placemaking Parts 1 & 2

NPF4 Policy 14 states that the development proposals should be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless

of scale. Development proposals 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.

Development proposals that are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported.

Policy 15 aims to encourage, promote and facilitate the application of the Place Principle and create connected and compact neighbourhoods where people can meet the majority of their daily needs within a reasonable distance of their home, preferably by walking, wheeling or cycling or using sustainable transport options.

Policy 16 aims to encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable homes, in the right locations, providing choice across tenures that meet the diverse housing needs of people and communities across Scotland.

Policy 17 aims to encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable rural homes in the right locations.

CDP 1 and SG 1 to improve the quality of development taking place in Glasgow by promoting a design-led approach. 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.

All residential developments must take into account the Placemaking Principles set out in SG1 - Placemaking, Part 1, as well as the guidance and standards set out in the Residential Design Guide (RDG). SG 1 states:

2.41 Residential Layouts should:

- a) take a design-led approach towards aspect and orientation to maximise daylight and sunlight, reduce energy use, and prevent overlooking and loss of privacy, particularly when providing balcony and/or garden spaces.
- b) make appropriate provision for refuse and recycling storage areas.

- c) wherever possible, retain all significant trees on sites, unless removal is necessary, e.g. for good arboricultural reasons.
- d) have roads designed to the standards set out in RDG.
- e) incorporate a SUDS strategy to take account of the space and design requirements of the required SUDS scheme.
- f) ensure that all new homes do not have upper rooms, balconies etc which directly overlook adjacent private gardens/backcourts.
- g) ensure sufficient permeability through the provision of walking/cycling routes and open spaces connected to the wider paths network and other community facilities. Off road paths should be located centrally and be overlooked in order to promote public safety.

5.3 It is expected that all new development, depending on the nature and scale of the development, will:

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

5.4 It is expected that when specifying the materiality of a new development, consideration will be paid to:

- a) microclimatic issues, with particular thought as to how the visual appearance of a development will be affected over time;
- b) mitigating the negative visual impact that air pollution can have on facing materials, see also SG1 - Placemaking, Part 2, Detailed Guidance - Air Quality;
- c) the lifespan and maintenance of the chosen materials (evidence of the maintenance requirements of the materials specified will require discussion with the Council and will be a consideration by the Council in assessing development proposals);
- d) ensuring that a development acknowledges and responds to the materials of the surrounding townscape and the hierarchies of streets and spaces. Proposals should harmonise with the prevailing materiality of the surrounding built environment. The Council will be supportive of schemes which specify locally sourced materials; and
- e) ensuring that the specified materials do not detract from the visual amenity of existing buildings and the surrounding environment.

Committee should note that:

- The proposed development seeks to erect 49 residential dwellinghouses in a rural location adjacent to other residential developments associated with the Gartloch Masterplan area.
- The red line boundary for the application does not encompass all of the proposed development, including tree removal, landscaping, water management and pathways.
- The submitted information does not include a SWOT analysis or strategy/optioneering to show why this particular layout has been proposed.
- It is not clear how the site constraints have been actively considered.

- The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate how flood risk and drainage will be managed.
- The site investigation information has not been provided to demonstrate the full extent of the peat and justify in detail the design of the proposal against this constraint.
- The proposal is an inward facing development with limited connection to the wider Gartloch village, and with a lack of functional communal landscaping (or open space?) for residents.
- The proposed dwellinghouses have dual aspect and windows are considered to be sufficiently sized. There is no loss of daylight to the adjacent existing properties.
- There are no concerns with regard to privacy – habitable rooms and rear gardens will experience minimal overlooking.
- The development generally faces inward, informally enclosing it from the existing residential developments and wider area.
- Gable activation is limited, with blank gables at key corners, reducing activity and raising safety and supervision concerns.
- Connecting pathways are not fully overlooked, limiting safe and supervised routes into and out of the site.
- Rear gardens and three houses face the central landscape corridor, which is fenced on one side and bordered by a shared driveway on the other.
- Both connection pathways lie outside the red line boundary.
- There is no pathway on the east side to Gartloch Village and the 310 bus; although the applicant suggested one could be added, no revised drawings were provided.
- The proposal does not have public transport use and connections to nearby housing estates.
- The main communal open space is the landscape corridor, supplemented by a small grassed area near the play area.
- The play area is positioned to one side of the layout and includes various equipment and uses natural materials like wood.
- Provision for refuse and recycling facilities are provided within each plot.
- The site is within a TPO, with tree removal proposed outside the red line. A submitted tree survey indicates the affected trees are generally of poor quality.
- Proposed materials for the development include render, facing stone, concrete and uPVC.

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposed layout and design appropriately respond to the site constraints, including the red line boundary, landscape, tree protection, and flood/drainage considerations.
- the development provides safe, functional, and well-overlooked connections, including pathways, gable activation, and links to Gartloch Village and public transport.
- the communal open space and play areas are suitably located, functional, and accessible for residents, taking into account overlooking, integration, and amenity.
- refuse, recycling, and materials proposed are sufficient and comply with council standards and sustainability considerations.

- the proposal adequately addresses ecological and environmental considerations, including tree removal, peat soils, and biodiversity impacts.

8.6 Water management

NPF4 Policy 22: Flood Risk and Water Management and CDP8/SG8 - Water Environment

NPF4 Policy 22 states that the development proposals will:

- i. not increase the risk of surface water flooding to others, or itself be at risk.
- ii. manage all rain and surface water through sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS), which should form part of and integrate with proposed and existing bluegreen infrastructure. All proposals should presume no surface water connection to the combined sewer;
- iii. seek to minimise the area of impermeable surface.

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

CDP 8 focuses on protecting and enhancing the city's water environment. It requires that development proposals:

- i. minimise and reduce flood risk, including impacts from surface water and climate change;
- ii. make satisfactory provision for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS), designed to manage water sustainably and provide environmental benefits;
- iii. protect and improve water quality and aquatic habitats;
- iv. protect land that contributes to sustainable flood management; and
- v. recognise the role of Scottish Water in delivering water and wastewater services.

SG8 provides the practical guidance to implement CDP 8 and explains the detail the council expects in relation to:

- i. reducing flood risk and avoiding increases in flood vulnerability;
- ii. SuDS strategies, including surface water drainage design and how SuDS should be integrated into site design;
- iii. when flood risk screenings, Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs), and Drainage Impact Assessments (DIAs) are required;
- iv. how the water environment should be protected and improved, including opportunities for restoring natural watercourses (e.g., deculverting) and using natural flood management techniques;
- v. development on functional floodplain and the circumstances where land raising or other engineering works may be acceptable; and
- vi. links to wider flood management strategies, such as the Metropolitan Glasgow Strategic Drainage Partnership and strategic flood management plans.

Committee should note that:

- The applicant has provided a Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment (FRDIA), as well as a drainage layout and site levels.
- The site is within the Protected Species Water Vole trigger map area.
- The existing SuDS pond mentioned in association with the water management of the proposal are all located outwith the red line boundary for the proposal.
- It should be noted that there are existing areas of standing water to the north/northeast of the site
- NRS Flood Risk Management note that the red line boundary does not cover all relevant areas, including the footway, drainage ditches, circulation pathways, and attenuation ponds. As a result, flood risk and water management works associated with the development could occur outside planning and environmental control.
- The proposal intends to discharge surface water to an existing SuDS pond outside the red line, originally built for earlier Gartloch phases. However, it is unclear how the pond's capacity, climate change allowances, and development outflows have been assessed, and the submitted information does not fully clarify this.
- The proposal also does not include any above or below ground Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) or any form of attenuation within the red line boundary to limit the effects of climate change or discharge to the existing SuDS Pond/Basin.
- The requests for information have not been provided in full and the concerns raised by NRS Flood Risk Management have also not been addressed in full. The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment has not been self-certified or independently checked, and professional indemnity insurance has not been provided.

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposed flood risk and drainage arrangements are acceptable, noting that key elements (SuDS pond, footways, ditches, pathways, attenuation) lie outside the red line boundary and may occur beyond planning control.
- the capacity and management of the existing SuDS pond adequately accommodate surface water flows from the development, particularly considering climate change allowances and elapsed time since construction.
- the absence of SuDS or attenuation within the red line meets CDP 8 / SG8 requirements for sustainable water management and climate change mitigation.
- the submitted Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment (FRDIA) provides sufficient evidence, given it has not been self-certified, independently checked, or accompanied by professional indemnity insurance.

9 COMMITTEE DECISION

9.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with or without conditions; or
- b. Refuse planning permission.

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

10 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

11 RECOMMENDATIONS

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