Item 1

24th November 2026

Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Tim Moss Ext: 76032

26/00062/LOCAL – 2178 Paisley Road West, Glasgow, G52 3SJ
Use of former bank (Class 1A) as betting shop (Sui Generis) and external alterations including air conditioning units to rear.

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): 04 – Cardonald Citywide: n/a

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

***PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING**:*

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

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

1 LOCATION, DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS AND PROPOSAL

Location

1.1 The application site is a ground floor commercial unit in a single storey commercial building split into 2no. units. The site is within Cardonald/Halfway Local Town Centre and within Ward 4 – Pollokshields.

1.2 The area has a high public transport accessibility.

Proposal

1.3 The development proposed is the use of a Class 1A unit to a Sui Generis betting shop. The floor space will total 233 sqm.

1.4 External alterations include the removal of a box fascia and replacement with a shorter fascia (replicating the depth of the fascia at the adjacent unit), there is a replacement guttering, installation of signage, removal of an ATM, formation of new window openings, installation of a stall riser and the removal of the existing roller shutter.

1.5 2no. air conditioner units will be installed to the rear of the building, and 2no. new satellite dishes will be erected to the rear of the property.

1.6 The proposed hours of operation are stated in the submitted Planning Statement as being as 08:00 – 22:00 seven days a week (every day). No waste and recycling storage plan has been proposed.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

- **Policy 1:** Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises
- **Policy 2:** Climate Mitigation and Adaptation
- **Policy 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 27:** City, Town, Local and Commercial Centres

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

- **CDP 1 & SG 1:** The Placemaking Principle
- **CDP4 & SG4:** Network of Centres
- **CDP11 & SG11:** Sustainable Transport

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

01. The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.

02. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policy 12: Zero Waste, Policy 13: Sustainable Transport; Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place, and Policy 27: City, Local and Commercial Centres, and it is contrary to City Development Plan Policies CDP1 and SG1 (Part 2): The Placemaking Principle, CDP4 and SG4: Network of Centres, and CDP11 and SG11: Sustainable Transport, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.

03. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policies 14 and 27 and to CDP1 and SG1 (Part 2) and CDP4 and SG4 in the City Development Plan in that the use of the property as a betting shop (Sui Generis) use would result in an overconcentration of this non-retail use within this street block, at 13.63% or 3 out of 22 units, and as such would negatively impact on the viability, character and amenity of the Cardonald / Halfway Local Town Centre and undermine its primary retail function. Furthermore, it would be detrimental to the health and wellbeing of communities in and within proximity to the application property.

04. The proposed development is contrary to NPF4 Policies 12 and 13 and to CDP1 and SG1 (Part 2) and CPD11 and SG11 in that the submitted information does not show the location of the waste and recycling storage for trade waste or the minimum required cycle parking provision within the application site area.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

01. When read as a whole, the proposal accords with the development plan and there are material considerations that weigh in its favour. These include: reoccupation of a long vacant unit, employment creation and additional footfall within the town centre.

02. There is no demand for a Class 1A unit. There is no evidence to demonstrate an unacceptable concentration of betting/non-retail uses on the street block, or that the proposal would undermine the viability of the primary function of the LTC.

03. Betting shop numbers within the Local Town Centre have reduced significantly over time and the proposal would only restore provision to a previously existing level.

04. The premises already has a gambling licence and would operate under a regulated licensing regime with responsible gambling measures in place.

05. The appellant is happy for a waste and recycling plan to be addressed by condition.

06. The site is in a highly accessible location with good public transport links. Cycle parking provision could also be addressed by condition and does not justify refusal.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

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

- 24/02106/FUL – Erection of extract flue. – Grant Subject to Condition(s)
- 25/01270/FUL – Use of bank (Class 1A) as restaurant (Class 3) with hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) and erection of flue. – Refuse.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 There were four representations received to the application, which can summarised as follows:

- Over-concentration of similar premises, with two betting shops within a few hundred metres of the site.
- No demonstrable need, but there is a demonstrable need to maintain the number of class 1a units in the town centre.
- Would not provide high quality amenity and not generate significant footfall.

7 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Committee should consider if the following are in accordance with National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), the relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance, and if there are material considerations which outweigh the Development Plan considerations.

7.2 The following are the relevant policy considerations:

7.3 **Climate change, Mitigation and adaption**

Committee should note that:

- *NPF4: Policy 1 - Tackling the climate and nature crises and Policy 2 - Climate Mitigation and Adaptation* require significant weight is given to climate crisis and mitigation in all proposals.
- NPF4 Policy 9 Brownfield, Vacant and Derelict Land and Empty Buildings and 12 Zero Waste support development proposals for the reuse of existing buildings, taking into account their suitability for conversion to other uses.
- The proposal is to re-use an existing building.

Committee should consider whether:

- They are satisfied that the environmental impacts are sufficiently considered in this application?

7.4 **Retail Amenity, Health and Wellbeing**

Committee should note that:

- NPF4 Policy 27 City, town, local and commercial centres Does not support proposals for non-retail uses if further provision of such services, including betting shops, will undermine the character and amenity of the area or the health and wellbeing of communities, particularly in disadvantaged areas.
- CDP 4 and SG4 – Network of Centres states that local town centres are the preferred location for retail, commercial leisure and complementary uses. The aim is to maintain an appropriate balance between retail and other uses;
- Within SG4 Assessment Guideline 5 sets out criteria that seek to protect the existing level of retail whilst also permitting non-retail uses in appropriate circumstances. If the proportion of Class 1 shops in a town centre is less than 70% of the units the following criteria must be met:
  - Contribute positively to the town centre, providing an active frontage.
  - Not have an acceptable effect on the centre or residential amenity.
  - Not result in more than 3 adjacent non-Class 1 units in a street block
  - Deliver long term re-use of a vacant premises.
- While the use Class 1A has superseded Class 1 (and Class 2), the council's retail survey still monitors for Class 1 uses. In Cardonald Halfway Local Town Centre, the proportion is 48.1% as of the 5th of September 2025.
- The use would provide an active frontage but would not be considered a positive use; NPF4 Policy 27 City, town, local and commercial centres refers to Betting offices as a proposal that could 'undermine the character and amenity of' an area if further provision is made.
- In terms of residential amenity, residents have voiced objection on these grounds.
- The use would not result in more than 3 adjacent non-Class 1 units in the block. The use would deliver a re-use of a long vacant premises and satisfactory evidence has been provided to demonstrate that marketing of the unit has taken place.

Committee should consider whether:

- They are satisfied the use is compatible with policy on town centres and provides a positive re-use to the local area?
- They are satisfied the use will not result in a detrimental effect on residential amenity?

7.6 **Parking and active travel**

Committee should note that:

- NPF4: Policy 13 - Sustainable Transport: states that development proposals for significant travel generating uses will not be supported in locations which would increase reliance on the private car
- SG11: Sustainable Transport states that significant travel generating uses should be sited at locations well served by public transport. Table 3.3 shows

that ‘Retail – Non-food stores’, the item closest matching the item, is 4.5 spaces per 100sqm gross floor area.

- For cycle parking minimum standards required are set out on Table 2.3 as 1 space per 200sqm gross and 1 space per 10 staff.
- The area has high public transport accessibility.
- There is no proposed change to vehicle parking, and the area does suffer from parking issues.
- There are no cycle parking racks within sight of the shop, however a Sheffield bike stand is 2 minutes walk away at Cardonald Place and Paisley Road West.

Committee should consider whether:

- They are satisfied with the lack of cycle parking provision in this instance or whether further provision could be met through a planning condition?
- They are satisfied this development is adequately supported by public transport?
- They are satisfied the car parking provision given in the proposal?

7.7 **Waste Management**

Committee should note that:

- NPF4: Policy 12 states that development proposals likely to generate waste when operational should set out how that waste will be managed, separated at source and minimise cross-contamination. SG1 Part 2 sets out the requirement for a waste management plan.
- The submitted drawings do not show the location of waste storage, contrary to policy.

Committee should consider whether:

- They are satisfied with the lack of a waste management plan or identification of where waste would be stored in this instance or whether a solution could be met through a planning condition?

8 COMMITTEE DECISION

8.1 The options available to the Committee are:

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

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

9 Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

Financial:

Legal:

Personnel:

Procurement:

Council Strategic Plan: Specify which Grand Challenge (s) and Mission (s) the proposal supports. Where appropriate the relevant Commitment can also be listed.

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2025-29? Please specify.

What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report? (no significant impact, positive impact or negative impact)

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

Climate Impacts:

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

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

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

Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:

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

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

10 Recommendations

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