

Supporting Statement

REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED PREVIOUSLY

Application 20/02283 (refused) generated 3 issues from local residents and are outlined below:

The application has generated four representations, including one from Baillie Ballantyne. The grounds of objection may be summarised as follows:

- 1. Scott Street is already congested and the proposal will result in further problems associated with traffic congestion;*
- 2. There are too many hot-food takeaways in Baillieston, especially in the vicinity of the application site;*
- 3. The proposed development will result in more litter.*

The current proposals seek to alleviate the above concerns by implementing the following:

A private carpark has been formed on adjacent land owned by the applicant and denoted on the proposals to service the new restaurant to ensure all parking is off street and does not cause parking issues to the existing street.

These proposals are not for Hot food takeaway, the proposals are for sit in restaurant with a health grille theme, an option not currently available on Main Street to residents.

The development of the restaurant should not lead to additional litter given the sit in nature of the proposals.

CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Application 20/02283 (refused) was assessed on the following criteria, this application seeks to provide updates in support of the relevant policies.

SG4 Network of Centres/Assessment Guideline 10 Food, Drink and Entertainment Uses

In order to protect residential amenity, hot-food shops should not be located adjacent residential buildings. In addition, no more than 20% of the number of units in a street block frontage should be in use as hot-food shop or public house. In this instance, half of the units are already in use as takeaways. There is a residential flat above the proposed takeaway, which conflicts with the locational terms of the City Development Plan. Whilst the applicant argues that this is acceptable because the flat will be occupied by the owner of the takeaway, the policy does not distinguish between owners/occupiers, and is simply viewed as a residential unit. In view of this, it is SG4 Network of considered that the proposal does not comply with the terms set out in CDP4 Network of Centres and relevant Supplementary Guidance

The upper storey is to become part of the restaurant and removes any clash with the CPD in regards to a residential property above. The proposals seek to place a restaurant on site rather than a public house or hot food takeaway with a theme missing from the local street scene providing a healthy eating option to the area.

SG4 Network of Centres/Assessment Guideline 12 Treatment and Disposal of Cooking/Heating Fumes
Environmental Health has no objection against the arrangements for the dispersal of fumes and this matter would have been the subject of a planning condition had the proposed development been acceptable.

We assume that Environmental Health would have no objections in this regard as well.

SG4 Network of Centres/AG5 Proposed Non-Retail Uses Within Local Town Centres

In Town Centres where the proportion of ground floor shops is less than 70%, hot-food shops may be considered favourably where they do not have an unacceptable effect on residential amenity. Although the Baillieston Town Centre has just over 50% Class 1 Shops it is considered that the proposed development would be to the detriment of residential amenity, being adjacent a residential flat. In view of the above, it is considered that the proposal does not comply with the terms set out in CDP4 Network of Centres.

As previously noted, the upper storey is to become part of the restaurant and removes any clash with the CPD in regards to a residential property above. We would argue now the proposals should now be “considered favourably” given they they do not have an “unacceptable effect on residential amenity”

CD1 Placemaking/SG1 Placemaking

Placemaking encourages development to be informed by a place based approach, which means that new development should be responsive to its context. Furthermore, associated Supplementary Guidance Non-Residential Development Affecting Residential Areas aims to ensure that non-residential development in proximity to residential uses does not harm residential amenity. In view of the proposed development being adjacent a residential flat and in conflict with locational criteria included AG5 and AG10, it is considered that the development does not comply with the placemaking aspirations set out in CDP1.

As previously noted, the upper storey is to become part of the restaurant and removes any clash with the CPD in regards to a residential property above. We would argue now *that the issue of non-residential development in proximity to residential uses that can potentially harm residential amenity has been resolved.*

Given the above issues that contributed to the refusal of Application 20/02283 have been dealt with we would ask that our proposals be supported by planning and recommended for approval.

We have spoken with three local councillors (noted below) and presented them with the plans who have confirmed their support given we have looked to address their concerns, namely parking and bin storage.

Councillor Elaine Ballentyne, Andy McGowan and the chair of the Baillieston community council.