

	<h1>Report</h1>	Agenda Item <h2>4</h2>
--	-----------------	--------------------------------------

Report to: **Planning Committee**
 Date of Meeting: **8 June 2010**
 Report by: **Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)**

Application No HM/09/0252
 Planning Proposal: Demolition of Existing Factory Building and Erection of Class 1 Retail Store (Supermarket) with Associated Petrol Filling Station (Planning Permission in Principle)

1 Summary Application Information

- Application Type : Permission in Principle
- Applicant : Alexandra Plc
- Location : Alexandra Factory
Bothwell Park Industrial Estate
Uddingston

2 Recommendation(s)

2.1 The Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) Refuse Planning Permission in Principle - based on reasons attached.

2.2 Other Actions/Notes

- (1) The Planning Committee has delegated powers to determine this application.

3 Other Information

- ◆ Applicant's Agent: RPS Planning & Development Ltd
- ◆ Council Area/Ward: 16 Bothwell and Uddingston
- ◆ Policy Reference(s): **South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Adopted)**
Policy ECON 1 – Industrial Land Use Policy
Policy ECON 13 - Non-conforming Uses in Industrial Areas Policy
Policy COM 3 – New Retail/Commercial Development Policy
Policy COM 6 – Village/Neighbourhood Centres Policy
Policy DM 1 – Development Management Policy

- ◆ Representation(s):
 - ▶ 0 Objection Letters
 - ▶ 0 Comments Letters
- ◆ Consultation(s):

Environmental Services

Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan Team

North Lanarkshire Council

Roads and Transportation Services (Hamilton Area)

Roads and Transportation Services (Transportation)

Roads and Transportation Services (Flooding)

Scottish Water

Transport Scotland

Uddingston Community Council

Planning Application Report

1 Application Site

- 1.1 The application relates to an area of land located in the Bothwell Park Industrial Estate to the south side of Bellshill Road on the eastern edge of Uddingston. The site currently comprises a factory and warehouse that are occupied by Alexandra Plc. The site is bounded to the north by Bellshill Road and adjacent industrial premises, to the south and west by industrial premises and to the east by the M74 motorway. The surrounding area is mainly industrial in character. The site is essentially flat, rectangular in shape and it extends to approximately 3.2 hectares. Access to the site is currently via Bellshill Road and Goldie Road.

2 Proposal(s)

- 2.1 Planning permission in principle is sought for the demolition of the existing factory building within the site and the erection of a Class 1 retail store (supermarket) with associated petrol filling station. Whilst a detailed layout has not been submitted with the application an indicative layout has been submitted showing the provision of a retail store with a 6000 square metre gross internal floor area and a 1000 square metre petrol filling station. No operator has been identified for the proposed store at this stage.
- 2.2 This floorspace is anticipated to comprise 3600 square metres of net floorspace (sales floorspace), 2400 square metres would be storage, circulation area, offices and staff areas. A total of 2340 square metres of the proposed sales area would be for the retail of convenience goods and the remaining 1260 square metres would be for the sale of comparison goods. Provision would be made for servicing the retail unit, car parking (including staff, shopper, disabled and parent and child parking), cycle parking and associated landscaping. A petrol filling station including a car wash would also be incorporated. The site would be served by a new compact roundabout on Bellshill Road.
- 2.3 A Planning Statement, Transport Assessment and Retail Impact Assessment were submitted with the application as supporting documents.

3 Background

3.1 Local Plan Status

- 3.1.1 The application site is located within an industrial area of Uddingston in the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan. The relevant policies in terms of the assessment of this application are Policies ECON 1 – Industrial Land Use Policy, ECON 13 - Non-conforming Uses in Industrial Areas Policy, COM 3 – New Retail/Commercial Development Policy, COM 6 – Village/Neighbourhood Centres Policy and DM 1 – Development Management Policy. The content of the above policies and how they relate to the proposal is assessed in detail in Section 6 of this report.

3.2 Structure Plan Policy

- 3.2.1 Strategic Policy 5 of the adopted Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2006 requires that (a) a minimum 10 year potentially marketable and serviceable industrial land supply is maintained and (b) that the strategic economic locations identified in categories (a) to (d) are developed for business and industry and safeguarded from inappropriate alternative uses. Strategic Policy 6 c) – Quality of Life and Health of Local Communities requires the protection, management and enhancement of Town Centres as the preferred locations for retailing and other

community focussed activities. Strategic Policy 9 – Assessment of Development Proposals identifies the criteria which should be applied in the assessment of any planning proposal in order to determine if it accords with the Structure Plan and any proposal which fails to meet the relevant criteria will be regarded as a departure from the Development Plan. Consideration shall require to be given to the appropriateness of the development having regard to the justification for the development in addition to the economic, social and environmental benefits identified under Strategic Policy 10.

3.3 **Government Advice/Policy**

3.3.1 With regard to economic development, Scottish Planning Policy states that planning authorities should ensure that there is a range and choice of marketable sites and locations for businesses allocated in development plans, including opportunities for mixed use development, to meet anticipated requirements and a variety of size and quality requirements. Marketable land should meet business requirements, be serviced or serviceable within 5 years, be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport, and have a secure planning status. The supply of marketable sites should be regularly reviewed. New sites should be brought forward where existing allocations do not meet current and anticipated market expectations. Where identified sites are no longer considered appropriate or marketable, they should be reallocated for another use through the development plan.

3.3.2 In relation to retail proposals, Scottish Planning Policy states that the sequential approach should be used when selecting locations for all retail and commercial leisure uses unless the development plan identifies an exception. This approach should also apply to proposals to expand or change the use of existing developments where proposals are of a scale or form sufficient to change their role and function. The sequential approach requires that locations are considered in the following order: town centre, edge of town centre, other commercial centres identified in the development plan, out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes.

3.4 **Planning Background**

3.4.1 None directly relevant to the site, however, it should be noted that outline planning permission was granted to Sunvic Control Limited on 11 February 2009 for residential development on the site of premises to north of Bellshill Road which is located to the north of the application site (HM/07/0785).

4 **Consultation(s)**

4.1 **Environmental Services** – have no objections to the application subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to acceptable noise levels, contaminated land investigations, ventilation, waste control and dust mitigation measures. Informatives should also be attached advising the applicant of acceptable hours for audible construction activities at the site, requirements relating to smoking shelter provision, the requirement for a survey of existing structures for the presence of asbestos prior to their demolition and additional health and safety matters.

Response:- Noted.

4.2 **Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan Team** – consider that the proposal is of strategic significance in terms of Schedule 9 of the Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan and a departure from the Plan in the context of the criteria set out in Strategic Policy 9.

Response: Noted. The matters raised by the Structure Plan Team are discussed in detail in Section 6 of this report.

- 4.3 **North Lanarkshire Council** – no response to date.
Response: - Noted.
- 4.4 **Roads and Transportation Services (Hamilton Area)** – have no objections to the proposal subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to the provision of appropriate visibility splays, car parking and surface water trapping within the site. The above Service also noted that the submitted Transport Assessment recommended the construction of a roundabout on Bellshill Road.
Response:- Noted.
- 4.5 **Roads and Transportation Services (Transportation)** – recommended that any decision be deferred until the submitted Transport Assessment and Statement Scoping Form is completed and agreed. Whilst the application is for planning permission in principle the complexities of the internal parking and circulatory arrangements will have a detrimental effect on the efficient operation of the access to the development and subsequently to the operation of the new roundabout unless a satisfactory arrangement can be agreed.
Response:- Noted.
- 4.6 **Roads and Transportation Services (Flooding)** – have no objection to the proposal subject to the Council's Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) design criteria being satisfied through the completion of a self certification document.
Response: - Noted.
- 4.7 **Scottish Water** – have no objections to the proposal subject to the provision of an acceptable sewerage system and a sustainable urban drainage system for the development. They have stated that Daldowie Waste Water Treatment Works currently has sufficient capacity to service the proposed development.
Response:- Noted.
- 4.8 **Transport Scotland** – have no objections to the proposal.
Response:- Noted.
- 4.9 **Uddingston Community Council** – the Community Council support the input and diversity of local shop owners who live and trade within the Village. They have contributed to the Village for many years. There are currently two national supermarket outlets in Uddingston, Lidl and Tesco. The Community Council would, therefore, oppose any further large development such as this which would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the Village.
Response:- Noted.

5 Representation(s)

- 5.1 Statutory neighbour notification procedures were undertaken and the application was advertised as Development Potentially Contrary to the Development Plan in the Hamilton Advertiser. No letters of objection were received.

6 Assessment and Conclusions

- 6.1 The determining issues in consideration of this application are its compliance with national, structure and local plan policy. If the application does not comply with the above policy an assessment has to be made as to whether there is a material justification for a departure from the development plan.

- 6.2 The applicant seeks planning permission in principle for the demolition of the existing factory building on the site and the erection of a Class 1 retail store (supermarket) with associated petrol filling station. In terms of national planning policy relative to economic development, Scottish Planning Policy states that planning authorities should ensure that there is a range and choice of marketable sites and locations for businesses allocated in development plans, including opportunities for mixed use development, to meet anticipated requirements and a variety of size and quality requirements. Marketable land should meet business requirements, be serviced or serviceable within 5 years, be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport, and have a secure planning status. The supply of marketable sites should be regularly reviewed. New sites should be brought forward where existing allocations do not meet current and anticipated market expectations. Where identified sites are no longer considered appropriate or marketable, they should be reallocated for another use through the development plan. In relation to retail proposals, Scottish Planning Policy states that the sequential approach should be used when selecting locations for all retail and commercial leisure uses unless the development plan identifies an exception. This approach should also apply to proposals to expand or change the use of existing developments where proposals are of a scale or form sufficient to change their role and function. The sequential approach requires that locations are considered in the following order: town centre, edge of town centre, other commercial centres identified in the development plan, out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes. The following assessment will show that the proposed development does not conform with national planning guidance as it has not been demonstrated clearly that the sequential approach to site selection for retail developments has been used.
- 6.3 In terms of structure plan policy, the main policies in the adopted Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2006 relevant to this application are Strategic Policy 5 – Competitive Economic Framework, Strategic Policy 6 – Quality of Life and Health of Local Communities, Strategic Policy 9 – Assessment of Development Proposals and Strategic Policy 10 – Departures from the Structure Plan. Strategic Policy 5 requires that (a) a minimum 10 year potentially marketable and serviceable industrial land supply is maintained and (b) that the strategic economic locations identified in categories (a) to (d) are developed for business and industry and safeguarded from inappropriate alternative uses. Strategic Policy 6 – Quality of Life and Health of Local Communities, specifically 6 c), requires the protection, management and enhancement of Town Centres as the preferred locations for retailing and other community focussed activities. Strategic Policy 9 identifies the criteria which should be applied in the assessment of any planning proposal in order to determine if it accords with the Structure Plan and any proposal which fails to meet the relevant criteria will be regarded as a departure from the Development Plan. Consideration shall require to be given to the appropriateness of the development having regard to the justification for the development in addition to the economic, social and environmental benefits identified under Strategic Policy 10.
- 6.4 The application site does not form part of the 10 year marketable industrial land supply which is protected by Structure and Local Plan policy and the site is not located in a Strategic Economic Location identified in the Structure Plan. It is, therefore, considered that the loss of the site to non-industrial/business uses would not raise strategic issues and would not be contrary to Strategic Policy 5.
- 6.5 Schedule 6 (c) (i) (a) of Strategic Policy 6 requires analysis of expenditure compared to turnover in the appropriate catchment area. The submitted Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) demonstrates that the proposed retail development can be

supported by the derived area's catchment population. However, on the periphery of the primary catchment area, there are several supermarkets and their respective turnovers are not taken into consideration as the derived catchment boundary has been drawn tightly and excludes these retail stores. The centres that exist within the primary catchment area are defined as village and neighbourhood centres in the Local Plan.

- 6.6 Schedule 6 (c) (i) (b) requires analysis of the impact including direct and cumulative impact on safeguarded town centres. Table 5 within the RIA identifies trade draw from existing retail stores both within the identified primary catchment area and outwith the catchment area. The list of convenience stores in Table 5 does not include particular stores that are identified within the NEMS household survey, and as a result the trade draw on these supermarket stores is not legible. Notwithstanding this, the overall trade draw on Uddingston, Hamilton and Ballieston centres appears low and it is uncertain from the data provided why this pattern has emerged.
- 6.7 Schedule 6 (c) (i) (d) requires analysis of the contribution to the improvement of the vitality or viability of town centres however there is no evidence of improvements resulting from this development to the local and neighbourhoods centres or town centres. Schedule 6 (c) (i) (h) requires to locate new development in locations which can be assessed in accordance with Strategic Policies 3 and 9 B (vi). The proposed development is located within an industrial estate and there are no active bus stops within 400m of the proposed development site. The submitted Transport Assessment (TA) also states that the nearest active bus stops are over 800m from the proposed retail store. An existing cycle route runs to the north of the site with a proposed cycle route along Main Street in Uddingston. The nearest train station is in Uddingston which is located 1500m from the proposed retail store. The proposed development site is considered to be out-of-centre with minimal evidence that it is accessible by a choice of modes of transport, and would result in it being greatly dependant on access predominantly by car.
- 6.8 In terms of Strategic Policy 9, Criteria 9 A (iv) relates to the criteria set out in Schedule 6 (c) (i) Assessment of Significant Retail Proposals and the requirements identified in Schedule 6 (c) (iv) Additional Retailing Opportunities. The proposal does not demonstrate improvement to the vitality and viability of town centres or local neighbourhood centres. Strategic Policy 9 B relates to the location of the development where there is a need to safeguard and promote the vitality and viability of town centres identified in Schedule 1 (a) by taking a sequential approach to proposals for retail, office, cultural and leisure development. In addition it serves to promote sustainable transport by the application of the Hierarchy of Accessibility as set out in Schedule 3 (a) (i) and the application of criteria for sustainable locational choices as set out in Schedule 3 (a) (ii). There is minimal evidence of the sequential approach to identify site selection and it has not been demonstrated clearly that the sequential test has been carried out. The site is located within an existing industrial area and in terms of the Hierarchy of Accessibility has limited accessibility by foot, cycle or public transport. Schedule 3 (a) (ii) sets out locational preferences to be applied in the assessment of development proposals and requires that shopping, leisure, office and other town centre uses should be sited where there is a choice of transport and should not be dependent on access predominantly by car.

- 6.9 Strategic Policy 10 relates to departures from the Structure Plan and from the above assessment the application is considered to be contrary to Strategic Policies 6 and 9, therefore, it must be assessed against Strategic Policy 10. Of particular relevance is criterion 10 A (ii) – clear evidence of a shortfall in the existing and planned supply of land for retail development within the appropriate catchment area. The RIA does not fully demonstrate that there is clear evidence of a shortfall in the existing and planned supply of land for retail development. Strategic Policy 10 B relates to economic, social and environmental benefits. In terms of economic benefits proposals may be justified if they involve inward investment for industrial and business purposes that would otherwise be lost to the Structure Plan area, or if they protect existing jobs or create a significant number of net additional permanent jobs to the Structure Plan Area. It is not considered that the employment this proposal would create is strategically significant. With regard to social benefits, the proposal is not located within any of the priority areas identified in the Structure Plan and does not support or enhance community facilities. It, therefore, cannot be justified in relation to this criterion. In terms of environmental benefits, the proposal does not involve any strategic environmental resources identified in Structure Plan Schedule 7 and does not involve the redevelopment of vacant and derelict land for environmental purposes, therefore, it cannot be justified in relation to this criterion. The proposal is contrary to Strategic Policies 6 and 9 and cannot be justified against any of the criteria in Strategic Policy 10. It is, therefore, considered that there are strategic grounds for the refusal of the application.
- 6.10 In terms of local plan policy, the application site is designated for industrial use in the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan. The relevant policies for the assessment of this application are Policies ECON 1 – Industrial Land Use Policy, ECON 13 - Non-conforming Uses in Industrial Areas Policy, COM 3 – New Retail/Commercial Development Policy, COM 6 – Village/Neighbourhood Centres Policy and DM 1 – Development Management Policy. Policy ECON 1 states that areas identified for industry will continue primarily in industrial use and the Council will direct new industrial development to them. This includes Class 4 (Business), Class 5 (General Industrial) and Class 6 (Storage and Distribution) uses. Proposals for other uses will only be appropriate if the criteria contained in Policy ECON 13 – Non-conforming uses in Industrial Areas Policy are met. All new development must comply with Council design policies as set out in Volume II of the Local Plan and Policy DM 1 – Development Management Policy.
- 6.11 As the proposal relates to a non-industrial use in a designated industrial area the application requires to be assessed against the terms of Policy ECON 13 which states that in all non-strategic industrial areas proposals for uses which do not conform to the general industrial policy will be assessed against a number of criteria and these are listed below with the appropriate response relative to the proposals:
- a. The effect the loss of the site will have on the continuity of the industrial land supply in terms of quantity, range and quality.
Response:- The land supply position in the Hamilton area is currently still in excess of a 10 year supply but is dropping close to the minimum 10 year supply. The application site is currently in use and is, therefore, not part of the marketable supply, however, if it became vacant it would qualify for addition to the supply and would be one of the larger and better located sites in the industrial estate. On this basis, it is considered that the release of this particular site would not conform to Criterion a.
- b. That the development of the site or premises would not adversely affect the industrial operation, amenity, industrial character and function of the area
Response:- It is possible that the development of the site may affect the industrial operation, amenity, industrial character and function of the area. The Council's

Roads and Transportation Services raised concerns that the complexities of the internal parking and circulatory arrangements would have a detrimental effect on the efficient operation of the access to the development and subsequently to the operation of the new roundabout unless a satisfactory arrangement could be agreed. Whilst satisfactory mitigation measures may be achievable, to date these matters have not been resolved.

c. The site or premises has been subject to an independent development viability and marketing appraisal for classes 4, 5 and 6 to the Council's satisfaction

Response:- The site and premises has not been subject to an independent development viability and marketing appraisal for classes 4, 5 and 6 to the Council's satisfaction, therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not conform to Criterion c.

d. The site or premises is located at the edge of an industrial area and can easily be accessed from main road routes and have satisfactory access by walking, cycling and public transport unless the proposal is ancillary to an existing industrial use

Response:- The site is not located at the edge of the industrial estate and it should again be noted that there are no active bus stops located within 400 metres of the proposed development site. As discussed, the submitted TA also states that the nearest active bus stops are over 800 metres from the proposed retail store and the nearest train station is in Uddingston which is located 1500 metres from the proposed store. There is minimal evidence that the site is accessible by a choice of modes of transport and would result in it being greatly dependant on access predominantly by car. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not conform to Criterion d.

e. The site/premises is or can be served by public transport

Response:- As above, there are no active bus stops located within 400 metres of the proposed development site, the nearest active bus stops are over 800 metres from the proposed retail store and the nearest train station is in Uddingston which is located 1500 metres from the proposed store. There is minimal evidence that the site is accessible by a choice of modes of transport and would result in it being greatly dependant on access predominantly by car. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not conform to Criterion e.

Response:- It is generally considered that this issue could be addressed through the submission of reserved matters if applicable.

f. The development will not adversely affect public safety

Response:- It is generally considered that this issue could be addressed through the submission of reserved matters if applicable.

g. The infrastructural implications including the impact on the transport network of the development are acceptable or can be mitigated to an acceptable level.

Response:- It is generally considered that this issue could be addressed through the submission of reserved matters if applicable.

h. The development will not adversely affect the natural or built environment

Response:- It is generally considered that this issue could be addressed through the submission of reserved matters if applicable.

i. The development makes provision for cycling, walking and public transport and/or has a Green Travel Plan, as appropriate.

Response:- Again, there are no active bus stops located within 400 metres of the proposed development site, the nearest active bus stops are over 800 metres from

the proposed retail store and the nearest train station is in Uddingston which is located 1500 metres from the proposed store. There is minimal evidence that the site is accessible by a choice of modes of transport and would result in it being greatly dependant on access predominantly by car. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not conform to Criterion i.

6.12 It should be noted that the supporting text for Policy ECON 13 states that in the event of a site being acceptable, in principle, for a non-conforming use in an industrial area, the proposal must not undermine the vitality and viability of existing town and village centres within South Lanarkshire. Policy COM 3 states that proposals for new retail/commercial development shall be assessed against the following criteria:-

- a. they follow the sequential approach as set out in Scottish Planning Policy 8 – Town Centres and Retailing
- b. they do not undermine the vitality and viability of town centres identified by COM 1 ‘Town Centre Land Use Policy’ and/or village/neighbourhood centres identified by COM 6 ‘Village/Neighbourhood Centres Policy’
- c. they can be supported by the areas’ catchment population
- d. they complement regeneration strategies for the area
- e. they promote sustainable development by:
 - i. taking account of the development location and accessibility (refer to TRA 1 ‘Development Location and Transport Assessment Policy’)
 - ii. minimising environmental and traffic impact
 - iii. promoting design quality
 - iv. taking account of drainage and service infrastructure implications

6.13 The Policy goes on to say that the Council will support and promote the development of new retail/commercial floorspace in those centres listed in Table 5.2 ‘Opportunities for Additional Comparison Retail Floorspace’. In other centres the Council will support new or replacement retail/commercial development assessed to be commensurate with the scale of the centre. Major development proposals (over 2000 square metres (gross) comparison (non-food) goods floorspace; 1000 square metres (gross) convenience (food) goods should be accompanied by a retail assessment. The retail assessment should include a quantitative assessment of retail impact and capacity but should also include an assessment of the qualitative impacts of the proposal. The cumulative effect of recently implemented or consented retail developments in nearby locations should also be included. In particular locations e.g. village or neighbourhood centres, a retail assessment may also be required for developments less than 1000 square metres gross floorspace. Policy COM 6 states that proposals for changes of use in village/neighbourhood centres will be assessed with regard to the appropriate mix of uses, retaining a retail element to serve the needs of the local area, and with further regard to the amenity of the surrounding area. Within the village and neighbourhood centres listed in Table 5.5 ‘Village and Neighbourhood Centres’, proposals for change of use will not be supported if the representation of retail units is below 60%. Only in circumstances where it can be proven, to the satisfaction of the Council, that the premises have been marketed unsuccessfully for a period of one year, will changes of use be considered.

6.14 South Lanarkshire’s main towns are supplemented by the village and local neighbourhood centres which include Uddingston and Bothwell. The Local Plan recognises and supports these centres and proposed developments should not impact upon them where it could undermine their retail function. The revitalisation and improvement of the centres is a key priority in the Council’s Community

Regeneration Statement. The sequential approach to site selection for retail developments is supported by both national and local planning policy. Matters relating to site selection and the retail impact of the proposal have been discussed in detail in the preceding paragraphs of this report. It is worth emphasising that the submitted Retail Impact Assessment states that the sequential approach has been followed, however, it does not fully demonstrate that other sites have been assessed or considered. The RIA does not take into account several supermarkets and their respective turnovers for example, the Tesco store in Bellshill town centre which opened in November 2009 and has been a committed development for some time. The RIA addressed the vitality and viability of retail stores within the catchment, however, it is uncertain from the data shown why the impact on the nearby centres would be as low. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the out of centre location is accessible by a choice of transport modes. Following the assessment of the RIA it is considered that the proposal does not fully demonstrate compliance with the retail development policy in the adopted Local Plan. It is considered that the proposal would compete with the existing Uddingston retail offer and would result in a negative impact on the network of local neighbourhood centres.

- 6.15 In terms of design and layout issues, Policy DM 1 – Development Management Policy is also relevant to the assessment of the application. This policy generally requires all development to take into account the local context and built form of the area and provides guidance as to the criteria to be adhered to. However, in this instance the application is for planning permission in principle and no detailed layout or design details have been submitted.
- 6.16 In summary, the proposal to develop the site for retail use is considered to be contrary to national, structure and local planning policies. On this basis, I recommend that the application be refused.

7 Reasons for Decision

- 7.1 The proposal is contrary to Policies ECON 1, ECON 13 and COM 3 of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan. The Proposal is also contrary to Scottish Planning Policy in relation to Town Centres and Retailing and Strategic Policies 6, 9 and 10 of the adopted Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2006.

Colin McDowall
Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

19 May 2010

Previous References
HM/07/0785

List of Background Papers

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ Consultations
 - Transport Scotland 06/07/2009
 - Scottish Water 12/06/2009

Environmental Services	12/06/2009
Roads & Transportation Services H.Q.(Transportation)	12/06/2009
Roads and Transportation Services (Hamilton Area)	22/07/2009
Roads & Transportation Services H.Q. (Flooding)	14/08/2009
Uddingston Community Council	12/06/2009
Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan Team	19/04/2010

- Representations
- None

Contact for Further Information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Jim Blake, Planning Officer, Brandon Gate, Hamilton
 Ext 3508 (Tel :01698 453508)
 E-mail: Enterprise.hamilton@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 1 The proposal is contrary to Policy ECON 1 of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan in that the site is designated for industrial use.
- 2 The proposal is contrary to Policy ECON 13 - Criterion a, c, d, e and i of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan.
- 3 The proposal is contrary to Policy COM 3 of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan in that it would compete with the existing Uddingston retail offer and would result in a negative impact on the network of local neighbourhood centres.
- 4 The proposal is contrary to Scottish Planning Policy in that it does not follow the sequential approach to site selection for retail developments.
- 5 The proposal is contrary to Policies 6, 9 and 10 of the adopted Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan.

