

Report to:	<b>Planning Committee</b>
Date of Meeting:	<b>24 May 2011</b>
Report by:	<b>Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)</b>

Application No	CL/10/0080
Planning Proposal:	Erection of Retail Store and Formation of New Access and Car Parking

## 1 Summary Application Information

- Application Type : Detailed Planning Application
- Applicant : Lidl UK GMBH
- Location : 8 Airdrie Road  
Carluke

## 2 Recommendation(s)

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

- (1) Refuse Detailed Planning permission – (For Reason Stated).

### 2.2 Other Actions/Notes

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

## 3 Other Information

- ◆ Applicant's Agent: Smiths Design Associates
- ◆ Council Area/Ward: 01 Clydesdale West
- ◆ Policy Reference(s): **South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Adopted)**
  - Policy RES2: Proposed Housing Sites
  - Policy RES6: Residential Land Use
  - Policy COM3: New Retail/Commercial Development
  - Policy ENV11: Design Quality
  - Policy ENV30: New Development Design
  - Policy DM1: Development Management

### **The Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan (2006)**

Strategic Policy 1 : Strategic Development Locations  
 Strategic Policy 6: Quality of Life and Health of Local Communities

Strategic Policy 9: Assessment of Proposals  
Strategic Policy 10: Departures from the  
Structure Plan

- ◆ Representation(s):
  - ▶ 3 Objection Letters
  - ▶ 63 Support Letters
  - ▶ 1 Comments Letter

- ◆ Consultation(s):

S.E.P.A. (West Region) (Flooding)

Environmental Services

Roads & Transportation Services H.Q. (Flooding)

Scottish Water

Roads & Transportation Services H.Q.(Traffic and Transportation)

## Planning Application Report

### 1 Application Site

- 1.1 The application site (0.75 hectares) is located on Airdrie Road (A73) towards the northern outskirts of Carluke on the site of a former industrial site used to manufacture conservatories. The site has since been cleared. The land is generally level, albeit that there is a drop from the main road down into the site.
- 1.2 The site is bounded to the south by a small burn and beyond by playing fields. To the east is vacant derelict land zoned for housing, and to the north are 4 residential dwellings and the site of a former petrol filling station, again zoned for housing. The site also covers an area of hardstanding to the front of the 4 houses. To the west is Airdrie Road and beyond residential dwellings, amenity space and an industrial estate. There is an existing three arm roundabout at the junction of Airdrie Road and Weighhouse Road. The site is currently accessed directly from Airdrie Road at the southern end of the site.

### 2 Proposal(s)

- 2.1 The applicant seeks detailed planning consent for the erection of a Class 1 retail unit, road works, car parking, landscaping and associated works. The building amounts to 1439m<sup>2</sup> with an internal net sales area of 1063m<sup>2</sup>. The merchandised sales area covers 999.9m<sup>2</sup> whilst the remaining area includes the delivery area, storage, office, ancillary staff area and entrance/exit porch. The building would be located in the north/eastern corner with the remaining site area laid out for parking (100 parking spaces including 5 disabled bays), turning, deliveries and vehicle maneuverability. Landscaping would be established around the boundaries. Access from Airdrie Road would be taken directly from the existing roundabout through the creation of a fourth leg. A spur from the main access would be formed to serve the existing 4 houses on the adjoining land and to access the proposed housing site on land to the north and east. The existing access would be closed.
- 2.2 In design terms the store is rectangular in shape with a mono pitched roof and will be externally finished in render, cladding and glazing. The highest standards of insulation will be incorporated to minimize heat loss and a lighting sensor system will help conserve energy. There will be one delivery vehicle a day which will unload onto a specially designed delivery ramp. It is estimated that the store will employ 20 people.
- 2.3 The applicant has submitted a number of supporting documents including a Retail Impact Assessment (and subsequent additional information), a Flood Risk Assessment and a Transport Impact Assessment.

### 3 Background

#### 3.1 National Policy Status

- 3.1.1 Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) provides advice on national planning policy issues. Town Centres which are the focus of retailing activity should be identified in Local Plans. Their vitality and viability should be protected by supporting policies. The local plan should be sufficiently flexible to address deficiencies in shopping provision. A sequential test should be adopted which highlights preferred locations for retail development 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. Outwith a town centre location a detailed assessment should be undertaken to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of a town centre and the proposal is required to meet a qualitative and quantitative deficiency.

### 3.2 **Structure Plan Status**

3.2.1 The application requires to be assessed against the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan 2006. Strategic Policy 1 – Strategic Development Locations states priority will be given a number of strategic development locations. This includes town centres listed in Schedule 1(a) and includes Carluke. Strategic Policy 6 – Quality of Life and Health of Local Communities which seeks the protection, management and enhancement of Town Centres as the preferred locations for retailing and other community focused activities. All applications require to be assessed against Strategic Policy 9: Assessment of Development Proposals. Those which fail to meet the criteria in Strategic Policy 9 are considered as a departure from the Structure Plan and consideration will be given to their appropriateness under Strategic Policy 10 – Departures from the Structure Plan.

### 3.3 **Local Plan Status**

3.3.1 In the South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Adopted), Policies RES2: Proposed Housing Sites, RES6: Residential Land Use, COM3: New Retail/Commercial Development, ENV11: Design Quality, ENV30: New Development Design, and DM1: Development Management are relevant.

3.3.2 The site (apart from a small area of land in front of the existing four houses) is identified as a new housing site where Policy RES2 states that the Council will promote the development for housing of sites with this allocation. The small remaining area is zoned as a Residential Land Use area where Policy RES6 applies. This aims to protect residential amenity from bad neighbour uses. Each application will be judged on its own merits with particular consideration given to the impact on residential amenity.

3.3.3 Policy COM3 states that new retail development shall be assessed against criteria which require a sequential approach as set down by Government Policy. It is also important to demonstrate that the vitality and viability of the town centre will not be undermined and that the proposal can be supported by the catchment population. Policy COM4: A New Retail/Commercial Development Proposals identifies Loch Park in Carluke as being a development opportunity for a foodstore.

3.3.4 Policy ENV11 encourages sustainable development which makes a positive contribution to the character of an area. Policy ENV30 aims to promote quality designs which respect the locality and are accessible to sustainable transport needs. Policy DM1 reiterates the need to respect local context and amenity, make use of appropriate materials and provide suitable access, parking and have no adverse implications for public safety.

### 3.4 **Planning Background**

3.4.1 Planning Permission was granted for a residential development (outline) in November 2004 (CL/04/0563) but this has now lapsed. A planning application submitted by Lidl (CL/07/0166) was refused for a Class 1 retail unit (1439m<sup>2</sup> with internal sites area being 1063m<sup>2</sup>) in January 2008 on grounds that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not impact upon Carluke Town Centre nor that it was necessary to remedy qualitative deficiencies in retail provision. Other

reasons for refusal included deficient access arrangements which would impact upon traffic safety, a potential flood risk and the loss of a site identified as a new housing site.

- 3.4.2 Detailed planning consent was granted to Tesco for a foodstore on a site at Loch Park in Carluke in April 2009. This is a material consideration in the determination of this planning application.

#### **4 Consultation(s)**

- 4.1 **Roads and Transportation Services (Traffic and Transportation)** – The Transport Assessment submitted by the applicants includes a recommendation to provide access via a new arm from the roundabout on Airdrie Road. Roads have confirmed that this is acceptable in principle and that a detailed design has been agreed. A 2 metre wide footway should be provided along the site frontage and tactile parking crossing points provided at the roundabout. 6 cycle parking spaces should be allocated along with a bus stop on Airdrie Road. A travel plan to discourage private car use should be implemented. Generally they are satisfied that there are no outstanding matters which can not be addressed by planning conditions.

**Response:** Noted. This matter could be covered by planning conditions however there are other material planning issues affecting the proposals.

- 4.2 **Roads and Transportation Services – Flooding Unit** – no objection however they have requested details of drainage arrangements that accord with the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. The developer will need to complete self certification documents.

**Response:** Noted. These matters could be covered by planning conditions however there are other material planning issues affecting the proposals.

- 4.3 **Scottish Water:** have offered no objections and have advised that there is sufficient capacity in their water and sewerage networks. If the connection to the public sewer and/or water main requires to be laid through land outwith public ownership, the developer must provide evidence of formal approval from the affected landowner(s). It is possible this proposed development may involve building over or obstruct access to existing Scottish Water infrastructure. On receipt of an application Scottish Water will provide advice that will require to be implemented by the developer to protect existing infrastructure.

**Response:** Noted. A planning condition could cover the requirement of the submission of confirmation from Scottish Water that connections to their network can be achieved however there are other material planning issues affecting the proposals.

- 4.4 **Environmental Services** – no objection subject to conditions covering noise control and contaminated land investigations.

**Response:** Noted. These matters could be covered by planning conditions however there are other material planning issues affecting the proposals.

- 4.5 **SEPA** - initially objected on grounds of insufficient information relative to the flood risk assessment. The applicant has supplied additional clarification on the flood risk assessment and this objection has now been withdrawn.

**Response:** Noted.

#### **5 Representation(s)**

5.1 The application was advertised in the local press as Development Contrary to the Development Plan and non notification of neighbours. Following this publicity and the carrying out of statutory neighbour notification 3 objections and 1 comment letter were received. In addition, 63 letters in support of the application have been received. I will consider the points of support and objection separately.

5.1.2 Firstly the grounds of objection can be summarised as follows:

(a) **The construction of the proposed footway would include the removal of a tree and part of an existing hedge and fence.**

**Response:** The extent of these works would fall within the existing two metre road verge. In addition, the loss of these features would be compensated by new planting within the site.

(b) **A request has been made that warning of concealed entrances to properties on Airdrie Road are put in place.**

**Response:** These entrances are already existing. On the approach to the roundabout the traffic naturally slows therefore in this instance Roads do not believe that additional warning signs are necessary.

(c) **Additional traffic generated by the proposal will contribute to adverse road conditions.**

**Response:** After considering a comprehensive transport assessment Roads are satisfied that the proposal can be accommodated without adverse impacts on the local road network.

(d) **Disturbance to dwellings adjoining the application site which use the existing mutual access. Access would run down a steep gradient towards these houses and would compromise public and road safety. The access to the houses involves driving through the allocated car park. Noise and emissions from vehicles would cause disturbance.**

**Response:** A new adoptable access and junction is proposed which in terms of width, gradient and maneuverability will adhere to current standards. The access spur serving the existing dwellings does not involve driving through the car park. Conditions would be attached to the consent to minimize noise nuisance including restrictions on the hours of opening and deliveries. Environmental Health in their consultation response have not identified vehicle emissions as an issue of concern.

(e) **Car parking for existing houses would be located a short distance from the front of the objector's house thereby resulting in disturbance day and night.**

**Response:** Only three visitor parking spaces have been identified for this location. The level of disturbance is expected to be minimal.

(f) **A convenience store would only serve the residential estate across the road.**

**Response:** A retail assessment for the proposal will be fully considered in section 6 of the report..

(g) **The plans specify an area which falls outwith the applicants control.**

**Response:** The plans have been altered to accord with the land title.

(h) **A household has rights to use a septic tank within the application site and therefore is opposed to any development which interferes with that right.**

**Response:** The applicant has confirmed that the title allows for access to the manhole of the septic tank. Within this proposal, the provision for access to this area has been retained.

- (i) **The proposal would affect an existing right of access from Airdrie Road to the residential properties.**

**Response:** This relates to the existing access to the south of the site. The applicant has advised that the title requires access to be provided to the residential properties adjacent to the site. The title also allows for this access to be substituted at any time, provided any alternative access to the south west boundaries of numbers 8, 10, 12 and 14 Airdrie Road is created. The submitted plans show that these properties would be appropriately served by the proposed new access via the roundabout.

- (j) **At the present time there is adequate parking outside the street adjoining the site. If the proposed development is allowed to proceed, the parking will become non-existent.**

**Response:** The parking area referred to is within the ownership of the applicants and there are no rights for residents to be parking in this area. Nevertheless, the proposals involve the creation of three visitor spaces opposite the existing houses. In addition, vehicular access to the curtilage of these properties will be maintained.

- (k) **Effect upon value of the existing houses.**

**Response:** This is not a relevant planning consideration.

- (l) **The plans have been prepared with no consideration for the residents living in the area. As the plans stand the existing houses are akin to an island in the middle of a building site and then car park.**

**Response:** The store and most of the car parking and vehicle maneuvering areas are located to the south some distance from the existing houses. The outlook for the houses to the front and rear will remain unaffected. Also landscaping belts are proposed to be established along the southern and eastern boundaries of these dwellings to act as a buffer zone to the proposed development.

- (m) **There are further safety issues in that the houses would be in the middle of a building site.**

**Response:** This would also be the case if the site were developed for housing which is promoted in the adopted local plan. Notwithstanding construction traffic and operations will have to adhere to current health and safety legislative standards.

- (n) **The concern of a large car park at this position in town will be a magnet for social problems in the evenings and at weekends and this will further damage the amenity of the area.**

**Response:** Issues of anti-social behavior is a police matter.

- (o) **Require reassurance that the new exit from the roundabout on Airdrie Road is suitable for accessing housing land adjoining the application site. A condition should be attached to ensure access is provided to the adjacent housing sites. This should be up to the legal boundary with no ransom strip.**

**Response:** Roads and Transportation Services have advised that the access spur is sufficient for accessing the adjoining proposed housing site. A planning

condition could be used to ensure access is provided to the legal boundary however there are other planning issues associated with the proposals.

- (p) **Any new drainage arrangements if required to be taken to the nearest water course will require to cross neighbouring land.**

**Response:** The drainage proposal does not necessitate use of land outwith the applicants control.

- (q) **The access from the roundabout will create more congestion at the roundabout.**

**Response:** Roads and Transportation Services are satisfied that there will be no adverse impacts on the roundabout.

5.1.3 The letters of support can be summarised as follows.

- (a) **The site is an eyesore – the proposal will result in environmental improvements and brighten up the entrance to Carluke.**

**Response:** The site is currently derelict however any development which takes place must be acceptable in planning terms.

- (b) **Job creation opportunities**

**Response:** It is estimated that 20 jobs will be created however this has to be weighed against the potential impact on existing traders in the town centre.

- (c) **This store will provide an alternative to travelling outwith Carluke for shopping – there is also the possibility that it would attract trade from outwith the settlement thereby benefiting the town. It would provide an alternative to shopping in Lanark and Wishaw.**

**Response:** The Tesco store was consented to meet the deficiency of convenience retailing in the town. There is also an existing discount store (Aldi) in the town. There is a possibility that a small percentage of trade will result from residents who live outwith Carluke who are attracted because of the presence of a Lidl store. This issue is addressed fully in section 6 of the report.

- (d) **The Tesco store which has been approved will have a far bigger impact than the proposed Lidl store.**

**Response:** The cumulative impact of both stores has been considered together in the retail impact assessment.

- (e) **Make use of an empty space.**

**Response:** The proposal will result in the redevelopment of a brownfield site however any development which takes place must be acceptable in planning terms.

- (f) **Most of the stores in Carluke are overpriced. The existing retail stores in town offer an insufficient range for a family shop and are expensive. Lidl would provide a bigger and better variety.**

**Response:** The lack of a discount and low priced stores from a planning perspective is not judged to be a qualitative deficiency. Notwithstanding there is already a discount store in the form of Aldi to the south of the town centre.

- (g) **The proposal will not necessarily impact upon the town centre or compete with existing outlets.**

**Response:** Although unlikely to compete directly with specialised shops it is accepted in the Retail Impact assessment that there will be some trade



diversion from the town centre. This will be addressed fully in section 6 of the report.

**(h) The proposal will improve the access to the existing houses adjoining the site:**

**Response:** Agree.

**(i) More choice and competition.**

**Response:** In general competition should be encouraged however it still remains necessary from a planning perspective to demonstrate that proposed stores located outwith a designated town centre will not have an adverse impact upon the viability or vitality of a town centre. This will be addressed fully in section 6 of the report.

**(j) More accessible to neighbouring housing estates especially for elderly people as for transport to the town centre is difficult. There are no alternative shops in this part of Carluke.**

**Response:** It is accepted that this store would be more convenient to surrounding residential areas however the overall retail impact on the town needs to be accessed. This will be addressed fully in section 6 of the report.

The letters referred to above have been copied and are available in the usual manner and on the Planning Portal.

## **6 Assessment and Conclusions**

- 6.1 The proposal involves the development of a foodstore on vacant land at Airdrie Road in Carluke on the northern periphery of the town. The main determining issues in this instance are compliance with structure and local plan policies and government guidance (namely the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)), in particular the retail impact of the proposal on Carluke town centre. Other considerations include the impact on road safety and residential amenity.

### Structure Plan Assessment

- 6.2 The policies which are relevant to the assessment of the application are Strategic Policies 1, 6, 9 and 10.
- 6.3 Strategic Policy 1 – Strategic Development Locations identifies strategic town centres as listed in Schedule 1(a) as one of the priorities for future investment. Within the catchment area of the proposal as defined by the applicant in the accompanying Retail Impact Assessment (RIA), there is one strategic centre. Carluke is the only strategic town centre in the catchment area.
- 6.4 Strategic Policy 6 (c) requires the protection, management and enhancement of Town Centres as the preferred locations for retailing and other community focused activities. Schedule 1 (a) identifies the network of town centres that provides vital social and economic functions recognised in the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Development. Carluke is identified as a town centre to be safeguarded. The application site is not within Carluke town centre as defined in the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan nor is it identified in Schedule 6(c)(iii) – Out of Centre Retail Locations. The proposal therefore requires to be further considered in relation to the criteria listed in Schedule 6(c)(i) and 6(c)(ii).

- 6.5 Schedule 6(c)(i) sets out a number of criteria that new retail proposals require to be considered against in regard to convenience floorspace. The relevant criteria are set out as follows:
- (a) expenditure compared to turnover;
  - (b) impact on strategic centres;
  - (c) sequential approach in Schedule 6 (c)(ii)
  - (d) contribution to the improvement of the vitality and viability of town centres
  - (h) promotion of sustainable transport and
  - (j) contribution the development will make to remedying any qualitative deficiencies in existing retail provision.

These will be considered in turn. For clarification the applicants submitted a retail impact assessment and following review of the assessment the applicant has provided further information to address issues raised by the Council in its assessment of the RIA.

- 6.6 *Criterion (a)* - Within the Lanark/Carluke/Biggar catchment area in which the application is located, the Structure Plan Technical Report TR07 identified a surplus of expenditure of approximately £16.55m at 2011 (based on 2003 shopping survey patterns). This shortfall in the catchment area has been addressed by the allocation of a site in the Local Plan which has subsequently obtained consent by Tesco. A household shopping (HS) survey was undertaken in December 2008 by the applicant in respect of their proposed development. This more recent information on food shopping patterns provides current data, which has been used in the assessment of the proposed foodstore. The catchment area for this proposal has been defined in the Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) and covers the ML8-4 and ML8-5 postcode areas. This includes the whole settlement of Carluke and a number of outlying settlements but does not include the surrounding towns of Wishaw, Lanark and Larkhall. It is partly based on the Structure Plan 2003 household shopping survey. More recent information on food shopping patterns is provided by the household shopping survey for the catchment area and this current data has been used in the assessment of the retail proposals. Corroboration with these latest survey findings on shopping patterns confirms the validity of the selected area as the main catchment.
- 6.7 In April 2009 Tesco received planning consent for 2,750 sqm net sales (4,460 sqm gross) food store on the local plan designated retail site at Loch Park. Work has recently started on site and it is anticipated the store will be open for trading by the end of the year. The Carluke Retail Capacity Study (dated March 2007) determined that there was expenditure capacity to support a store of approximately 4,000 sqm at Loch Park. An update of that study estimates that the spare capacity to support new foodstore developments would be £26.4 million by 2015. The convenience turnover of the Tesco is estimated to be £25.6 million. This will leave only £0.8 million spare capacity. In the supporting Lidl RIA, the proposed turnover of Lidl's convenience goods sales is estimated at £3.12m in 2015. Therefore I am satisfied that there is no capacity to support the proposed development without threatening the vitality and viability of the town centre, and therefore the proposals do not accord with Strategic Policy 6(c) (i) (a)
- 6.8 *Criterion (b)* - Impact on Strategic Centres requires assessment of impact, including direct and cumulative impact, on town centres listed in Schedule 1(a). Carluke is listed in Schedule 1(a) and the sustainability and improvement of centres is a key priority for the Structure Plan and the Council. The current provision of convenience retailing in Carluke includes two Co-op stores, Haldanes (formerly Somerfield) and Aldi. The Carluke Retail Capacity Study 2007 commissioned by the Council in

2007 concluded there was capacity of a store of approximately 4,000 sq. metres gross floorspace in the Carluke catchment. This study has been updated for the purposes of assessing this application by using the more recent household shopping survey for the catchment area undertaken by the applicants.

- 6.9 In terms of cumulative impact, the RIA estimates that there will be 3% impact on Carluke Town Centre which results in £0.93m being diverted from existing convenience stores. The RIA therefore states that the main impact would not be on the town centre but the consented Tesco development, which itself would incur an impact of 5% which equates to a trade diversion of £1.43m in 2015. The updated Carluke Retail Capacity Study estimates that the impact of the proposed Lidl on the town centre is 28% which results in £0.9m being diverted from the town centre. It also updates the impact of the Tesco on the town centre using the December 2008 HS survey figures. It concludes the impact of Tesco on the town centre is 18%, which results in a trade diversion of £3.1m. However, I consider that the Tesco consent can still be accommodated based on the HS survey but that the town centre convenience shops would continue to trade at lower and rather marginal levels. If the trade diversion is higher than this level, then the impact on the town centre is likely to rise. This position is not supportive of introducing an additional out of centre convenience store beyond the Tesco consent, without potentially threatening Carluke town centre.
- 6.10 In terms of the estimated pattern of trade diversion and impact levels on the proposed Lidl store in 2015, and assuming that the Tesco store is operational, the trade diversion estimated by the applicant show much lower proportions are estimated to affect the town centre, with higher proportions loaded on the consented Tesco store. The issue here though is the location of the proposed Lidl store. The measured distance from the proposed Lidl store to the town centre is slightly greater than the measured distance from Tesco site to the town centre. However, the perception is that Tesco site is closer to the town centre and there are opportunities to link with the town centre. The proposed Lidl site is located on the northern periphery of the town and a number of busy junctions must be encountered. The proposal has the potential to capture shoppers before entering the town centre, with a resulting reduction in footfall to the town centre. It is not unreasonable to conclude the proposed Lidl store is likely to compete strongly with general stores in the town centre. On this basis I consider that the proposed Lidl will have a detrimental impact Carluke town centre and therefore does not comply with Schedule 6(c) (i) (b).
- 6.11 *Criterion (c)* deals with the sequential approach which establishes that the town centre is the first preference for new retail developments. A sequential assessment was undertaken in the RIA in accordance with the requirements of SPP and local plan policy. SPP states that where development proposals in out-of-centre locations are not consistent with the development plan, it has to be demonstrated by the applicant that more central options have been thoroughly assessed and that the impact on existing centres is acceptable. In this case, the RIA looked at two other sites namely the former health centre in Market Place and land at James Street/ Hamilton Street. The former is in the town centre and the latter sits on the edge. However both sites were discounted due to the limited area available to accommodate the required size of store, their irregular shape and ownership constraints which could make site assembly difficult. No other town centre or edge of centre locations were identified. The sequential approach has thoroughly assessed more central options and I concur that other sequentially preferable sites are not available. However the impact on existing centres has to be acceptable for out-of-centre locations to be acceptable. As noted above there is no capacity to

accommodate this store and therefore the impact on the existing centre would be acceptable. As a result the proposal does not comply with Schedule 6(c) (i) (c).

- 6.12 *Criterion (d)* – As noted above Strategic Policy 1 identifies Carluke as a town centre to be safeguarded. The proposed site is out-of-centre, though the sequential approach has been undertaken as noted above. The proposal does not contribute directly to the improvement of the town centre and from the above assessment will have a negative impact on the town centre. The proposal is not supportive of criterion (d) or Strategic Policy 1 as it is not directing major retail investment to town centres listed in Schedule 1, therefore the proposal does not comply with Schedule 6(c) (i) (d).
- 6.13 *Criterion (h)* – The proposal is situated on an out of centre site and does not provide opportunities to link with the retail core of the town. Although the site lies on a bus route and cycling could be encouraged through the provision of cycle bays it is accessible by walking from only a relatively small part of the town. As a result I do not consider the proposal is entirely supportive of criterion (h).
- 6.14 *Criterion (j)* - This relates to the contribution the development would make to remedy any qualitative deficiencies in existing retail provision. The shortfall in convenience floorspace for the Structure Plan catchment area was recognised by the Local Plan and a designated site provided. Subsequently consent has been given to Tesco Stores Ltd for a 4,460 sq. metre (gross) store. Taking into account the above assessment there is no further identified quantitative deficiency for an out-of-centre retail store and on this basis I am not satisfied that the proposal complies with this criteria.
- 6.15 Overall I conclude that the proposed development cannot be accommodated in terms of retail capacity or retail impact and does not remedy any quantitative or qualitative deficiencies in the existing retail provision in the catchment area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Strategic Policy 6.
- 6.16 The application also requires to be assessed against Strategic Policy 9 which 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. Strategic Policy 9A relates to the need for the development in terms of the relevant demand assessment. Of particular relevance is criterion (iv) which requires to satisfy criteria in Schedule 6 (c )(i). An assessment in regard to Schedule 6(c)(i) has been set out in the above paragraphs which concludes that the development cannot be accommodated in terms of retail capacity and retail impact.
- 6.17 Strategic Policy 9B relates to the location of the development and its impact on strategic resources. Strategic Policy 9B(i) specifically refers to the need to safeguard the strategic development locations identified in strategic policies 1, 6 and 9 which includes Carluke town centre. The proposal is not supportive of Strategic Policy 1 as it is not directing major retail investment to the town centre. In addition, the proposal will also undermine the vitality and viability of Carluke town centre. The application is therefore not in accordance with Strategic Policy 9B.
- 6.18 Strategic Policy 9C relates to the provision by the developer of appropriate infrastructure/mitigation measures. There have not been any adverse comments from statutory consultees and therefore this criteria is satisfied. However as the proposal fails to satisfy one or more criteria in Strategic Policy 9 it does not accord with the Structure Plan and as a result it requires to be assessed against the criteria in Strategic Policy 10 to determine whether a departure is appropriate.

- 6.19 Strategic Policy 10A (iv) requires the proposal to remedy qualitative deficiencies in existing retail provision. There are no identified qualitative deficiencies in existing retail provision for the town. In terms of economic benefit the applicants have estimated that a small number of jobs would be created through the development. However this is not considered to meet the criteria in Strategic Policy 10B i) with regard to the creation of a significant number of net additional permanent jobs to the Structure Plan Area. In addition the adverse impact on the town centre may result in the loss of employment.
- 6.20 Criteria 10B (ii) relates to social benefit and requires a proposal to assist urban renewal, support or enhance local facilities and for the settlement to be of a capacity to be able to absorb further development. The proposal is not required to promote urban renewal nor would it improve community facilities. In addition from the above assessment retail capacity is marginal for the settlement and surrounding area to absorb further retail development, therefore it is concluded that the application fails to meet this criteria.
- 6.21 Criteria 10B (iii) relates to environmental benefit, in particular criteria b) which considers development in terms of significant restoration of vacant or derelict land for environmental purposes. Although the application site is currently vacant land the level of dereliction it is not considered significant and a sufficient reason to justify a departure.
- 6.22 Overall the application raises significant issues with regard to Strategic Policies 1 and 6 and fails to address satisfactorily criteria in Strategic Policy 9. The proposal is therefore a development plan departure. Assessment against Strategic Policy 10 provides no justification for the application on economic, social and environmental grounds. Therefore, I conclude that the application contravenes the Structure Plan and that a departure is not justified.

#### Local Plan Assessment

- 6.23 In land use terms most of the site has been identified as a new housing site in the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan. Policy RES2 seeks to promote the development for housing of sites with this allocation. The proposal is therefore contrary to the land use allocation in the local plan. The site forms part of the Councils housing land supply and in principle should be protected from alternative development. However, development of allocated housing sites has been negligible due to the recent economic downturn so that the current housing land supply remains high. In addition, this site contributes a relatively small amount to the overall land supply. As a result the development of the site for alternative uses would not significantly adversely affect housing land supply.
- 6.24 The proposed store requires to be assessed against retail policy in the South Lanarkshire Local Plan. Policy COM 3 – New Retail/Commercial Development Policy sets out the criteria to assess new retail development proposals and reflects the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and strategic policy framework for assessing new development. This policy sets out criteria that must be satisfied in order for a proposal to be acceptable.
- 6.25 Firstly criterion (a) establishes that a sequential approach should be used which requires that the town centre is the first preference for new retail developments. A sequential assessment was undertaken in the RIA in accordance with the requirements of SPP and local plan policy. SPP states that where development

proposals in out-of-centre locations are not consistent with the development plan, it has to be demonstrated by the applicant that more central options have been thoroughly assessed and that the impact on existing centres is acceptable.. In this case, the RIA looked at two other sites namely the former health centre in Market Place and land at James Street/ Hamilton Street. Consideration of the sequential approach carried out by the applicants is set out in 6.11. I am satisfied that there are no other alternative sites that could accommodate the proposal, however as noted above the capacity and impact on existing centres has to be acceptable for out-of-centre locations to be acceptable. I am not satisfied that the impact on Carlisle is acceptable and therefore this criteria is not satisfied.

- 6.26 Policy COM 3 (b) requires that proposals do not undermine the vitality and viability of town, village or neighbourhood centres. Carlisle town centre is one of South Lanarkshire's strategic centres, and the sustainability and improvement of centres is a key priority for the Council. The current provision of convenience retailing in Carlisle is described in 6.8 above. The Carlisle Retail Capacity Study in 2007 concluded there was capacity of a store of approximately 4,000 sq. metres gross floorspace in the Carlisle catchment. This has been absorbed fully by the Tesco development now under construction. As described in 6.9 above, I have concerns about the level of impact that the store would have on the town centre. Essentially, the impact levels on the town centre, assuming that the Tesco store is operational, are high, and therefore there is a risk to the existing stores in the town centre. This position is not supportive of introducing an additional out of centre convenience store beyond the Tesco consent, without potentially threatening Carlisle town centre.
- 6.27 The Council's assessment has also considered the estimated pattern of trade diversion and impact levels on the proposed Lidl store in 2015, assuming that the Tesco store is operational. The trade diversion estimates produced by the applicants show much lower proportions would affect the town centre, with higher proportions loaded on the consented Tesco store. However the location of the proposed store on the northern periphery of the town is likely to capture shoppers before entering the town centre, with the potential result being a reduced footfall to the town centre. It is concluded that the store is likely to compete strongly with general stores in the town centre to the detriment of the vitality and viability of the town centre. I consider that the proposed Lidl will undermine the vitality and viability of the convenience sector of the town centre and therefore does not comply with Local Plan Policy COM 3(b).
- 6.28 Criteria (c ) requires the proposal to be supported by the areas catchment population. The main catchment area used by the RIA covers the ML8-4 and ML8-5 postcodes. As noted in 6.6 above, corroboration with the other survey findings on shopping patterns confirms the validity of the selected area as the main catchment. Using the HS survey data (December 2010) the estimated capacity for the catchment area is £26.4m (in 2009 prices) in 2015. In comparison the Carlisle Retail Capacity Study (dated March 2007) estimated that capacity was £20.3m in 2004 prices in 2010. This shows the conclusions are broadly similar but with slightly more capacity available than anticipated in the 2007 study. In the Lidl RIA, the turnover of the proposed store's convenience goods sales is estimated at £3.12m in 2015. The estimated convenience turnover for the Tesco store is £25.6m. Taken together, total turnover is £28.72m, which is marginally greater than the estimated capacity. Considering the above I am not satisfied that the areas catchment population can support the proposed development without threatening the vitality and viability of the town centre.

- 6.29 With regard to Local Plan Policy COM 3 (d) the Council is committed to supporting, enhancing and promoting Carluke town centre through the Local Plan and wider strategies. The Local Plan states that new developments should be in locations that accord with and complement the regeneration priorities of the Council, as set out by the Community Plan and Community Regeneration Statement. The location of the proposed store is located on the outskirts of the town and it is likely that the majority of shoppers will access the store by car since there are no other services nearby that would encourage a more sustainable travel pattern. As the site is situated in the northern periphery of Carluke, it would not readily encourage joined up trips with the town centre and the consented Tesco supermarket due to the distances involved. It is considered that the location of the proposed store is not in line with the Council priorities for Carluke town centre. The Council has invested in the physical environment through improving the streetscape of Carluke town centre in 2006, and more recently invested in a Carluke Town Centre Assessment report, which was prepared in 2009 in partnership with the Council, South Lanarkshire Rural Partnership and Carluke Development Trust.
- 6.30 Annual Health Checks and Key Performance Indicators allow the Council to monitor statistics as well as local perceptions on the town centres. The visiting figures and shopping trends for Carluke town centre have changed since 2006 with daily visits increasing by 6% and frequency of weekly visits increasing by 4%. The completion of the streetscape works has significantly enhanced the main shopping area which has been a driver for this increase. However the town centre remains a fragile centre with limited comparison retail offer. It is important to protect and expand custom to the town centre. The linkages and connections to the town centre with the future supermarket at Loch Park will maximise linked shopping trips. Capitalising on the Tesco development, new custom can be generated for the town centre and increase footfall. In the longer term the supermarket could act as a catalyst for additional private sector investment in retail and services in the town centre. I do not consider that the proposed Lidl store will complement the regeneration strategies for the area, and therefore it does not comply with Local Plan Policy COM 3(d).
- 6.31 Finally criteria (e) requires the proposal to promote sustainable development by encouraging the development in accessible places thereby promoting travel by walking, cycling and public transport, minimizing environmental and traffic impact, promoting design quality and taking account of infrastructure implications. The design of the store is broadly acceptable and there have been no objections from consultees. However the site is located at the northern periphery of Carluke and the development is likely to generate increased numbers of trips by car. As a result I do not consider this criteria is satisfied.
- 6.32 Overall, the proposal is situated on an out of centre site and does not provide opportunities to link with the retail core of the town. Protecting the existing level of footfall is critical towards promoting the vitality of town centres and supporting Council strategies. It is considered that the location of this proposed retail development does not support the Council's strategies for the medium to longer term for the town. In addition the impact levels of the proposed store would potentially be detrimental to the vitality and viability of the town centre and it is considered the proposed development would conflict with regeneration strategies for the area. In conclusion, the proposal does not fully demonstrate compliance with Policy COM 3.
- 6.33 A small area of land within the site is affected by Policy RES6 which broadly aims to protect residential amenity. The land in question would form part of the overall access arrangements by providing access to the existing houses adjacent to the site and the adjoining new housing site. To date no planning application has been

submitted for this housing site, however it is likely that access to this land would similarly be via the roundabout irrespective of whether a foodstore is developed due to other site constraints. The impact of this proposal on the existing residents is considered to be acceptable as the store and most of the parking is situated back from these houses. Landscaping will be established around the boundaries to provide a buffer. Noise conditions could be applied to protect residents from noise nuisance while the proposed use is no more intrusive than the previous use of the site as a conservatory factory. The restoration of a derelict land will remove an eyesore and directly benefit nearby residents however any development needs to be acceptable in land use terms. There I am satisfied that the aims of the policy will not be compromised.

- 6.34 Policies ENV11, ENV30 and DM1 seek good quality designs which respect the local context, ensures the provision of adequate parking and access and encourages sustainability and alternatives to car use. In the context of the surroundings there is no cohesive established architectural characteristic. There is a mixture of surrounding land uses and buildings of varying age and design. I believe store could be accommodated on site without any noticeable affect upon the established character and amenity of the area. The re-use of a brownfield site ties in with the principles of sustainability. The highest standards of installation will be incorporated within the fabric of the building. In view of this I am satisfied that there is no contravention of Policies ENV11, ENV30 and DM1.
- 6.35 In terms of national policy on new retail development, Scottish Planning Policy states that the sequential test should be used when selecting locations for all retail uses unless the development plan identifies an exception. This approach requires that locations are considered in the following order: town centre, edge of town centre, other commercial centres identified in the development plan and out of centre locations that are or can be made accessible by a choice of transport modes. Outwith a town centre location a detailed assessment should be undertaken to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of a town centre and the proposal is required to meet a qualitative and quantitative deficiency. Where a proposal is contrary to the development plan, planning authorities should ensure that;
- The sequential approach to site selection has been used
  - There is no unacceptable individual or cumulative impact on the vitality and viability of the identified network of town centres
  - The proposal will help to meet quantitative or qualitative deficiencies identified in the development plan
  - The proposal does not conflict with other significant objectives of the development plan or other relevant strategy.
- 6.36 It has been concluded earlier that, although there are no sequentially preferable sites available elsewhere in the town, overall there would be an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre. Deficiencies in retail provision in Carlisle have been satisfied by the Tesco development which there is no additional capacity shortfall to be remedied. It is also considered that this proposal would undermine the Councils objectives for the town centre. The proposal therefore fails to accord with national policy guidance on retail development.
- 6.37 Planning Permission (CL/07/0166) was refused for a retail store on site in January 2008 on grounds of adverse traffic conditions, a flood risk, contravention of designated land use and that it had not been demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of Carlisle town centre. Roads and



Transportation Services are satisfied that improvements to the access and roundabout can address safety concerns. Flood remediation measures have addressed earlier concerns to the satisfaction of SEPA. The proposal does contravene the housing designation for the site therefore on this occasion a departure from the Local Plan needs to be justified. In this case however the overriding adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre has not been satisfactorily addressed.

6.38 In summary, the following points are noted. Firstly the Council through the preparation of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan addressed the quantitative and qualitative deficiencies in retail provision in Carluke by identifying the site at Loch Park. Secondly, the detailed consent for the site at Loch Park has been approved and is in the process of being implemented. Thirdly, it is the view of the Council that the implementation of that consent will absorb spare retail capacity in the catchment area and as such any further retail provision would have an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Carluke Town Centre. Lastly, after carefully reviewing all supporting information, consultation responses and the circumstances prevailing at the site I consider that the proposal fails to comply with the objectives and policies of the development plan. I therefore recommend that planning permission be refused.

## **7 Reasons for Decision**

7.1 The proposal is contrary to Strategic Policies 1, 6 and 9 of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan and Policy COM3 of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Adopted) and is not consistent with national policy guidance on retail development as set out in Scottish Planning Policy.

**Colin McDowall**  
**Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)**

**16 May 2011**

### **Previous References**

- Refusal of Planning Permission CL/07/0166

### **List of Background Papers**

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ Consultations
  - Environmental Services 15/03/2010
  - Scottish Water 04/03/2010
  - Roads and Transportation Services (South Division) 17/03/2010
  - S.E.P.A. (West Region) (Flooding) 22/09/2010
  - Roads & Transportation Services H.Q.(Transportation) 18/03/2010

## ► Representations

Representation from : Mr & Mrs Parker, c/o D Stewart Toy, 29 High Street, Lanark, ML11 7LU, DATED 16/03/2010

Representation from : Graham Norrie & Lyndsay Robertson, 8 Airdire Road, Carluke, ML8 5EW, DATED 16/03/2010

Representation from : Jean Ward, 19 High Street, Carluke, ML8 4AL, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Claire Bridges, 1 Allan Avenue, Carluke, ML8 5UA, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : J K Morris, 10 High Meadow, Carluke, ML8 4PT, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : D Brooks, 4 Burn Road, Carluke, ML8 5BZ, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Thomas H Weston, 41 Burn Road, Carluke, , DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Amanda S Muncie, 19 Greenfield Road, Carluke, ML8 5DA, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Alan Elder, 17 Buchanan Drive, Carluke, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Mr & Mrs MacMillan, 7 Heather Row, Carluke, , DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : M Nelson, 6 Heather Row, Carluke, ML8 5EG, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : H E Black, 12 Glencoe Road, Carluke, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Jim Murphy, 55 Brown Street, Carluke, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Donna Nelson, 7 Langshaw Crescent, Carluke, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Mary Ramage, 82 Moorside Street, Carluke, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Lorna Stewart, 55 Brown Street, Carluke, ML8 5DT, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : J W Somerville, 19 Burn Road, Carluke, ML8 5BZ, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Susan Merilees, 17 Langshaw Crescent, Carluke, ML8 5AN, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : G & A McLunn, 11 Jackson Place, Carluke, ML8 5LB, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : M E Elder, 17 Buchanan Drive, Carluke, ML8 4RN, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : A McKenzie, Flat 1, Stonefield Gardens, Carluke, ML8 5RS, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : W Thomson, 39 Honeybank Crescent, Carluke, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Mrs Lambert, 28 Burn Road, Carluke, ML8 5BZ, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : Margaret Prentice, 3 Park Circus, Carluke, ML8 5DB, DATED 07/09/2010

Representation from : M Barclay, 68 Douglas Street, Carluke, DATED 11/10/2010

Representation from : Robin Mawhinney, 88 Unitas Crescent, Carluke, ML8 5AP, DATED 09/09/2010

Representation from : G Lawson & R Lawson, 8 Cairnban Court, Carluke, ML8 5RY, DATED 09/09/2010

Representation from : E Frame, 24 Allan Avenue, Carluke, ML8 5UA, DATED 09/09/2010

Representation from : James Gracie, 70 Unitas Crescent, Carluke, ML8 5AW, DATED 09/09/2010

Representation from : E Brownlie, 21 Burn Road, Carluke, ML8 5BZ, DATED 09/09/2010

Representation from : M Cossar, 74 Cairneymount Road, Carluke, DATED 09/09/2010

Representation from : R Fleming, 145 Clyde Street, Carluke, ML8 5BG, DATED 08/09/2010

Representation from : Frazer Lambert, 28 Burn Road, Carluke, ML8 5BZ, DATED 13/09/2010

Representation from : Margaret Kellighan, 6 Yvetot Court, Carluke, DATED 13/09/2010

Representation from : Mr Kevin Edment, 10 Greenfield Road, Carluke, DATED 10/09/2010

Representation from : P Fisher, 39 Glenafeoch Road, Carluke, DATED 13/09/2010

Representation from : William McLean, 106 Miller Street, Carluke, , DATED 13/09/2010

Representation from : Margaret Cringan, 19 Holm Street, Carluke, DATED 21/09/2010

Representation from : C Rea, 68 Brown Street, Carluke, DATED 17/09/2010

Representation from : M Carruthers, 5 Greenfield Road, Carluke, DATED 17/09/2010

Representation from : Lyndsay Hamilton, 12 Airdrie Road, Carluke, ML8 5EW, DATED 05/10/2010

Representation from : Mr & Mrs J McDowall, 165 Wilton Road, Carluke, ML8 4LN, DATED 20/09/2010

Representation from : David Wilson, 1 Castleknowe Gardens, Carluke, , DATED 15/09/2010

Representation from : M Ferrie, 58 Honeybank Crescent, Carluke, ML8 4BZ, DATED 15/09/2010

Representation from : Isabel Norrie, 88 Stewart Street, Carluke, ML8 5BY, DATED 15/09/2010

Representation from : Mr & Mrs Donnelly, 14 Airdrie Road, Carluke, ML8 5EW, DATED

Representation from : Shona Keay, 42 Burn Road, Carluke, ML8 5BZ, DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : John Steele, 12 Bridgend View, Carluke, ML8 4HL, DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : Mr J Good, 33 Burn Road, Carluke, ML8 5BZ, DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : S MacMillan, 8 Glencoe Road, Carluke, , DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : Mrs E Good, 33 Burn Road, Carluke, ML8 5BZ, DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : C McGurk, 13 Elmbank Street, Carluke, DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : E Dickie, 30 Allan Avenue, Carluke, ML8 5UA, DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : Peter B Hamilton, 180 Wilton Road, Carluke, ML8 4LN, DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : G Dickie, 30 Allan Avenue, Carluke, ML8 5UA, DATED 06/09/2010

Representation from : Mr John Sellar, 24 Unitas Crescent, Carluke, DATED 06/10/2010

- Representation from : Mary Ross, 18 Glenburn Terrace, Carluke, DATED 10/09/2010
- Representation from : Kevin Edment, 10 Greenfield Road, Carluke, DATED 10/09/2010
- Representation from : J.M Moulds, 6A Douglas Dale Street, Carluke, ML8 5BH, DATED 10/09/2010
- Representation from : Mr Raymond Edment & Mrs Elizabeth Edment, 10 Greenfield Road, Carluke, DATED 10/09/2010
- Representation from : J Muncie, 19 Greenfield Road, Carluke, DATED 10/09/2010
- Representation from : Mrs June F Ramsey, 17 Airdrie Road, Carluke, ML8 5EW, DATED 23/03/2010
- Representation from : E Mathers, 19 Elmbank Street, Carluke, DATED 14/09/2010
- Representation from : C R Frame, 6 Tarbert Place, Carluke, , DATED 14/09/2010
- Representation from : Lillian Hare, 86 Goremire Road, Carluke, ML8 4PF, DATED 14/09/2010
- Representation from : William Frame, 6 Tarbert Place, Carluke, DATED 14/09/2010
- Representation from : W Ross, 61 Miller Street, Carluke, DATED 30/09/2010

**Contact for Further Information**

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

Ian Hamilton, Planning Officer, South Vennel, Lanark, ML11 7JT  
Ext 3186 (Tel :01555 673186 )  
E-mail: [Enterprise.lanark@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:Enterprise.lanark@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)

**REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

- 1 The proposal is contrary to the terms of Scottish Planning Policy, Strategic Policy 1 and 6, in particular Schedule 6 (c) (i) (c) of the approved Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2006, and Policy COM3 (a) of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan (2009) in that the sequential test is not fully complied with as there would be an unacceptable impact on Carluke town centre. .
- 2 The proposal is contrary to the terms of Scottish Planning Policy, Strategic Policy 6, in particular Schedule 6 (c) (i) (a) of the approved Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2006, and Policy COM3 (c) of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan (2009) in that the applicants have not fully demonstrate that there is capacity for the proposed foodstore.
- 3 The proposal is contrary to the terms of Scottish Planning Policy, Strategic Policy 1 and 6, in particular Schedule 6 (c) (i) (b) and (d) of the approved Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2006, and Policy COM3 (b) of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan (2009) in that there will be an unacceptable cumulative impact on the vitality and viability of Carluke town centre.
- 4 The proposal is contrary to the terms of Scottish Planning Policy, Strategic Policy 6, in particular Schedule 6 (c) (i) (h) of the approved Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2006, and Policy COM3 (e) of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan (2009) in that the application site is located on the northern periphery of Carluke and as a result it is unlikely to encourage sustainable travel patterns.
- 5 The proposal is contrary to the terms of Scottish Planning Policy and Strategic Policy 6, in particular Schedule 6 (c) (i) (j) of the approved Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2006 in that the proposal will not help to meet qualitative or quantitative deficiencies in existing retail provision.
- 6 The proposal is contrary to the terms of Policy COM3 (d) of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan (2009) in that proposal does not complement the Councils regeneration strategies for the area.

For information only



For information only