



Item 4

13th May 2025

Neighbourhoods, Regeneration
and Sustainability
Glasgow City Council
Exchange House
231 George Street
Glasgow, G1 1RX
www.glasgow.gov.uk

Executive Director
George Gillespie
BEng (Hons) CEng MICE

Ninety One Architects
Per Claudio Marini
Baltic Chambers
50 Wellington Street
GLASGOW
G2 6HJ

Our ref: DECISION
GCC Application Ref: **24/00269/FUL**

6 September 2024

Dear Sir/Madam

SITE: 1095 Great Western Road Glasgow G12 0AA

PROPOSAL: Erection of two storey extension and orangery to rear of dwellinghouse and alterations to boundary wall.

I am obliged to inform you that a decision to refuse your application, **24/00269/FUL** has now been taken.

A copy of the decision notice is attached with any appropriate notes which should be read together with the decision.

The decision notice is a legal document and should be retained for future reference.

Should you require any additional information regarding the decision, please contact the case officer **Jamie McArdle** on direct phone **0141 287 6042**, or email james.mcardle@drs.glasgow.gov.uk, who will be happy to help you.

Yours faithfully

Head of Planning

Encls.



PLANNING DECISION NOTICE

Full Planning Permission REFUSAL

IN RESPECT OF APPLICATION **24/00269/FUL**

Erection of two storey extension and orangery to rear of dwellinghouse and alterations to boundary wall.

AT

1095 Great Western Road Glasgow G12 0AA

AS SHOWN ON THE FOLLOWING SUBMITTED PLAN(S)

Reason(s) for decision

01. The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.
02. The development proposal is contrary to Policy 7: Historic Assets & Places and Policy 16: Quality Homes of the National Planning Framework 4, CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle, CDP 9: Historic Environment, SG 9: Historic Environment and SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2, Residential Development - Alterations to Dwellings & Gardens) of the Glasgow City Development Plan as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.
03. The proposal is contrary to Policy 7: Historic Assets & Places of National Planning Framework 4 in that the extensions fail to preserve or enhance the character, setting, special architectural and historic interest of this Category B Listed Building due to its inappropriate siting, scale and design.
04. The proposal is contrary to Policy 16: Quality Homes of National Planning Framework 4 in that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the character and environmental quality of the home in terms of its of siting, scale and design.
05. The proposal is contrary to CDP 1 of the City Development Plan in that the proposed development fails to meet the highest standards of design while providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents in the City. Furthermore, the proposed development fails to respect the quality and character of the historic environment and does not protect the City's heritage.

06. The proposal is contrary to CDP 9 of the City Development Plan in that the proposed development, by virtue of its siting, scale and design, will erode the historic character and special architectural interest of this Category B Listed Building. The proposed development fails to respect the period, style and architectural character of the Listed building.
07. The proposed extensions and loss of the original servant's wing are contrary to SG 9 of the City Development Plan in that by reason of their siting, scale and design, they fail to preserve or enhance the character of this Category B Listed property as a building of special architectural and historic interest. The proposed extensions and the resultant loss of the original servant's wing does not respect the period, style and architectural character of this Category B Listed property. The proposed extensions would give the appearance of an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the Listed Building and would also detract from the character and appearance of the property. The proposed extensions and loss of the original servant's wing would adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of this Category B Listed building.
08. The proposal is contrary to SG 1 of the City Development Plan in that the extensions, by virtue of their siting, scale and design will visually detract from the character and appearance of the property and would not be in keeping with the existing dwelling. The proposed development will prejudice the prevailing architectural character of the property and does not complement the property. The proposed development will give the appearance of an incongruous and disproportionate addition to the dwelling which would dominate the existing building to the detriment of visual and residential amenity.

Drawings

The development has been refused in relation to the following drawing(s)

1. L(0-)00 Location Plan Received 5 February 2024
2. L(0-)01 Proposed Block Plan Received 5 February 2024
3. L(2-)01C Proposed Floor Plans Received 5 February 2024
4. L(2-)02C Proposed Elevations Received 5 February 2024
5. L(2-)03 Proposed Boundary Wall Received 16 February 2024

As qualified by the above reason(s), or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority



Dated: 6th September 2024

Head of Planning

THIS DECISION NOTICE SHOULD BE READ WITH THE ATTACHED ADVICE NOTES

IMPORTANT NOTES ABOUT THIS REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

BY THIS NOTICE, YOUR PROPOSAL HAS BEEN REFUSED.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL

If you are not satisfied with this refusal of planning permission, you may request a review within **three months** of the date on this notice. Please note that the right of appeal is to the Planning Local Review Committee of the Council and **not** to Scottish Ministers.

Before pursuing a review, you should consider contacting your case officer to discuss whether there are changes which could be made to the proposed development to make it acceptable. The case officer's contact details are on the letter accompanying this Decision Notice. Your case officer can also advise on how a fresh application could be submitted. Please note that if you do submit a fresh application within 12 months, you would be unlikely to have to pay a further planning fee.

Before contacting the case officer, you would be well advised to view the report on the application. It is available for inspection [online](#). The report explains how the decision was reached and should help you decide whether to proceed with further discussion or a review. If your application was granted subject to conditions, it may be clear from the terms of the report that any conditions which you might be concerned about are necessary.

A notice of review must be served on the Planning Local Review Committee by submitting online at <https://www.eplanning.scot/ePlanningClient/>

The notice of review must include a statement setting out your reasons for requiring the Planning Local Review Committee to review this case. You must state by what procedure (written representations, hearing session(s), inspection of application site) or combination of procedures you wish the review to be conducted. However, please note that the Planning Local Review Committee will decide on the review procedure to be followed.

You must also include with the notice of review a copy of this decision notice, the planning application form, the plans listed on the decision notice and any other documents forming part of the proposed development as determined. If you have a representative, you must give their name and address. Please state whether any notice or other correspondence should be sent to the representative instead of to you.