



**Glasgow City Council**  
**Planning Local Review Committee**

**Item 1**

**18th March 2025**

**Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration  
and Sustainability**

**Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654**

**24/00218/LOCAL – 1095 Great Western Road G12 0AA**

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

**Purpose of Report:**

To provide the Committee with a summary of the relevant considerations in the  
above review.

**Recommendations:**

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

Ward No(s): 23 – Partick Citywide: N/A  
East/Kelvindale

consulted: Yes  No

Local member(s) advised: Yes  No

**PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:**

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

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

## **1 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS**

- 1.1 The application site is a detached traditional sandstone villa on the south side of Great Western Road. The property is located in an established residential area (Ward 23). The villa sits within its own grounds, with combination of mature gardens, shrubbery and trees.
- 1.2 The application property forms part of a group of 10no villas known as Whittingehame Gardens. As with the other 9no villas, the application property possesses an impressive traditional architectural character in terms of design, style, scale and materials. However, the application property is Category B Listed whereas the other properties are C-Listed.
- 1.3 To the rear, there is an original single-storey pitched roof servant's wing and a detached garage to the south west corner.
- 1.4 It is proposed to demolish part of the original servant's wing, including the original roof, to accommodate a first floor extension. To remove the west elevation wall, including an original bay-window on the servant's wing, to accommodate the new 'orangery' extension. To remove the south elevation wall on the servant's wing to accommodate new apertures associated with the proposed two-storey extension. To erect an 'orangery' extension to the servant's wing. To remove original windows on the ground floor and 1st floor on the rear elevation to allow for internal access to the proposed two-storey extension.
- 1.5 It is proposed to widen the original boundary wall to the front to form a vehicular access.
- 1.6 The materials and roof design of the extension are proposed to match the existing.

## **2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

- 2.1 NPF4 was adopted by the Scottish Ministers on 13 February 2023 and is part of the statutory Development Plan. Where there is an area of incompatibility it is expected that the newest policy document will take precedence, which will be NPF4 for the time being.

In this case, the relevant policies from NPF4 are:

- Policy 16: Quality homes
- Policy 7: Historic assets and places

- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies are:
  - CDP1: The Placemaking Principle
  - CDP9: Historic Environment

- 2.3 The relevant Supplementary Guidance is:

- SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2)
- SG9: Historic Environment

2.4 Historic Environment Scotland (HES) - Managing change in the Historic Environment: Extensions and External Walls and HES New Design in Historic Settings.

### **3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)**

3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

01. The proposal is not considered to be in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, as it will not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and its setting and will adversely impact on its special architectural or historic interest.
02. The development proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 16 and 7; CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle and CDP9: Historic Environment; SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2, Residential Development - Alterations to Dwellings & Gardens) and SG9: Historic Environment of the City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) and HES guidance 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.

#### **4 APPEAL STATEMENT**

- 4.1 A summary of the material points raised in the appeal statement is given below.
  01. The siting of the extension is to the rear of the dwelling, with no side or front protrusions or visual elements that would directly impact the view of the existing dwelling from any member of the public from any vantage point surrounding the site. The scale of the proposed extension is appropriate and similar to the nine other servants' wings to the rear of the surrounding villas from the same period. The proposal meets the requirements outlined in SG9.
  02. The design of the proposed Orangery is similar to other historical architecture from the same area. The materials proposed are all specified to match the existing dwelling; the window design matches the existing property; the roof is a slate ridged roof to match the surrounding villas. The proposals comply fully with SG9 and SG1.
  03. The design proposal was to improve the amenity for the owners of the dwelling by providing a layout that is more suited to modern-day living. The proposed design, scale and materials meet the Council's own 'highest standards of design' set in the supplementary guidance for SG9.
  04. The design respects the quality and character of the historic environment; its design is a direct reflection of the surrounding servant's wings in scale, design, location and materiality, therefore respecting the character of the historic environment.
  05. The surrounding villas have individually designed servants' wings, each one designed specifically to suit the requirements of the original families occupying the houses at the time. These servants wings vary in size, scale and design, but all are larger than the existing servant's wing on the application site, which is the smallest of all of the ten villas. All of the servants' wings are of a traditional style

with sandstone finish and slate pitched roofs; the proposed extension to the servant' wing has been specifically designed to reflect the other two storey servants' wings in style, scale and materiality, thus specifically respecting the period, style and architectural character of the listed property.

06. The scale of the proposal is in-keeping with the surrounding villas, proposed to the rear of the property, and is sympathetic to the existing property in all aspects, and so the proposals cannot be described as 'incongruous' as they are harmonious and in keeping with the surroundings.
07. The original servant's wing is not being lost, it is being extended and reconfigured. The servant's wings to all 10 properties comprising Whittingeham Gardens were built to varying sizes and masses to suit specific user requirements
08. The proposed development is in the same character as the existing property, designed to reflect the period of the existing dwelling and all surrounding dwellings in scale, design and materials. The proposal complements the property perfectly as demonstrated by the historical precedents along the same row of houses, which have successfully complemented the main houses for decades.
09. The proposed extension cannot be described as dominating the existing property; its scale is subservient to the main house in all aspects, it is contained to the rear of the property and the existing main house is entirely unaffected visually from all aspects of public view. The proposed extension does not affect residential amenity to the house or any surrounding houses by complying with all relative policies in SG9 and SG1.
10. The applicant did not request any further procedure in the determination of the application.

## **5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS**

- 5.1 One representation was received from the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland. They objected as below:
  - The proposed sub-division of the front bedroom (Bedroom 2), inserting a bathroom into it, is contrary to CDP, SG9, para 2.112. This is an unusually shaped room, incorporating the large 'tower' window, and to sub-divide it in this way would be to obliterate completely the original proportions of the room. The proposal to rebuild it as a two-storey extension, however, by adding an orangery, will result in the loss of its existing subordinate character and of the characterful bay window.
- 5.2 There were no representations to this Review.

## 6 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Committee should consider if the following are in accordance with NPF4, the relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance, and if there are material considerations which outweigh the Development Plan considerations.

6.2 The following are the relevant policy considerations:

6.3 **NPF4 Policy 16: Quality Homes; NPF4 Policy 7: Historic assets and places; CDP1/SG1: The Placemaking Principle and CDP9/SG9: Historic Environment**

**NPF4 Policy 16** Intent: To encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable homes, in the right locations, providing choice across tenures that meet the diverse housing needs of people and communities across Scotland.

The relevant policy guidance is:

- g) Householder development proposals will be supported where they:
- not have a detrimental impact on the character or environmental quality of the home and the surrounding area in terms of size, design and materials; and
  - do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.

**NPF4 Policy 7** Intent: To protect and enhance historic environment assets and places. Policy 7 states that development proposals for the reuse, alteration or extension of a listed building will only be supported where they will preserve its character, special architectural or historic interest and setting. Relevant considerations include the:

- architectural and historic character of the area;
- existing density, built form and layout; and
- context and siting, quality of design and suitable materials.

Committee should note:

- The external alterations included within this proposal are to the rear of the dwellinghouse.
- The building is category B listed.
- The site slopes from rear (south) to front (north).

Committee should consider whether:

- The proposed development affects the architectural character of the listed building.
- The loss of the original servant's wing, in particular its ornate bay window and original fenestration, will impact on the character of the listed building.

**CDP 1** is an overarching Policy which must be considered for all development proposals to help achieve the key aims of the Glasgow City Development Plan. CDP 1 states that new development should aspire towards the highest standards of design while providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents in the City. New development should respect the environment by responding to its qualities and character, while protecting the City's heritage.

**SG1 (Part 2): Placemaking Principle** includes the following specific policy advice:

#### Residential Development - Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens

This guidance outlines the criteria that must be met in relation to, for example design and materials, privacy and overlooking and daylighting and sunlight. It seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to houses and flats are carefully designed, so that the visual amenity of residential buildings and areas is not adversely affected by over-dominant extensions and that residential amenity is not reduced e.g. by the excessive reduction of useable private garden space or a loss of privacy. To ensure the visual amenity of residential streets, the Council will also, where it is able, seek to limit the areas of front gardens given over to car parking.

Design and Materials – The following guidance applies:

- a) the siting, form, scale, proportions, detailed design and use of materials should be in keeping with the existing building and wider area;
- b) high quality innovative design is encouraged where it will complement the property;
- c) extensions and other alterations to dwellings should be designed so they do not dominate the existing building, or neighbouring buildings; and
- d) external materials should reflect the character of the original building and the street and the windows and doors in an extension should match those of the existing property.

Committee should note:

- The extension is proposed to be constructed in materials to match the original dwellinghouse, in accordance with policy.

Committee should consider whether:

- The siting, form, scale, proportions, detailed design and use of materials are in keeping with the existing building and wider area.
- The proposed development dominates the existing building or neighbouring buildings.
- The external materials proposed reflect the character of the original building and street and the windows and doors match those of the existing property.

Front to Rear Access – The following guidance applies:

Extensions should not be built up to a common boundary thereby blocking off the only route around the house for garden equipment and refuse bins. All extensions, garages, etc., should be set back from the side property boundary by at least 900 mm to allow external movement of refuse bins, garden equipment etc from the front to the rear of the property.

Committee should note:

- Front to rear access will be maintained, in compliance with policy.

Useable Private Garden Space – The following guidance applies:

A minimum of 66% of the original useable private garden space (adequately screened land, usually to the rear and side of the property, including decking but excluding driveways, garages and any parking spaces) should be retained in all house plots after extensions, garages, and outbuildings, etc., have been built, to avoid over-development of the site. Adequate car parking shall be maintained within the curtilage of the property after any extension or structure is erected.

Committee should note:

- No changes to the private garden space are proposed. The proposed development will not result in the development of more than 34% of the rear private usable garden

Privacy and Overlooking – The following guidance applies:

- a) There should be no adverse impact on existing or proposed accommodation;
- b) Windows of habitable rooms should not increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms;
- c) At ground floor level, screening of 1.8 metre high will usually be required along boundaries where new windows face neighbouring properties;
- d) Above ground floor level, windows of habitable rooms which directly face each other, including dormers, should be at least 18m apart and at least 10m from the site boundary. These distances do not apply to rooflights; and
- e) Obscure glazing in windows of habitable rooms is not considered an acceptable means to mitigate against privacy issues.

Exceptions to these distances may be made in situations where windows are at an angle to each other, or, for ground floor rooms, effective permanent screening either exists, or can be erected.

Committee should note:

- The property being a detached villa and the siting of the extensions a suitable distance away from the boundaries of the site, there will be no significant detrimental amenity impact in terms of overlooking/privacy.

Daylight and Sunlight – The following guidance applies:

Extensions should not cause a significant loss of daylight to any habitable room of neighbouring properties or significantly block sunlight to adjacent private gardens. There should be no significant adverse impact on either existing adjacent properties, or the proposed accommodation.

The following assessments are used to assess this impact:

- a) single storey extensions will be assessed using the 45° test. Failure on both the elevation and plan would result in a significant loss of daylight to the habitable rooms in the neighbouring house and will not be acceptable;
- b) two storey extensions, or larger, shall be assessed for their impact on habitable rooms of neighbouring properties using the 'Vertical Sky Component'; and
- c) the impact of extensions on private garden ground should be assessed, where considered necessary, using the 'Calculation of Sun on the Ground' test. Applicants should submit this information where requested using three points in time: 9a.m, 12midday and 3pm, for the Spring Equinox. The impact of the original dwellinghouse must be shown at these times as well as the impact of the proposed extension, to see whether the proposed extension will significantly increase the effect on neighbouring property.

Committee should note:

- The applicant has not provided any assessment, but this was not requested during the application and was not considered to be of significant concern due to the siting and orientation of this property and neighbouring properties.
- Committee should consider whether the proposals will adversely impact neighbouring residents' daylight or sunlight.

### Extensions

Extensions should generally have a pitched roof, should not project in front of the building line, should relate to the design of the original dwellinghouse, and should be subordinate to the original dwelling house in scale and design. Flat roofs on single storey extensions, if a high quality modern design, may be considered as long as the scale and design are appropriate for the existing dwelling.

### One and a Half and Two Storey Extensions – Rear Extensions

To reduce the dominance of the extension, two storey rear extensions should also have a ridgeline well below the ridge of the existing house and should not generally be deeper than half the depth of the house.

Committee should note:

- The proposed extension has a pitched roof, in compliance with policy. This roofline will mirror the existing design.
- The proposed materials will match the existing dwelling.

Committee should consider whether:

- The proposed extension relates to the design of the original listed building.
- The proposed extension is subordinate to the original dwellinghouse.

**CDP9: Historic Environment** This Policy aims to ensure the appropriate protection, enhancement and management of Glasgow's heritage assets by providing clear guidance to applicants. The Council will assess the impact of proposed developments and support high quality design that respects and complements the character and appearance of the historic environment and the special architectural or historic interest of its listed buildings. The Council is unlikely to support development that would have a negative impact on the historic environment.

### **SG 9: Historic Environment**

This Policy states that all works must be carried out in a way which respects the character and quality of Listed Buildings and conservation areas. In terms of specific guidance for the works proposed in this application, SG 9 states: "Proposals for the extension of a Listed Building must ensure that the scale is subservient to the original building. Its location, design, scale, massing and proportion protects the building's appearance, character and setting. The detailed design and use of materials complement the building's period, style and character".

Committee should note:

- The neighbouring villas have two storey service wings to the rear.
- The new materials proposed are minimal, and it is proposed to reuse the existing sandstone removed from the west and south elevation. The proposed Orangery has traditional ornate aesthetic, reflecting the Orangery of adjoining villas.

Committee should consider whether:

- The proposal impacts the original characteristics, layout of the property and its traditional design
- The fundamental principles of this proposed development will detract from the period, style and architectural character of this listed property.

### **Historic Environment Scotland - 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions'**

The HES document 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions' (2010) advises that: "Extensions must protect the character and appearance of the building."

“Most historic buildings can sustain some degree of sensitive alteration or extension to accommodate continuing or new uses. Yet historic buildings vary in the extent to which they can accommodate change without loss to special interest. Some present the opportunity to promote design intervention that would not have been possible without the historic building as a creative spark. Others are sensitive even to slight alterations. This is especially so of buildings with important interiors”.

“An addition or extension should play a subordinate role. It should not dominate the original building as a result of its scale, materials or location, and should not overlay principal elevations”. “An extension that would unbalance a symmetrical elevation and threaten the original design concept should be avoided”.

“An extension should be modestly scaled and skilfully sited”.

In terms of extensions to the roof, such as that to the servant’s wing, the guidance states: “Where the external form is significant to the character of the building, or where the internal structure and decoration have historic interest, a roof extension will not be appropriate that destroys this or requires such a high degree of new supporting structure that only the facades of the historic building remain”.

Committee should consider whether:

- The proposed development preserves or enhance the character, setting, special architectural and historic interest of the category B listed building.
- The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the character and environmental quality of the home in terms of its siting, scale and design.
- The proposed development respects the quality and character of the historic environment and protects the City's heritage.
- 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.
- They are completely satisfied with the standards of the proposed design,
- They are completely satisfied that the amenity of the existing dwellinghouse will be preserved.

## **7 COMMITTEE DECISION**

7.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with the same or different conditions from those listed below; or
- b. Refuse planning permission.
- c. Continue the review to request further information.

## 8 Policy and Resource Implications

### Resource Implications:

*Financial:* n/a

*Legal:* n/a

*Personnel:* n/a

*Procurement:* n/a

**Council Strategic Plan:** n/a

### Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

*Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2021-25? Please specify.* n/a

*What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?* no significant impact

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

### Climate Impacts:

*Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions? Please specify:* n/a

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

*Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?* n/a

**Privacy and Data  
Protection Impacts:**

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

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

**9 Recommendations**

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