

Report of Handling for Application 24/00269/FUL

ADDRESS:	1095 Great Western Road Glasgow G12 0AA	Item 3 18th March 2025
PROPOSAL:	Erection of two storey extension and orangery to rear of dwellinghouse and alterations to boundary wall.	

DATE OF ADVERT:	1 March 2024
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	<p>7no neighbour notification letters were issued, the application was advertised in the local press and was also included on the Weekly List of Applications. One representation was received from the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland objecting to the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“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 listing description also specifically refers to the single-storey extension to the rear. The proposal to rebuild it as a two-storey extension, while adding an orangery, will result in the loss of its existing subordinate character... and of the characterful bay window. While some of the proposed changes are of a fairly minor character and could be achieved without too much loss to the character of the villa, those listed above would be highly detrimental to, and represent a loss of, its unique character”.</i> <p>Case Officer Comment: Noted. These issues will be addressed in the relevant sections of this report.</p>
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	<p>None. Historic Environment Scotland (HES) were a statutory consultee for the associated application for Listed Building Consent. Their response noted:</p> <p><i>“The proposals involve substantial alterations to this B-listed Edwardian villa, including significant remodelling and extension to its rear wing and alterations to the historic floor plan of the under-stair rooms and one of the front bedrooms. We encourage amendments that would better respect the historic fabric and floor plan of the house.</i></p> <p><i>4 Whittinghame Gardens is one of a line of 10 villas designed by the architects Fryers & Penman in 1903-4. The other nine are listed at category C; number 4 was listed at category B because its interior was less altered than the others.</i></p> <p><i>The street-facing elevations of the houses follow two similar patterns, but there is more variety to the rear. The rear wings of most of the houses were built to differing massing and footprints, presumably reflecting the individual requirements of the original owners. Comparison with the historic Ordnance Survey maps indicates that the footprints of all these houses remains as they were built, though we are unable to say whether any have been extended upwards. No. 4 was built to a rather more compact plan than the other houses, with a relatively small service wing. The inclusion of a bay window in the service wing is unusual.</i></p> <p><i>The proposals involve substantial duntaking of the service wing to allow construction of an orangery, re-location of the bay window and a 1st floor extension. We encourage your Council to consider whether a less impactful scheme might be feasible. For example, could the orangery be located on the south elevation of the service wing where it would have less impact?</i></p>
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	<p>Formal pre-application reference number 23/01824/PRE. The submitted drawings were by a different architect/agent and not identical to those submitted for the current application for Full Planning Permission. However, as with the current application, the pre-application proposals included a two-storey extension, an orangery, the removal of the servant's wing and significant internal alterations. The Council's response to the proposed works stated:</p> <p><i>“It is considered that this proposed development will detract from the period, style and architectural character of the Category B Listed property. The scale, siting, built form</i></p>

	<p><i>and design of the proposed development fails to protect the character of this Category B Listed property as a building of special architectural and historic interest. The proposed development would give the appearance of an incongruous, over-dominant and disproportionate addition to the Listed Building. The proposed development fails to respect and complement the character and appearance of the historic environment and the special architectural and historic interest of this B-Listed Building".</i></p> <p>No further formal pre-application request was submitted.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

EIA - MAIN ISSUES	NONE
CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
DESIGN OR DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
IMPACT/POTENTIAL IMPACT STATEMENTS – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
S75 AGREEMENT SUMMARY	NOT APPLICABLE
DETAILS OF DIRECTION UNDER REGS 30/31/32	NOT APPLICABLE
NPF4 POLICIES	<p>The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the national spatial strategy for Scotland up to 2045. Unlike previous national planning documents, the NPF4 is part of the statutory development plan and Glasgow City Council as planning authority must assess all proposed development against its policies. The following policies are considered relevant to this application:</p> <p>Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation Policy 7: Historic assets and places Policy 16: Quality homes</p>
CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES	<p>CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle CDP 9: Historic Environment SG 1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2) SG 9: Historic Environment</p>
OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	Historic Environment Scotland - 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions' (2010)
REASON FOR DECISION	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.

Comments	
Planning History	No history of any applications for listed building consent or full planning permission. This is reflected in the HES statutory listing which states: <i>"One of the few remaining villas in this row which is still in single residential use and the last to retain all its original features"</i> .
Siting	<p>The application site is a detached traditional sandstone villa on the south side of Great Western Road. The property has never been sub-divided and is still in its original use as a single dwellinghouse. The property is located in an established residential area (Ward 23). The villa sits within its own grounds, with mature gardens, shrubbery and trees. There is a pedestrian and vehicular entrance from Great Western Road.</p> <p>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.</p>
Design and Materials	<p>External Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial partial-demolition of original servant's wing, including original roof, to allow for the erection of a 1st floor extension. • Removal of west elevation wall, including original bay-window, on servant's wing to accommodate the new 'orangery' extension. • Removal of most of south elevation wall on servant's wing to accommodate new apertures associated with proposed two-storey extension. • Erection of an 'orangery' extension to the remodelled servant's wing. • Removal of original windows on ground floor and 1st floor on rear elevation to allow for internal access to the proposed two-storey extension. • Works to original front boundary wall to widen the existing vehicular access.
Daylight	Due to the property being a detached villa and the siting of the extensions away from the boundaries of the site, the proposed development will not impact on any windows of habitable rooms in the neighbouring dwellings or on the adjoining gardens. Therefore, a 45-degree daylight assessment and sun-on-ground test is not required.
Aspect	The front elevation faces south.
Privacy	Due to 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.
Adjacent Levels	The property slopes from rear (south) to front (north). The house sits at an elevated level to the street at the front.
Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)	The proposed development will not result in the overdevelopment of the private usable garden ground to the rear.
Access and Parking	The proposals involve the widening of the current vehicular access at the front of the property from 2545mm to 3500mm.
Site Constraints	<p>The application property is a Category B Listed building (LB32325). Historic Environment Scotland's statutory description:</p> <p><i>"Fryers & Penman, circa 1903. 2-storey Edwardian villa in Scottish revival style incorporating Scots Baronial and 17th century Renaissance details. Bull-faced red sandstone with ashlar dressings. Cill courses; string course; ashlar mullioned windows with stop-chamfered arrises; cartouche decoration to 1st floor window aprons on N elevation; crowstepped dormerheads to windows breaking eaves.</i></p> <p><i>N (ENTRANCE) ELEVATION: recessed bay to centre with doorway off-centre left, 2-leaf panelled door, screened by full-width loggia/porch with tripartite basket-arched arcade, rope-moulded surround to arches, entrance to centre bay, ashlar balustrade on stone base between arches to flanking bays, balustraded parapet with raised panel to centre with masque decoration. Dormerheaded window off-centre left at 1st floor. Full-height semi-octogonal bay canted out from right angle, regular fenestration, balustraded parapet with urn-like finials to dies. Bay to left with full-height canted</i></p>

	<p>windows of 1-2-1 lights.</p> <p><i>E ELEVATION:</i> deep canted stair window to centre, 3 small windows at ground, 3 tall, transomed stair lights above. Bipartite window to left, dormerheaded bipartite window above. Single storey service wing to outer left.</p> <p><i>S (REAR) ELEVATION:</i> single storey service wing to right. Irregular fenestration at ground and 1st floor.</p> <p><i>W ELEVATION:</i> V-plan window projecting to centre, crenellated parapet. Dormerheaded bipartite window above. Full-height canted windows of 1-2-1 lights to right.</p> <p>Timber sash and case windows. Art Nouveau stained glass panes to upper sashes. Grey/green slate roof, coped ashlar stacks with broader ashlar panels at base flanked by 'beak skewputts'. Cast-iron rainwater goods.</p> <p><i>INTERIOR:</i> fine unaltered Edwardian interior with original Art Nouveau chimneypieces, fixtures and fittings. Stained glass to half-glazed vestibule door with flanking lights. Plain cornices. Wainscott to hall, double return timber stair with balusters, stained glass panels to stair window.</p> <p><i>GARAGE:</i> rectangular-plan. Bull-faced snecked red sandstone, ashlar dressings. Gabled (N) entrance elevation with double doors. E elevation; 2 bipartite windows with single window to outer left. Grey/green slate roof. Ashlar coped skewes.</p> <p><i>GATEPIERS:</i> red sandstone ashlar drum piers with pyramidal caps.</p> <p><i>STATEMENT OF SPECIAL INTEREST:</i> One of the few remaining villas in this row which is still in single residential use and the last to retain all its original features. One of ten villas known as Whittingehame Gardens, designed by Fryers and Penman and built by George Hamilton. There are two designs used for the row (except for No 7). No 4 is the same design as Nos 2, 5 and 9".</p>
<p>Other Comments</p>	<p>Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts require that when an application is made, it shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise. In addition, under the terms of Section 59 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas)(Scotland) Act 1997, the Council is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.</p> <p>The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; b) whether the proposals would impact on the setting of the listed building or nearby listed buildings; c) whether any other material considerations (including objections and supplementary guidance) have been satisfactorily addressed. <p>In order to assess (a) and (b) the proposal must be considered against Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises, Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation and Policy 7: Historic Assets and Places; and Policy CDP9 and SG 9: Historic Environment and CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle and SG 1: Placemaking of the City Development Plan.</p> <p>National Planning Framework 4 (NPF 4)</p> <p>Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises.</p> <p>Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>Policies 1 and 2 are overarching policies which must be taken into consideration for all development proposals: <i>when considering all development proposals significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises.</i></p> <p>Case Officer Comment: The proposed development does not directly address the global climate emergency and nature crises. The proposed development will necessitate the use of new building materials as the proposals involve significant physical works to the property. It is not clear if any original materials will be re-used in the proposed development.</p> <p>Policy 7: Historic assets and places</p>

The intent of Policy 7 (Historic assets and places) is *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*.

Case Officer Comment: The proposed extensions will, effectively, result in the loss of the original servant's wing. The rear elevation of this listed building retains its original appearance, including the unusually ornate bay-windowed servant's wing. The original fenestration, in terms of scale, proportions and positioning, is respected and reflects the historic functions of the rooms to the rear of the building. The proposed two-storey extension and orangery would be prominent on the rear elevation and would significantly harm this B-Listed Building's special architectural and historic interest.

Consequently, it is assessed that the proposed development will not protect nor enhance this historic asset. This development proposal cannot be supported as it will not preserve or enhance the character and special architectural and historic interest of this Category B Listed building.

This application is not considered to be consistent with the aims of Policy 7 of NPF4.

Policy 16: Quality Homes

Policy 16 states that *householder development proposals will be supported where they do 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*.

Case Officer Comment: It is assessed that the proposed development fails to preserve or enhance the character and special architectural and historic interest of this Category B Listed building. The proposed development has been poorly designed and is inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places due to its siting, scale, built form and design. Additionally, the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the character and environmental quality of the home due to its siting, scale, and design. In particular, the incongruity of the proposed extensions, the loss of historic features and detailing and the significant detrimental effect it will have on the special historic character of this Listed Building.

The proposal is not considered to be consistent with the aims of Policy 16 of NPF4.

Glasgow City Development Plan

CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle

Policy 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*.

Case Officer Comment: The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate siting, scale and design will detract from the character and appearance of this Category B Listed property. The proposed works would have a negative impact on the historic environment and fail to respect and complement the character and appearance of the City's heritage and the special architectural and historic interest of the property. Consequently, 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.

This application is, therefore, contrary to CDP 1.

Policy CDP 9: 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.

Case Officer Comment: The proposed development, by virtue of its siting, scale and design, will erode the historic character of this Category B Listed Building. The proposed development would have an overall negative impact on the historic environment. The original characteristics and layout of the property and its traditional design details, make a valuable contribution to the historic character of this Category B Listed Building. It is assessed that this proposed development fails to respect the period, style and architectural character of the application property. Consequently, the proposed development will erode the historic character of the Listed building.

This application is, therefore, contrary to CDP 9.

SG 9: Historic Environment

SG 9 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".

Case Officer Comment: The fundamental principles of this proposed development will detract from the period, style and architectural character of this Category B Listed property. The siting, scale and design of the proposed development fails to enhance or protect the character of this Category B Listed property as a building of special architectural and historic interest.

The proposed extensions and loss of the original servant's wing would give the appearance of an incongruous and unsympathetic alteration to this B-Listed Building and would also detract from the character and appearance of the property. The proposed extensions are not considered to be subservient to the original building. The location, design and scale of the extensions (and the loss of the original servant's wing) would adversely affect the appearance and the special architectural and historic interest of this Category B Listed building.

Overall, the proposed development fails to respect and complement the character and appearance of the historic environment and the special architectural and historic interest of this Category B Listed building.

This application is, therefore, contrary to SG 9.

Supplementary Guidance SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2), Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens

This guidance sets out the planning requirements for alterations to dwellings and gardens for particular types of householder developments, such as extensions. It outlines the criteria that must be met in relation to, for example design and daylighting. It seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to houses 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. The following is an extract of the guidance that applies to all extensions:

- *The siting, form, scale, proportions and detailed design should be in keeping with the existing building and wider area.*
- *High quality innovative design is encouraged where it will complement the property.*
- *Extensions and other alterations to dwellings should be designed so they do not dominate the existing building, or neighbouring buildings.*
- *External materials should reflect the character of the original building and the street.*
- *Extensions should relate to the design of the original dwelling and should be subordinate in scale and design.*

Case Officer Comment: The proposal is considered to be contrary to SG 1 in that the two-storey extension and orangery, by virtue of their inappropriate 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 extensions are not considered to be of a high-quality innovative design and do not reflect the special historic character of the original building. The proposed development will prejudice the prevailing architectural character of the property. The anomalous appearance of the proposed development does not reflect the character of the original building 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.

The proposal is considered to be contrary to SG 1.

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".*

Case Officer Comment: The proposed extension and orangery are not considered to protect or enhance the character and appearance of this Category B Listed building. The extensions and the substantial demolition of the original servant's wing would result in the loss of historic features which make a substantial contribution to the special interest of this building. As noted above, the rear elevation of the building retains its original appearance and makes a significant contribution to the special architectural and historic interest of the property. The original fenestration, in terms of scale, proportions and positioning, is respected and reflects the historic functions of the rooms to the rear of the building. The proposed two-storey extension and orangery would be prominent on the rear elevation and, in combination with the loss of the original servant's wing, would harm the building's special architectural and historic interest.

Whilst there are similar structures attached to other properties within the Whittinghame Gardens group of villas to the extensions which are proposed in this application, these cannot be considered as a 'precedent'. Each application has to be considered on its own merits. To grant this application based exclusively on the 'precedent' of an earlier development or entirely on the context of other developments in the local area would be a regressive step and ultimately detrimental to the special architectural and historic interest of this Category B Listed building. While there is a need to maintain consistency in the consideration of points of merit, this is not the same as a 'precedent'. No two applications are the same and each proposal must be determined on its own merits while paying special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

It is considered that the proposed two-storey extension and orangery (and loss of the servant's wing), despite being on a secondary (rear) elevation, would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the rear facade of this Category B Listed Building.

In respect of **c)**, other material considerations include the views of statutory and other consultees and the contents of letters of representations. The comments received from Historic Environment Scotland and the issues raised in the representation have been considered and addressed above.

It is considered, for the reasons outlined in the report above, this application is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan. On the basis of the foregoing, it is recommended that this application for Full Planning permission be **refused**.

Recommendation	Refuse

Date: 05.09.2024	DM Officer	Jamie McArdle
Date	DM Manager	