

# Report of Handling for Application 24/00057/FUL

<p>Item 3</p> <p>21st January 2025</p>
--

<b>ADDRESS:</b>	Site On Corner Of Queens Park Avenue/ Crosshill Avenue Glasgow
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of detached dwellinghouse - material variation to 22/00568/FUL to incorporate a detached single storey garage.

<b>DATE OF ADVERT:</b>	23 February 2024
<b>NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED</b>	<p>3 representations received (summarised below):</p> <p>Consent is being sought for a garage, in essentially the same location, with the same visual impact as the previously unsupported structure.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>It is agreed that there are similarities in terms of siting. However, the previous proposal sought consent for a garage with an upper storey for use as a workshop studio.</p> <p>The absence of visible garages along the street contributes to the unique aesthetic appeal of the neighbourhood.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>Agreed. The proposal is contrary to SG 1 and 9. Further details are provided under the heading "Other Comments".</p> <p>Concern expressed regarding the viability of the lawson cypress should the proposal proceed.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>Given the proximity of this 4m high tree to the proposed garage, its survival is highly unlikely were the proposal proceed. Further details below under "Other Comments".</p> <p>The application wrongly labels the site as undeveloped; it was a garden before being sold.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>It's assumed that this description references the recent planning application, 22/00568/FUL- Erection of detached dwellinghouse which is yet to be implemented.</p> <p>Inconsistency with Environmental Policies: A two-car garage contradicts the council's emissions reduction and space-saving policies.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>There is nothing in the City Development Plan that specifically precludes the development of a two-car garage.</p> <p>The application aims to connect to the drainage network and water supply without addressing flooding risks. Queens Park Avenue faces annual flooding and is particularly bad at the entrance with Crosshill Avenue.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>This proposal seeks to include a garage as part of a larger and previously consented proposal. These issues were addressed at that time and would not form part of the assessment for the current proposal.</p>
<b>PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES</b>	No consultations undertaken

<b>PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS</b>	<p>The applicant and agent did not seek pre-application advice or discussions with Glasgow City Council prior to submission of this application. Therefore, the case officer was unable to provide advice on whether the proposed development complied with the relevant Policy and Guidance of NPF 4 and the City Development Plan.</p> <p>The Council has formalised the means for obtaining pre-application advice of this type in order to make this stage of the Planning process more accessible and efficient for applicants, agents and Planning staff. The Council welcomes pre-application discussions between the applicant, their agent(s) and its planning staff in advance of making an application for any scale of development. As stated above, the agent and applicant failed to avail themselves of this service.</p> <p>But it should be noted that discussions regarding the siting of a garage at this location within the site raised concerns about the impact on the street and wider conservation area. As a result the original approval for the house was amended to remove the garage from this location. There has been no change in circumstances that would merit the siting of a garage in this location.</p>
---------------------------------	--

<b>EIA - MAIN ISSUES</b>	NONE
<b>CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>DESIGN OR DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>IMPACT/POTENTIAL IMPACT STATEMENTS – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>S75 AGREEMENT SUMMARY</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>DETAILS OF DIRECTION UNDER REGS 30/31/32</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>NPF4 POLICIES</b>	<p>The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the national spatial strategy for Scotland up to 2045. Unlikely 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 the application:</p> <p><b>Policy 1:</b> Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises  <b>Policy 2:</b> Climate Mitigation and Adaptation  <b>Policy 7:</b> Historic Assets and Places  <b>Policy 14:</b> Design, Quality and Place  <b>Policy 16:</b> Quality Homes</p>
<b>CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES</b>	<p><b>CDP 1:</b> The Placemaking Principle  <b>SG 1:</b> Placemaking, Part 2  <b>CDP 2 – Sustainable Spatial Strategy</b>  <b>CDP 9/SG 9:</b> Historic Environment</p>
<b>OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	Crosshill Conservation Area
<b>REASON FOR DECISION</b>	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.

Comments	
<b>Planning History</b>	22/00568/FUL- Erection of detached dwellinghouse- GC 20/01151/PRE Erection of residential development - CLO 19/03370/FUL Erection of detached dwellinghouse - renewal of planning permission 16/02744/DC Variation of planning condition 01 of planning consent 15/02650/DC: Variation of condition 01 of planning consent 14/01941/DC to facilitate the installation of 3 new windows and erection of garage to side of dwelling house, to facilitate the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of dwellinghouse – GC 15/02650/DC Variation of condition 01 of planning consent 14/01941/DC to facilitate the installation of 3 new windows and erection of garage to side of dwelling house – GC 14/01941/DC Erection of detached dwellinghouse – GC 11/00850/DC Erection of detached dwellinghouse – GC
<b>Site Visits (Dates)</b>	Application determined using Google Maps and drawings provided.
<b>Siting</b>	This application site is located on the corner of Queens Park Avenue and Crosshill Avenue within the Crosshill Conservation Area in the southside of the city. Ward 8 – Southside Central  This proposal has been submitted further to a recent application, 22/00568/FUL, which gained consent for the erection of detached two-storey dwellinghouse.
<b>Design and Materials</b>	The proposed double garage would measure 9.2m (south east elevation and north west) x 5.9m (south west and north east elevation) and would be 3m high. <b>External materials:</b> Door: Up and over steel garage door (pale brown) Walls-Lunawood Luna panel system (tongue and groove cladding arrangement). Roof: Capping in Pimento by VMZinc Rainwater pipes and hoppers-Alumasc PPC rainwater pipes and hoppers (PPC to match cladding)-colour to be decided.
<b>Daylight</b>	No development plan policy failures.
<b>Aspect</b>	North eastern corner of plot.
<b>Privacy</b>	No development plan policy failures.
<b>Adjacent Levels</b>	Relatively flat.
<b>Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)</b>	Considering the main entrance is off Crosshill Avenue, the garage is forward of the front elevation of the dwellinghouse and so the proposal does not impact usable private garden space.
<b>Access and Parking</b>	No development plan policy failures. Front to rear access is maintained. Two off street parking spaces formed part of the previous consented proposal. This proposal changes this only from the point of view that these would be within a garage.
<b>Site Constraints</b>	Battle Of Langside/ Crosshill Conservation Area/ Coal Authority - High Risk
<b>Other Comments</b>	<b>Assessment</b> 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. Section 64 of the same Act requires the Council to pay special regard to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area, including the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.  The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be:

- a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan;
- b) whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or the appearance of the Conservation Area;
- c) whether the proposals would impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings;
- d) whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed.

In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises of NPF4 adopted 13<sup>th</sup> February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted on the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2017.

#### **NPF4**

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 in or affecting conservation areas will only be supported where the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced*. *Relevant considerations include the:*

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

The objective of Policy 14 (Design, Quality & Place) is *to encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the Place Principle*. *Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale*. *Development proposals that are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported*.

Policy 16 (Quality Homes) 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*.

**Comment: The proposal is not considered to be consistent with the aims of Policy 7, Policy 14 and Policy 16 of NPF4.**

The redevelopment of the site to accommodate a house has been established with the previous consent.

During the negotiations associated with that previous consent, 22/00568/FUL, the siting of a garage and workshop in this location, forward of the building line and in close proximity to the road and mature trees was considered to be unacceptable. The proposal was amended to remove this part of the development and consent granted on that basis.

This proposal aims to reinstate that feature, albeit at a lower scale.

Extensive discussions were undertaken in order to take account of the new houses frontage onto Queens Park Avenue. This garage would undermine those discussions and the final decision which was reached.

Whilst more detail is provided below through scrutiny of the relevant City Development Plan policies, it is assessed that the proposed development fails to preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the Crosshill Conservation Area due to its inappropriate siting, built form and design.

Furthermore, the proposed development has not been designed to improve the quality of the area. It is assessed that the proposed development has been poorly designed, will be detrimental to the amenity of the area and is inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places due to its siting, built form and design.

In relation to Policy 1 and Policy 2 of NPF4, the proposed development will not make any significant contribution to tackling the climate and nature crises. Although a

relatively small-scale development, the proposed works will still necessitate the use of new building materials.

**To reiterate, the proposal is not considered to be consistent with the aims of Policy 7, Policy 14 and Policy 16 of NPF4.**

**SG1: Placemaking, Part 2** sets out guidance for residential dwellings and associated garages

**Free-standing Garages** - Garages should:

- a) be set a minimum of 6 metres back from the rear edge of the public/common footpath, except in private lanes where they may be set on the boundary;
- b) have a pitched roof, unless well screened from public view;
- c) not extend in front of the established building line (see Definition); and
- d) be finished in materials to match the original house.

**SG 9\_ Historic Environment** provides further guidance:

**Car Parking, Driveways, Garages and Outbuildings**

All proposals to form parking areas or garages in a garden will firstly have to meet the standards set out in SG 1 - The Placemaking Principle, Detailed Guidance on Development Affecting Residential Property.

**Domestic Garages, Sheds and Outbuildings** - The design of garages, sheds and outbuildings should incorporate a ridged or mono-pitched roof, and walls in a material sympathetic to the main property; green roof systems or designs incorporating a contemporary modern design and materials will be considered on their own merits. Alternatively, a good quality timber structure with ridged felt roof may be acceptable dependent on prevailing architecture within the area. Paintwork should match the colour scheme of the dwelling.

Garages, sheds and outbuildings should be located to the rear of the property or where least open to public view. The structure should be subsidiary in scale and sympathetic in design, and should respect the character of the Listed Building and/or Conservation Area.

**Comment:**

Contrary to SG1 the garage has been located forward of the established building line and is not located within the rear of the property. Similarly the siting of the garage, only 1m from the boundary wall on Queen Park Avenue and, at the closest point, only 2m from the boundary of Crosshill Avenue does not correspond with the above guidance which states that " Garages should be set a minimum of 6 metres back from the rear edge of the public/common footpath".

The siting of the garage, forward of the front elevation of the property and on the corner of Queen Park Avenue (it will protrude 1.4m above the main boundary wall at this point and is as close as 1m to it) and Crosshill Avenue (it will protrude 1.9m beyond the wall on this elevation and at the closest point is only 2m from the boundary) will be readily observable and will, therefore, have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the property and conservation area.

Furthermore the front elevation of the garage comprises a 9.2m wide featureless, timber wall that fronts Queen Park Avenue and a 5.9m wall fronts Crosshill Avenue.

All trees have been removed from this corner of the plot and the remaining one, a 4m high lawson cypress, would be highly unlikely to survive given its proximity to the garage. The tree survey provided indicates that the tree is classified as B which means that its retention is desirable. The tree survey also indicates that this tree is located 1.2m from the southern boundary wall. If the site plan as proposed (L(--))01 is

	<p>correct then this would mean the tree would require removal. Given that all other trees fronting Queen Park Avenue in this location have been removed, this would mean complete visibility of this structure from both Queens Park Avenue and Crosshill Avenue to the detriment of visual amenity.</p> <p>In term of (b) above, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or the appearance of the Conservation Area for the reasons detailed above.</p> <p>In terms of (c) above, whilst there are listed buildings in the vicinity of the application site, non are directly impacted by the proposal.</p> <p>In terms of (d) noted above, no consultations were deemed necessary and 3 representations were received and responded to above. No further material considerations have been identified.</p> <p>Insummary, the proposed development will be an incongruous, inappropriate addition whose presence in such a prominent location would have a detrimental impact on the application site and the Crosshill Conservation Area. 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.</p> <p>On the basis of the foregoing, it is recommended that this application for Full Planning permission be <b>refused</b>.</p>
<b>Recommendation</b>	Refuse

Date: 07/05/24	DM Officer	<b>Eileen Dudziak</b>
Date: <u>07/06/2024</u>	DM Manager	Ross Middleton