



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

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

Item 1

22 September 2026

Contact: Tim Moss Ext: 76032

**26/00040/LOCAL – Flat 1, 25 Onslow Drive, Glasgow, G31 2LY
Partial removal of wall and installation of metal gates and bin storage area
(retrospective).**

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): 22 – Dennistoun

Citywide: N/A

Local member(s) advised: Yes ☐ No ☐

consulted: 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

Location

- 1.1 The proposal site is on the front garden under the sole ownership of a first floor flat within a two-storey sandstone tenement. The flat has no access to the rear of the property.
- 1.2 The specific area is 1.9m from the west site boundary and 3.1m from the eastern boundary.
- 1.3 The building is unlisted, sits in the Dennistoun Conservation Area, and is within the Dennistoun ward – 22.

Proposal

- 1.4 The proposal is the retrospective partial removal of the front boundary wall and installation of metal gates to create a bin storage area. The store measures 2.8m x 1.2m.
- 1.5 Materials used include a smoothed concrete base, breezeblock walls and flat coping stones.

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 7: Historic assets and places
- Policy 14; Design, quality and place
- Policy 16: Quality Homes

- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies and supplementary guidance's are:

- CDP1 & SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Parts 1 & 2)
- CDP2 Sustainable spatial strategy
- CDP9 & SG9 Historic Environment

- 2.4 Other relevant guidance is:

- Glasgow Central Conservation Area Appraisal 2012
- Dennistoun Conservation Area Appraisal;
- HES guidance Managing Change in the Historic Environment

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

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 proposal is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 (adopted February 2023) Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place and Policy 7: Historic Assets and Places and CDP1: The Placemaking Principle and CDP9: Historic Environment of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) in that the partial removal of the historic front boundary wall and siting in a prominent location results in a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the streetscape and fails to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Dennistoun Conservation Area.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

- 4.1 A summary of the material points raised in the appeal statement are given below.

01. 25 Onslow Drive was split into an upper and lower flat, the applicant lives on the upper flat and has no access to the back lane.

02. The previous arrangement involved the applicant moving bins down a large set of stairs, which was awkward for the applicant who is elderly.
03. The reasons for the refusal are incorrect as they failed to give consideration to the applicants individual circumstances.
04. The recommended alternatives by the Heritage team fail to account for that mature hedging would obscure the view from the lower window.
05. There is no requirement in planning applications to give rationale for alternatives considered.
06. Health and safety of the applicant should have been considered in the decision making process. There is no requirement for, nor even mention of, an 'access audit and conservation statement' in the planning application form – it was fundamentally unfair and unreasonable to recommend rejection of the application because of the absence of something which was not a requirement within the application form.
- 4.2 The applicant did not request any further procedure in the determination of the review.

5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 There were no letters of representation received to the application.

DRS - HERITAGE AND WEST provided consultation advice and recommended refusal, for the application, as summarised in the planning considerations.

- 5.2 No letters of representation were received 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 relevant policy considerations:

6.3 Design and visual amenity

Committee should note:

- NPF4 Policy 16: Quality Homes: states that where development to people with health conditions that lead to particular accommodation needs will be supported.
- HES recommends an access audit and conservation statement are undertaken where this applies. Alternatives should be explored such as “storing the bins behind the boundary wall, adjusting the ground levels to

allow them to be rolled out the original gateway and providing hedging to screen them from public view” as discussed by the heritage team.

- NPF4 Policy 14: Design, quality and place: supports development consistent with the six qualities of successful places, including “**Distinctive**” (Supporting attention to detail of local architectural styles into designs to reinforce identity), and “**Adaptable**” (Supporting commitment to investing in the long-term value of buildings).
- *SG1 Part 2 – The Placemaking Principle prefers bin stores to be located as far as possible from windows, should not be within a front garden and be suitably screened.*
- The materials listed include: concrete base, breezeblock walls and flat coping stones. The Council requests that a high quality of design and materials are expected in conservation areas.
- There is no screening for the bin store and places 4 no. bins adjacent to the public footway.

Committee should consider whether:

- Committee should consider if they are satisfied that the materials of this bin storage area are appropriate for the conservation area.

6.5 Historic Assets and Place

Committee should note:

- NPF4 Policy 7: Historic Assets and Places - supports development to preserves or enhances a conservation area.
- CDP9/SG9: Historic Environment - notes that boundary walls and railings on unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas should be retained in situ, repaired, reinstated, or replaced as they contribute to the character of the conservation area.
- Dennistoun Conservation Area Appraisal encourages the enclosure of front gardens with traditional treatments, such as the re-introduction of original railing and the retention and repair of original stone.
- HES Managing Change in the Historic Environment Guidance provides guidance on boundary walls, emphasising their importance in defining the character of conservation areas. Age, design, materials, and associated features are amongst the factors that contribute to the interest of historic boundaries.
- On consultation with the heritage team, the proposal was rejected on the grounds that :
- The development would create a visual break and involves the change of materials from traditional to modern.

Committee should consider whether:

- they are satisfied that the development is sensitive to the character of the conservation area and the visual amenity of the street.

7 COMMITTEE DECISION

8.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with or without conditions;
- b. Refuse planning permission; or
- c. Continue the application for further information.

8.2 *Section 43A(12)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997* requires that reasoning behind why the local review body has been decided be supplied in the decision notice. Should committee be minded to grant planning permission, material considerations that justify a departure from the plan would require to be identified.

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

OFFICIAL

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.