



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration
and Sustainability

Item 1

27th August 2024

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

24/00041/LOCAL – 56 Waukglen Drive, Glasgow

Erection of upper storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear of dwellinghouse.

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): 03 – Greater Pollok

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

- 1.1 The proposal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Waukglen Drive. The property is located in a primarily residential area with surrounding properties being of similar design and materials.
- 1.2 The property is constructed of brick with white window frames, brown rainwater goods and brown fascias and soffits. The roof is pitched with concrete roof tiles.
- 1.3 There is currently an integrated garage to the side of the property, with porch to the front.
- 1.4 It is proposed to extend this garage to the rear (by 3.3m) and erect another storey onto this to create a two-storey side extension. This extension will align with both the eaves and ridge of the existing dwelling. The first floor of this extension will overhang the existing garage, creating a covered pend access along the side boundary to the rear. The materials of the extension are proposed to match the existing.
- 1.5 At the rear, it is further proposed to erect a single-storey extension. The materials of the extension are proposed to match the existing. This extension will project out from the rear of the dwelling by 3.6m, be 3m in width, and will be 2.6m to the eaves and 3.6m to the ridge.
- 1.6 The two sections of rear extensions will be connected via a glazed canopy which will be 2.1m in width, 2.6m in depth and will be 2.6m from ground level.

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 14: Design, quality and place
- Policy 16: Quality homes

- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies are:
 - CDP1: The Placemaking Principle
- 2.3 The relevant Supplementary Guidance is:
 - SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2)

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

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 proposed development, would be contrary to NPF 4: Policies 14 and 16 and CDP 1 - The Placemaking Principle and the corresponding Supplementary Guidance SG 1 - Placemaking, Part 2 Residential Development of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.
03. The proposal is contrary to Policy 14 and 16 of NPF4 and CDP 1 and SG 1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the proposed upper storey extension at the side and rear elevations is not subordinate to the existing house and is too dominant in scale and design. Notably, the ridge line of the roof is not sufficiently below that of the existing house and this results in a terracing effect with the neighbouring property. This has an adverse impact on visual amenity of the dwelling and streetscape.
04. The proposal is contrary to Policy 14 and 16 of NPF4 and CDP 1 and SG 1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the proposed rear extension designed in conjunction with the upper storey extension is considered unsatisfactory with regards to siting and detailed design. In its entirety the upper storey and rear extension do not relate well to the existing dwelling and would have an adverse impact on visual amenity.
05. The proposal is contrary to Policy 14 and 16 of NPF4 and CDP 1 and SG 1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the proposed pend access does not provide satisfactory front to rear access, as well as threatening the visual amenity of the dwelling. According to SG1, extensions should not be built up to a common boundary and despite the provision of a front to rear access, this pend measures approximately 850mm which does not satisfy the 900mm minimum required to facilitate sufficient access.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

01. Our proposal directly addresses the increasing demand for residential space, reflecting the shift in family structures and the pursuit of improved living conditions. The project addresses these critical needs by extending essential living areas and increasing bedroom capacity while adding value and utility to the property.

02. The design of the proposed extensions has been planned to minimise visual impact and ensure seamless integration with the neighbourhood's architectural character, thus preserving the area's aesthetic integrity and communal harmony.
03. The architectural design of the proposed upper-storey extensions at the side and rear elevations has been thoughtfully developed to ensure a harmonious integration with the existing structure. Addressing concerns of dominance, significant design considerations have been employed to ensure the roof's ridge line is notably lower than that of the existing house. This strategy effectively negates any potential for a terracing effect on adjacent properties.
04. A deliberate effort was made to achieve visual synergy with the existing dwelling. This effort includes adopting architectural features and materials that reflect the aesthetic of the neighbouring property at 58 Waukglen Drive. Our design strategy 5 ensures a unified architectural language, incorporating similar materials, roof pitches, and fenestration patterns.
05. Our proposal meticulously preserves the integrity of front-to-rear access, maintaining a space of 1150mm between properties 56 and 58, which surpasses the minimum requirements.
06. The applicant has requested that the review be conducted by means of the review documents only. Where the Committee decides that the review documents do not provide sufficient information to make a decision, it is for the Committee to determine how further information may be obtained. This can either by means of further written submissions, the holding of one or more hearing sessions, or a site inspection, or a combination of these, as set out in the Local Review Regulations.

5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 There were no representations to the application.
- 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 14: Design, quality and place; NPF4 Policy 16: Quality Homes and CDP1/SG1: The Placemaking Principle**

NPF4 Policy 14 Intent: To encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the Place Principle.

The relevant policy guidance is:

- a) Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale.
- b) 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.

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:

Householder development proposals will be supported where they:

- i. 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; and
- ii. do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.

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

Residential Development - Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens

Extensions and alterations to houses and flats should be 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.

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 extensions are 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 extensions dominate 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:

a) 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:

- It is proposed to create a pend access along the boundary. There are discrepancies in the drawings which include incorrect scale bars and different pend widths, with the width at the rear being approximately 0.85m and the width at the front and in other drawings being approximately 1m.
- Committee should consider if there is adequate front-to-rear access.

Useable Private Garden Space

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:

- The original usable garden space was approximately 100sqm. The combined developments are approximately 21sqm. This is 21% of the

garden area, leaving 79% of the original garden space remaining, in compliance with policy.

- Committee should consider if this proposal would result in the loss of garden ground to the detriment of residential amenity.
- Committee should consider if this proposal is overdevelopment of the site.

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.

Committee should note:

- At the rear of the side extension, the window on first floor level is a bedroom. This window is 8.5m from the rear boundary (contrary to policy), but is an acceptable distance from the neighbouring property to the south.
 - There are no windows proposed on the side elevations facing neighbouring properties.
 - At ground level there is existing screening (timber fencing) of 1.8m high.
- Committee should consider whether the proposed extensions will have an adverse impact on any existing or proposed accommodation, or whether it will increase direct overlooking onto adjacent private gardens or rooms.

Daylight and Sunlight

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 – Side Extensions

To ensure extensions are subordinate to the existing house and avoid a terracing effect, 1.5 and 2-storey side extensions should generally:

- not double the footprint of the house;
- be set back a minimum of 1.5 metres from the building line; and
- incorporate a roof style which carries through the line of the eaves of the existing house and has a ridgeline lower than the ridge of the roof of the house.

A relaxation to the full 1.5 metres setback may be made for extensions to houses where a terracing effect, or unbroken massing, could not arise in the future. These could include houses on a street corner; where the house extension would be adjacent to a non-residential use; or houses with asymmetrical frontages and staggered building lines, and when a proposed ridgeline set-down for the extension creates a subordinate appearance.

Committee should note:

- The proposed extensions both have pitched roofs.
- It is proposed that the materials will match the existing dwelling.
- The proposed side extension will not double the footprint of the original dwelling, in compliance with policy.
- There is no established building line along Waukglen Drive.
- The proposed side extension is to be erected on top of the existing garage building and will align with the upper storey of the original dwelling.
- The pitched roof style carries through the line of the eaves of the existing house (in accordance with policy), but the ridgeline is of the same height as the original roof (contrary to policy).

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposed extensions are subordinate to the original dwellinghouse.
- The proposed extensions relate to the design of the original dwellinghouse.
- If a relaxation of the 1.5m set back requirement is appropriate in this case.

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 n/a

*Equality Outcomes
2021-25? Please
specify.*

*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.