



Item 4

27th August 2024

Neighbourhoods, Regeneration
and Sustainability
Glasgow City Council
Exchange House
231 George Street
Glasgow, G1 1RX
www.glasgow.gov.uk

Executive Director
George Gillespie
BEng (Hons) CEng MICE

TmC Planning And Property Development Ltd.
Ramya Peela
Clyde Offices 2nd Floor
48 West George Street
Glasgow
G2 1DP

Our ref:
GCC Application Ref:

DECISION
23/01881/FUL

15 March 2024

Dear Sir/Madam

SITE: 56 Waukglen Drive Glasgow G53 7UG

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

I am obliged to inform you that a decision to refuse your application, **23/01881/FUL** has now been taken.

A copy of the decision notice is attached with any appropriate notes which should be read together with the decision.

The decision notice is a legal document and should be retained for future reference.

Should you require any additional information regarding the decision, please contact the case officer **Kate Flowerday** on direct phone , or email kate.flowerday@glasgow.gov.uk, who will be happy to help you.

Yours faithfully

Head of Planning

Encls.



PLANNING DECISION NOTICE

Full Planning Permission REFUSAL

IN RESPECT OF APPLICATION 23/01881/FUL

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

AT

56 Waukglen Drive Glasgow G53 7UG

AS SHOWN ON THE FOLLOWING SUBMITTED PLAN(S)

Reason(s) for decision

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.

Drawings

The development has been refused in relation to the following drawing(s)

1. PL-LOC-01 LOCATION PLAN-2 IN 1250 SCALE Received 28 August 2023
2. PL-LAY-11 Elevations and Sections as Proposed B Received 16 November 2023

As qualified by the above reason(s), or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority



Dated: 15th March 2024

Head of Planning

THIS DECISION NOTICE SHOULD BE READ WITH THE ATTACHED ADVICE NOTES

IMPORTANT NOTES ABOUT THIS REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

BY THIS NOTICE, YOUR PROPOSAL HAS BEEN REFUSED.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL

If you are not satisfied with this refusal of planning permission, you may request a review within **three months** of the date on this notice. Please note that the right of appeal is to the Planning Local Review Committee of the Council and **not** to Scottish Ministers.

Before pursuing a review, you should consider contacting your case officer to discuss whether there are changes which could be made to the proposed development to make it acceptable. The case officer's contact details are on the letter accompanying this Decision Notice. Your case officer can also advise on how a fresh application could be submitted. Please note that if you do submit a fresh application within 12 months, you would be unlikely to have to pay a further planning fee.

Before contacting the case officer, you would be well advised to view the report on the application. It is available for inspection [online](#). The report explains how the decision was reached and should help you decide whether to proceed with further discussion or a review. If your application was granted subject to conditions, it may be clear from the terms of the report that any conditions which you might be concerned about are necessary.

A notice of review must be served on the Planning Local Review Committee by submitting online at <https://www.eplanning.scot/ePlanningClient/>

The notice of review must include a statement setting out your reasons for requiring the Planning Local Review Committee to review this case. You must state by what procedure (written representations, hearing session(s), inspection of application site) or combination of procedures you wish the review to be conducted. However, please note that the Planning Local Review Committee will decide on the review procedure to be followed.

You must also include with the notice of review a copy of this decision notice, the planning application form, the plans listed on the decision notice and any other documents forming part of the proposed development as determined. If you have a representative, you must give their name and address. Please state whether any notice or other correspondence should be sent to the representative instead of to you.