



Planning Services 231 George Street GLASGOW G1 1RX Tel: 0141 287 8555 Email: onlineplanning@glasgow.gov.uk

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE 100667248-001

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? * (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

☐ Applicant ☒ Agent

Agent Details

Please enter Agent details

Company/Organisation:	Planning Services UK		
Ref. Number:		You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
First Name: *	Philip	Building Name:	The Circle
Last Name: *	Landa	Building Number:	
Telephone Number: *		Address 1 (Street): *	Westerwood Business Park
Extension Number:		Address 2:	69-71 Aberdalgie Road
Mobile Number:		Town/City: *	Glasgow
Fax Number:		Country: *	United Kingdom
		Postcode: *	G34 9HJ
Email Address: *			

Is the applicant an individual or an organisation/corporate entity? *

☒ Individual ☐ Organisation/Corporate entity

Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

Title:	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>	You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
Other Title:	<input type="text"/>	Building Name:	<input type="text"/>
First Name: *	<input type="text" value="Shaan"/>	Building Number:	<input type="text" value="56"/>
Last Name: *	<input type="text" value="Ali"/>	Address 1 (Street): *	<input type="text" value="Waukglen Drive"/>
Company/Organisation	<input type="text"/>	Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number: *	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>	Town/City: *	<input type="text" value="Glasgow"/>
Extension Number:	<input type="text"/>	Country: *	<input type="text" value="Scotland"/>
Mobile Number:	<input type="text"/>	Postcode: *	<input type="text" value="G53 7UG"/>
Fax Number:	<input type="text"/>		
Email Address: *	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>		

Site Address Details

Planning Authority:	<input type="text" value="Glasgow City Council"/>
Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available):	
Address 1:	<input type="text" value="56 WAUKGLEN DRIVE"/>
Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Address 3:	<input type="text"/>
Address 4:	<input type="text"/>
Address 5:	<input type="text"/>
Town/City/Settlement:	<input type="text" value="GLASGOW"/>
Post Code:	<input type="text" value="G53 7UG"/>

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing	<input type="text" value="659071"/>	Easting	<input type="text" value="252914"/>
----------	-------------------------------------	---------	-------------------------------------

Description of Proposal

Please provide a description of your proposal to which your review relates. The description should be the same as given in the application form, or as amended with the agreement of the planning authority: *
(Max 500 characters)

Local Review Body against decision notice from the council for extension at 56 Waukglen Drive, Glasgow

Type of Application

What type of application did you submit to the planning authority? *

- ☒ Application for planning permission (including householder application but excluding application to work minerals).
- ☐ Application for planning permission in principle.
- ☐ Further application.
- ☐ Application for approval of matters specified in conditions.

What does your review relate to? *

- ☒ Refusal Notice.
- ☐ Grant of permission with Conditions imposed.
- ☐ No decision reached within the prescribed period (two months after validation date or any agreed extension) – deemed refusal.

Statement of reasons for seeking review

You must state in full, why you are seeking a review of the planning authority's decision (or failure to make a decision). Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. If necessary this can be provided as a separate document in the 'Supporting Documents' section: * (Max 500 characters)

Note: you are unlikely to have a further opportunity to add to your statement of appeal at a later date, so it is essential that you produce all of the information you want the decision-maker to take into account.

You should not however raise any new matter which was not before the planning authority at the time it decided your application (or at the time expiry of the period of determination), unless you can demonstrate that the new matter could not have been raised before that time or that it not being raised before that time is a consequence of exceptional circumstances.

Please refer to appeal statement attached

Have you raised any matters which were not before the appointed officer at the time the Determination on your application was made? *

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, you should explain in the box below, why you are raising the new matter, why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and why you consider it should be considered in your review: * (Max 500 characters)

Please provide a list of all supporting documents, materials and evidence which you wish to submit with your notice of review and intend to rely on in support of your review. You can attach these documents electronically later in the process: * (Max 500 characters)

1. Decision Notice 2. Appeal Statement 3. Location Plan 4. application form 5. Elevation and sections as proposed 6. elevation and sections as proposed 7. elevation and sections as proposed 8. floor and roof plans as proposed 9. location plan 10. notification list neighbours 11. planning statement rev 12. Planning Statement 1 13. planning statement 2 14. plan elevations and section as existing 15. proposed site plan 16. site plan as existing 17. site plan as proposed

Application Details

Please provide the application reference no. given to you by your planning authority for your previous application.

23/01881/FUL

What date was the application submitted to the planning authority? *

11/05/2023

What date was the decision issued by the planning authority? *

15/03/2024

Review Procedure

The Local Review Body will decide on the procedure to be used to determine your review and may at any time during the review process require that further information or representations be made to enable them to determine the review. Further information may be required by one or a combination of procedures, such as: written submissions; the holding of one or more hearing sessions and/or inspecting the land which is the subject of the review case.

Can this review continue to a conclusion, in your opinion, based on a review of the relevant information provided by yourself and other parties only, without any further procedures? For example, written submission, hearing session, site inspection. *

☒ Yes ☐ No

In the event that the Local Review Body appointed to consider your application decides to inspect the site, in your opinion:

Can the site be clearly seen from a road or public land? *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely and without barriers to entry? *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Checklist – Application for Notice of Review

Please complete the following checklist to make sure you have provided all the necessary information in support of your appeal. Failure to submit all this information may result in your appeal being deemed invalid.

Have you provided the name and address of the applicant? *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Have you provided the date and reference number of the application which is the subject of this review? *

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you are the agent, acting on behalf of the applicant, have you provided details of your name and address and indicated whether any notice or correspondence required in connection with the review should be sent to you or the applicant? *

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Have you provided a statement setting out your reasons for requiring a review and by what procedure (or combination of procedures) you wish the review to be conducted? *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: You must state, in full, why you are seeking a review on your application. Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. You may not have a further opportunity to add to your statement of review at a later date. It is therefore essential that you submit with your notice of review, all necessary information and evidence that you rely on and wish the Local Review Body to consider as part of your review.

Please attach a copy of all documents, material and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and Drawings) which are now the subject of this review *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: Where the review relates to a further application e.g. renewal of planning permission or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition or where it relates to an application for approval of matters specified in conditions, it is advisable to provide the application reference number, approved plans and decision notice (if any) from the earlier consent.

Declare – Notice of Review

I/We the applicant/agent certify that this is an application for review on the grounds stated.

Declaration Name: The Thomas Cochrane

Declaration Date: 04/04/2024



PLANNING SERVICES UK
your ally for success

Appeal Statement for
56 Waukglen Drive,
Glasgow G53 7UG.

Application Ref:
23/01881/FUL

Planning Services UK
The Circle
Westerwood Business Park
69-71 Aberdalgie Road
Glasgow, G34 9HJ
0141 266 6666
www.planning-services.co.uk

LOCATION

Planning Services UK has been engaged to prepare and submit a detailed supporting statement for the planning appeal concerning the proposed development at 56 Waukglen Drive, G53 7UG. The appeal seeks permission to construct a first-floor extension on the side and a ground-floor extension on the rear of the semi-detached property.

Objective of the Report

This report aims to establish the framework for evaluating the proposed extensions comprehensively. This includes a thorough property description detailing its architectural features, historical significance, and setting within the local environment. Following this, the report will present an in-depth exploration of the proposed modifications to the existing structure.

Review of Planning Context

Central to this document is an analysis of the relevant planning policies, guidelines, and recent decisions that apply to the appeal. This review is designed to assess the proposal's compliance with the established planning framework and demonstrate how the proposed extensions can be realised in a manner that satisfactorily addresses these regulatory stipulations.

Site Description

The property in question encompasses an area of 258.2 square meters and features a semi-detached house constructed before 1997. Acquired by the current applicant in 2018, the residence includes a garage, lounge, dining room, kitchen on the ground floor, three bedrooms and a single bathroom on the first floor. **Refer to Figure 1: Location Plan.**

The forthcoming sections of this report will detail the proposed development, align it with the planning policy landscape, and articulate how the appeal supports the criteria for granting planning permission, ensuring a harmonious integration with the existing property and surrounding area.

REASON REFUSED

Reason(s) for the decision to refuse.

- 1. The proposal was not considered in accordance with the Development Plan, and no material considerations outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.**

Response:

The proposal to extend the kitchen and dining area to the rear side on the ground floor, along with the addition of two single bedrooms on the east side of the first floor of the existing semi-detached house, is a thoughtful response to the modern residential requirements. This plan, aiming for five bedrooms on the first floor alongside enhanced living and dining spaces, merits planning permission based on its substantial alignment with the evolving community and property needs. Contrary to the assessment that the proposal diverges from the Development Plan without presenting adequate material considerations, a comprehensive re-evaluation is warranted.

Development plans inherently possess the flexibility to adapt to the changing dynamics of communities and their built environments. 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.

Material considerations underpinning this proposal include enhancing the property's functionality and value and significantly improving the occupants' quality of life. Furthermore, the project's commitment to sustainability aligns with contemporary planning goals, offering a compelling context for a variance from the existing Development Plan. 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.

Therefore, it is posited that the proposal embodies material considerations of considerable significance, harmonising with the essence of the Development Plan and providing benefits that decisively outweigh any perceived deviations. In recognising the dynamic nature of residential development and community growth, it is essential for planning decisions to utilise the flexibility embedded in the Development Plan, fostering environments that can evolve to meet the inhabitants' current and future needs.

- 2. 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 from them.**

Response:

In response to the assertion that the proposed development conflicts with NPF 4: Policies 14 and 16, CDP 1—The Placemaking Principle, and the accompanying Supplementary Guidance SG 1—Placemaking, Part 2 Residential Development of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017), a detailed counterargument underscores the necessity and justification for a nuanced interpretation of these policies in light of the project's broader benefits.

Firstly, it is essential to contextualise the interpretation of the policies in question within the dynamic and evolving landscape of urban development. NPF 4's Policies 14 and 16, along with CDP 1, fundamentally aim to enhance the quality of the built environment, ensuring developments contribute positively to the locality's character and meet the community's needs. The proposed development is designed with a deep understanding of these objectives, offering a vision that respects and actively contributes to the local architectural and social fabric.

The contention that no overriding reason exists to deviate from the established policies overlooks the project's significant contributions to housing diversity and quality. The project addresses urgent needs within the community for increased residential space and improved living conditions. Moreover, the development strategy includes innovative design and sustainability measures that align with the core intent of placemaking principles, focusing on creating spaces that foster community interaction and well-being.

Additionally, the proposed development's design and planning have been meticulously considered to ensure they are sympathetic to the existing landscape, integrating modern living requirements without compromising the area's aesthetic and cultural integrity. This approach embodies the placemaking principle's essence, which is not merely about adhering to prescriptive measures but rather about the holistic enhancement of spaces for the people who inhabit them.

Notably, the development proposal also considers precedent cases within the locality where similar projects have been successfully integrated, demonstrating the planning authority's flexibility in adapting policies to suit each development's

unique challenges and opportunities. These precedents establish a framework for considering departures from policy under specific circumstances where the benefits of development convincingly outweigh potential concerns.

Given these considerations, the proposed development presents compelling reasons to depart from the strict interpretations of NPF 4: Policies 14 and 16 and CDP 1. By fostering a balanced dialogue between policy objectives and innovative development practices, the project offers an opportunity to advance the principles of placemaking and residential development in a manner that respects policy frameworks and is responsive to contemporary urban challenges.

- 3. 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, resulting in a terracing effect on the neighbouring property. This adversely impacts the visual amenity of the dwelling and streetscape.**

Response:

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.

- 4. The proposal is contrary to Policies 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 regard 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 amenities.**

Response:

In crafting the rear extension, in conjunction with the upper-storey addition, 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

ensures a unified architectural language, incorporating similar materials, roof pitches, and fenestration patterns.

- 5. 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 front-to-rear access, this pend measure approximately 850mm, which does not satisfy the 900mm minimum required to facilitate sufficient access.**

Response:

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. This design decision not only safeguards the visual amenity but also adheres strictly to the guidelines against encroachments on common boundaries.

Design and Materials

The proposed extensions are meticulously designed to complement the existing neighbourhood fabric, utilising matching roofing materials, roof angles, and window placements.

Front-to-Rear Access

Our design strategy carefully preserves the existing spatial arrangement between the properties, demonstrating our commitment to upholding access standards.

Usable Private Garden Space

The design ensures that a substantial portion of the property remains open post-extension, with adequate parking facilities, showcasing our adherence to open space and parking norms.

Privacy and Overlooking

The proposed design incorporates strategic screening and window placements, effectively maintaining privacy across neighbouring properties consistent with existing conditions.

Daylight and Sunlight

Our analyses affirm that the extensions will not adversely impact the availability of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties, particularly concerning habitable spaces.

The proposed extensions enhance the property's value and the surrounding area's visual appeal while fully complying with the relevant policies and guidelines.

SUMMARY

In light of the proposed development's perceived deviation from the guiding principles of NPF 4: Policies 14 and 16, CDP 1—The Placemaking Principle, and Supplementary Guidance SG 1—Placemaking, Part 2 Residential Development of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017), a thorough re-evaluation is warranted. This call for reassessment is driven by the proposal's strong alignment with the broad objectives of enhancing community development and significantly improving the residential quality of the targeted area. The design of this proposal has been informed by a keen understanding of the community's evolving needs, aiming to elevate living standards and foster a vibrant sense of place within the urban landscape.

Acknowledging the precedents set within the local area where the planning authority has previously approved similar projects is essential. These precedents signify the planning authority's acknowledgement of the necessity for flexibility and adaptation to meet the changing needs of urban environments and residential demands. Such prior approvals lay a foundational basis for assessing the merits of the current proposal, emphasising the critical role of innovative and adaptive planning in addressing contemporary urban challenges.

The successful incorporation of comparable projects into the community illustrates the vital need for urban development frameworks to be adaptable. This allows for projects that offer substantial benefits in sustainable development, residential quality enhancement, and overall community well-being despite initial appearances of non-compliance.

Thus, planning authorities must consider the proposed development's significant potential to impact community growth and enhance quality of life. Adopting a collaborative and forward-thinking approach to planning will facilitate the realisation of projects that not only serve the interests of individual property owners but also contribute significantly to the collective advancement of community interests in alignment with the core objectives of the Glasgow City Development Plan.

Moreover, the existence of similar, previously approved developments within the same vicinity highlights an inconsistency in the authority's application of planning policies, casting doubt on the rationale behind the refusal of this particular proposal. This inconsistency, underscored by direct references to similar approved projects, suggests a selective policy application that compromises the principles of fairness and predictability crucial to the planning process. By drawing specific comparisons between the features, scope, and impacts of these approved developments and the current proposal, a compelling argument emerges for reevaluating the decision through a lens of consistency and equity in policy application.

In conclusion, the presence of similar approved developments within the area, combined with a detailed examination of how comparable proposals have been historically assessed, presents a strong case against the refusal of this development. This evident inconsistency in policy application necessitates a reconsideration of the decision-making process, advocating for a planning approach that is transparent, equitable, and consistent, thereby upholding legislative requirements and planning guidelines.

Contact Information

Prepared by:

Philip M. Landa, BSc. (Hon), MSc. In Town and Country Planning
Planning Consultant

Email: Planning-applications@planning-services.co.uk

Revised and edited by:

Thomas Cochrane BSc (Hons) HND, CPC
Principal Planning Consultant
Planning Services UK

tommy@planning-services.co.uk

Mobile: 07450939889

Office: 0141 266 666

APPENDIX



Figure 1: Location Plan

PRECEDENCE 1

1. **06/03859/DC** | Erection of two-storey side extension to dwellinghouse. | 59 Waukglan Drive Glasgow G53 7UG. **GRANTED**

★ Track

🖨️ Print

🔗 Share

Details

Comments (0)Constraints (4)Documents (0)Related Cases (1)Map

SummaryFurther InformationContactsImportant Dates

Reference	06/03859/DC
Alternative Reference	Not Available
Application Received	Tue 28 Nov 2006
Application Validated	Wed 13 Dec 2006
Address	59 Waukglen Drive Glasgow G53 7UG
Proposal	Erection of two storey side extension to dwellinghouse.
Status	Decided - Grant Subject to Condition(s)
Decision	Grant Subject to Condition(s)
Decision Issued Date	Fri 09 Feb 2007
Appeal Status	Unknown
Appeal Decision	Not Available



PRECEDENCE 2

2. **06/02886/DC** | Erection of two-storey side extension to dwellinghouse. | 29 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH | **GRANTED.**

06/02886/DC | Erection of two storey side extension to dwellinghouse. | 29 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH

[Save search](#) [Refine search](#) [Track](#) [Print](#) [Share](#)

Details [Comments \(0\)](#) [Constraints \(4\)](#) [Documents \(0\)](#) [Related Cases \(2\)](#) [Map](#)

Summary [Further Information](#) [Contacts](#) [Important Dates](#)

Reference	06/02886/DC
Alternative Reference	Not Available
Application Received	Tue 29 Aug 2006
Application Validated	Tue 29 Aug 2006
Address	29 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH
Proposal	Erection of two storey side extension to dwellinghouse.
Status	Decided - Grant Subject to Condition(s)
Decision	Grant Subject to Condition(s)
Decision Issued Date	Fri 20 Oct 2006
Appeal Status	Unknown
Appeal Decision	Not Available



PRECEDENCE 3

3. **10/01034/DC** | Erection of two-storey side extension to dwellinghouse. | 35 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH | **GRANTED.**

10/01034/DC | Erection of two storey side extension to dwellinghouse. | 35 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH

Save search

Refine search

Track

Print

Share

Details

Comments (0)

Constraints (4)

Documents (14)

Related Cases (1)

Map

Summary

Further Information

Contacts

Important Dates

Reference	10/01034/DC
Alternative Reference	000008543-001
Application Received	Tue 04 May 2010
Application Validated	Tue 04 May 2010
Address	35 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH
Proposal	Erection of two storey side extension to dwellinghouse.
Status	Decided - Grant Subject to Condition(s)
Decision	Grant Subject to Condition(s)
Decision Issued Date	Mon 12 Jul 2010
Appeal Status	Unknown
Appeal Decision	Not Available



PRECEDENCE 4

4. **04/03805/DC** | Erection of two-storey extension to side of dwellinghouse. | 45 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH | **GRANTED.**

04/03805/DC | Erection of two storey extension to side of dwellinghouse. | 45 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH

Save search

Refine search

Track

Print

Share

Details

Comments (0)

Constraints (3)

Documents (0)

Related Cases (1)

Map

Summary

Further Information

Contacts

Important Dates

Reference	04/03805/DC
Alternative Reference	Not Available
Application Received	Mon 08 Nov 2004
Application Validated	Tue 11 Jan 2005
Address	45 Teasel Avenue Glasgow G53 7UH
Proposal	Erection of two storey extension to side of dwellinghouse.
Status	Decided - Grant Subject to Condition(s)
Decision	Grant Subject to Condition(s)
Decision Issued Date	Wed 11 May 2005
Appeal Status	Unknown
Appeal Decision	Not Available



PRECEDENCE 5

41 and 43 Teasel Avenue

