



Glasgow City Council
Planning Local Review Committee

Item 1

10th September 2024

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration
and Sustainability

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

24/00044/LOCAL – 266 Carsaig Drive, Glasgow

**Formation of driveway and access to front of flatted dwelling
(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): 06 - Pollokshields

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 is situated on the south western side of Carsaig Road, within an unlisted 4-in-a-block ground-floor flat within an established residential area.
- 1.2 The site is located outwith a Conservation Area.
- 1.3 The site is located in an area of High Public Transport Accessibility.
- 1.4 The proposal seeks retrospective consent for the formation of a driveway and access to the flatted dwelling.
- 1.5 The driveway is formed using monoblock and occupies the entirety of the front garden. Slate chips are present from the landing of the access stair to the rear elevation of the property.
- 1.6 It is noted that the lower flat at 264 Carsaig Drive and the adjoining property at 260 Carsaig Drive have driveways formed of monoblock within their front gardens, resulting in three adjacent driveways.

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 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises
- Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation
- 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 development proposal is contrary to Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises, Policy 2 - Climate Mitigation and Adaptation and Policy 14: Design, Quality & Place of the National Planning Framework 4.
03. The development proposal is contrary to CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle and SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2, Residential Development - Alterations to Dwellings & Gardens) of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.
04. The driveway occupies the full extent of the front garden area at no 266 Carsaig Drive to the detriment of the visual amenity of the property, wider locale and to the detriment of climate mitigation objectives and biodiversity.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

01. Carsaig Drive is a particularly narrow thoroughfare which does not accommodate two vehicles passing because of parked cars. This is due mainly to the fact that many of the houses do not have driveways and on street parking is the only option. The fact that at this location Carsaig Drive is on a bend with poor sight lines exacerbates the problem which will only be made worse by the recently introduced pavement parking restrictions.
02. It is noted under the section Design and Materials that reference is made to the fact that the ground floor property at 264 has already mono-blocked their front garden and this appears to infer that accordingly the same treatment cannot be considered appropriate in this instance. The fact that the neighbour has carried out the same works is not a valid or relevant matter and should not be a consideration in refusing the application.
03. Policy 14 of NPF4 is cited as requiring well designed buildings and spaces and that when practiced can produce successful places. It is not made clear how successful places are defined as the existing situation with narrow roads, poor sightlines, and parking restrictions is

far from successful and it is only the applicants measures which has contributed to easing these safety concerns, so it might reasonably be argued that the works carried out have created a successful place and certainly a safer place.

- 04. It is also suggested that the works have created a place which is not resilient to climate change impacts or creates a more nature positive place. It is also claimed that the lack of any greenery and the extent of the hard landscaping is detrimental to the area.
- 05. Policy 2.26 makes specific reference to the fact that no more than 50% of the front garden should be given over to vehicular access, the reality is that in a four in the block situation it is almost impossible to provide sufficient off-street parking without using the front garden areas, but how is front garden defined. In a 4 in the block a front garden is defined as that area immediately in front of the door to the lower apartment while the upper apartment has the area defined as the side garden. As this application does not relate to the front garden the issue of 50% is irrelevant.
- 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 representations received and no consultations were undertaken.

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 **CDP1: The Placemaking Principle and SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2)**

CDP1 is an overarching policy which states that new development should encourage placemaking by being design-led, aspiring towards the highest standards of design while directing development to the right place. All development should respect and protect the City's heritage by responding to its qualities and character of its site and surroundings. Development should make the City an appealing place to live, work and visit for all members of society, providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents.

SG1 provides the following detailed guidance in relation to this proposal:

Front Garden Parking (outwith Conservation Areas, in flatted development and in properties where permitted development rights have been removed) - As car ownership rises, particularly in flatted areas, owners are increasingly forming parking space within their front gardens. These areas, however, have a vital role to play in the creation of pleasant residential streets, which would be severely affected if there was a concentration of hard surfaced front gardens used for car parking.

When such development is considered acceptable:

- a) The vehicular access should:
 - be a minimum of 2.5m wide; and
 - be at right angles to the road.

- b) The parking area should:
 - have a maximum gradient of 10%;
 - have its first 2 metres hard paved across its entire width, to prevent gravel spilling on to the public footpath/road;
 - be a minimum of 5 metres in length and 2.5 metres in width; and
 - take up no more than 50% of the front garden area, and not fragment the garden into small unusable spaces.

Development is unlikely to be supported where:

- a) the proposed access is located within 25 metres of a major traffic junction
- b) the Council's Road's Authority has recommended refusal for traffic reasons;
- c) the proposed vehicular public footpath crossing would create more than two driveways side by side;
- d) in tenement properties, front gardens have a vital role in the preservation of townscape and residential amenity; and
- e) the formation of the driveway would involve the removal of, have an adverse effect on, any mature tree in either the garden or on the public footpath.

In terms of other legal requirements, regardless of whether planning permission is required or not, applicants may also require a Footway Crossing Permit from the Council's Road's Authority. When parking provision is made in the front garden area, 50% of the original front garden should be retained.

Committee should note:

- 100% of the former front garden area forward of the principal elevation of the property has been converted to mono-block driveway.

- The development has resulted in 3 driveways that require a vehicular public footpath crossing side-by-side.
- Committee should consider whether the concentration of hard surfaced front gardens used for car parking detracts from the creation of a pleasant residential street.

6.4 **NPF4 Policies 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises and 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation**

NPF4 Policy 1 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crises. Policy requires that, when considering all developments, significant weight be given to the global climate and nature crises

NPF4 Policy 2 intends to encourage, promote and facilitate development that minimizes emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change. Policy 2 requires:

- a) Development proposals will be sited and designed to minimize lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible.
- b) Development proposals will be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.
- c) Development proposals to retrofit measures to existing developments that reduce emissions or support adaptation to climate change will be supported.

Committee should note:

- All grass and shrubs, including the former 1m high boundary hedge, have been removed to accommodate the development.
- Committee should consider whether the development has a detrimental impact on a nature positive place that is resilient to climate change impacts.

6.5 **NPF4 Policy 16: Quality Homes**

NPF4 Policy 16 supports householder development proposals that 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.

Committee should note:

- Front garden driveways are present within the surrounding area, including the ground floor flat of the adjacent property to the north west.
- Committee should consider whether the loss of vegetation and design of the development has a detrimental impact on the character or environmental quality of the surrounding area.

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 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

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.