

OFFICIAL
REPORT OF HANDLING FOR APPLICATION 24/00551/FUL

ADDRESS:	34 Redford Street Glasgow G33 2HE
PROPOSAL:	Erection of single storey extension to side of dwellinghouse
DATE OF ADVERT:	No advert required
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	No representations received
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	No consultations requested or required
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	<p>There were no pre-application discussions and this has been confirmed as such on the application form. As a consequence of this, the Planning Authority was unable to provide advice on whether the proposal is deemed to comply or not with the relevant policy guidance in National Planning Framework 4 and the City Development Plan.</p> <p>The Council has formalised the means for obtaining pre-application advice of this type in order to make this stage of the planning process more accessible and efficient for applicants, agents and Planning staff. The Council welcomes pre-application discussions between the applicant, their agent(s) and its planning staff in advance of making an application for any scale of development. As stated above, the applicant did not avail of this service.</p>
EIA - MAIN ISSUES	NONE
CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
DESIGN OR DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
IMPACT/POTENTIAL IMPACT STATEMENTS – MAIN ISSUES	NOT APPLICABLE
S75 AGREEMENT SUMMARY	NOT APPLICABLE
DETAILS OF DIRECTION UNDER REGS 30/31/32	NOT APPLICABLE
NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK 4 (NPF4) POLICIES	<p>National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the national spatial strategy for Scotland up to 2045. It was formally adopted by Scottish Ministers on 13th February 2023. Unlike previous national planning documents, NPF4 is part of the statutory Development Plan and Glasgow City Council as Planning Authority must assess all development proposals against the policies contained therein. The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the proposal subject of this application:</p> <p>Policy 14 – Design, quality and place Policy 16 - Quality homes</p>
CITY DEVELOPMENT	CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

PLAN POLICIES	SG 1 The Placemaking Principle (Part 2), Section 2 - Residential Development: Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens
OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	None
REASON FOR DECISION	V02 - The proposal is not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material considerations which outweigh the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.
	COMMENTS
PLANNING HISTORY	08/00334/DC - External alteration to flats including application of insulated render cladding. Various Properties In Longford St/ Morningside St/ Redford St/ Warriston Cres/ Warriston St/ Liberton Street. Granted subject to condition(s)
SITE VISITS (DATES)	A site visit was not deemed to be necessary; the Case Officer has been able to undertake a full assessment based on the information provided and resources available.
SITING	The application site is a two-storey semi-detached residential dwellinghouse and its grounds at the south east corner of the Redford Street/ Liberton Street crossroads. Semi-detached and four-in-a-block are the predominant house types in this residential setting. Carntyne Primary School is on the opposite side of Redford Street from the dwellinghouse. The A80 Cumbernauld Road is to the west of the property. The property is in an established residential area in Local Ward 18 – East Centre.
DESIGN AND MATERIALS	<p>The applicant proposes to construct a single storey extension on to the side of the host dwellinghouse. It is proposed to provide for 2no. further bedrooms and some hallway space.</p> <p>The extension protrudes 4860mm from the side of the house and the dimension along its side elevation is 6870mm. It is set back from the front elevation of the existing house by 900mm. The overall height of the extension to its roof ridgeline is 5.3m and the eaves height is 3m. A door with stepped access to garden level as well as a single window are proposed for the extensions front elevation which faces towards Redford Street/ Liberton Street, and the same is proposed for the rear elevation. No window openings are proposed for the extensions side elevation. The roof of the extension is pitched which is in-keeping with the roof of the existing house.</p> <p>In terms of materiality: Walls – roughcast finish as well as brickwork basecourse to match existing house Roof – roof tiles to match existing house Windows – uPVC framed double glazed to match existing Rainwater goods – uPVC to match existing</p>
DAYLIGHT	<p>SG1 – The Placemaking Principle (Part 2), Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens states that extensions should not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cause a significant loss of daylight to any habitable room of neighbouring properties, or • significantly block sunlight to adjacent private garden <p>Case Officer comment: there are no concerns in respect of this as the siting of the proposed extension will result in no daylight impact on the habitable rooms or the private rear garden spaces of the neighbouring dwellinghouse – numbers 38 and 40 Redford Street which is a four-in-a-block property. The extension shall be well set-off from this neighbouring four-in-a-block building so as to not lead to any concern in respect of daylight impact.</p>
ASPECT	The extension is proposed to adjoin the dwellinghouses side/ east facing elevation
PRIVACY	<p>SG1 – The Placemaking Principle (Part 2), Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens states the following guidance which is of relevance to the assessment of this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • windows of habitable rooms should not increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms. 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.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

	<p>Case Officer comment: there are no concerns in respect of this as the extension shall not unacceptably exacerbate the current overlooking situation to the side and rear of the house. The siting and orientation of the house also leads to no concerns that the extension shall have a detrimental impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties. No windows are proposed for the side elevation of the extension which faces towards numbers 38 and 40 Redford Street.</p>
ADJACENT LEVELS	The site and surrounding area are generally level
LANDSCAPING (INCLUDING GARDEN GROUND)	<p>SG1 – The Placemaking Principle (Part 2), Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens states that a minimum of 66% of the original useable private garden space should be retained in all house plots after extensions, garages and outbuildings etc. have been built to avoid over-development of the site.</p> <p>Case Officer comment: the proposal complies with this policy as none of the back garden area shall be impacted by the extension. The rear wall of the extension shall be flush with the rear wall of the existing house.</p>
ACCESS & CAR PARKING	Front to rear access shall not be impeded and the proposal shall have no impact on the existing car parking arrangements.
SITE CONSTRAINTS	There are no constraints which are of relevance to the proposal
ASSESSMENT	<p>Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts require that when an application is made, it shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise.</p> <p>The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be:</p> <p>a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; and</p> <p>b) whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) which was adopted on 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan which was adopted on 29th March 2017.</p> <p><u>National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) February 2023</u></p> <p>The proposal is not considered to be generally consistent with the aims and above-mentioned policies of NPF4, and this relates to Policy 14 – Design, quality and place in particular. Owing to its siting and unacceptable width, the proposed extension shall significantly breach the established building line on this southern side of Redford Street which shall be of detriment to not only the local streetscene but also to the host dwellinghouse itself. The proposals acceptability in respect of various other considerations as outlined above does not override this. Householder proposals must also safeguard the established character of the residential settings they are located in.</p> <p>The application is a local development which does not raise any strategic issues.</p> <p><u>Glasgow City Development Plan March 2017</u></p> <p>The City Development Plan seeks to move away from the traditional land-use based approach of previous local plans and instead promotes a place-based design led approach. Glasgow is therefore no longer covered by broad land-use designations meaning this is not the starting point for development proposals.</p> <p>CDP 1 & SG 1 The Placemaking Principle – this policy aims to improve the quality of development taking place in Glasgow by promoting a design-led approach. This will contribute towards protecting and improving the quality of the environment, improving health and reducing health inequality, making the planning process as inclusive as possible and ensuring that new development attains the highest sustainability levels. SG 1 supports</p>

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

	<p>CDP 1 by providing guidance to promote the overarching Placemaking Principle being applied to all development in the city. The guidance sets out how developers will be expected to incorporate a design-led approach within the context of the Placemaking Principle and Glasgow's interpretation of the Six Qualities of Place.</p> <p>Within the City Development Plan, SG 1 The Placemaking Principle (Part 2) outlines guidance for Alterations to Residential Dwellings and Gardens. This guidance sets out the planning requirements for alterations to dwellings and gardens for particular types of householder developments, such as extensions. It outlines the criteria that must be met in relation to, for example design and materials, privacy and overlooking and daylighting and sunlight. It seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to houses and flats are carefully designed, so that the visual amenity of residential buildings and areas is not adversely affected.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed against the detailed policy criteria in Supplementary Guidance SG 1 The Placemaking Principle (Part 2), Section 2 - Residential Development: Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens from the City Development Plan. The proposed side extension has been found to be acceptable when assessed against various policy considerations as explained above, however, it cannot be supported by the Planning Authority due to the unacceptable impact the proposed design of the extension shall have on the local streetscene. The following policy from SG 1 The Placemaking Principle (Part 2) is key:</p> <p><i>'2.12 Extensions - Extensions should generally have a pitched roof, <u>should not project in front of the building line</u>, should relate to the design of the original dwellinghouse, and should be subordinate to the original dwelling house in scale and design.'</i></p> <p>Case Officer comment: the proposal clearly fails against the policy above as the proposed side extension if allowed would significantly breach the established building line on the southern side of Redford Street. This would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the local streetscene and would also be detrimental to the host dwellinghouse itself. It is important that householder proposals safeguard the established character of the residential areas in which they are located and this proposal fails to do that. The Case Officer has attempted to negotiate alterations to the proposal with the agent which would overcome this but many weeks later this has proved to be fruitless hence having to progress this application to refusal.</p> <p>b) No objections have been received and there are no other material considerations which would lead to the Planning Authority being able to support the proposal. This in itself does not override the proposal variance with the Development Plan.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined in this report of handling it is considered that the proposal is not acceptable when assessed against the Development Plan and it is therefore recommended that planning permission should be refused.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	Refuse

Date: 8/7/24	DM Officer	Mr P Fusco
Date: <u>24/07/2024</u>	DM Manager	Ian Briggs

REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

1. The proposal is not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material considerations which outweigh the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.
2. The development proposal is contrary to Policy 14: Design, quality & place and Policy 16: Quality homes of National Planning Framework 4, and also with CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle and SG 1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2) of the Glasgow City Development Plan as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

3. The proposal is contrary to Policy 14: Design, quality & place of National Planning Framework 4 in that the proposed development has not been designed to improve the quality of the area. Due to its unacceptable design, it would be detrimental to the amenity of the area and is inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places due to its siting, scale and built form.
4. The proposal is contrary to Policy 16: Quality homes of National Planning Framework 4 in that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the established appearance and character of the site and the surrounding area in terms of its siting, scale and built form.
5. The proposal is contrary to CDP 1 the Placemaking Principle of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that, due to its inappropriate siting, scale and built form, the proposed development fails to meet the highest standards of design while providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents in the City. Furthermore, the proposed development fails to respect the character of the local built environment.
6. The proposal is contrary to SG 1 The Placemaking Principle (Part 2) of the City Development Plan in that the proposed single storey side extension would significantly breach the established building line on the southern side of Redford Street. Consequently, the proposed development, due to its inappropriate siting, scale and built form, would give the appearance of an incongruous and disproportionate addition to the dwellinghouse which would dominate the existing semi-detached property and the neighbouring dwellings to the detriment of visual amenity and the character of the local streetscene.

Refused Drawings

The development shall not be implemented in accordance with the following drawings:

1. AL(0)014 RevA PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION Dated 19.3.24 Received 19.3.24
2. AL(0)015 RevA PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION Dated 19.3.24 Received 19.3.24
3. AL(0)016 RevA PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION Dated 19.3.24 Received 19.3.24
4. AL(90)001 EXISTING LOCATION & SITE PLANS Received 27.2.24
5. AL(90)003 PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN Received 27.2.24
6. AL(90)011 PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN Received 27.2.24
7. AL(90)012 PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN Received 27.2.24
8. AL(90)013 PROPOSED ROOF PLAN Received 27.2.24

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

OFFICIAL