



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

**Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods,
Regeneration and Sustainability**

Item 1

26th November 2024

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

**24/00130/LOCAL – 34 Redford Street
Erection of single storey extension to side 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): 18

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 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. Semidetached and four-in-a-block are the predominant house types in this residential setting
- 1.2 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.
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 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.
- 1.5 A door with stepped access to garden level as well as a single window are proposed for the extension's 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 extension's side elevation. The roof of the extension is pitched which is in keeping with the roof of the existing house.
- 1.6 In terms of materials, the walls will be roughcast finish as well as brickwork basecourse to match existing house. The roof tiles will match the existing house. The windows will be uPVC framed double glazed to match existing. The rainwater goods will be uPVC to match the existing.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

- 2.1 The relevant National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) and City Development Plan (CDP) policies and Supplementary Guidance are:

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

CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle
SG 1 The Placemaking Principle (Part 2), Section 2 - Residential Development: Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens

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 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.
03. 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.
04. 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 of siting, scale and built form.
05. 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.
06. 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 street scene.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

Statement of Review

The appellant responded to the reasons for refusal, as follows:

1. The existing property doesn't create a building line, as it is angled at 45 - degree to Redford Street. The neighbouring building at 38-44 Redford Street is the only property along this road that "fronts" onto the street.

2. Several corner plots on adjacent streets have similar single or two-storey side extensions that project beyond the building line: notably, 60 Warriston Street, 4 Liberton Street, 71 Liberton Street and 36 Longford Street.
3. 34 Redford Street turns away from the street, so no building line is present.
4. The extension is subservient to the existing dwellinghouse.
5. There is no detrimental impact, in terms of: physical impact, overshadowing and overlooking.

5 PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSION

- 5.1 There were no pre-application discussions relating to the proposal.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

- 6.1 There were no representations received for the planning application or for the review.

7 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 The following are the relevant policy considerations:

The proposal is not considered to present any concerns in terms of: the proposed pitch roof design, materials, daylight, privacy and overlooking, useable private garden ground, front to rear access and car parking arrangements.

NPF 4 Policy 14 – Design, quality and place / SG 1 Placemaking

Committee should note that:

- the extension is 4.86 m in width, which would almost double the width of the existing dwellinghouse;
- the proposal site is a corner plot, with the result that the existing house is oriented at an angle;
- the proposed extension would therefore protrude beyond the building line set by 38-44 Redford Street. Para 2.12 in SG 1 notes:

2.12 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.

Committee should consider:

- whether the width of the proposed extension contributes to an unacceptable breach of the building line;
- whether this would be detrimental to the house and the street scene, and
- whether the character of the residential area would be preserved.

8 COMMITTEE DECISION

8.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with or without conditions;
- b. Refuse planning permission; or
- c. Continue the application for further information.

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

- 9.1 That Committee consider the content of this report in coming to their decision.