

Report of Handling for Application 24/00520/FUL

ADDRESS:	3 Criffell Gardens Glasgow G32 9JD	<div>Item 3</div> <div>12th November 2024</div>
PROPOSAL:	Erection of roof dormers to front and rear of dwellinghouse.	

DATE OF ADVERT:	No advertisement required.
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	11 neighbour notification letters were issued, and the application was included on the Weekly List of Applications. No representations were received.
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	None.
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	<p>No formal pre-application discussion recorded on Uniform.</p> <p>This application is a resubmission following the refusal of application 23/02798/FUL. The initial submission for the subject application had many of the same issues as the above refusal application.</p> <p>It should be noted that a substantial degree of discussion and negotiation took place on this application, however an agreement was not reached. Following initial feedback and discussion, the agent uploaded drawings (dated 3rd May on the application file) which would have been considered supportable, however later these drawings were retracted, and alternative drawings were uploaded (dated 7th May on the application file). The Case Officer suggested that the proposed front dormers from the drawings dated 3rd May and the proposed rear dormer from the drawings dated 7th May together would be considered supportable. However, this design was not materialised by the agent. The agent submitted final proposals dated 20th May 2024 on the application file, which are the drawings that the decision has been based upon.</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
NPF4 POLICIES	The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the national spatial strategy for Scotland up to 2045. Unlikely previous national planning documents, the NPF4 is part of the statutory Development Plan and Glasgow City Council as planning

	<p>authority must assess all proposed development against its policies. The following policies are considered relevant to the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place • Policy 16: Quality Homes
CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES	<p>The City Development Plan consists of high-level policies with statutory supplementary guidance providing further information or detail in respect of the policies. The following are considered relevant to the application:</p> <p>CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle SG 1: Placemaking, Residential Development</p>
OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	None.
REASON FOR DECISION	The proposal is not considered to be in accordance with NPF4 or the Development Plan and there were no material considerations, which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.

Comments	
-----------------	--

Planning History	Development Management			
	Ref	Proposal	Decision Issued	Decision
	23/02798/FUL	Erection of roof dormers to front and rear of dwellinghouse.	06.02.2024	RF
Site Visits (Dates)	Application determined using Google Maps and drawings provided.			
Siting	The application site is a semi-detached bungalow located in a well-established residential area on the southeast side of Criffell Gardens in Ward 19 - Shettleston.			
Design and Materials	<p>The proposed development is for the formation of a dormer on the front elevation and a dormer on the rear elevation.</p> <p>Design</p> <p><u>Approx. front elevation dormer measurements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.6m width • 1.8m height (maximum) • 3.25m length (extending out from roof - maximum) • 0.8m down from ridge of roof • 1.37m from front elevation roof eaves <p>The existing roof width is around 9.2m. The dormer on the front elevation extends 4.6m wide.</p> <p><u>Approx. rear elevation dormer measurements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.3m total width • 1.9m height (maximum) • 3.4m length (extending out from roof - maximum) • 0.8m down from ridge of roof • 0.7m from rear elevation roof eaves (using the part of the roof above the rear door, the proposed dormer sits far closer to the eaves of the other section of roof) <p>The existing roof width is 9.1m. The dormer on the rear elevation extends 7.3m wide.</p> <p>Materials</p> <p>Dormer cheeks/walls/roof: red/brown TATA steel cladding</p>			

	It should be noted that the existing dwelling has a red/brown tiled roof with a sandy coloured render and stone cladding in matching colours to the render on the walls.
Daylight	No issues.
Aspect	The dormers are proposed to be attached to the roof of the property on the front and rear elevations.
Privacy	<p>SG1 (part 2) states:</p> <p>2.6 Privacy and Overlooking - <i>The following guidance applies:</i></p> <p><i>a) there should be no adverse impact on existing or proposed accommodation;</i></p> <p><i>b) windows of habitable rooms (see Definition) should not increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms;</i></p> <p><i>c) at ground floor level, screening of 1.8 metre high will usually be required along boundaries where new windows face neighbouring properties;</i></p> <p><i>d) 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. These distances do not apply to rooflights; and</i></p> <p><i>e) Obscure glazing in windows of habitable rooms (see Definition) is not considered an acceptable means to mitigate against privacy issues.</i></p> <p>Case Officer Comment:</p> <p>No issues. The proposed dormer to the front is around 11m from the property boundary (and around 26m to the property directly opposite) and the proposed dormer to the rear is around 13.6m from the property boundary / the rear garden of 30 Criffell Road.</p>
Adjacent Levels	The site appears to be relatively flat.
Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)	No issues.
Access and Parking	No issues.
Site Constraints	The site is located within a Coal Authority Low Risk Area and Protected Species Water Voles have been recorded at this site.
Other Comments	<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. 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 NPF4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted on the 29th March 2017.</p> <p><u>NPF4</u></p> <p>The proposed development overall does not comply with Policies 14 and 16 of NPF4. The proposed front dormer will have a detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the property and surrounding area due to its design, which is not in keeping with the proportions and style of the existing property.</p> <p><u>CDP</u></p> <p>With respect to the City Development Plan Policy, CDP 1 is an overarching Policy which must be considered for all development proposals to help achieve the key aims of the City Development Plan. SG1 sets out in detail the planning requirements for alterations to dwellings and gardens. It seeks to ensure that alterations to houses are</p>

carefully considered, so that the visual amenity of residential buildings and areas is not adversely affected by over-dominant additions and that residential amenity is not reduced.

SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2), Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens states:

2.14 Dormers, Roof Terraces and Balconies

Dormers should:

- a) be well below the ridgeline of the roof;*
- b) be finished to match the materials of the existing roof;*
- c) have a front face predominantly glazed;*
- d) match the style of any existing dormers present on the roof/adjacent buildings;*
- e) be well drawn back from the eaves by at least 300mm;*
- f) not extend more than 50% of the width of the roof (two small dormers on the same elevation would be preferable to one larger dormer);*
- g) not be over-dominant in relation to the existing scale of the property; and*
- h) relate to windows and doors below in character, proportion and alignment.*

2.15 *Dormers, roof terraces and balconies should not be located where they could infringe the privacy of neighbours, by directly looking into their windows or private gardens (exceptions may be made where the space the dormer serves is clearly non-habitable). Obscure glazing is not considered an acceptable means to mitigate against privacy issues.*

2.16 *The alteration to the roof should also not have a significant effect on the appearance of the roof. The cumulative effect of dormers and other roof alterations on the appearance of the dwelling will also be taken into account.*

Case Officer Comment:

The proposed dormers do not appear to infringe on the privacy of neighbouring properties or private rear gardens as they appear to be a suitable distance away from the property's site boundaries. However, in terms of design, the proposed front dormer does not meet the criteria of SG1.

The proposed front dormer does not meet criteria g) or h) above. Whilst the proposed front dormer meets a majority of the size-related criteria above, its overall impact is that it dominates the roof of the modestly sized property. The proposed front dormer intends to service two separate rooms and uses a small section of cladding between the glazed face of the dormer in order to facilitate this. As policy states, it would be preferable for there to be two smaller dormers on a roof rather than one larger dormer. The two-dormer approach would have fit the context better as there would have been opportunity to service a room each without needing to split the glazing with cladding, creating a more seamless design, and the proportions of two smaller dormers would be less dominating than one larger one.

In line with this, the existing design hierarchy of the property is clear, with a bay-style window on either side of the front door. The proposed single dormer on the front elevation extends unevenly across the existing windows, impacting the character of the existing property by making the proposed dormer the new dominant feature. Two appropriately sized dormers on the front elevation would have been the preference in this context, as there would be opportunity to fit in with the existing hierarchy of the property by mirroring the existing symmetry.

Lastly, the proposed front dormer windows do not match the style of the windows below. The proposed front dormer windows are vertical in design and are arranged in a row of 7 panes. The existing windows are horizontal in design with three clear sections. This creates a mismatched frontage to the property, detrimentally impacting its existing appearance.

	<p>Overall, the proposed front dormer is considered to be an incongruous and dominating feature on the existing property. The proposed front dormer disrupts the existing hierarchy of the property, and the proportions and style of window does not match or complement the property. On this basis, the proposed development does not comply with the policy criteria in SG1 (part 2).</p> <p>With regard to b), there are no material considerations which would merit a breach of the Council's Statutory Guidance.</p> <p>Overall, for the reasons outlined above, it is recommended that the application be <u>refused</u>.</p>
Recommendation	Refuse

Date: 22.05.2024	DM Officer	Lisa Davison
Date: <u>05/06/2023</u>	DM Manager	Ian Briggs

Reasons for Refusal

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 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 front dormer is considered to be an incongruous and dominating addition to the existing property, which will disrupt the existing hierarchy of the property and impact the visual amenity of the dwelling and wider area.

Drawings

The development shall not be implemented in accordance with the drawing(s)

1. AL001 - A Location Plan Received 23 February 2024
2. AL005 - Proposed Elevations Received 20 May 2024
3. AL004 - Proposed Floor Plans Received 20 May 2024
4. AL003 - Proposed Site Plan Received 20 May 2024

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