

## REPORT OF HANDLING FOR APPLICATION 23/01814/FUL

<b>ADDRESS:</b>	349 Albert Drive Glasgow G41 5PH
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of one/two storey extension to side and rear of dwellinghouse and external alterations

<b>DATE OF ADVERT:</b>	11 August 2023
<b>NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED</b>	<p><b>Three objections submitted</b>, one from the Pollokshields Heritage, one from The Architectural Heritage Society and one from a member of the public. (summarised below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal is totally alien to the existing villa and the conservation area.</li> <li>• The scale of this extension is excessive for both the plot and the location. The locale is characterised by generous spacing both front and rear, as well as to the sides.</li> <li>• The design does not reflect or respond to the character of the original villa with minimal loss of the original fabric and features.”</li> <li>• The unsympathetic materials (where detailed) have no reference to the villa or the wider context.</li> <li>• The massive rear window is unsightly, and there may be issues of overlooking (especially from balcony) neighbouring properties/gardens.</li> <li>• No details of rooflights provided for single storey structure which may be visible from street.</li> <li>• The front and side elevation of the property are highly visible from the street.</li> <li>• Whilst it is welcomed that the applicant now intends to replace the existing rooflights with new conservation style units, it is noted that details have not been provided for the central, glazed area.</li> <li>• Despite such a large increase in building footprint there is reduced provision for covered car parking.</li> <li>• The Trustees of Pollokshields Heritage (PH) note an additional photomontage and letter have been uploaded onto the planning portal. The re-opening of the consultation has not, we understand, been notified to neighbours or included on a weekly list, so it was only by chance it was noticed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment:</b> Generally in agreement with above points and these are responded to within the body of the report but to note: The replacement rooflights to the existing roof are conservation style which represents an improvement to the current situation. There is some concern regarding the east elevation as the rooflights appear to have been re-located and one appears larger than the original. Replacement rooflights are unlikely to be supported on this roof pitch. As the existing drawings do not detail this feature it is difficult to establish this with certainty. As the application will be refused in all cases, requesting further details,</p>

	<p>would create additional work without having an impact on the Decision. This issue can be addressed at a later stage if/when a further proposal is brought forward.</p> <p>For elevations not visible from a public area, a different type of rooflight may be considered acceptable, particularly given the contemporary nature of the proposal and the flat roofed design.</p> <p>In terms of car parking provision, the site can accommodate at least 3 cars. Ample space is also available on street.</p> <p>With reference to the additional photomontage and letter uploaded, the agent submitted further details in support of the proposal. This is normal practice and additional documents and even amended plans can be submitted at this stage without triggering further public consultation.</p>
<p><b>PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES</b></p>	<p>No external consultations issued</p>
<p><b>PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS</b></p>	<p>The applicant and agent did not seek pre-application advice or discussions with Glasgow City Council prior to submission of this application. Therefore, the case officer was unable to provide advice on whether the proposed development complied with the relevant Policy and Guidance of NPF 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 agent and applicant failed to avail themselves of this service.</p> <p>Following the validation of the application, the agent was contacted by email to advise that the application was significantly at variance to the Development Plan. Initial comments relayed to the agent further to discussions with Heritage and City Design Team were:</p> <p>(summarised):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justification should be provided for the demolition of the existing garage/ utility (this structure has actually been demolished according to Google Streetview) or it could be incorporated into the proposals.</li> <li>• Failing the above, the existing material could be incorporated into the proposal with an emphasis on the frontage proposals.</li> <li>• The scale of the proposal is a detraction from the original house and over dominant.</li> <li>• No reference in scale or suitable proportionality has been demonstrated in the proposal.</li> <li>• The proposal is a mis match of detail and design which does not provide harmony to the overall design.</li> <li>• While materiality excludes the existing stone, the opportunity to provide a consistency of material on the main elevation is missed.</li> <li>• Like the design the materiality is a mis match of textures and colour which provide no harmony to the overall design and are over complicated.</li> <li>• The balcony to the rear while partially screened from the adjoining property does provide an overseeing issue to their amenity space.</li> <li>• The distance from proposed gable to the boundary is not dimensioned on the plans and while the minimum of 1m to glazing may be achieved this is not demonstrated on the CGI images.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agents response (summarised):</b>  The existing garage/ utility was in a poor state of repair due maintenance issues which has led to rising damp issues. Consequently, much of the stonework cannot be salvaged but stone has since been incorporated into the front and return of the side elevation. <i>(It should be noted that partial demolition would have required planning permission. No such consent has been sought according to the planning history associated with this property).</i></p> <p>The agent refuted the suggestion that the extension was excessive and commented that the new extension is to be a detraction from the original house and does not try to mimic the existing Victorian Villa. Also refuted was the suggestion that the materiality</p>

	<p>resulted in a mismatch of textures and colour stating that “it added interest”.</p> <p>A drawing that demonstrated the extent of over-looking the balcony created (in the agents view) was provided.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> An opportunity was provided to address the above issues. However, the changes made to the proposal were minimal and fell significantly short of addressing the numerous concerns identified. Given this, and the fact that the changes required were considered too extensive, a view was taken to proceed with determination.</p>
--	--

<b>EIA - MAIN ISSUES</b>	NONE
<b>CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>DESIGN OR DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>IMPACT/POTENTIAL IMPACT STATEMENTS – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>S75 AGREEMENT SUMMARY</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>DETAILS OF DIRECTION UNDER REGS 30/31/32</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>NPF4 POLICIES</b>	<p>The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the national spatial strategy for Scotland up to 2045. Unlike previous national planning documents, the NPF4 is part of the statutory development plan and Glasgow City Council as planning authority must assess all proposed development against its policies. The following policies are considered relevant to this application:</p> <p><b>Policy 1:</b> Tackling the climate and nature crises  <b>Policy 7:</b> Historic assets and places  <b>Policy 16:</b> Quality homes</p>
<b>CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES</b>	<p><b>CDP 1:</b> The Placemaking Principle  <b>SG 1:</b> Placemaking, Part 2, Residential Development – Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens  <b>CDP 9:</b> Historic Environment  <b>SG 9:</b> Historic Environment, Unlisted Buildings within Conservation Areas</p>
<b>OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	This address is within the West Pollokshields Conservation Area. No other material considerations identified.
<b>REASON FOR DECISION</b>	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.

	<b>COMMENTS</b>
--	-----------------

<b>PLANNING HISTORY</b>	<b>Development Management</b>			
	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision Issued</b>	<b>Decision</b>
	09/01290/DC	Erection of two storey side extension, rear conservatory and single storey detached outbuilding to side of dwellinghouse and associated boundary works.	06.08.2009	RF

	10/00473/DC	Erection of two storey side extension, rear conservatory and associated boundary works to dwellinghouse.	03.08.2010	GC
	13/01216/DC	Erection of two storey side extension, rear conservatory and associated boundary works to dwellinghouse.	19.07.2013	GC
	21/01468/FUL	Erection of two storey extension to side, conservatory and installation of rooflight to rear of dwellinghouse.	06.08.2021	RF
	22/02092/FUL	Erection of two storey extension to side, single storey extension to rear and installation of three rooflights	15.11.2022	VW
	23/01814/FUL	Erection of two storey extension to side of dwellinghouse and external alterations.		PCO
	<p><b>Planning History Background:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The previous proposal (21/01468/FUL) was first submitted in 2009. This received significant opposition and was refused.</li> <li>• The plans were submitted, unchanged in form in 2010 and were consented with conditions.</li> <li>• A resubmission of the same design was received in 2013 and was consented with conditions.</li> <li>• The 2021 proposal was unchanged from this design created in 2009 and first consented in 2010. This was refused.</li> </ul> <p>Since the most recent consent, in 2013, the relevant assessment policies had changed, and the 2021 proposal was not deemed to be a suitable scale or position for this building or the wider Conservation Area.</p> <p>The most recent proposal (23/01814/FUL) seeks consent for a very contemporary contrast to the property and is assessed below:</p>			
<b>SITE VISITS (DATES)</b>	Application determined using Google Maps and drawings provided.			
<b>SITING</b>	<p>The application property is a detached Victorian villa on the south side of Albert Drive, a traditional residential street within an established part of the Pollokshaws area, located southwest of the city centre.</p> <p>Ward 06 – Pollokshields</p>			
<b>DESIGN AND MATERIALS</b>	<p>This application is for the erection of a two-storey extension to side of dwellinghouse and external alterations.</p> <p><b>Design:</b> To extend to the side, an existing single storey section has been removed. This extended around 9.6m from the side of the main building.</p> <p><b>Extension:</b> The width of the new extension is to be 8.2m (at the widest point) but 2.1m of this is single storey (set back from front elevation by 5.2m)) and 15.2m deep, extending 4.1m past the rear wall of the main dwelling. The two-storey element is 6.4m high and the single storey is 3m high. The single storey element has a setback from the front elevation of 5.1m and the two-storey element by 1m. The extension also wraps around to the rear elevation where it becomes single storey.</p> <p>Ground floor accommodates: a gym area, additional sitting room, extended kitchen and bedroom with ensuite. This also has its own dedicated access (which should be removed if a further application is submitted).</p> <p>143m<sup>2</sup> of additional floorspace is added at ground floor level (The existing building's floorspace is approximately 171m<sup>2</sup>- (includes oriel windows))</p>			

	<p><b>First Floor:</b></p> <p>It is only the side extension that is 2 storeys high (which extends to the rear). It is 5.9m wide, 15.2 m deep (again 4.1m past the rear wall of the main dwelling). A balcony is included to the rear of this and the internal space measures 5.2m×1.6m.</p> <p>First floor level accommodates: a bedroom with ensuite, a TV room and balcony. There is 91m<sup>2</sup> of additional floorspace at first floor level (The existing building's floorspace is approximately 163m<sup>2</sup>).</p> <p>In total, the extension adds approximately 234m<sup>2</sup> of additional floorspace. This represents a 70% increase in floorspace.</p> <p><b>Attic Level:</b></p> <p>Attic Level accommodates: A cinema and bedroom with ensuite.</p> <p>Both the single storey and 2 storey extensions have flat roofs. The 2 storey extension will feature a PV array. Any future submission should include a specification brochure and drawings that demonstrate that there is no protrusion from the roof surface.</p> <p>The rooflights on all 3 roofplanes of the original property will be replaced with conservation style rooflights. On the eastern elevation the rooflights appear to have been re-located according to Google Streetview. It is difficult to tell as the existing drawings do not include this feature. Also, there appears to be a very thick frame surrounding the glazing and so the accuracy of the drawings is questionable.</p> <p><b>Material palette includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single ply roofing membrane- black;</li> <li>• Zinc Rainscreen Cladding- Dark gray;</li> <li>• Black Cladding- Dark Gray;</li> <li>• Glazing;</li> <li>• Hardwood Railway Sleeper- Stained;</li> <li>• Reclaimed Sandstone;</li> <li>• UPVC Windows- Anthracite Gray;</li> <li>• Render- white;</li> <li>• Photovoltaic Module- Black; and</li> <li>• Zinc Coping-Black.</li> </ul>
<b>DAYLIGHT</b>	The 2-storey element of the extension is approximately 7m from the property at no. 347 Albert Drive and so no issues are anticipated due to this distance and, given the height of the extension.
<b>ASPECT</b>	Extension to the (east) side and rear (south)
<b>PRIVACY</b>	<p><b>SG 1, Part 2, Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens:</b></p> <p><b>Privacy and Overlooking</b> - <i>The following guidance applies:</i></p> <p>a) <i>there should be no adverse impact on existing or proposed accommodation;</i></p> <p>b) <i>windows of habitable rooms (see Definition) should not increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms;</i></p> <p>c) <i>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>d) <i>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</i></p>

	<p><i>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><b>Dormers, roof terraces and balconies</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>The balcony at first floor level cannot not be supported as this would provide direct views to the neighbouring garden to the rear at 349 Aytoun Road.</p> <p>The side window at first floor level is located approximately 29m from the neighbouring property at 351 Albert Drive and 23m to the boundary. Given the distances involved and, as this window would have direct views to the side elevation of the property at 351, this situation is acceptable.</p>
<b>ADJACENT LEVELS</b>	No issues found.
<b>LANDSCAPING (INCLUDING GARDEN GROUND)</b>	No landscaping proposed with this application. This proposal would leave sufficient useable garden ground.
<b>ACCESS AND PARKING</b>	No issues found.
<b>SITE CONSTRAINTS</b>	This site has been identified as a low-risk area by the Coal Authority. This is also within the Pollokshields West Conservation Area.
<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>	<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. In addition, under the terms of Section 59 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas)(Scotland) Act 1997, the Council is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Section 64 of the same Act requires the Council to pay special regard to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area, including the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.</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;</p> <p>b) whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or the appearance of the Conservation Area;</p> <p>c) whether the proposals would impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings;</p> <p>d) whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>In respect of (a) and (b), the Development Plan comprises of NPF4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted 29th March 2017.</p> <p><b>NPF4</b></p> <p><b>The proposal is not considered to be consistent with the aims of Policy 7 and Policy 16 of NPF4.</b></p> <p>The intent of Policy 7 (Historic assets and places) is to protect and enhance historic</p>

environment assets and places. Policy 7 states that development proposals in or affecting conservation areas will only be supported where the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced. Relevant considerations include the:

- i. architectural and historic character of the area
- ii. existing density, built form and layout; and
- iii. context and siting, quality of design and suitable materials.

Policy 16 (Quality Homes) states that householder development proposals will be *supported where they 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.*

**Comment:**

The proposed development fails to preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the West Pollokshields Conservation Area. Furthermore, the proposed development fails to respect the architectural character and established built form of the West Pollokshields Conservation Area. Additionally, the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the character and environmental quality of the home and the surrounding conservation area due to its of size, design and unsuitable external materials (Upvc windows/extensive use of render in particular).

**CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle**

**The proposal is considered to be contrary to CDP 1.**

Policy CDP 1 is an overarching Policy which must be considered for all development proposals to help achieve the key aims of the Glasgow City Development Plan. CDP 1 states that *new development should aspire towards the highest standards of design while providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents in the City. New development should respect the environment by responding to its qualities and character, while protecting the City's heritage.*

**Comment:**

The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate siting, design, massing, scale and materials, will detract from the character and appearance of the property and the West Pollokshields Conservation Area. The proposed works would have a negative impact on the historic environment and fails to respect and complement the character and appearance of the City's heritage and the special architectural and historic interest of the West Pollokshields Conservation Area.

Consequently, 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 quality and character of the environment and does not protect the City's heritage.

**This application is, therefore, contrary to CDP 1.**

**Supplementary Guidance SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2), Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens**

**The proposal is considered to be contrary to SG 1.**

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 daylighting. It seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to houses are carefully designed, so that the visual amenity of residential buildings and areas is not adversely affected by over-dominant extensions and that residential amenity is not reduced. The following is an extract of the guidance that applies to all extensions:

- *The siting, form, scale, proportions and detailed design should be in keeping with the existing building and wider area.*
- *High quality innovative design is encouraged where it will complement the property.*

- *Extensions and other alterations to dwellings should be designed so they do not dominate the existing building, or neighbouring buildings.*
- *External materials should reflect the character of the original building and the street.*
- *Extensions should relate to the design of the original dwelling and should be subordinate in scale and design.*

**Comment:**

The proposal is considered to be contrary to SG 1 in that, the extension, by virtue of its siting, form, proportions, scale and materials will visually detract from the character and appearance of the property and would not be in keeping with the existing dwelling and the wider area.

Whilst contemporary in appearance the proposed extension is not considered to be of a high-quality, innovative design and does little to reflect the character of the original building and the street.

Contemporary and contrasting extensions within an historic environment can be challenging requiring a balance of scale, siting, detailing and materials. In this situation the development is flat roofed, sits below the ridge, has a solid link structure and an inconsistency in the design where the front is modern with sandstone and the sides are relegated to white render (not traditional to the conservation area) and a rear that is a mix of architectural styles. The materials are not of high quality with only the front and part side including an element of sandstone but the rest being upvc, single ply membrane, white render and brick cladding. As a whole the fenestration bears no resemblance in form nor alignment to the existing property. Furthermore, the proposed extension, particularly the inappropriate roof-design, does not relate to the design of the original dwelling. The proposed development will prejudice the prevailing architectural character of the property and wider townscape.

The incongruous appearance of the proposed development does not reflect the character of the original building and the locale and does not complement the property. This is a significant addition, adding approximately 234m<sup>2</sup> of extra floorspace to the property, representing an overall 70% increase in floorspace. In addition, the proposal would create over-looking issues due to the inclusion of a balcony that provides direct views to the neighbouring garden at the rear of the property to the detriment of residential amenity.

The proposed development will give the appearance of incongruous and disproportionate addition to the dwelling which would dominate the existing building and introduce a palette of materials that do not reflect the quality of the existing and neighbouring dwellings to the detriment of visual and residential amenity and the character of the street scene.

Consequently, the proposal is considered to be contrary to SG 1.

As this proposal is for a dwelling that is within a Conservation Area, this application is also subject to guidance set out in **SG9: Historic Environment**. This details the approach to alterations and developments regarding Glasgow's heritage assets – listed buildings and Conservation Areas.

**Policy CDP 9: Historic Environment**

**The proposal is considered to be contrary to CDP 9.**

This Policy aims to ensure the appropriate protection, enhancement and management of Glasgow's heritage assets by providing clear guidance to applicants. The Council will assess the impact of proposed developments and support high quality design that respects and complements the character and appearance of the historic environment and the special architectural interest of its conservation areas. The Council is unlikely to support development that would have a negative impact on the historic environment.

**SG 9** states that all works must be carried out in a way which safeguards the quality of conservation areas. In terms of specific guidance for extensions and alterations, **SG 9** states:



- *It may be acceptable for additions to be different and distinguishable from the existing building, in terms of design. The use of high-quality materials which complement the main building will be required together with innovative modern design that is appropriate to its context. In some cases however it may be appropriate to match the new proposals to the existing, in which case the new materials should be carefully specified in response to those of the original property.*
- *Extensions should be located to the rear or side of the property. Extensions should not protrude beyond the front elevation of the existing building. The setting back of extensions will be encouraged.*
- *Any extensions to properties within Conservation Areas should be subsidiary in scale, sympathetic in design, reflect and respond to the character of the Conservation Area and not dominate the original property. Within this context, high quality innovative modern design will be encouraged.*
- *Materials should complement those of the existing property in terms of their colour, texture and scale.*
- *In the case of a traditionally designed extension - windows should match those of the existing property however alternative fenestration may be considered appropriate in the case of contemporary designs.*
- *Roofs should be ridged or mono-pitched. Flat roofs should be avoided unless the intention is to provide a green roofing system or the design is integral to an overall approved contemporary design.*
- *Extensions should not disrupt the established plot pattern and should preserve or enhance all other key characteristics of the conservation area or site.*

**Roof Lights** - *The use of conservation style roof lights is the preferred solution in the creation of additional roof space. Where acceptable, these should be on the rear elevation of a building or within the valley of an M shaped roof. New roof lights should not be introduced on the front elevation of Listed Buildings or unlisted building in a Conservation Area.*

*New roof lights should replicate traditional roof lights in design, low profile framing and structural glazing bars, and be coloured to blend in with the roof finish and be flush fitted. The number of roof lights proposed will also be taken into consideration.*

**Comment:**

In terms of the replacement rooflights proposed, this alteration is a welcomed and will assist in addressing the inappropriate, historic intervention to this property. The only concern is the replacement rooflights on the eastern elevation that appear to have been relocated and altered in dimensions. This should be clarified in any future submission by clearly and accurately including this feature in existing and proposed drawings.

In terms of the extension, the proposed development by virtue of its siting, design, massing, scale and materials would not preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the West Pollokshields Conservation Area. The proposed development would have a negative impact on the historic environment. Original and traditional design details, such as the established plot pattern, spacing and built form make a valuable contribution to the quality of the West Pollokshields Conservation Area and contribute to its cohesive character. It is assessed that this proposed development fails to respect the period, style and architectural character of the application property.

Whilst a good quality, contemporary contrast can make a positive contribution, the proposal, as it stands, would require significant amendments to the design, scale and materials selected before it may be considered as such. The accumulation of inferior and unsuitable design details such as the inappropriate roof-design, the over-dominant scale, the incongruous use of render, particularly to the highly visible side elevation over two-storeys and the failure to respect the established built-form and plot pattern will have a significant detrimental impact on the architectural integrity of the property and the wider conservation area. In addition the proposal would create over-looking issues to the detriment of residential amenity.

Consequently, the proposed development will erode the character of the building and neighbouring properties and will have a detrimental impact on special architectural interest of the West Pollokshields Conservation Area.

**This application is, therefore, contrary to CDP 9.**

	<p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>This proposal fails to take account of this architecturally significant site and respond the Conservation Area suitably. Though this is not a listed building, the merit of this traditional sandstone dwelling within a wider streetscape and area of historic character should not be underestimated. The contribution of these detached buildings to the quality of the wider environment is important and should be handled accordingly.</p> <p>This traditional, double-fronted sandstone villa has a symmetrical front elevation which appears to be as original. The existing side section has, unfortunately been removed but was set back around 6.5m and was single storey. This two-storey proposal (omitting the single storey element) remains a significant addition and still adds just short of half the width of the main building. It would significantly change the balance and appearance of this attractive dwelling from the front and side elevation, including from a wide aspect from the street.</p> <p>The dwelling as existing is a sizeable and largely unaltered example of this era of architecture. Proposed changes should respect the form, particularly from the front elevation, and create a design that complements the original whether this with minimal loss of the original fabric and features.</p> <p>In terms of (c), whether the proposals would impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings, there are no listed buildings in the direct vicinity.</p> <p>In terms of (d), other material considerations include the views of statutory and other consultees and the contents of letters of representations. No consultations were received and the issues raised in the representation are considered to have been addressed in this report.</p> <p>Overall, this proposal is not in accordance important policies within NPF 4- Policy 7: Historic Assets &amp; Places and Policy 16: Quality Homes and the Glasgow City Development Plan- SG1: Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens and SG9: Historic Environment. The extension's scale, materiality, subservience and mixed design elements are not complimentary to the existing building or street scene would not appear subordinate. This addition would be incongruous and would have a significant impact on the main dwelling and the wider area to the detriment to residential and visual amenity and is therefore not in accordance with the current City Development Plan.</p>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	Refuse

Date: 21/02/24	DM Officer	<b>Eileen Dudziak</b>
Date: <u>22/02/2024</u>	DM Manager	Ross Middleton

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 7: Historic Assets & Places and Policy 16: Quality Homes of the National Planning Framework 4, CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle, CDP 9: Historic Environment, SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2, Residential Development - Alterations to Dwellings & Gardens) and SG 9: Historic Environment 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 16: Quality Homes of National Planning Framework 4 in that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the character and environmental quality of the home and the surrounding area in terms of its of size, design and materials.

04. The proposal is contrary to CDP 1 of the City Development Plan in that 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 quality and character of the historic environment and does not protect the City's heritage.

05. The proposal is contrary to Policy 7: Historic Assets & Places of the National Planning Framework 4 and CDP 9 of the City Development Plan in that the proposed development will erode the character of the building and neighbouring properties and will have a detrimental impact on the special architectural interest of the West Pollokshields Conservation Area.

06. The proposal is contrary to SG 1 of the City Development Plan in that the extension, by virtue of its siting, design, massing, scale and materials will visually detract from the character and appearance of the property and would not be in keeping with the dwelling and the wider area. The proposed development will prejudice the prevailing architectural character of the property and wider townscape. The incongruous appearance of the proposed development does not reflect the character of the original building and the locale and does not complement the property. The proposed development will give the appearance of an incongruous and disproportionate addition to the dwelling which would dominate the existing building and the neighbouring dwellings to the detriment of visual and residential amenity and the character of the street scene.

07. The proposal is contrary to Policy 7: Historic Assets & Places of the National Planning Framework 4 and CDP 9 of the City Development Plan in that the extension, by virtue of its siting, design, massing, scale and materials will visually detract from the character and appearance of the property and the West Pollokshields Conservation Area. This would also interrupt the spacing of the buildings, to the detriment of the streetscape and wider traditional built urban form. The proposed development will have a negative impact on the historic environment and fails to respect and complement the character and appearance of the historic environment and the special architectural and historic interest of the West Pollokshields Conservation Area.