

Report of Handling for Application 25/00511/FUL

ADDRESS:	240 Thornliebank Road Glasgow G46 7RQ	Item 3 25th November 2025
PROPOSAL:	Installation of replacement fencing (Retrospective)	

DATE OF ADVERT:	This application did not require to be advertised.
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	No representations were made.
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	No consultations requested.
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	No pre-application advice sought prior to the development

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. 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: Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place Policy 16: Quality Homes
CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES	CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle SG 1: Placemaking, Residential Development – Alterations to Dwellings & Gardens
OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	None
REASON FOR DECISION	The proposal is 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.

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

Planning History	Development Management			
	Ref	Proposal	Decision Issued	Decision
	25/00511/FUL	Installation of replacement fencing		PDE
Site Visits (Dates)	None required, desk research was carried out.			
Siting	The proposal lies to the southern boundary of 240 Thornliebank			
Design and Materials	Formation of a 1.8m high boundary fence along the southern side of the property that fronts onto the street along Thornliebank Road. The application is in retrospect. The fence is formed of vertical slatted timber set on top of a concrete base. The fence is closed boarded. The previous boundary, now removed, was that of a chainlink fence and a mixture of vegetation and trees. The works are associated with recent improvements to the bridge carried out by Network Rail who removed the previous boundary treatment.			
Daylight	No issues.			
Aspect	The proposed fence will front onto the street along the south boundary of the site.			
Privacy	Generally, front gardens and side gardens with a street-facing frontage are not considered to offer the same levels of private amenity as a rear garden. This development's historic building typology is such that the rear garden faces the road and the front faces the railway line. The boundary treatment pattern for this side of the street is a mixture of low and high boundary walls. Prior to the recent railway bridge development, the street benefitted from a mature tree canopy which provided ample privacy.			
Adjacent Levels	No issues.			
Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)	The proposal includes the removal of several mature trees.			
Access and Parking	None.			
Site Constraints	No relevant site constraints.			
Other Comments	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: a) Whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; b) Whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed. In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises of NPF4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted 29th March 2017. The proposal is inconsistent with the aims and abovementioned policies of NPF4 as the proposal uses unsustainable materials for construction of a boundary wall of this sitting and location. Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place The intent of Policy 14 is to encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the Place Principle. Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale. Development proposals that are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the			

surrounding area or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported.

Policy 16: Quality Homes

Policy 16 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.

With respect to the City Development Plan CDP1 and SG1 are most relevant.

Glasgow City Development Plan

CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle

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.*

SG 1: The Placemaking Principle

This guidance sets out the planning requirements for alterations to dwellings and gardens for particular types of householder developments, such as fences and boundary treatments. It outlines the criteria that must be met in relation to, for example design and materials. It seeks to ensure that alterations to houses are carefully designed, so that the visual amenity of residential buildings and areas is not adversely affected by over-dominant developments and that residential amenity is not reduced. The following is an extract of the guidance that applies to this application:

- *The siting, form, scale, proportions and detailed design should be in keeping with the existing building and wider area.*
- *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.*
- *In front gardens, where privacy is less of a consideration, walls and fences should not exceed 1 metre in height.*
- *In rear gardens, where a level of privacy can be expected, walls and fences up to 2 metres are acceptable.*
- *Exceptions may be made in areas where higher garden boundaries are the established pattern*

Case Officer Comment:

The application proposes to regularise a high close boarded timber fence that has been erected in place of a previously natural boundary. The fence extends approximately 17.9 metres at a height of 1.8 metres. Timber gates are located on the end of the fence.

The previous boundary was a chainlink fence, low level vegetation and trees, all of which have been removed.

Neighbouring the site is a low stone wall which forms part of the railway bridge and at the opposite end, a stone and railing boundary which marks the extents of Eastwood Cemetery. On the opposite side of the road is a commercial building with open fencing and further down residential flats with a stone wall and railing above. B

Network Rail have applied on behalf of the property owner and advise that in their opinion there is 'no single established boundary treatment' on the neighbouring fences. The previously used chain-link fences were regarded as inappropriate to the owner's privacy.

Whilst boundary treatments are not in consistent in design and scale there is a consistency in their openness and quality. There are also no close boarded timber

	fences of this scale on this stretch of the road. Alternative materials were suggested to the applicant but were discounted therefore this assessment is based on the application as it stands. Generally front gardens would have a low boundary treatment up to 1 metre, with more natural boundaries permitted to be higher. This is no ordinary house owing to the site location and the topography of the land but this is not reason to permit a fence of this scale in such a prominent location. The desire for complete privacy must be balanced with the need to maintain the quality of the streetscape and in this case the fence adds little quality to the street and is incongruous. A more suitable design would be like those adjacent boundaries where a mix of stone and open railings could be used or at the very least a lower fence. New vegetation behind would help soften the boundary whilst providing the desired level of privacy over time. The scale and close boarded nature of the fence also creates a potential issue in relation to sightlines from the driveway which is served by similarly large and close boarded gates. These gates are also unacceptable and offer little to the quality of the street. Based on the development's height, design, siting and materials it is not considered that the proposal would be acceptable and has a detrimental impact on the quality of the streetscape. The proposal therefore fails to meet CDP1, SG1 and corresponding policies in NPF4. Regarding b), no objections have been received but this is not reason in itself to grant planning permission. There are no other material considerations which would justify approval in this case. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused and the matter be passed to Planning Enforcement for investigation.
Recommendation	Refused

Date: 03/07/2025	DM Officer	Tim Moss
Date: <u>18/07/2025</u>	DM Manager	Ross Middleton

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 development proposal is contrary to Policy 14 'Design, Quality and Place' and Policy 16 'Quality Homes' of NPF4 and CDP 1 & SG 1: Placemaking of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted 2017) for the reasons specified below.

03. The proposed height, design, siting and materials of the fence and gates are incongruous and have a detrimental visual impact on the quality of the street and the host property. The development fails to complement the character of boundaries in the immediate area which include high quality materials and are open in nature and design.

Approved Drawings

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved drawing(s)

1. 3467-MHB-SKT-1003 BLOCK PLAN Received 5 March 2025
2. 3467-MHB-SKT-1006 ELEVATIONS Received 5 March 2025
3. 001A Received 13 March 2025

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