



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods,
Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

Item 1

25th November 2025

**25/00071/LOCAL – 240 Thornliebank Road, G46 7RQ
Installation of replacement fencing (Retrospective)**

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): 02 - Newlands/Auldburn 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

Location

- 1.1 The proposal site borders a residential garden of a detached dwellinghouse at 240 Thornliebank, which is approximately 1,600sq.m.
- 1.2 There is an embankment between Thornliebank Road and the house and the house sit at a lower level. The site does not have vehicular access from the road, only pedestrian. Beyond the railway, a car wash and fitness centre face the west of the site, with Auldhouse Burn running along the east.

Proposal

- 1.3 The proposal is for the retrospective erection of a 1.8m high wooden fencing and a gate along the shared boundary with Thornliebank Road, running to 2m in part along the road. The fence runs for approximately 17.9m along Thornliebank Road.
- 1.4 The works were part of the East Kilbride Enhancement Project to install a new bridge deck at Thornliebank Road required a temporary pedestrian, services footbridge with the previous boundary treatment cleared. This (24/01188/PAP) was carried out under separate planning legislation.
 - Currently, the site is subject to enforcement action for 'Installation of fencing, refused retrospective application: 25/00511/FUL'
- 1.5 The previous boundary, now removed, was a chain-link fence lined with trees. Neighbouring sites, including at the recent development at 285 Burnfield Road, include stone boundary treatment with metal fencing above.
- 1.6 The proposal included the removal of several mature trees.

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
- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance are:
 - CDP 1 The Placemaking Principle
 - SG 1 Placemaking, Residential Development

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

- 3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

- 1) 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.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

1. Network Rail offered the planning officer an accompanied site visit as it was a construction site with limited public access. This was declined and we were advised that a site visit had already been carried out. We note from the Report of Handling that no site visit date is recorded. We believe that all the matters outlined above would have been viewed as 'material' had a site visit been undertaken.
Committee should note: The site visit was carried out on the 30th of April.
2. We note reference to a driveway and potential issue in relation to sightlines from the driveway. We confirm that the property has no driveway and there are therefore no issues relating to sightlines.
3. We note reference that 'the rear garden faces the road, and the front faces the railway line'. This is not the case. The rear garden faces the railway line, and the front faces the cemetery. However, even accepting this assumption would suggest that a higher fence height may be appropriate in this location in line with SG1: Part 2, section 2.31 when balanced with the material considerations above.
4. The suggestion of replacing the fence with a concrete wall similar to the bridge parapets is neither practical nor appropriate use of public money. The bridge parapets visible are the exposed part of integrated pre-cast units which form the superstructure of the bridge deck and cannot be continued along in this form. The height required for a new concrete wall to maintain garden privacy would require significant structural foundation works as the ground levels fall away steeply from the pavement edge.

5. Network Rail have considered what mitigation measures could be applied and sought advice from Development Management in this respect. As set out in our Planning Statement none of the suggestions met with the requirements of the owners, without whom this major road and railway infrastructure project could have taken place. The use of their garden for a temporary pedestrian and services bridge was critical to the delivery of the project which took around 15 months.
6. Network Rail are of the view that there is no established boundary treatment within the area. The use of grey concrete 'planks' along the base of the fencing provides some continuity of material and colour with the bridge adjacent. The fencing material is of a high-quality finish, and we do not accept that it 'adds little quality to the street and is incongruous'. The site has a unique set of circumstances, and the approval of planning permission will not set a precedent in the area.
7. The owners have been firmly against tree planting on their property. They were pleased to have the trees removed along the boundary and elsewhere in their garden and do not wish future maintenance resulting from any tree planting.
8. We note that no representations have been made in respect of the planning application. In addition, images and videos of the bridge opening which included views of the fencing were widely shared on Network Rail's comms channels and no adverse comments have been received by Network Rail.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 There following planning applications for the property are relevant to this review:
 - 24/01188/PAP - Removal and replacement of railway bridge deck. - Decided - Prior Approval Required – Grant
 - 25/00500/EN - Alleged breach: installation of fencing, refused retrospective application: 25/00511/FUL - Pending Consideration.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

- 6.1 No representations received.

7 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The key issues for Committee to consider are:

7.2 Design, Quality and Placemaking

NPF4 Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place, Policy 16: Quality Homes and CDP1/SG1: The placemaking principle

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. This includes:

Adaptable: Supporting commitment to investing in the long-term value of buildings, streets and spaces by allowing for flexibility so that they can be changed quickly to accommodate different uses as well as maintained over time.

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.

Committee should note that:

- The previous boundary was a chain-link fence, low level vegetation and trees, all of which have been cleared. No remediation is proposed.
- 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.
- The timber materials chosen would degrade over time and require regular maintenance.
- Correspondence between the appellant and council continued from 28th of July through to the 10th of October. Alternative materials, massing options and boundary treatments were suggested to the applicant but were discounted.

Committee should consider whether:

- the scale, design, and materials of the existing fence are acceptable in this prominent location, given its impact on the streetscape and character of the area?

CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle 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.

Committee should note that:

- The front garden fence exceeds 1 metre in height, contrary to policy.
- There is no pattern of high fences in the area. 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.
- In terms of materials. There are no close-boarded timber fences of this scale along this part of the road. The majority of treatments at this section of the road are of stone low parapet with metal railings above. The nearest boundary treatment to use timber fencing is at 3 Bemersyde Ave, 650m away and at 272 Thornliebank Road (East Renfrewshire Council), 100 metres away.

Committee should consider whether:

- the loss of the previous low, open boundary (chain-link fence and vegetation) is acceptable in terms of visual amenity and openness?
- An exception to policy and the height of 1.8 metres for the close-boarded timber fence is acceptable in this instance?

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.

8.2 Section 43A(12)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that reasoning behind why the local review body has been decided be supplied in the decision notice. Should committee be minded to grant planning permission, material considerations that justify a departure from the plan would require to be identified.

9 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 n/a

*Glasgow's net zero
carbon target?*

**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

10 RECOMMENDATIONS

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