

Report of Handling for Application 25/01917/FUL

ADDRESS:	17 Daleview Avenue Glasgow G12 0HE	Item 3 20th January 2026
PROPOSAL:	Erection of two storey extension to side, formation of dormer windows to side and rear of dwellinghouse and external alterations.	

DATE OF ADVERT:	No advert required.
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	18 neighbour notification letters were issued and the application was included on the Weekly List of Applications. No representations have been received.
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	None.
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	No formal pre-application advice was requested. This application is the same as previously submitted application 25/00255/FUL, and no alterations have been made to address the previous reasons for refusal.

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	<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.</p> <p>The following policies are considered relevant to the application:</p> <p>Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaptation Policy 14: Design, quality and place Policy 16: Quality homes</p>
CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES	<p>The City Development Plan consists of high-level policies with statutory Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>The following policies were considered when assessing the application:</p> <p>CDP1 and SG1 (Part 2): The Placemaking Principle</p>
OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	None.

REASON FOR DECISION	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.
----------------------------	---

Comments

Planning History	<p>25/00054/PLGA: Erection of two storey extension to side, formation of dormer windows to side and rear of dwellinghouse and external alterations. – Appeal withdrawn</p> <p>25/00255/FUL: Erection of two storey extension to side, formation of dormer windows to side and rear of dwellinghouse and external alterations. – Refuse</p> <p>00/02479/DC: Extension to rear of dwellinghouse. – GC</p>
Site Visits (Dates)	Not required. This application was assessed using the information provided alongside online resources.
Siting	<p>The application site is a semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the western side of Daleview Avenue. This is an established residential area with properties of similar character and scale.</p> <p>The property is within Ward 23.</p>
Design and Materials	<p>This application seeks consent for the following external alterations:</p> <p>Side Extension: A two-storey side extension to the southern elevation. This has a footprint of 10.2sqm and accommodates a new porch entrance and staircase to the upper level. The extension has an overall height of 6.1m and will be set-back from the front elevation by 4.7m. The extension will be finished in render walls and the monopitch roof slated to match the existing.</p> <p>Dormer to the rear (western) roofslope: Two elements are proposed – a box dormer and an adjoining glass box dormer. The box dormer is proposed to be 3.2m wide, 2.6m in height and will project from the roof slope by 3.7m. This is proposed to be finished in slate cladding with a membrane roof. The glazed dormer is attached to the box dormer and is 1m wide, 1.8m in height and projects 2.5m. The top of the glazed dormer will align with the eaves of the box dormer.</p> <p>Dormer to the side (northern) roofslope: This dormer is proposed to be 3.2m wide, 2.8m in height and project 4.4m. This is to be finished in slate cladding with a slate roof. The roof profile is to have a hipped profile.</p>
Daylight	Due to the siting of the extension on the side elevation of the original house, it will not impact on any windows of habitable rooms in the neighbouring dwellings or adjacent gardens. Therefore, a daylight assessment is not required.
Aspect	The front elevation of the property faces east.
Privacy	No Development Plan issues. Neither the proposed extension or side dormer serve habitable rooms and therefore do not present privacy concerns. The rear dormer is proposed to serve a bedroom (a habitable room), but this is orientated to face the occupier's own private rear garden and is sited a suitable distance from the site boundary, therefore no privacy concerns are raised.
Adjacent Levels	No Development Plan issues.
Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)	The proposed development is compliant with policy. SG1 policy states that a minimum of 66% of the original useable private garden space should be retained to avoid over-development of the site. Usable garden space is defined as land, under the exclusive control of the applicant, including decking, to a dwelling before the erection of any

	<p>extensions or garages, etc. that has been adequately screened, usually to the rear and side of the property, but excludes the driveway, garage and any parking space.</p> <p>Original Usable Private Rear Garden Space: 131sqm Proposed Extension (additional footprint): 7.6sqm Existing Extension: 17.4sqm Garage/outbuilding (within rear garden): 4.1sqm This equates to the development of 22.2% of the usable rear garden ground, which is acceptable.</p>
Access and Parking	No change to the existing arrangements.
Site Constraints	Coal Authority – High Risk
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: 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.</p> <p>NPF4 Policies 1 and 2 are overarching polices which must be considered for all development, giving weight to the climate and nature crises, and minimising lifecycle emissions. These policies will be considered throughout this assessment, but overall, the development is not considered to negatively impact on either crises. This development will require significant physical works to the property which will necessitate the use of new building materials. No information as to the reuse or recycling of any material, such as roof slates, has been provided.</p> <p>CDP1 and NPF4 Policy 14 are considered for all development proposals, advising 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. NPF4 Policy 16 provides guidance in relation to householder proposals, stating these will be supported where the size, design and materials of the proposal don't impact on the character of the home or area, and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties. SG1 (Part 2) provides the following detailed policy guidance:</p> <p>Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens – This guidance provides detail for particular types of householder developments, including extensions and dormers. It seeks to ensure that alterations are carefully designed so that the visual amenity of the building and area is not adversely affected by over-dominant extensions and the amenity is not reduced by a loss of privacy or a reduction in garden space.</p> <p>Useable Private Garden Space – As mentioned above, the development complies with this guidance as the proposal will retain more than 66% of the original useable private garden space for the dwelling.</p> <p>Privacy and Overlooking – As mentioned above, the development complies with this guidance, the proposal will not introduce any concerns as to privacy or overlooking. Both the side extension and side dormer will not serve habitable rooms, and the rear dormer is suitably sited to prevent privacy issues. Similarly, there will be no issues of overshadowing or loss of daylight introduced by this proposal.</p> <p>Two-Storey Side Extensions – The proposed two-storey side extension is appropriately set back from the building line and will not double the footprint of the</p>

house, which complies with this guidance. However, the proposed roof style will not carry through the line of the eaves as required by policy. It is proposed to create a gable-style roof which has a lower eaves level and different pitch angle to the existing roof. This results in an awkward addition to the side of the property, rather than looking like a natural addition. Similarly, the existing dwelling has a contrasting red brick base course and faux string course detailing to the upper level which runs across the front and side elevations. The base course detailing is proposed to be reflected at the front elevation, but no string course detail will be replicated.

Dormers – The dormers to both roofslopes mostly fail the policy guidance for dormer windows, which is detailed below:

a) be well below the ridgeline of the roof;

Comment: Neither main dormer complies with this, with both being sited at ridge level. The smaller glass box dormer complies with this element.

b) be finished to match the materials of the existing roof;

Comment: The proposed use of slate cladding and slate are compatible with this guidance, however, the box dormer is incongruous.

c) have a front face predominantly glazed;

Comment: Neither main dormer comply with this element.

d) match the style of any existing dormers present on the roof/adjacent buildings;

Comment: Very few surrounding properties have dormer windows. There is a dormer to the side elevation of 8 Daleview Avenue which was approved in 2012. The siting, scale and form of this dormer is in-keeping with this type of property. Additionally, it must be noted that the application property is a semi-detached property and such a large-scale dormer will unbalance the roofscape and cohesion with the immediately adjacent property.

e) be well drawn back from the eaves by at least 300mm;

Comment: Neither main dormer complies with this element. The glazed dormer is compliant.

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);

Comment: The side elevation dormer is in accordance with this guidance. However, although there are two rear elevation dormers, as these are adjoined this reads as one large dormer which fails this section.

g) not be over-dominant in relation to the existing scale of the property;

Comment: This proposal fails this element of the assessment. The introduction of three dormer windows, two of which are very large, will create a top-heavy and dominant appearance to the property.

h) relate to windows and doors below in character, proportion and alignment.

Comment: None of the proposed windows relate to the existing fenestration in terms of proportion, alignment or character, and therefore this fails this element of assessment. The existing dwelling has a strong, cohesive window character, and the proposed additions do not relate well to this.

Overall, it is assessed that the proposed development **does not comply** with the above policy guidance. The proposed development is considered to be poorly designed and will not improve the quality of the area, which has a strong uniformity of character. The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the character and quality of the home and surrounding area due to its scale, built form and design. The proposed

	<p>two-storey side extension will introduce an awkward roof style which does not carry through the line of the eaves; and the dormers are incongruous and overbearing to the existing dwelling.</p> <p>In respect of b) other material considerations, no consultations were required, and no public comments were received.</p> <p>It is considered, for the reasons details above that this application is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed this proposal's variance with the Development Plan. On the basis of the above , it is recommended that this application for Full Planning Permission be refused.</p>
Recommendation	Refuse

Date: 20/10/2025	DM Officer	Claire Hunt
Date 24/10/2025	DM Manager	Mark Thomson

CONDITIONS AND REASONS

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 National Planning Framework 4 Policies 14 and 16 (adopted February 2023) and CDP1 and the associated supplementary guidance of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom:

- By virtue of its siting, scale, built form and design, the proposed development is poor designed and will have a detrimental impact on the amenity, character and environmental quality of the site and the surrounding area.
- The proposed side elevation dormer, by virtue of its scale and design, will give the appearance of an incongruous and disproportionate addition to the dwelling which would dominate the existing property and the adjoining dwelling to the detriment of visual amenity and the character of the street scene.
- The proposed rear elevation dormers, by virtue of their scale, design and materials, will visually detract from the character and appearance of the property and would not be in keeping with the existing semi-detached dwelling and the wider area.
- The proposed two-storey side extension, by virtue of its inappropriate built form and design, will create an anomalous feature at the property and within the street-scene, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the property and the character of the street scene.

Drawings

The development has been refused in relation to the following drawing(s)

1. 01 LOCATION PLAN ; Received 19 August 2025
2. 02 BLOCK PLAN ; Received 19 August 2025
3. 08 PROPOSED SITE PLAN ; Received 19 August 2025
4. 09 PROPOSED PLANS ; Received 19 August 2025
5. 10 PROPOSED PLANS ; Received 19 August 2025
6. 11 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS ; Received 19 August 2025
7. 12 PROPOSED SECTIONS ; Received 19 August 2025
8. 13 DOWNTAKINGS ; Received 19 August 2025

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