



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

**Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods,
Regeneration and Sustainability**

Item 1

24th June 2025

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

**25/00034/LOCAL – 2339 Paisley Road West Glasgow G52 3QB
Formation of dormer windows to front, side and rear of dwellinghouse**

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): 4

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

- 1.1 The application site is a semi-detached, 1.5 storey dwellinghouse with neighbouring properties to both sides and the rear. The site is bound by a public road (Paisley Road West) to the front (north). The site is located outwith any Conservation Area and within Ward 04 – Cardonald.
- 1.2 It is proposed to install dormers to the front, side and rear of the dwellinghouse. The front dormer would measure approximately 4.1m x 4.8m and 2.9m in height and would be set back approximately 0.7m from the eaves. The front face of the dormer would have an area of approximately 9.75sqm and an area of glazing of approximately 6.27sqm (64.4%).
- 1.3 The side dormer would measure approximately 3.1m x 4.7m and 3.2m in height and would be set back approximately 0.7m from the eaves. The front face of the dormer would have an area of approximately 8.79sqm and an area of glazing of approximately 4.25sqm (48.4%).
- 1.4 The rear dormer would measure approximately 4.2m x 4.8m and 3.1m in height and would be set back approximately 0.6m from the eaves. The front face of the dormer would have an area of approximately 10.55sqm and an area of glazing of approximately 6.35sqm (60.2%).
- 1.5 The dormers would be finished in concrete tiles on the roof, vertical tiles on the dormer walls. The windows would be double glazed, however, the material is not specified.
- 1.6 The front and rear dormers would be sited approximately 0.2m below the ridgeline of the existing building and the side dormer would sit flush with the ridgeline.

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 places
Policy 16 Quality homes
- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance are:
CDP1/SG1: The Placemaking Principle
CDP2: Sustainable Spatial Strategy

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 proposed development would be contrary to NPF 4: Policies 14 and 16 and CDP 1 - The Placemaking Principle and corresponding Supplementary Guidance SG 1 - Placemaking, Part 2 Residential Development of the Glasgow City Development Plan (adopted March 2017) as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.
- 3) The proposed dormers due to their scale, design and positioning would have a detrimental impact on the character of the existing building and on the appearance of the wider area.
- 4) The proposed dormers would not be well below the existing roof ridgeline and do not relate well with the character and alignment of the existing windows or doors at the front, rear, or side elevation.
- 5) The proposed dormers would not relate to the character, scale, and design of those found on the neighbouring property and would be inappropriate to the character of dormers found within the surrounding area.
- 6) The proposed side dormer would be located within 9 metres of the side boundary and would impact on the privacy of neighbours or create the perception of being overlooked to the detriment of neighbouring amenity.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

1. There are many styles of dormers around the application site that do not align well with design standards. But, this proposal sets a higher design standard.
2. While SG1 (Pt 2) says dormers should sit below the ridge, the local context includes many dormers ('cat slide' types) that go all the way to or over the ridge. Therefore, it is inconsistent to insist on strict compliance here when existing nearby dormers do not follow that rule.
3. Drawing No. 2428/03 contains a detailed specification of materials.

Note to the Committee: Specification notes and section in the case file.

4. The proposal has been revised to increase the glazed areas in response to the original case officer's comments, which has enhanced the scheme.

5. As stated, the referenced dormers have 'cat slide' roofs extending to the ridge with felt covering over the tiles.
6. It is not the case that the side dormer fails to set back at least 0.3m from the eaves which is clearly mentioned in the drawing.
7. The assessment is subjective. The dormers sit below the ridge, use matching materials, and complement the property without dominating.
8. The human eye perceives the roof as three-dimensional planes, so interpreting elevations as flat plans can be misleading; therefore, the dormers do not appear overly massive.
9. The dormers do not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The previous planning application history for the property includes the following:

- 24/02454/FUL – Formation of dormer windows to front, side and rear of dwellinghouse. Refused.

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 There were no representations received in objection to the application.

7 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Committee should consider if the following are in accordance with NPF4, the relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance, and if there are material considerations which outweigh the Development Plan considerations.

7.2 The following are the relevant policy considerations:

7.3 **NPF4 Policy 14: Design, quality and places, Policy 16: Quality homes and CDP1/SG1 (Part 2): The placemaking principle**

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.

Policy 14 requires:

- a) "Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale.
- b) Development proposals will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places:
 - a) Healthy: Supporting the prioritization of women's safety and improving physical and mental health.
 - b) Pleasant: Supporting attractive natural and built spaces.
 - c) Connected: Supporting well connected networks that make moving around easy and reduce car dependency.
 - d) Distinctive: Supporting attention to detail of local architectural styles and natural landscapes to be interpreted, literally or creatively, into designs to reinforce identity.
 - e) Sustainable: Supporting the efficient use of resources that will allow people to live, play, work and stay in their area, ensuring climate resilience, and integrating nature positive, biodiversity solutions.
 - f) 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. Further details on delivering the six qualities of successful places are set out in Annex D.

c) 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 supports householder proposals where they:

- a) 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; and
- b) do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.

CDP1 (The Placemaking Principle) and CDP2 (Sustainable Spatial Strategy) are overarching policies which, together with their associated Supplementary Guidance, must be considered for all development proposals to help achieve the key aims of the City Development Plan. CDP1 seeks a holistic, design-led approach to development. SG1 (Part 2) provides specific guidance for residential extensions:

- a) the siting, form, scale, proportions, detailed design and use of materials should be in keeping with the existing building and wider area;
- b) high quality innovative design is encouraged where it will complement the property;
- c) extensions and other alterations to dwellings should be designed so they do not dominate the existing building, or neighbouring buildings; and
- d) external materials should reflect the character of the original building and the street and the windows and doors in an extension should match those of the existing property.

Privacy and Overlooking - The following guidance applies:

- a) the siting, form, scale, proportions, detailed design and use of materials should be in keeping with the existing building and wider area;
- b) windows of habitable rooms (see Definition) should not increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms;
- c) at ground floor level, screening of 1.8 metre high will usually be required along boundaries where new windows face neighbouring properties;
- 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
- e) obscure glazing in windows of habitable rooms (see Definition) is not considered an acceptable means to mitigate against privacy issues.

Exceptions to these distances may be made in situations where windows are at an angle to each other, or, for ground floor rooms, effective permanent screening either exists, or can be erected. Decking is unlikely to be acceptable where, if there is a requirement for the erection of new permanent screening, the screening itself would have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.

Daylighting and Sunlight - Extensions to properties may cast a shadow over a neighbour's house or private garden that reduces their daylight or sunlight, and therefore adversely affect their amenity.

Extensions should not cause a significant loss of daylight to any habitable room (see Definition) of neighbouring properties or significantly block sunlight to adjacent private gardens. There should be no significant adverse impact on either existing adjacent properties, or the proposed accommodation.

Dormers, Roof Terraces and Balconies (including inverted 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.

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.

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.

Committee should note that:

- The dormer roof material would be concrete, whilst the existing roof material is slate.
- The proposed front dormer would look onto the public road, the rear dormer would look primarily onto the site itself, and the side dormer would look onto the blank roof plane of the neighbouring property and provide views from a non-habitable room only.
- The proposed development would not raise any significant issues regarding neighbouring amenities in terms of overlooking and overshadowing.
- The front and rear dormers are set about 0.2m below the ridge, while the side dormer sits flush with the existing ridge, both contrary to guidance.
- The front and side dormers would be set back approximately 0.7m from the eaves and the rear dormer would be set back approximately 0.6m from the eaves.
- No dormer would extend more than 50% of the width of the roof.
- The front, side, and rear dormers are approximately 60.4%, 48.4%, and 60.2% glazed, so the side dormer is not predominantly glazed, contrary to guidance.
- The windows would be double glazed, but the material (uPVC or timber or aluminium) is not specified.
- The proposed windows would not relate to the windows and doors of the existing in the property, in terms of character, proportion, or alignment.
- The dormers would not match the style of those found on the adjacent property.

Committee should consider whether:

- the proposed dormers complement the existing property well, despite the use of concrete roof tiles rather than slate?
- the proportion of glazed area in each dormer affects the overall visual balance and design quality, particularly in the side dormer?
- the dormer's positioning in relation to the ridge line is consistent with planning guidance and the local context? (the guidance states that dormers should be set well below the roof ridge).
- the dormer's height, form, and massing create an over-dominant effect or if they integrate suitably with the existing structure?
- the scale, form, and design of the dormers are acceptable?

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.

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

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

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