

Report of Handling for Application 24/02454/FUL

Item 3

24th June 2025

ADDRESS:	2339 Paisley Road West Glasgow G52 3QB
PROPOSAL:	Formation of dormer windows to front, side and rear of dwellinghouse.

DATE OF ADVERT:	N/A
NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	None received.
PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES	No consultations made.
PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS	None sought.

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. 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. The following policies were considered when assessing the application:</p> <p>CDP1 The Placemaking Principle CDP2 Sustainable Spatial Strategy</p>

	SG1 The Placemaking Principle (Part 2)
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 deviation from the Development Plan.

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

Planning History	Development Management			
	Ref	Proposal	Decision Issued	Decision
	97/03255/DC	Installation of rooflights.	20.01.1998	GC
Siting	The application site contains an unlisted, 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.			
Design and Materials	<p>The proposed development comprises of the introduction of three window dormers to the front, side, and rear roof planes.</p> <p>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%).</p> <p>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%).</p> <p>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%).</p> <p>The dormers would be finished using concrete tiles on the roof, vertical tiles on the dormer walls. The windows would be double glazed but the material is not specified.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A different scheme with separate plans which were more closely in line with the design and scale of the existing dormers on the attached neighbouring property at no. 2337 Paisley Road West was previously submitted under a separate agent as part of the same application. An amended scheme was provided and then, following discussions between the Council and the applicant's agent, further amendments to the plans were made which are assessed as part of this determination.</p>			
Daylight	Due to the nature of the proposal, the introduction of the proposed dormers would not result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring daylight/sunlight provision.			
Aspect	N/A			

Privacy	<p>The proposed front dormer would look onto the public road and would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The proposed rear dormer would primarily onto the site itself. The dormer would be sited approximately 29.9m from the mutual site boundary to the rear and 55.3m from the neighbouring dwellinghouse to the rear, which is considered a sufficient distance to protect neighbouring privacy.</p> <p>The side dormer would look onto a blank roof plan of the neighbouring property. The side dormer would provide views from a non-habitable room only. As such, the side dormer would not result in an unacceptable loss of neighbouring privacy levels.</p>
Adjacent Levels	N/A
Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)	N/A
Access and Parking	N/A
Site Constraints	None.
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.</p> <p>The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; b. Whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed. <p>In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises of NPF4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted 29th March 2017. In order to assess</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the proposal must be considered against the following policies: <p>NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMWORK 4</p> <p><u>Policies 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises and 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation</u></p> <p>NPF4 Policies 1 and 2 are overarching policies that intend to encourage, promote, and facilitate development that addresses the global climate and nature crises, minimises emissions, and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>The existing site is already developed and the proposal would be of a small scale. As such, the proposed development would have minimal impacts on the climate emergency and is not considered to deviate from these policies. The proposal is therefore acceptable in regards to NPF4 Policies 1 and 2.</p> <p><u>Policy 14 - Design, Quality and Place</u> requires:</p>

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:*

Healthy: Supporting the prioritisation of women's safety and improving physical and mental health.

Pleasant: Supporting attractive natural and built spaces.

Connected: Supporting well connected networks that make moving around easy and reduce car dependency.

Distinctive: Supporting attention to detail of local architectural styles and natural landscapes to be interpreted, literally or creatively, into designs to reinforce identity.

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

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."*

Comment

The purpose of Policy 14 is consistent with the policy criteria set out within CDP1/SG1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan. As outlined below, the proposal is considered to be poorly designed and not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area so is not in compliance with parts (b) or (c) of Policy 14.

Policy 16 Quality Homes

Policy 16 supports householder proposals where they:

- i. 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*
- ii. do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.*

Comment

The policy requirements and intention of NPF4 Policy 16 match those of the Glasgow City Development Plan Policy CDP1 and its Supplementary Guidance. As outlined below, the proposal is overly dominant to the character of the existing building and would not be in compliance with part (g) i.) of Policy 16.

CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN, ADOPTED 2017

Policies 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 & SG1 The Placemaking Principle

CDP1 seeks a holistic, design-led approach to development. SG1 (Part 2) provides specific guidance for residential extensions:

2.3 *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.

2.6 Privacy and Overlooking - The following guidance applies:

a) there should be no adverse impact on existing or proposed accommodation;
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.

2.7 *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.*

2.8 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.*

2.9 *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.*

2.14 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.

2.15 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.

2.16 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.

Comment

There are existing examples of front and rear window dormers throughout the surrounding area so the nature of these would not be out of place. However, there is not this same precedent for side dormers. The scale, form, and design would not be in keeping with dormers found elsewhere within the surrounding area and would be overly dominant to the character of the existing building and the neighbouring property, contrary to SG1. It is not considered that, due to their scale and form, the dormers would complement the property, contrary to SG1. The dormer roof material would be concrete, whilst the existing roof material is slate, contrary to SG1.

As noted above, the proposed development would not raise any significant issues regarding neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking and overshadowing and is in line with SG1 in this regard.

The proposed front and rear dormers would be set approximately 0.2m below the ridgeline of the existing building and the side dormer would be sit flush with existing ridgeline. This is not considered a sufficient distance to be considered 'well below the ridgeline', contrary to SG1. Some leniency could be given to the front and rear dormers to match the level of the neighbouring property if this proposal were granted but the side dormer is outright contrary to the guidance.

The dormer roof would be finished using concrete tiles, which is noted in the plans as matching the existing roof finish. However, the existing roof is slate so the proposal would not match the materials of the existing roof, contrary to SG1.

The front face of the front, side, and rear dormers would be approximately 60.4%, 48.4%, and 60.2% glazed, respectively. As such, the side dormer would not be predominantly glazed, contrary to SG1.

The dormers would not match the style of those found on the adjacent property, contrary to SG1.

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, in line with SG1.

No dormer would extend more than 50% of the width of the roof, in line with SG1.

	<p>Due to the height, form, and overall massing of the three dormers, the proposal would be over-dominant in relation to the existing scale of the property, contrary to SG1.</p> <p>The proposed windows would not relate to the windows and doors below in terms of character, proportion, or alignment, contrary to SG1.</p> <p>As noted above, the proposed dormers are not considered to be detrimental to neighbouring privacy, in line with SG1.</p> <p>The overall massing of 3 dormers of this scale would significantly alter the appearance of the roof, contrary to SG1.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed against the relevant Development Plan policies in detail above. The proposal would not be in compliance with the relevant criteria set out in NPF4 Policies 14 and 16 and the City Development Plan Policy CDP1 and its relevant guidance, SG1.</p> <p>In respect of (b), no public representations have been received.</p> <p>Overall, and for the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the Development Plan, and it is recommended that this application be refused.</p>
Recommendation	Refuse

Date: 11/02/2025	DM Officer	Dominic Batty
Date	DM Manager	

Refused Drawing(s)

1. 1502-PL-01 LOCATION PLAN; Received 07.10.2024
2. PLAN AND ELEVATIONS AS PROPOSED; Received 13.01.2025
3. SPECIFICATION NOTES AND SECTIONS; Received 13.01.2025

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 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.
03. The proposed dormers would result in development that is too dominant for the existing dwelling in terms of scale, design, and overall massing. The proposed dormer would be finished in concrete roof tiles which does not match the existing roof and the side dormer will not have a predominantly glazed dormer face. The proposed dormers would not be well below the existing roof ridgeline and does not relate well with the character and alignment of the existing windows or doors at the front, rear, or side elevation. The dormers are generally over-dominant in relation to the existing scale of the property.

04. 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.