

Item 1
26 MAY 2026



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

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

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

**26/00013/LOCAL – 5 Greentree Drive, Glasgow, G69 7UW
Erection of two storey extension to side 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): 20 - Baillieston

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, DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS AND PROPOSAL

Location

- 1.1 The application site is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse on Greentree Drive, with an attached garage.
- 1.2 The property is unlisted, and this address has a base public transport accessibility. It is within Ward 20 - Baillieston.

Proposal

- 1.3 The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension along with a bay window to the east elevation. This includes:
 - Side extension: A two-storey addition to the existing ground floor side entrance comprising of a bedroom and lounge and kitchen. The existing garage will be dismantled.
 - The rear ground floor dining French doors and surrounding wall will be dismantled to be replaced with 3.5m wide bi-folding doors.
- 1.4 The materials listed include brick walls, roof tiles, UPVC windows, doors and drainage; all of which is to match existing.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

- 2.1 The relevant National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) and City Development Plan (CDP) policies and Supplementary Guidance are:
 - **Policy 1:** Tackling the climate and nature crises
 - **Policy 2:** Climate mitigation and adaptation
 - **Policy 14:** Design, Quality and Place
 - **Policy 16:** Quality Homes
- 2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance are:
 - **CDP 1 & SG 1:** The Placemaking Principle

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

3.1 The reasons for refusal are set out below:

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 CDP1/SG1 'Placemaking' of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the proposed extension has not been set back from the front building line or have a ridge line sufficiently lower than the ridge line of the existing house. The extension is not subordinate to the existing house, and the resultant building is over-dominant, to the detriment of visual amenity of the property itself and the surrounding street scene.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

01. The development is proportionate in scale relative to a generous corner plot; causes no demonstrable harm to streetscape character. There is no loss of spacing or terracing effect.
02. The policy does not prescribe fixed dimensional standards for ridge reduction or façade setback. Subordination is a matter of design judgement in context. The footprint is relative to the plot size and there is a 300mm step-down in ridge level.
03. The original dwelling remains the dominant built form. The assertion that the ridge is not "sufficiently lower" is not supported by any quantitative policy benchmark.
04. The property is a detached dwelling on a corner plot, so as there is no adjoining property to the side extension, no terraced effect can arise.
05. The proposal represents a proportionate, policy-compliant extension to a detached dwelling, designed to respect both the host property and the wider streetscape.
06. The proposal does not overwhelm the host dwelling; does not fill the plot; retains generous private amenity space; does not materially alter the character of the streetscape.

5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 Relevant planning applications for the property are detailed below:
89/01980/DC: Erection of domestic garage. – Grant subject to conditions

6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 There were no representations received to the application or to the review.

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 Climate change and mitigation

National Planning Framework 4: NPF4 Policy 1 Tackling the climate and nature crises and Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation states that “when considering all development proposals significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises” and that “development proposals to retrofit measures to existing developments that reduce emissions or support adaptation to climate change will be supported.”

Committee should note that:

- The proposal includes the removal of a mature pine tree.
- No information on how climate issues could be mitigated against, such as the reuse of existing materials, has been provided

7.4 Residential amenity and design

General Principles

NPF4 Policy 14 Design, Quality and Place intends to encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development. These include six qualities of successful places, in particular:

Pleasant: Supporting attractive natural and built spaces.

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

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.

NPF4 Policy 16 Quality Homes: states proposals will be supported unless they 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 do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.

Daylight loss and Massing

CDP1 & SG1 - The Placemaking Principle (Part 2)

Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens: high quality innovative design is encouraged where it will complement the property; the development must retain more than 66% of the original useable private garden space.

- 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.
- 2.10 The Building Research Establishment (BRE) document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice', second edition (PJ Littlefair, 2011) will be used to assess any impact on daylight or sunlight.
- 2.11 Where deemed necessary, applicants shall be required to provide the following assessments as detailed within the BRE guide to good practice:
- b) two storey extensions, or larger, shall be assessed for their impact on habitable rooms of neighbouring properties using the 'Vertical Sky Component'; and
 - c) the impact of extensions on private garden ground should be assessed, where considered necessary, using the 'Calculation of Sun on the Ground' test. Applicants should submit this information where requested using three points in time: 9a.m, 12midday and 3pm, for the Spring Equinox. The impact of the original dwellinghouse must be shown at these times as well as the impact of the proposed extension, to see whether the proposed extension will significantly increase the effect on neighbouring property

2.13 One and a Half and Two Storey Extensions –

- a) **Side Extensions** To ensure extensions are subordinate to the existing house and avoid a terracing effect, 1.5 and 2-storey side extensions should generally:
- not double the footprint of the house;
 - be set back a minimum of 1.5 metres from the building line; and
 - incorporate a roof style which carries through the line of the eaves of the existing house and has a ridgeline lower than the ridge of the roof of the house.

A relaxation to the full 1.5 metres setback may be made for extensions to houses where a terracing effect, or unbroken massing, could not arise in the future. These could include houses on a street corner; where the house extension would be adjacent to a non-residential use; or houses with

asymmetrical frontages and staggered building lines, and when a proposed ridgeline set down for the extension creates a subordinate appearance.

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.

Committee should note that:

- 90% of the garden ground is retained, in line with policy.
- The ridge line of the extension is 250mm below the original dwelling, however the original dwelling appears less dominant due to the topography of the site.
- The extension is not set back a minimum of 1.5 metres from the building line, contrary to policy.
- The property is a corner plot.
- The extension sits on a hill and could cause significant loss of daylight in the morning for the garden and a potentially habitable room at the neighbouring residents at 3 Greentree Drive.
- No vertical sky component test has been provided in line with BRE standards and contrary to policy.
- There is no concern around privacy and overlooking in this instance as the rear window is not for a habitable room.

Committee should consider whether:

- Is the threat of unbroken massing, considering the topography of the estate, a concern – contrary to policy?
- The proposal incorporates a roof style which is not subordinate or lower than the ridge of the roof of the house, which would be contrary to policy?
- They are completely satisfied that the design standards employed here, contrary to policy, are acceptable in this instance?
- They are satisfied with the lack of information on the loss of daylight is acceptable in this case?

Other considerations

2.23 Conversion of Garages to Living Accommodation - In general, planning permission is not required to convert garages to habitable rooms. However, in some developments garage conversions are not permitted and householders should check with the planning authority to see whether planning permission will be required in their particular case. The following guidance applies where planning permission is required:

- a) the loss of garage space should not reduce the need for appropriate car parking provision on site;
- b) the frontage alterations should reflect the character and appearance of the house;
- c) conversion of the garage should not block access from the front to the rear of the house; and
- d) the potential cumulative impact on on-street parking should also be considered.

Committee should note that:

- The extension would lead to the loss of a garage.
- The frontage alteration includes a bay window that does not have precedent in the estate.
- The area has a base level of public transport accessibility.

Committee should consider whether:

- The loss of the garage would have any cumulative effect on street parking?
- Is the frontage alteration acceptable in this instance, given its lack of precedence elsewhere in the estate?
- Has the highest level of design been employed 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 n/a

2021-25? Please specify.

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 Glasgow's net zero carbon target? n/a

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

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