



**Glasgow City Council**

**Planning Local Review Committee**

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

**Item 1**

**12th May 2026**

**Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654**

**26/00015/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 - Cardonald

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 one and a half storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse on Paisley Road West between Moulin Road and Crookston Road. Within the garden is a detached garage. Nearby properties with dormers are often of the 'shed' dormer style.
- 1.2 The property is unlisted, and this address has a high public transport accessibility. It is within Ward 4 - Cardonald.

### *Proposal*

- 1.3 It is proposed to install gabled style dormers to the front, side and rear of the dwellinghouse.
- 1.4 The front dormer is set down 395mm below the ridgeline of the existing roof, the front face is predominantly glazed. It is drawn back 400mm from the eaves and extends approximately 50% of the width of the roof. The dormer is between 4,150mm and 4,422mm in width, and the roof is between 8,350mm and 8,812mm in width.
- 1.5 The side dormer is set down 395mm below the ridgeline of the existing roof, the front face is predominantly glazed. It is drawn back 380mm from the eaves and extends approximately 30-32.5% of the width of the roof. The dormer is between 3,150mm and 3,450mm in width, and the roof is between 10,300mm and 10,450mm in width.
- 1.6 The rear dormer is set down 395mm below the ridgeline of the existing roof, the front face is predominantly glazed. It is drawn back an estimated 430mm from the eaves and extends approximately 50% of the width of the roof. The dormer is between 4,150mm and 4,422mm in width, and the roof is between 8,350mm and 8,812mm in width.

**Committee should note:** the drawing provided (2428 02D Rev) contains measurements in red that do match the scale given, and measurements in black that are out of proportion by a factor of 1.9 to 2 times depending on the individual measurement.

- 1.7 The materials listed include slate, UPVC C.I rainwater goods to match the existing roof walls. Window materials are not stated explicitly.

## 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 adaption

- **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 As the review is for non-determination of the application, there are no reasons for refusal or relevant conditions.

### **4 APPEAL STATEMENT**

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

01. The dormer is 395mm below the ridge line which is double the previous application. The finishes now match the existing roof, and the face is predominantly glazed.
02. The agent has submitted a photo of 2280 Paisley Road West (opposite the site) and contends "this illustrates the difference between box dormers and a pitched roof dormer. It is easy to see which sits better on the roof."
03. All dormers are drawn back 1050mm, which is 3 and a half times the stated guidance. All dormers are 50% of the roof that they are added to.

**Committee should note:** the drawing provided (2428 02D Rev) contains measurements in red that do match the scale given, and measurements in black that are out of proportion by a factor of 1.9 to 2 times.

04. As can be seen from the submitted drawings, all dormers have been designed and are finished in a manner that stops them being over dominant which is confirmed by the way in which they comply with all of the foregoing criteria.

### **5 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 5.1 Relevant planning applications for the property are detailed below:

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

25/00034/LOCAL Formation of dormer windows to front, side and rear of dwellinghouse. - Refused

25/02697/FUL Formation of dormer windows to front, side and rear of dwellinghouse. - Refused

### **6 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS**

- 6.1 There were no representations received 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 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 ii. do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.

#### CDP1 & SG1 - The Placemaking Principle (Part 2)

CDP1 (The Placemaking Principle) is an 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.

## **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.

### *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.

Committee should note that:

- The following table compares each dormer against SG1 Part 2 policy:

Dormer Policy	Front Dormer	Side Dormer	Rear Dormer
a) "well below ridgeline of roof"	All dormers sit 395mm below the ridgeline.		
b) be finished to match materials	All dormers state the materials match the existing slate roof, however it is not stated if the windows will match the existing wood-effect UPVC, contrary to policy.		
c) be predominantly glazed	All dormers are predominantly glazed, in line with policy.		
d) match style of existing dormers on adjacent buildings	The adjacent building is a shed-style dormer, as is the opposite facing house, and many on this street. This is a gable-style dormer, contrary to policy.		
e) drawn back from eaves by at least 300mm	400mm from the eaves.	380mm from the eaves.	430mm from the eaves.
f) not be more than 50% of roof width	Approx 50% of the width of the roof (between 4150mm to 4422mm size dormer and between 8350mm and 8812mm sized roof), contrary to policy.	Approx 30-32.5% of the width of the roof (between 3150mm to 3450mm size dormer and between 10300mm and 10450mm sized roof).	Approx 50% of the width of the roof (between 4150mm to 4422mm size dormer and between 8350mm and 8812mm sized roof), contrary to policy.
g) not be over dominant to existing scale of property	The existing roof has an area of 85m <sup>2</sup> , the area of the dormers proposed are 50m <sup>2</sup> , or 59% of the existing scale of the property which creates a cumulative impact potentially contrary to policy.		
h) relate to windows and doors below in character proportion and alignment	Dormer area is 6.73m <sup>2</sup>	Dormer area is 4.86m <sup>2</sup>	Dormer area is 6.73m <sup>2</sup>
	The front bay window, next nearest in size is 5m <sup>2</sup> , to the rear the French doors are 3.33m <sup>2</sup> , with 1.25m <sup>2</sup> and 0.5m <sup>2</sup> windows. No windows and doors match the scale of the existing, and the shape of the individual panes is over dominant and does not align with the pattern of the ground floor fenestration, contrary to policy.		

- As the table details, the front and rear dormers are contrary to policy in terms of their level of roof width, and the proportion and alignment of their windows. All dormers and the extensions are contrary to policy in terms of style of dormer for the area, lack of clarity on fenestration material, dominance of the existing property, and lack of alignment with the windows or doors on the ground floor.
- 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.

Committee should consider whether:

- They are satisfied that the dormers prominence and design, in departure from policy, would not erode the character of the area and the existing building?
- The proposed dormers complement the existing property well, particularly in terms of dominance of the dormer?
- 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 scale, form, and design of the dormers are acceptable?
- Considering the departure from neighbouring dormer styles and the potentially dominant effect, have the six qualities of design, particularly around distinctiveness and pleasantness, been sufficiently considered in this design?

## **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 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.