Item 3

24th November 2026

# Which Report of Handling for Application 25/02943/FUL

| | |
|---|---|
| **ADDRESS:** | 11 Woodburn Road<br>Glasgow<br>G43 2TN |
| **PROPOSAL:** | Installation of replacement roof and 2No. outbuildings to garden (retrospective). |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATE OF ADVERT:** | 20 February 2026 |
| **NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED** | 13 objections were submitted and are summarised below:<br><br>Concern expressed that both buildings could be suitable for residential use.<br>**Comment:**<br>This home office only includes an accessible toilet and so any other facilities have since been omitted. If there was concern that a building could be used as separate accommodation, a condition would be added to the consent to prohibit this.<br><br>The proposed outbuildings are excessive and their design and materials (PVC, Marley roof tiles, modern facing brick and render) are unsympathetic to the host property and wider conservation area.<br>**Comment:**<br>Agreed and, in terms of the brick proposed to match those of the adjacent garage, the neighbouring garage has been in situ for some time (at least since 2008 according to Google Streetview) and its erection likely pre-dates the designation of the conservation area in 1985 (other representations suggest it was erected over 40 years ago). There is also no planning history on file to suggest that the garage at number 13 has consent. Being located in a conservation area, if it were to be assessed under the current development plan, its design and materials would not be supported.<br><br>The unfinished buildings which are already over 3m high will overshadow adjacent gardens and properties.<br>**Comment:**<br>The impact on Daylight is assessed under the section headed “Daylight” below.<br><br>The large structures with concrete foundations will create drainage issues.<br>**Comment:**<br>The drawings include gutters and downpipes.<br><br>Work start date 01/06/2024” is incorrect, as the starting date was circa 14/04/2024 (Enforcement Stop Notice dated 09/05/2024)<br>**Comment:**<br>Noted.<br><br>No appropriate explanation provided as to why work started prior to submitting a Planning Application<br>**Comment:**<br>The brief description provided is sufficient. The enforcement file includes additional information if required. The main purpose of this application is to establish whether the works are acceptable.<br><br>No description of the proposed Development is provided.<br>**Comment:**<br>The application form includes a description of the proposal under the section headed |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *"Description of Proposal"*, which states: *"Renewal of slate roof covering, removal of timber garage and replacement with garden office and storage building."* Following validation, the description of development is amended to more accurately reflect the proposal and to accord fully with the Council's established approach to describing development. The development is therefore recorded as: *"Installation of replacement roof and two outbuildings to garden (retrospective)."*<br><br>Pre-Application discussion is marked NO. According to the correspondence from the Enforcement Team, the owner's agent has been in discussions since May 2024.<br>**Comment:**<br>The application form has been completed correctly. The pre-application process is a formalised process by which an applicant and agent can seek advice on the acceptability of a proposal prior to submitting a full planning application. Had this taken place then it would have been logged in our database. Discussions with the Enforcement Team, a separate team, would have been held in connection with the planning breach but do not constitute pre application advice.<br><br>Plans submitted are basic and only provide the minimum of detail.<br>**Comment:**<br>Some specifics in terms of materials have been omitted such as the type of slate used on the roof of the dwellinghouse.<br><br>Block plan as existing, does NOT show the two unauthorised outbuildings only the former position of the original garage which was demolished.<br>**Comment:**<br>The illustrations provided are correct.<br><br>The windows featured will have an unacceptable impact on the privacy of these neighbouring properties<br>**Comment:**<br>Privacy issues are considered under the section headed "Privacy" below.<br><br>References to policy regarding over development of site.<br>**Comment:**<br>This element of the proposal is assessed under the section headed "Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)" below. However, regardless of whether the criteria is met, the size of the outbuildings is substantial and disproportionate.<br><br>The position of an outbuilding should be a minimum 1000mm from a mutual boundary.<br>**Comment:**<br>There is no such requirement under planning guidance.<br><br>Requests site visit if this becomes a committee item.<br>**Comment:**<br>The decision will be a delegated one and a site visit has been made as part of the assessment.<br><br>This development has resulted in removal of all shrubbery at sides of outbuilding.<br>**Comment:**<br>The hedge between the application property and the neighbour at no 13 has been either severely cut back or removed. In spatial terms, it is the whole Conservation Area (made up of all buildings and the spaces between these buildings) that is of architectural or historic interest. Planning control is, therefore, directed at maintaining the integrity of the entire Conservation Area and enhancing its special character. The removal of this shrubbery is detrimental to the visual amenity of the site and, although |

| | |
|---|---|
| | largely conceal is visible. Part of the quality of environment provided by a conservation area includes its trees and shrubbery.<br><br>Why has enforcement action not be taken when an application has already been submitted and refused?<br>**Comment:**<br>The applicant has the right to two submissions and amendments have been made to the proposal since the previous submission.<br><br>The previous application was refused on 4 grounds. What has changed and why has a second application been accepted?<br>**Comment:**<br>This proposal will also be refused as the changes made are not extensive enough. The main changes are that the store at the rear has been reduced in size and windows have been omitted.<br><br>The areas of the two proposed building were 29 sq m and 44 sq m on the rejected application and are 25 sq m and 54 sq m in the current application. This increase in footprint is not accurately represented in the drawings.<br>**Comment:**<br>Dimensions taken from the drawings are provided below.<br><br>A standard velux window has been installed on the front elevation of the property and question as to whether guidance has been relaxed?<br>**Comment:**<br>Policy states that conservation style rooflights should be used for a building located within a conservation area and that these should not be located on the front elevation.<br><br>Question as to why neighbour notification, dated 12/2/26 had not been issued to 5 Woodburn Road?<br>**Comment:**<br>Only neighbours within 20m of the boundary of the application site are neighbour notified directly. However an advertisement is displayed in the Edinburgh Gazette and Evening Times. A site notice detailing the proposal will also have been attached, usually on a lamppost at the nearest point to the property.<br><br>Numerous references to policy provided.<br>**Comment:**<br>The proposal will be assessed against the relevant guidance from NPF4 and the Development Plan.<br><br>Various suggestions regarding attaching appropriate conditions if the proposal is granted.<br>**Comment:**<br>The proposal will be refused. Had this not been the case then suitable safeguarding conditions would have been added to the decision. |
| **PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES** | No consultations undertaken |
| **PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS** | No pre-application advice provided |

| | |
|---|---|
| **EIA - MAIN ISSUES** | NONE |
| **CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS** | NOT APPLICABLE |

| | |
|---|---|
| **ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES** | |
| **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** | The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the national spatial strategy for Scotland up to 2045. Unlikely 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:<br><br>Policy 1: Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises<br>Policy 2: Climate Mitigation and Adaptation<br>Policy 7: Historic Assets and Places<br>Policy 16: Quality Homes |
| **CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES** | The City Development Plan consists of high-level policies with statutory Supplementary Guidance.<br><br>The following policies were considered when assessing the application:<br><br>CDP1: The Placemaking Principle<br>SG1: Placemaking, Residential Development<br>CDP9 Historic Environment<br>SG9 Historic Environment |
| **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** | 24/02730/FUL-Installation of replacement roof and outbuilding to garden (retrospective).- RF |
| **Site Visits (Dates)** | April 2026 |
| **Siting** | The application site is a traditional blonde, semi-detached sandstone villa located within the Newlands Conservation Area. The existing timber garage at the side of the dwellinghouse has been removed and replaced with a large outbuilding. Behind this partially built home office, stands a further outbuilding. The property is situated within Ward 2 – Newlands/Auldburn. |
| **Design and Materials** | Both **outbuildings** are to have similar external finishing materials;<br><br>- Marley Modern roof tiles.<br>- uPVC windows and doors.<br>- uPVC fascia, soffits and rainwater goods.<br>- Key drawn render to emulate stone.<br>- Finished in Keim paint to match the colour of the dwelling.<br>- Facing brick to match neighbouring garage (front facing, south elevation of Home Office)<br>- Gable roof design.<br><br>The external area of the first outbuilding at the front elevation is 54m square (internal area is 44sqm and so no change since previous application 24/02730/FUL) metres (6.75×8). It also includes an accessible toilet. It has an overall height of 3.635m and height to eaves is 2.355m<br><br>The second outbuilding, the store, is 25 square (internally approx. 18.5sqm) metres (4.8×5.5). It has an overall height of 3.2m and so is slightly smaller than the home office. Height to eaves is 2.25m. The external measurement of the previous outbuilding was 38 Sqm and so this building has been reduced in size by 13 Sqm.<br><br>According to the drawings, there are level differences of approximately 0.8m between the home office and store, The home office sits at a higher level.<br><br>It should be noted that the Block Plan as Existing and Proposed, drawing number 3 Rev C, depicts the demolished garage as being the same size as the neighbouring garage at number 13 Woodburn Road, whereas, according to Google Streetview it is smaller and does not align with the front building line of the dwellinghouse.<br><br>**Roof:**<br>The main dwelling has had its roof replaced with slate. This is much darker than the roof it replaces and is visibly darker than the roof of the attached property. Modern rooflights have been installed on the front, side and rear of the property. |
| **Daylight** | The maximum height of the home office is 3.7 metres but, the presence of an intervening garage at 13 Woodburn Road means that there are no concerns regarding sunlight or daylight to number 13. In respect to the storeroom, this is only 06m away from the boundary with no 13 and is 3.2m high. There is an intervening boundary wall which is approximately 2m high. Whilst this may create some shadow in the morning, this is the only impact on no.13 and is not considered problematic.<br><br>The store-room is located close to the boundary with 4 Merrylee Road. The impact of this storeroom on sunlight to this garden is likely to be more significant. At the closest |

| | |
|---|---|
| | point, it is 0.4m to the boundary and it will reach an overall height of 3.2m. Its impact is likely to be felt in the morning and afternoon, which together make up a significant portion of the day. Whilst the outbuilding is single storey, the garden affected is small and so the impact cannot be considered negligible.<br><br>The proposal would not result in a loss of daylight to habitable rooms in the surrounding properties. |
| **Aspect** | The proposed outbuilding[s] are situated on the eastern side of the plot, with both outbuildings projecting in front of the respective front elevation and the rear elevation of the property. |
| **Privacy** | *SG1- The Placemaking Principle (Part 2), Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens – Privacy and Overlooking states the following guidance which is of relevance to the assessment of this application:*<br><br>*Privacy and Overlooking* - The following guidance applies:<br>a) there should be no adverse impact on existing or proposed accommodation.<br>b) windows of habitable rooms (see Definition) should not increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms.<br>c) at ground floor level, screening of 1.8 metre high will usually be required along boundaries where new windows face neighbouring properties.<br>d) Windows of habitable rooms should not increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms.<br>e) Above ground floor level, windows of habitable room;0ls which directly face each other, including dormers, should be at least 18m apart and at least 10m from the site boundary.<br>**Comment:**<br>The home office features windows on the front, rear eastern and western elevations. The window on the eastern side elevation serves a toilet which is a non-habitable room. Whilst is very close to the boundary with the neighbour, the window is mitigated by the existing brick garage located on the boundary with 13 Woodburn Road.<br>The window on the western elevation faces the dwellinghouse and the other windows on the rear elevation are, minimum, 13.8m from the boundary. The windows on the front elevation will not exacerbate privacy issues.<br><br>In terms of the rear garden store, windows feature on the western and front elevation. This building serves as a store and any use would be transient. On this basis, no privacy issues are anticipated. |
| **Adjacent Levels** | According to the drawings, there are level differences of approximately 0.8m between the home office and store, with the home office being higher. |
| **Landscaping (Including Garden Ground)** | The *SG1* of the City Development Plan states: 'a minimum 66% of the original useable private garden space should be retained in all house plots after extensions, garages, and outbuildings, etc., have been built, 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 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'.<br>**Comment:**<br>The overall area of usable garden ground is 202sqm -measured from drawing: BLOCK PLAN AS EXISTING AND PROPOSED, 03 Rev C. These dimensions include the rear and side gardens (measured from approximately behind the rear elevation of the demolished garage -this is a slightly generous measurement as Google Streetview shows that the rear elevation of this garage did not align with that of the neighbouring one). This means that the proposed larger home office protrudes into the Usable private garden space by approximately 4sqm. The second outbuilding will occupy a total area of 25 sq metres, meaning the remaining area of useable garden ground would be 173 square metres (14% of Usable Private Garden Space will be occupied by the new proposal). This means that 86% of useable garden ground remains and, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | therefore, this proposal is in accordance with this aspect of the City Development Plan.<br><br>However, whilst technically speaking, the proposal corresponds with this element of the policy, the outbuildings are considered excessive and their siting and size have fragmented a large proportion of the garden ground. Neighbouring gardens have not been developed in such a manner. The drawing Plan as Proposed, Plot analysis, 04 attempts to justify the proposal by comparing it to other dwellinghouses. None of these create the same impact in terms of the fragmentation the proposal creates. In terms of:<br>• 12 Woodburn Road, the original single storey element of the dwellinghouse has a deck to the rear but, a deck remains "usable" garden space. The garage at the side is modest in size and is sympathetically designed. Whilst, there is no planning history for this building, historic maps indicate the presence of an outbuilding in this location as far back as 1930<br>• 14 Woodburn Road has a relatively small outbuilding at the side and no other outbuildings in the rear garden. No planning history is available for this addition. It has timber doors and is largely sympathetic. Historic maps indicate its presence in this location since 1970.<br>• 16 Woodburn Road features an attached garage to the side. It appears to have been granted in 2000 and is located to the side of the dwellinghouse. It is a reasonably sized addition that leaves the rear garden intact. The materials, and design are sympathetic.<br>• 13 Woodburn Road. This has already been referred to in the report above and there is no planning history associated with the garage. There are no further outbuildings in the garden. Historic maps do not indicate its presence in the 1980s and there are no further map layers after this date, just an aerial image from 2006 that confirms the garage was present at this time. It is also visible in Google Streetview since 2008 (Google Streetview goes no further back than this). |
| **Access and Parking** | There is a 1.3m passageway between the proposal and side wall of the dwellinghouse. On the other side, there is 0.76m from the side of the home office to the boundary between the application site and no 13 Woodburn Road.<br>The front of the home office aligns with the front elevation of the dwellinghouse. Whilst this reduces the amount of space available for off-street parking, it is minimal, and a 6.5m length of provision remains. |
| **Site Constraints** | The dwellinghouse is located within the Newlands Conservation Area. There are no other material site constraints in relation to this householder application.<br>The dwelling is located within a Coal Authority - low risk area. |
| **Other Comments** | **Assessment**<br>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. In addition, under the terms of Section 59 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas)(Scotland) Act 1997, the Council is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Section 64 of the same Act requires the Council to pay special regard to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area, including the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.<br><br>The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be:<br><br>a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan;<br>b) whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or the appearance of the Conservation Area;<br>c) whether the proposals would impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings;<br>d) whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed.<br><br>To assess (a), the proposal must be considered against the Development Plan, which |

comprises *NPF4* (adopted 13 February 2023) and the *Glasgow City Development Plan* (adopted 29 March 2017).

**National Planning Framework 4:**

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:

**Policy 1 (Tackling the climate and nature crises) and Policy 2 (Climate mitigation and adaptation)** are applicable to all new development and must be considered in light of the proposals impact on the environment.

**Comment:**

The aim of these policies is to encourage, promote and facilitate development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crisis. The proposal seeks to replace the roof of the main dwellinghouse and provide an office and storage within the existing site. To a degree this could be considered a sustainable solution and, as such, the proposal broadly corresponds to Policies 1 and 2.

Due to the minor scale of the proposed development, it generally complies with **Policies 1 and 2 of NPF4**.

**NPF4 Policy 7(d):** *Historic assets and places advises that development proposals in or affecting conservation areas will only be supported where the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced. Relevant considerations include the:*

*i. architectural and historic character of the area.*

*ii. existing density, built form and layout; and*

*iii. context and siting, quality of design and suitable materials.*

**Policy 14. Design, quality and place**

*aims to encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the Place Principle.*

It states that:

*Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale.*

*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 (g) of NPF 4** is similar in its intent as *CDP1 and SG1 of the CDP in that these policies aim to ensure that householder development proposals will be supported where they:*

*i. Do not have a detrimental impact on the character or environmental quality the home and the surrounding area in terms of size, design, and materials*

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

**Comment:**

The proposed development, comprising part-retrospective alterations to the main dwelling and the erection of outbuildings, is considered unacceptable as it fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Newlands Conservation Area and results in a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area.

This is for the following reasons:

- The introduction of mismatched roof slate and the installation of incongruous rooflights on multiple roof planes of the principal dwelling fail to respect the established architectural and historic character of the conservation area. These

alterations introduce discordant elements that detract from the cohesive roofscape, contrary to the requirement to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area as set out in Policy 7(d) of NPF4.

- The siting, scale, massing and design of the outbuildings are excessive and poorly related to the host property and its curtilage. Despite a reduction in size, the structures remain overly dominant, resulting in the fragmentation of the rear garden space and an overdevelopment of the site. This fails to respect the established density, built form and layout of the area.
- The outbuildings incorporate materials and detailing of a poor quality and inappropriate nature which do not integrate with the established character of the surrounding built environment. The cumulative impact of their siting, design and materiality results in a visually intrusive form of development that fails to preserve the setting of the conservation area.
- The development has resulted in the loss of established boundary hedging which previously contributed positively to the character and visual amenity of the site and wider area. This loss further erodes the environmental quality and setting of the conservation area.
- Overall, the proposal represents a poorly considered, design-led approach and fails to comply with the Place Principle. The development neither improves the quality of the area nor responds positively to its context, and is therefore contrary to Policy 14 of NPF4.
- Furthermore, by virtue of its scale, design and materials, the proposal has a detrimental impact on the character and environmental quality of the property and surrounding area, contrary to Policy 16(g) of NPF4.

For these reasons, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Newlands Conservation Area and does not represent high-quality, contextually responsive development. It is therefore contrary to **Policies 7(d), 14 and 16(g) of National Planning Framework 4.**

**City Development Plan (CDP)**
Many of the policies in NPF4 are reflected by policies and statutory guidance associated with the Glasgow City Development Plan. These policies are considered in detail below.

***CDP1: The Placemaking Principle & SG 1 – Placemaking***
*Policy CDP1 is an overarching Policy which must be considered for all development proposals to help achieve the key aims of the Glasgow City Development Plan. This Policy aims to improve the quality of development taking place in Glasgow by promoting a design-led approach. This will contribute towards protecting and improving the quality of the environment, improving health and reducing health inequality, making the planning process as inclusive as possible and ensuring that new development attains the highest sustainability levels.*

*Supplementary Guidance **SG1 'Placemaking**' supports CDP1 and comprises two parts. Part 1 provides the context and approach of Placemaking established in Policy CDP1 and Part 2 contains detailed assessment criteria for small-scale development.*

**Comment:**
The application site comprises a semi-detached Victorian Villa located within Newlands Conservation area. The locale is characterised by similar well preserved, traditional properties. The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate siting, scale, design and materials, fails to meet the highest standards of design while providing high quality amenity to existing and new residents in the City. The introduction of these excessive, poorly designed outbuildings featuring inferior finishing materials fails to respect the quality and character of the property or the local built environment. Furthermore, the slate selected for the roof of the main dwellinghouse does not match that of the attached property. The resultant finish therefore represents an anomalous, addition that does not achieve cohesion, harmony and does not respect the quality of environment in which it sits.
The proposed design fails to blend sympathetically or contrast successfully with the existing and therefore cannot be supported.

| | |
|---|---|
| | Due to its detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the property and area, the proposal is contrary to **CDP1: The Placemaking Principle & SG 1 – Placemaking.**<br><br>**Supplementary Guidance SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2), Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens**<br>This guidance sets out the planning requirements for alterations to dwellings and gardens for particular types of householder developments, such as extensions. It outlines the criteria that must be met in relation to, for example design and daylighting. It seeks to ensure that householder development is carefully designed, so that the visual amenity of residential buildings and areas is not adversely affected by over-dominant additions and that residential amenity is not impacted. The following is an extract of the guidance that applies to this application:<br><br>*• The siting, form, scale, proportions and detailed design should be in keeping with the existing building and wider area.*<br>*• High quality innovative design is encouraged where it will complement the property.*<br>*• Extensions and other alterations to dwellings should be designed so they do not dominate the existing building, or neighbouring buildings.*<br>*• External materials should reflect the character of the original building and the street.*<br><br>*The following guidance, specific to **Daylight and Sunlight** applies:*<br>*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.*<br><br>***Free-standing Garages** - Garages should:*<br><br>*a) be set a minimum of 6 metres back from the rear edge of the public/common footpath, except in private lanes where they may be set on the boundary;*<br>*b) have a pitched roof, unless well screened from public view;*<br>*c) not extend in front of the established building line (see Definition); and*<br>*d) be finished in materials to match the original house.*<br><br>***Ancillary Garden Structures (Garden Sheds, Pigeon Lofts etc)** – Ancillary garden structures should be:*<br>*a) similar in size and appearance to traditional garden sheds; and*<br>*b) sited behind the building line (see Definition) and preferably within the rear garden area.*<br>**Comment:**<br>The proposed outbuildings and replacement roof have not been carefully designed in a manner that safeguards the visual amenity of the host property or the wider residential area, as required by SG1: Placemaking (Part 2).<br><br>The replacement of the existing timber garage with a home office of a significantly greater scale, in a prominent location, and finished in inappropriate materials results in a visually intrusive and incongruous form of development. It fails to reflect the character, proportions and materiality of the original dwelling or surrounding built environment and does not represent a sympathetic or subordinate ancillary structure.<br><br>In addition, despite its reduction in size, the rear store remains excessive in scale and massing relative to the site. Its siting and design appear over-dominant within the garden curtilage, resulting in a fragmented and poorly arranged outdoor space that detracts from the overall visual amenity and established character of the area.<br><br>With regard to the replacement roof, the use of mismatched slate, together with the introduction of visually prominent roof alterations, results in a poorly integrated and incoherent design. The alterations disrupt the architectural unity of the semi-detached property and fail to respect its original character and appearance. As a result, the works appear visually discordant and detract from the contribution the building makes to the |

wider streetscape.

Overall, the proposal does not demonstrate a carefully considered, design-led approach. The cumulative impact of the outbuildings and roof alterations results in an over-dominant, poorly integrated form of development that adversely affects the character and visual amenity of both the host property and the surrounding area, contrary to the requirements of SG1.

**CDP9 & SG9: Historic Environment**

*In spatial terms, it is the whole Conservation Area (made up of all buildings and the spaces between these buildings) that is of architectural or historic interest. Planning control is, therefore, directed at maintaining the integrity of the entire Conservation Area and enhancing its special character. It should be noted that Conservation Area status does not necessarily mean that new development is always unacceptable, but it does mean that great care should be taken to ensure that any new development will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.*

*CDP 9 and supplementary guidance SG 9 of the City Development Plan aim to preserve and enhance Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas throughout Glasgow. The policies aim to ensure the appropriate protection, enhancement and management of Glasgow's heritage assets by providing clear guidance to applicants.*

*SG 9: Historic Environment provides the following additional guidance with respect to:*

***Roofs***

*Repair of Existing Roof Fabric –*

*In Glasgow, the traditional roofing material is Scottish slates, although slates from other sources such as from Wales and Cumbria have also been used. Other traditional materials include pantiles, Rosemary tiles, lead (including lead on flat roofs), copper in domes and on the roof of decorative turrets and zinc ridges/flashing.*

*Where traditional materials have been used on the roof, these should always be used when re-roofing/repairs are undertaken.*

*Planning Permission and/or Listed Building Consent will be required where an alteration from the existing material is proposed or the roof is to be re-slated in its entirety. Where roofs are slated, owners will be encouraged to reuse the existing natural slates.*

*Matching new or second hand natural slates should be used on Listed Buildings taking care to match the diminishing course patterns or replicate any decorative details such as fish scale slates around turrets etc. On unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas, matching new natural slates or second hand slates should be used.*

***Roof Lights** - The use of conservation style roof lights is the preferred solution in the creation of additional roof space. Where acceptable, these should be on the rear elevation of a building or within the valley of an M shaped roof. New roof lights should not be introduced on the front elevation of Listed Buildings or unlisted building in a Conservation Area.*

*New roof lights should replicate traditional roof lights in design, low profile framing and structural glazing bars, and be coloured to blend in with the roof finish and be flush fitted. The number of roof lights proposed will also be taken into consideration.*

**SECTION C: DEVELOPMENT IN THE CURTILAGE OF LISTED BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES IN CONSERVATION AREAS INCLUDING NEW BUILDINGS**

***Domestic Garages, Sheds and Outbuildings** - The design of garages, sheds and outbuildings should incorporate a ridged or mono-pitched roof, and walls in a material sympathetic to the main property; green roof systems or designs incorporating a*

| | |
|---|---|
| | *contemporary modern design and materials will be considered on their own merits.*<br><br>*Alternatively, a good quality timber structure with ridged felt roof may be acceptable dependent on prevailing architecture within the area. Paintwork should match the colour scheme of the dwelling.*<br><br>*Garages, sheds and outbuildings should be located to the rear of the property or where least open to public view. The structure should be subsidiary in scale and sympathetic in design, and should respect the character of the Listed Building and/or Conservation Area.*<br><br>**Comment:**<br>Policy clearly states that planning permission is required where a roof is to be re-slated in its entirety. It also advises that existing natural slates should be retained and reused where possible, and that, within Conservation Areas, replacement materials should comprise natural slates that match the original in terms of colour, texture and size, or appropriate second-hand slates, in order to respect traditional materials and detailing.<br><br>The requirement for consent in this instance is demonstrated by the works undertaken, which have introduced a replacement slate that is significantly darker in tone and fails to match the existing or adjacent roof coverings. This results in a visually discordant roofscape that does not respect the established character of the building or surrounding area, and fails to preserve the architectural integrity, character and setting of the property, contrary to SG9 guidance. The works therefore detract from the character and appearance of both the host building and the wider conservation area.<br><br>Furthermore, the roof has been adversely affected by the introduction of modern rooflights which project above the roof plane rather than being flush-fitting, failing to minimise visual impact as required by SG9. Their installation across all roof planes, rather than being confined to less visually sensitive elevations, further erodes the building's traditional character and prominence within the streetscape. As such, the alterations fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and are not considered to accord with CDP Policy 9 and SG9 (Historic Environment).<br><br>With regard to the outbuildings, a previously existing timber garage of sympathetic design has been demolished, and retrospective consent is now sought for its replacement. It is noted that the submitted Block Plan (Existing and Proposed, Drawing No. 3 Rev C) depicts the former garage as being of similar size and alignment to the neighbouring garage at No. 13 Woodburn Road; however, available evidence, including Google Street View, indicates that the original structure was smaller in scale and set back from the principal building line of the dwellinghouse. The replacement of this structure with a larger home office introduces a prominent and incongruous feature that fails to respect the established pattern of development along the street. By virtue of its siting, increased scale, design and use of inferior materials, the building appears anomalous within its context and is detrimental to the character and setting of the host property and the wider conservation area, contrary to the requirements of CDP Policy 9 and SG9 (Historic Environment).<br><br>Furthermore, in order to accommodate this enlarged structure, the boundary hedging between the application property and No. 13 Woodburn Road has been either removed or significantly reduced. As noted above, the spatial character of a Conservation Area is derived not only from its buildings but also from the spaces between them. Landscaping features such as hedging, trees and shrubbery play an important role in defining this character and contribute positively to visual amenity and biodiversity. The loss of this established planting erodes the setting of the site and is detrimental to the special character and appearance of the conservation area, failing to preserve or enhance its overall quality.<br><br>In relation to the store located to the rear of the home office, while its footprint has been reduced, its overall scale remains excessive in the context of the site. In addition, its design and choice of materials are not in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. As such, it appears as a further incongruous addition that does not integrate with its context and detracts from the overall visual |

| | |
|---|---|
| | coherence of the site.<br><br>For the reasons outlined, the proposal is contrary to **SG9: Historic Environment**<br><br>**CONCLUSION**<br><br>Whilst a number of examples of gardens and outbuildings in the locale have been cited by the agent, an analysis of the planning history, design and other relevant considerations is provided above on a site by site basis. However, in summary and to re-iterate, this does not justify the works undertaken which are excessive, unsuitable and detrimental to the locale<br><br>Regardless of this, every application for Planning permission is assessed on its own merits against the current Development Plan. While there is a need to maintain consistency in the consideration of points of merit, this is not the same as a 'precedent'.<br><br>The inappropriate roof replacement on the original dwelling, compounded by the installation of modern rooflights on all roof planes will have a significant detrimental impact on the residential and visual amenity of the application site and neighbouring properties. This intervention, along with the demolition of a traditional timber garage and its replacement with the excessive and unsuitable buildings proposed is not considered to be sympathetic to the character of the property itself and does not preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the Newlands Conservation area.<br><br>With respect to (c), the proposals would not impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings.<br><br>In terms of (d), other material considerations include the views of statutory and other consultees and the contents of letters of representations. No consultations were received and the issues raised in the 11 representations submitted have been addressed in this report.<br><br>It is considered, for the reasons outlined in the report above, this application is not in accordance with NPF4 and the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan. On the basis of the foregoing, it is recommended that this application for Full Planning permission be refused<br><br>Whilst revisions which may have found a common ground, could have been considered, amended drawings submitted April 30th fail to sufficiently address the issues outlined. The type of slate used on the main dwellinghouse remains unspecified and modern, intrusive rooflights remain present on all roof planes.<br>In terms of the materials now proposed for the outbuildings, a mish mash of these are specified, some of which are suitable and others, like the UPVC windows on the front elevation, are not. Those that are suitable do not camouflage the excessive size of the buildings or their poor design. |
| **Recommendation** | **Refuse** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Date:<br>06/05/26 | | DM Officer | **Eileen Dudziak** |
| Date | 19/05/2026 | DM Manager | Ross Middleton |

## 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. For the reasons noted below, the proposed development is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 policies 14: Design, Quality & Place, 16: Quality Homes and 7: Historic Assets & Places. It is also contrary to City Development Plan Policies CDP 1/SG1: The Placemaking Principle, and SG 9: Historic Environment of the Glasgow City Development Plan as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.

03. It is considered that the proposal fails to meet the high quality of design expected for development, it is not consistent with the six qualities of successful places, in particular in relation to being distinctive and contextually appropriate. This is due to the use of mismatched slate and incongruous rooflights on the main dwelling, together with the siting, scale, design and materiality of the outbuildings, which collectively result in a development that fails to integrate with its context and has a detrimental impact on the character and visual amenity of the application site and wider area.. As such, the proposal fails to meet the highest standards of design and would adversely affect the residential and visual amenity of property itself and wider locale and is therefore contrary to the placemaking aims of NPF 4, Policy 14: Design, quality and place, Policy 16: Quality Homes and CDP 1 and SG 1.

04. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 16 (Quality Homes) and CDP and SG1 (Placemaking), Part 2, as the siting, scale and proximity of the proposed store to the boundary with 4 Merrylee Road, at approximately 0.4m and 3.2m in height, would result in unacceptable overshadowing of the neighbouring garden, particularly during the morning and afternoon, thereby failing to safeguard residential amenity

05. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places) and CDP Policy 9 and Supplementary Guidance 9 (Historic Environment), in that the use of significantly mismatched replacement slate, the introduction of incongruous modern rooflights across all roof planes, and the provision of outbuildings that are excessive in scale and incorporate inappropriate design detailing and poor-quality materials, fail to respect the scale, character and architectural integrity of the host property and do not preserve the character or appearance of the wider conservation area. In addition, the scale and extent of the development has resulted in the loss of established hedging, which contributes positively to the character and setting of the site and surrounding area. As such, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the Newlands Conservation Area.

## Drawings

The development shall not be implemented in accordance with the drawing(s)

1. 00 A LOCATION PLAN Received 22 December 2025
2. 01 REV A PLAN AS PROPOSED Received 22 December 2025
3. 02 REV C ELEVATIONS AS PROPOSED Received 22 December 2025
4. 02 REV C ELEVATIONS AS PROPOSED Received 22 December 2025
5. 03 REV C BLOCK PLAN AS EXISTING AND PROPOSED Received 22 December 2025
6. 04 PLAN AS PROPOSED PLOT ANAYSIS Received 22 December 2025
7. 04 REV B ROOF PLAN Received 6 February 2026

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