Item 1

24th November 2026

Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability

Contact: Tim Moss Ext: 78654

26/00045/LOCAL – 11 Woodburn Road Glasgow G43 2TN
Installation of replacement roof, demolition of existing garage and erection of 2No. outbuildings to garden (retrospective).

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): 02 – Newlands/Auldburn Citywide: N/A

Local member(s) advised: Yes o No o consulted: Yes o No o

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

Any Ordnance Survey mapping included within this Report is provided by Glasgow City Council under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to make available Council-held public domain information. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey Copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. The OS web site can be found at <http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk> "

If accessing this Report via the Internet, please note that any mapping is for illustrative purposes only and is not true to any marked scale

1 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS

Location

1.1 The proposal site is on the garden of a semi-detached blonde sandstone villa. The property sits on the northern side of the street.

1.2 The building is unlisted, sits in the Newlands Conservation Area, and is within the Newlands/Aulburn ward – 02.

1.3 A timber garage had existed at the side of the dwellinghouse, this has been demolished some time around 2024.

Proposal

1.4 The proposal is the partially retrospective erection of two outbuildings, including the removal of a garage. The front outbuilding is of 54sqm, will include an accessible toilet and act as a Home office. The rear outbuilding is 25sqm and is listed on the site plan as a 'Garden store'. Measurements of the outbuildings are:

- Front outbuilding: W 6.75m x D 8m x H 3.635m. Area: 54sqm
- Rear outbuilding: W 4.8m x D 5.5m x H 3.2m. Area: 25sqm

1.5 There is a slope of approximately 0.8m between front and rear outbuilding. The gable of the pitched roof of both outbuildings faces the front elevation.

1.6 Materials used will include Marley Modern roof tiles, uPVC guttering, uPVC windows, render outer block, Keim paint to match the existing colour, breeze block internal wall.

1.7 To the main dwelling, rooflights and replacement tiles have been added to the original property. The main dwelling roof alterations are required due to the area being in a conservation area. These tiles are visibly darker than the roof of the next door property.

1.8 As shown in the site photos, currently onsite are two breeze block buildings without roofs, which reflect the proposed outbuildings. The original garage has been removed and the tiles have been replaced on the main property.

1.9 Other alterations include a new concrete path to run to the rear outbuilding.

1.10 Enforcement action is pending the outcome of this appeal.

2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

2.1 NPF4 was adopted by the Scottish Ministers on 13 February 2023 and is part of the statutory Development Plan. Where there is an area of incompatibility it is expected that the newest policy document will take precedence, which will be NPF4 for the time being.

In this case, the relevant policies from NPF4 are:

- Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises
- Policy 2: Climate mitigation and adaption.
- Policy 7: Historic assets and places
- Policy 14; Design, quality and place
- Policy 16: Quality Homes

2.2 The relevant City Development Plan policies and supplementary guidance's are:

- CDP1 & SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Parts 1 & 2)
- CDP9 & SG9 Historic Environment

2.3 The other relevant guidance for this appeal is:

- Newlands Conservation Area Appraisal

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL

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. 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 roof lights 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 roof lights 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.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

4.1 A summary of the material points raised in the appeal statement are given below.

01. The application is retrospective as the applicant had been unaware that re-roofing in slate, replacing sash and cases windows with sash and case windows the rebuilding of the garage and an additional storage building would be classified as development.

02. The reasons for the refusal including the size, materials and design and that the outcome would result in only 41% of useable garden being retained The 41% was an error and should have read 62% as per the drawings submitted at the time.

03. In terms of retained Garden Ground Doc 5 illustrates that the application site has a larger footprint than those around it which is what at 342 square metres it has the largest garden ground when compared to those in close proximity.

05. Regarding the potential overshadowing, the size is commensurate with a single garage and it would not be close to any habitable building.

4.2 The applicant did not request any further procedure in the determination of the review.

5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

5.1 There were 13 letters of representation received to the application, all objecting to the proposal. Relevant points are summarised as below:

- **Inappropriate materials** (concrete tiles, drawn render UPVC fascia), inconsistent with conservation area and neighbouring properties. Also a lack of details around materials (style, size and colour of Marley roof tiles; design and colour of windows; colour of PVC fascia, soffit, gutters and downpipes).
- **Size and scale:** Inappropriate scale and massing compared to neighbouring properties. Development much larger than indicated in site plans.
    - Committee should note: Comments mentioned concern of a breach in the 66% garden rule, the plans do not appear to show this, however they do show issues around a culminative effect of the scale of both developments.
- **Questions around use of development:** Development likely to be a dwelling given the presence of washroom facilities.
    Committee should note: a condition can be attached to ensure the property would not be used as a dwelling. The lack of a full bathroom appears to show the property would remain subordinate to the original dwelling and not create independent living accommodation.
- **Overshadowing:** by rear outbuilding into neighbouring garden, giving rise to Privacy and overlooking concerns.
- **Other points raised:** Enforcement action is outstanding. Information missing and (listed but not in site plans): Patio doors, ventilation from kitchen and utilities.

- Committee should note: one objector requested a site visit to allow Committee to adequately understand the scale of the design. This decision would be taken by Committee.

- Committee should note: There is also concern whether the application should have been accepted on the basis that it is not a sufficiently different from the previous application.

5.2 Seven letters of representation were received to this review, largely restating the above objections. The following additional points were raised:

- Concern that the application plans are not a reflection of the current development in terms of scale.
- Concern around the time scales of the process.
- The level of over development for a plot in a conservation area.

6 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 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.

6.2. The following are relevant policy considerations:

6.3 Climate change, design and mitigation

Committee should note that:

- *NPF4: Policy 1 - Tackling the climate and nature crises and Policy 2 - Climate Mitigation and Adaptation* require significant weight is given to climate crisis and mitigation in all proposals.
- The building is made out of concrete breeze blocks and does not re-use any previous materials.

Committee should consider whether:

- they are completely satisfied that the development takes into account the climate and nature crises; and
- they are completely satisfied that the development minimises lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible.

6.4 **Design and visual amenity**

General principles

Committee should note:

- NPF4 Policy 14: Design, quality and place: supports development consistent with the six qualities of successful places, including **"Distinctive"** (Supporting attention to detail of local architectural styles into designs to reinforce identity), as well as **Healthy**, **Pleasant** and **Sustainable**.

Committee should consider if:

- The highest standards of design have been considered in this proposal?

Residential amenity

Committee should note:

- NPF4 Policy 16: Quality Homes requires that householder development does not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.
- SG1: The Placemaking Principle: states that there should be no adverse impact on existing and proposed accommodation. A 1.8m screening is required for windows facing neighbouring boundaries.
- SG1 Requires that a BRE daylight survey is undertaken where there is grounds to think a loss of daylight to neighbours could occur. Extensions should not case a shadow over a neighbours house or private garden.
- The replacement of the timber garage is significantly greater in scale and sits in a prominent location.

Committee should consider whether:

- If they are satisfied that the development is sensitive to the character of the conservation area and the visual amenity of the street.

6.5 **Historic Assets and Place**
Character of the conservation area

Committee should note:

- NPF4 Policy 7: Historic Assets and Places - supports development that preserves or enhances a conservation area. Considerations must include architectural and historic character of the area, existing density, built form and layout; and the context and siting, quality of design and suitable materials.
- CDP9/SG9: Historic Environment - notes that sheds should be of a sympathetic design to the main property, 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.
- On Roof lights: conservation style roof lights are preferred, new roof lights should replicate the traditional design in profile, framing and the use of structural glazing bars.
- The roof lights proposed are modern and project beyond the roof plane rather than sitting flush.

Committee should consider whether:

- they are satisfied that the development is sensitive to the character of the conservation area and the visual amenity of the street.

Repairs Materiality

Committee should note:

- NPF4 Policy 7: Historic Assets and Places and CDP9/SG9: Historic Environment - require development conservation areas to mind the historic character of an area through sympathetic and suitable building materials.
- SG9: Guidance on the repair of the existing roof fabric. States that "Where roofs are slated, owners will be encouraged to reuse the existing natural slates." "On unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas, matching new natural slates or second hand slates should be used."
- Newlands Conservation Area: references the 'Arts and Crafts' style timber garages, which are an important part of the townscape. The loss of these garages is listed as a key challenge under 'loss of original architectural detail'. As is the use of inappropriate materials.
    - The roof tiles proposed are modern and do not respect the established architectural or historic character.
    - The use of render outer wall is contrary to the conservation area appraisal and subject to numerous objections by neighbouring residents.
    - Outbuildings elsewhere in the conservation area tend to be of timber design, or pre-date the Conservation Area designation.

Committee should consider whether:

- they are satisfied that the materials used are sensitive to the character of the conservation area

Massing and Garden Ground

Committee should note:

- SG1 Part 2 – The Placemaking Principle states that a minimum of 66% of the original useable private garden space should be retained to avoid over-development. Car parking should be maintained within the curtilage of the property. Useable private garden 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.*
- The applicant has submitted a site plan showing 62.5% (342sqm) of retained garden. This calculation takes the whole plot and removes the proposed and existing outbuildings (125sqm, 54sqm and 25sqm). However this is not the correct method. The total space remaining is nearer 86%, meaning this is in accordance.
- However, at 3.65m the main outbuilding stands significantly higher than a typical outbuilding. Both buildings are do not sit with the character of the existing developments within the conservation area.
- Numerous objections from local residents mention the sitting, scale and massing being excessive for the conservation area.

Committee should consider whether:

- Committee should consider if they are satisfied the two outbuildings could be defined as sympathetic to the existing character.

7 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.

8 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	

9 Recommendations

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