



Glasgow City Council

Planning Local Review Committee

Report by Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration
and Sustainability

Contact: Tim Moss Ext: 70632

Item 1 (a)

11th August 2026

25/00084/LOCAL – 311 Calder Street Glasgow G42 7NQ
External alterations, with erection of two storey extension to rear.

Purpose of Report:

To provide Committee with the new information supplied as requested at the Local Review Committee meeting on 3rd March regarding the use of the building and a BRE vertical sky component for the item.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that Committee consider the additional information provided in the determination of the review.

Ward No(s): 08 - Southside Central

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 ITEM FOR LOCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE OF 9 June 2026

- 1.1 At the Local Review Committee (LRC) meeting of 3rd March 2026, the LRC requested further information to allow them to consider a review for the external alterations, with erection of two storey extension to rear at 311 Calder Street Glasgow G42 7NQ (reference 25/00084/LOCAL).
- 1.2 The proposal required further information regarding the management plan and appeal statement, which were omitted from the appeal in error. The Committee also asked for information regarding the BRE Vertical Sky Component and clarity on the proposed use for the halls to be erected. The purpose of this report and the request was to ascertain the loss of daylight to the neighbouring properties to the north at Batson Street, and measure the level of daylight to the proposal.
- 1.3 Further information requested was dependent on the use proposed, which was confirmed to be a place for social activities of a religious body (Class 10). As this use is already established on the site, further information was not deemed necessary.
- 1.4 Evidence was provided by the appellant and deemed satisfactory for review by the officer.

Vertical Sky Component Report Findings

- 1.5 The following points should also be noted from the Vertical Sky Component report presented to committee:
 - 1.5.1 The report looked at receptors (measuring points) in both the house on Batson Street, the proposed extension and the nursery (Little Wonder) play area. Receptors were not given for the neighbouring garden at 98 Batson Street.
 - 1.5.2 As a benchmark, BRE Guidelines suggest that VSC values of 27% are 'sufficient' for adequate daylight, between 15% and 27% would require large windows or shallower rooms, lower than 15% becomes challenging and below 5% is considered impossible.
 - 1.5.3 According to the report "The VSC results demonstrate that the principal neighbouring residential receptors on Batson Street retain more than 80% of their existing VSC values."
 - 1.5.4 Receptors for the extension (C1-C9) would see their VSC values reduced to between 16.8% and 31.2%, the north elevation of the extension is acceptable, the east elevation would require large windows to have adequate sunlight and the south elevation would not meet the BRE standards. This loss is considered acceptable given the internal layouts of the halls and level of fenestration to the east. However, it is clear that significant loss would be present in the

Northern elevation of the original building – currently the reception area to the entire building.

1.5.5 Receptors for the housing at 98-102 Batson Street show that the loss of VSC can be up to 11% in the worse instance. Though this is low, and this would mean that a habitable room of 98 Batson Street – the rear lower and middle windows – have their VSC% lower from 27.2% to 25%. This constitutes a marginal loss of daylight for neighbouring residents.

1.5.6 The report also notes a loss of daylight to the play area for the neighbouring nursery in the morning.

1.6 Committee reviewed the information provided. This information is included in the review papers for the Committee to consider.

2. COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 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.

2.2 Further to the addition of the BRE Vertical Sky Component the following considerations should be noted in assessing the document.

2.3 Sunlight and neighbouring amenity

SG1: The Placemaking Principle (Part 2) Daylighting and Sunlight states that - 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.

BRE - Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight - A guide to good practice

Summary

2.1.21 Obstructions can limit access to light from the sky. This can be checked at an early design stage by measuring or calculating the angle of visible sky θ , angle of obstruction or vertical sky component (VSC) at the centre of the lowest window where daylight is required.

In new buildings, if VSC is:

- at least 27% (θ is greater than 65° , obstruction angle less than 25°) conventional window design will usually give reasonable results.

- between 15% and 27% (θ is between 45° and 65°, obstruction angle between 25° and 45°) special measures (larger windows, changes to room layout) are usually needed to provide adequate daylight.
- between 5% and 15% (θ is between 25° and 45°, obstruction angle between 45° and 65°) it is very difficult to provide adequate daylight unless very large windows are used.
- less than 5% (θ less than 25°, obstruction angle more than 65°) it is often impossible to achieve reasonable daylight, even if the whole window wall is glazed.

If a new building faces an existing building, then the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected. This will be the case if either:

- the VSC measured at the centre of an existing main window is less than 27%, and less than 0.80 times its former value
- the area of the working plane in a room which can receive direct skylight is reduced to less than 0.80 times its former value.

Committee should note that:

- The report notes losses of daylight to 98 Batson Street's ground floor habitable rooms that would lead to significant loss of amenity. The garden which these rooms face onto would also be affected.
- The report highlights loss of sunlight to the Little Wonder Nursery play space in the morning.

Committee should consider whether:

- the loss of acceptable levels of sunlight to the nursery playspace, neighbouring habitable rooms and gardens are acceptable in this instance?

4 Summary of Committee Considerations

4.1 Having received the further information; Committee should note the proposal remains contrary to policy in the following areas:

- The extension differs in roof style, fenestration pattern to the listed building (contrary to NPF4 Policy 14, 16, SG1 Part 2 SG9).
- The entrance reception area protrudes beyond the side elevation building line (contrary to NPF4 Policy 14, 16, SG1 Part 2).
- The development uses inappropriate materials such as concrete roof tiles (contrary to NPF4 Policy 14, 16, SG1 Part 2, SG9).
- Loss of privacy to the neighbouring dwellinghouse from the overlooking by principal elevation windows (contrary to SG1 Part 2).
- Loss of daylight to the windows of habitable rooms of the tenements on Batson Street (contrary to SG1 Part 2).

- The alteration or demolition of part the listed building without listed building consent (contrary to SG9).

4.2 Furthermore, committee should consider whether there is a breach of policy in the following areas:

- The lack of noise impact assessment
- Intensification of use affecting climate adaptation and mitigation.
- The intensity of use could have a detrimental impact to neighbouring amenity.
- The lack of cycle or vehicle parking proposed, and the potential for congestion and parking problems as a result.

5 Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

Financial: None

Legal: None

Personnel: None

Procurement: None

Council Strategic Plan: Specify which theme(s) and outcome(s) the proposal supports

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts: N/A

Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2017-21 N/A

What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report? (no significant impact, positive impact or negative impact)
N/A

Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio economic disadvantage. N/A

Sustainability Impacts:

Environmental: N/A

Social, including
opportunities under
Article 20 of the
European Public
Procurement
Directive N/A

Economic: N/A

**Privacy and Data
Protection impacts:
N/A**

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 It is recommended that Committee consider the additional information provided in the determination of the review.