

## REPORT OF HANDLING FOR APPLICATION 23/00509/FUL

19th September 2023

<b>ADDRESS:</b>	1692 Gartloch Road Glasgow G69 8EN
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Formation of dormer window to rear of dwellinghouse
<b>DATE OF ADVERT:</b>	No advertisement required.
<b>NO OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED</b>	8 neighbour notification letters were issued, and the application was included on the Weekly List of Applications. No representations have been received.
<b>PARTIES CONSULTED AND RESPONSES</b>	None.
<b>PRE-APPLICATION COMMENTS</b>	<p>Pre-application advice was sought (23/00174/PRE) following a refusal (22/02869/FUL). The pre-application submission included very few changes since the refusal. The feedback provided included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The front face of the dormer is not considered to be predominantly glazed and looks unbalanced in terms of window to slate ratio. Glazing would need to be significantly increased, or the width decreased, for this to be considered acceptable.</li> <li>• The proposed dormer is too large in scale for the narrow section of the roof it sits on and for the modestly sized property in general. The dormer would need to be significantly reduced in width to comply with policy.</li> <li>• The proposed dormer, due to its width, gives the perception that it looks directly towards both the applicant's own garden and their neighbour's rear garden (1694 Gartloch Road). If the width was reduced, this perception would likely be removed and there would likely be no privacy concerns.</li> </ul> <p>Following this advice, the agent emailed the Case Officer requesting an opinion on a revised proposal, which appeared to increase the proportion of glazing. The Case Officer clarified that the issue with the width of the dormer still remained, and if it were to be reduced, it could potentially solve the other issues with the application. This correspondence (from 10<sup>th</sup> Feb 2023 and 24<sup>th</sup> Feb 2023) has been uploaded to the pre-application file.</p>
<b>EIA - MAIN ISSUES</b>	NONE
<b>CONSERVATION (NATURAL HABITATS ETC) REGS 1994 – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>DESIGN OR DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>IMPACT/POTENTIAL IMPACT STATEMENTS – MAIN ISSUES</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>S75 AGREEMENT SUMMARY</b>	NOT APPLICABLE
<b>DETAILS OF DIRECTION UNDER REGS 30/31/32</b>	NOT APPLICABLE

<b>NPF4 POLICIES</b>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Policy 1:</b> Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises</li> <li>• <b>Policy 2:</b> Climate Mitigation and Adaptation</li> <li>• <b>Policy 14:</b> Design, Quality and Place</li> <li>• <b>Policy 16:</b> Quality Homes</li> </ul>
<b>CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES</b>	<p>The City Development Plan consists of high-level policies with statutory supplementary guidance providing further information or detail in respect of the policies. The following are considered relevant to the application:</p> <p><b>CDP 1:</b> The Placemaking Principle  <b>SG 1:</b> Placemaking, Residential Development</p>
<b>OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	None.
<b>REASON FOR DECISION</b>	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.

<b>COMMENTS</b>
-----------------

<b>PLANNING HISTORY</b>	<b>Development Management</b>			
	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision Issued</b>	<b>Decision</b>
	22/02869/FUL	Formation of dormer window to rear of dwellinghouse	23.12.2022	RF
	23/00174/PRE	Formation of dormer window to rear of dwellinghouse	08.02.2023	CLO
	<b>Appeal or Local Review</b>			
	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision Issued</b>	<b>Decision</b>
	<b>Enforcement</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Closed</b>	<b>Decision</b>	
<b>SITE VISITS (DATES)</b>	Application determined using Google Maps and drawings provided.			
<b>SITING</b>	The application site is a terraced property to the south of Gartloch Road and northwest of Gartloch village, in Ward 21 – North East.			
<b>DESIGN AND MATERIALS</b>	<p>The proposed development is for the formation of a dormer window to the rear of the dwelling.</p> <p><b>Design</b>  <u>Approx. dormer measurements</u>  The dormer is around 3.9m in length from the roof and is around 1.9m in height and 2.3m in width. The dormer sits around 0.5m down from the ridge and 1.2m up from the eaves.</p> <p><b>Materials</b>  Checks: Slate finish to match existing roof  Roof: Slate finish to match existing roof  Window: UPVC</p>			
<b>DAYLIGHT</b>	N/A			
<b>ASPECT</b>	The dormer is proposed to be attached to the roof on the rear elevation.			

<b>PRIVACY</b>	Addressed in the 'Other Comments' section of this report.
<b>ADJACENT LEVELS</b>	N/A
<b>LANDSCAPING (INCLUDING GARDEN GROUND)</b>	N/A
<b>ACCESS AND PARKING</b>	N/A
<b>SITE CONSTRAINTS</b>	No constraints of relevance to this application.
<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>	<p>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. The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be:</p> <p>a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; and  b) whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises of NPF4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted on the 29th March 2017.</p> <p>The proposed development is not deemed to be consistent with some of the relevant policies of NPF4, specifically Policy 14 and 16, due to the proposal's width/scale and perceived impact on privacy. This is outlined in more detail within the assessment against the City Development Plan.</p> <p><b>SG 1</b> states the following guidance:</p> <p><b>2.14 Dormers, Roof Terraces and Balconies</b>  <i>Dormers should:</i>  a) <i>be well below the ridgeline of the roof;</i>  b) <i>be finished to match the materials of the existing roof;</i>  c) <i>have a front face predominantly glazed;</i>  d) <i>match the style of any existing dormers present on the roof/adjacent buildings;</i>  e) <i>be well drawn back from the eaves by at least 300mm;</i>  f) <i>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);</i>  g) <i>not be over-dominant in relation to the existing scale of the property; and</i>  h) <i>relate to windows and doors below in character, proportion and alignment.</i></p> <p><b>2.15</b> <i>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.</i></p> <p><b>2.16</b> <i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Case Officer Comment:</b>  <u>Design</u>  The dormer sits around 0.5m below the ridge of the roof and around 1.2m from the eaves. The front face of the dormer appears to be predominantly glazed and the proposed materials suitably match the existing dwelling.</p> <p>The dwelling's rear layout creates a roof split into two parts, as one side of the rear elevation extends out further than the other. The dormer sits on the non-projecting part of the property's roof, which in total measures around 2.9m in width. As the criteria above</p>

	<p>states, the dormer should not extend over 50% of the width of the roof, and as the proposed dormer measures around 2.8m in width, the dormer is considered to be too large/wide in scale for the narrow roof it sits on and for the modestly sized property in general. The proposed dormer therefore does not comply with Criteria 2.14(f) and (g) and as a result, it is recommended that the proposal is <b><u>refused</u></b>.</p> <p><b><u>Privacy</u></b></p> <p>The proposed dormer serves a habitable bedroom space. The rear gardens of the row of terraced properties, that the application property sits within, are all located in a row to the back of the properties, separated from the dwellings by a private street for residents.</p> <p>Many of the neighbouring properties in the row have second storey windows to the rear that face toward the gardens, however it should be noted that the dwelling at hand is one of the few properties in the residential row where one side of the property (in this case the non-projecting side where the dormer is proposed to sit) faces directly in between their own and a neighbour's private rear garden. It is not fully clear if the proposed dormer window itself would have direct views into the neighbouring rear garden however, as a result of the dormer's positioning and width, the dormer gives the perception that it looks directly towards both the applicant's own garden and their neighbour's rear garden (1694 Gartloch Road). As a result, the proposed dormer does not clearly pass the criteria required and therefore would not be considered acceptable.</p> <p>It should be noted that these types of gardens are not provided the same initial level of privacy as a standard private rear garden due to their layout, however the proposed dormer has the potential to further reduce the level of privacy currently possessed by their next-door neighbours.</p> <p>The proposed development therefore fails to meet Criteria 2.15 of SG1 and it is recommended that the proposal is <b><u>refused</u></b>.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>The proposed development is not consistent with the policies of NPF4 or CDP1/SG1. With regard to b), there are no material considerations which would merit a breach of the Councils Statutory Guidance.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, it is recommended the application be <b><u>refused</u></b>.</p>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>Refuse</b>

Date: <b>26.04.2023</b>	DM Officer	<b>Lisa Davison</b>
Date: <u>28/04/2023</u>	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. The development proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 14 and 16, and also CDP 1: The Placemaking Principle and SG 1: Placemaking (Part 2, Residential Development - Alterations to Dwellings & Gardens) of the Glasgow City Development Plan as specified below, and there is no overriding reason to depart therefrom.
03. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 14 and 16, and also CDP 1 and SG 1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the proposed rear dormer extends more than 50% of the width of the roof it is located on, and as a result, it would appear too large on the relatively narrow roof, compromising the visual amenity of the property.
04. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 Policy 14 and 16, and also CDP 1 and SG 1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the proposed rear dormer appears to overlook the private rear garden of 1694 Gartloch Road, which would result in an intrusion on the neighbour's privacy.

## **Drawings**

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

1. A003 C - BLOCK PLAN Received 1 March 2023
2. A210 E - ELEVATION Received 1 March 2023
3. A310 B - SECTIONS Received 7 March 2023
4. A110 C - PROPOSED UPPER FLOOR Received 7 March 2023
5. A111 B - PROPOSED ROOF PLANS Received 7 March 2023

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