



Glasgow City Council
Local Review Committee

Item 1

23rd May 2023

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

Contact: Sam Taylor Ext: 78654

23/00006/LOCAL – 8 Edgehill Road, Glasgow

**Erection of two storey extension to side and single storey extension to 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): 12 – Victoria Park

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 AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATIONS

- 1.1 The site consists of a two-storey end-terrace house on the northern side of Edgehill Road, close to the corner of Edgehill Road and Churchill Drive. The site is located on a large triangular-shaped plot.

The existing dwelling is finished in beige render to the front, with dark brown render to the side and rear. The roof consists of brown tiles. There are white uPVC windows, doors and rainwater goods. The existing garage will be demolished.

The principal elevation of the property is bounded by a 1.2 metre high hedge in front of the property, with an approximately 2 metre high hedge along the remaining front boundary screening the garden area. There is a 1.2 metre high timber fence to the rear separating it from the adjoining property and garden to the west, and a 1.8 metre high timber fence to the eastern side of the rear garden.

It is within a residential area and the surrounding properties are similar in design and materials.

It is proposed to extend the existing dwellinghouse creating a two-storey extension to the side and a single-storey extension to the rear:

The two-storey side extension is proposed to have two new uPVC windows to the front (one on each storey); three new aluminium windows (one on the ground, two of the first floor) to the rear; and two aluminium windows (one on each storey) and a set of aluminium patio doors to the side. The walls will be rendered, and the roof will be tiled and pitched in design. This extension will carry through the line of the eaves and the ridgeline will be set down by approximately 0.2 metres. The side extension will be set back from the building line by 0.59 metres.

The single-storey rear extension is proposed to be largely glazed, opening on to the rear garden area. It is proposed to have a set of patio doors and one large and two smaller new windows (all aluminium). The doors and large window are separated by cladding (design, materials and colour not provided). There will be triangular-shaped aluminium pressing containing the two smaller windows. There will also be five new rooflights, three to the western elevation, and two to the eastern elevation. The walls will be rendered, and the roof will be tiled and pitched in design, with a height of 2.1 metres to the eaves.

It is further proposed to replace the existing windows and doors so that all materials are matching. The details of the colours of the proposed windows and doors, the colour of the render, the colour of the aluminium pressing, and the colour and materials of the rainwater goods have not been provided.

The proposed side boundary fence would be 1.8m high, including that part of it in front of the building line. At the rear of the building the fencing would be 1.2m high.

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

2.1 The relevant City Development Plan policies and Supplementary Guidance are:

CDP1 The Placemaking Principle

SG1 (part 2) The Placemaking Principle

3 REASONS FOR REFUSAL / RELEVANT CONDITION(S)

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. The development proposal is contrary to 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 CDP 1 and SG 1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the addition of the proposed side and rear extensions, by virtue of the overall scale and form, would be a disproportionate addition to this property, more than doubling the footprint and nearly doubling the width of the property. This would compromise the overall appearance of the building and wider setting, to the detriment of visual amenity and the character of the street scene.
04. The proposal is contrary to CDP 1 and SG 1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the extension would develop more than 34% of the usable private garden space, resulting in overdevelopment of the site.
05. The proposal is contrary to CDP 1 and SG 1 of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that the proposed fence forward of the building line exceeds 1m, which would be detrimental to the visual amenity and the character of the street scene.

4 APPEAL STATEMENT

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

- The proposed extension cannot be considered overdevelopment as the proposal retains more than 66% of original useable private garden space, as per policy.
- Policy guidance states that “generally” doubling the footprint would not be acceptable, and this case should be treated on its own merits. In this case, doubling the footprint is acceptable as the site is capable of

accommodating the extension. The proposal complies with all other policies in regards to being set back from the building line, having a roof ridgeline that is set down, and will not create a terracing effect.

- The materials and design comply with guidance as they reflect and complement the host dwelling, therefore visual amenity will not be affected.
- The proposed screening to the front of the property will replicate existing screening which has been in situ since 2008, and any future changes to this can be controlled by condition.

5 REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

5.1 There were no representations to the application and no consultations were undertaken.

6 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 NPF4 was adopted by the Scottish Ministers on 13 February 2023 and is part of the statutory Development Plan. In the case of this application there is not considered to be any significant conflict between the proposals and the policies of NPF4 that require detailed assessment and it is considered that the proposals comply with the overall approach of NPF4.

6.2 The key issues for Committee to consider are:

SG1 The Placemaking Principle

Residential Development - Alterations to Dwellings and Gardens

Extensions and alterations to houses and flats should be carefully designed, so that the visual amenity of residential buildings and areas is not adversely affected by over-dominant extensions and that residential amenity is not reduced e.g. by the excessive reduction of useable private garden space or a loss of privacy.

Design and Materials – The following guidance applies:

- the siting, form, scale, proportions, detailed design and use of materials should be in keeping with the existing building and wider area;
- extensions and other alterations to dwellings should be designed so they do not dominate the existing building, or neighbouring buildings; and
- 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.

Committee should note:

- The side and rear extensions would more than double the size of the existing dwellinghouse, be similar in design to it, have a pitched roof with a ridgeline 0.2m lower than the existing dwelling, and be set back from the building line by 0.59m.

- The colour of the new rendering; the colour of the new uPVC windows and doors to the front; the colour of the new aluminium windows and doors to the rear and side; the colour of the new aluminium pressing to the rear extension; and the colour and materials of the proposed cladding to the rear extension have not been provided.

Committee should consider whether:

- the siting, form, scale, proportions, detailed design and use of materials are in keeping with the existing building and wider area.
- the proposed extension dominates the existing building or neighbouring buildings.
- the external materials proposed reflect the character of the original building and street and the windows and doors match those of the existing property.

Front to Rear Access

Extensions should be set back from the side property boundary by at least 900 mm to allow external movement of refuse bins, garden equipment etc from the front to the rear of the property.

Committee should note:

- an access route of 900mm between the side extension and the side boundary would be provided, in accord with policy.

Usable Private Garden Space

A minimum of 66% of the original useable private garden space (adequately screened land, usually to the rear and side of the property, including decking but excluding driveways, garages and any parking spaces) should be retained in all house plots after extensions, garages, and outbuildings, etc., have been built, to avoid over-development of the site. Adequate car parking shall be maintained within the curtilage of the property after any extension or structure is erected.

Committee should note:

- The case officer and the applicant differ in their calculation of the remaining useable private garden space. The different approaches relate to the level of screening of the front garden, the level of privacy it offers and, therefore, whether it should be included as useable private garden space or not. The applicant included the front garden area and concluded 73.2% of the original useable private garden space would remain. The case officer excluded the garden in front of the building line and concluded 62% of the original useable garden would remain (i.e. contrary to policy).

The applicant indicates:

- The existing usable private garden space (i.e. including the front garden): 281.7sqm.
- 34% of garden that can be developed: 95.8sqm

- Area of proposed extension (62.5sqm – this figure excludes the existing garage floorspace of approximately 18.7sqm, which is not an appropriate approach) plus (driveway extension 12.9sqm): 75.4sqm i.e. 26.7%, 7.3% (i.e. 20.4sqm) less than policy allows
- Area of remaining private garden space: 206.3 sqm (73.2%) i.e. more than the policy threshold would remain

The Planning Officer states:

- Existing usable private garden space (i.e. excluding the front garden): 215sqm
- 34% of garden that can be developed: 73.1sqm
- Area of proposed extension 81sqm i.e. 37.6%, 3.6% more than policy indicates
- Area of remaining private garden space: 134sqm (62.3%) i.e. less than the policy threshold would remain

Committee should consider:

- if the garden area in front of the building line can be considered as ‘useable private garden space’.
- whether or not this proposal is overdevelopment of the site.

Privacy and Overlooking – the following guidance applies:

- a) there should be no adverse impact on existing or proposed accommodation;
- b) windows of habitable rooms should not increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms;
- c) at ground floor level, screening of 1.8 metre high will usually be required along boundaries where new windows face neighbouring properties;
- d) above ground floor level, windows of habitable rooms which directly face each other should be at least 18m apart and at least 10m from the site boundary.

Committee should note:

- There are no properties facing to the front or rear elevations, although this extension will face on to the rear gardens of the residential properties along Churchill Drive to the east.
 - The only window on the upper side elevation is not a habitable room.
 - The new windows proposed on the ground floor are screened by the existing timber fence.
- Committee should consider whether the proposed extension will have any adverse impact on any existing or the proposed accommodation, or whether it will increase direct overlooking into adjacent private gardens or rooms.

Daylight and Sunlight

Extensions should not cause a significant loss of daylight to any habitable room 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.

The following assessments are used to assess this impact:

- a) single storey extensions will be assessed using the 45° test. Failure on both the elevation and plan would result in a significant loss of daylight to the habitable rooms in the neighbouring house and will not be acceptable;
- b) two storey extensions, or larger, shall be assessed for their impact on habitable rooms of neighbouring properties using the 'Vertical Sky Component'; and
- c) the impact of extensions on private garden ground should be assessed, where considered necessary, using the 'Calculation of Sun on the Ground' test. Applicants should submit this information where requested using three points in time: 9a.m, 12midday and 3pm, for the Spring Equinox. The impact of the original dwellinghouse must be shown at these times as well as the impact of the proposed extension, to see whether the proposed extension will significantly increase the effect on neighbouring property.

Committee should note:

- The applicant has provided a 45° test, showing that the rear single storey extension is sited lower than the rear windows of the neighbouring property, therefore this will have no impact.
- The applicant has not provided any assessment for the two-storey side extensions, stating this will have no impact as the extension is to the side of the property and habitable rooms of the neighbouring property are separated by a garage.
- The applicant has not provided a 'sun on ground' test, as in the pre-application discussions they were advised this would not have a significant impact on neighbouring properties.

Committee should consider whether:

- it is acceptable that no Vertical Sky Component assessment has been submitted in this case.
- if they consider that the proposals will have an adverse impact the neighbouring resident's daylight or sunlight.

Extensions

Extensions should generally have a pitched roof, should not project in front of the building line, should relate to the design of the original dwellinghouse, and should be subordinate to the original dwelling house in scale and design.

Two Storey Side Extensions

To ensure extensions are subordinate to the existing house and avoid a terracing effect they should generally:

- not double the footprint of the house;
- be set back a minimum of 1.5 metres from the building line; and
- incorporate a roof style which carries through the line of the eaves of the existing house and has a ridgeline lower than the ridge of the roof of the house.

A relaxation to the full 1.5 metres setback may be made for extensions to houses where a terracing effect, or unbroken massing, could not arise in the future. These could include houses on a street corner; where the house extension would be adjacent to a non-residential use; or houses with asymmetrical frontages and staggered

building lines, and when a proposed ridgeline set-down for the extension creates a subordinate appearance.

Committee should note:

- The proposed extension:
 - is to have a pitched roof;
 - is to be set back approximately 0.59 metres from the front building line i.e. less than policy requires;
 - is to carry through the line of the eaves and have a ridgeline approximately 0.2m lower than the existing house.

- There is a significant difference in the calculation of the footprint of the proposed extension. The difference is whether or not the current garage building (which is not original to the property and will be demolished and replaced by the side extension) is included in the calculation. However, both calculations agree that it will double the footprint of the house, contrary to policy:
 - The existing house has a footprint of approximately 53sqm.
 - The Agent states the proposed extension has a footprint of 62.5sqm.
 - The Officer states the proposed extension has a footprint of 81sqm.

Committee should consider:

- whether it is acceptable in this case to more than double the footprint of the property.
- whether the proposed extension relates to the design of the original dwellinghouse.
- whether the proposed extension is subordinate to the original dwellinghouse.
- if proposal could lead to a terracing effect in future or whether the location and/or ridgeline set-down would allow the 1.5 metre set-back to be relaxed in this case.

Fences and Walls

In some cases planning permission is not required for fences and walls. Where permission is required, generally in front of houses or bounding a road, the following guidance applies:

- a) in front gardens, where privacy is less of a consideration, walls and fences should not exceed 1 metre in height; and
- b) in rear gardens, where a level of privacy can be expected, walls and fences up to 2 metres are acceptable.

Exceptions may be made in areas where higher garden boundaries are the established pattern.

Committee should note:

- It is proposed to maintain most of the existing hedging to the front boundary. This has a height of 1.2 metres in front of the building, and 2 metres along the garden boundary.

- Committee should consider whether the height of the hedging is acceptable in this case, despite being contrary to policy.

7 COMMITTEE DECISION

7.1 The options available to the Committee are:

- a. Grant planning permission, with or without conditions (see over for draft conditions); or
- b. Refuse planning permission.
- c. Continue the review to request further information.

8 DRAFT CONDITIONS

01. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of grant of this permission.

Reason: In the interest of certainty and the proper planning of the area, and to comply with section 58 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended

02. Provision for new screening to a maximum height of 2 metres, shall be made along the boundary between the site and the neighbouring properties at 2 Edgehill Road, and 57, 61, 63 and 65 Churchill Drive, should the existing boundary treatment (i.e. hedge/fence) be removed.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity.

03. Should the hedge along the boundary of the site and the footpath on Edgehill Road be removed, any new/replacement screening should not exceed 1m in height.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity.

04. The extension shall be rendered to match the original house in texture and colour.

Reason: In order to protect the appearance of both the property itself and the surrounding area, and to protect the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

05. The roof shall be tiled to match the colour of the tiles on the original house.

Reason: In order to protect the appearance of both the property itself and the surrounding area, and to protect the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

06. Before any work on the site is begun, details of the colours of the proposed cladding, aluminium pressing and rooflights shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: To enable the planning authority to consider this/these aspect(s) in detail.

07. Before any work on the site is begun, details of the new porch canopy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: To enable the planning authority to consider this/these aspect(s) in detail.

Approved Drawings

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved drawing(s):

1.	01	Location Plan;	Received 03 August 2022
2.	02A	Block Plan;	Received 03 August 2022
3.	03A	Site Plan;	Received 03 August 2022
4.	08	Proposed Site Plan;	Received 03 August 2022
5.	09	Proposed Plans;	Received 03 August 2022
6.	10	Proposed Roof Plan;	Received 03 August 2022
7.	11	Proposed Elevations;	Received 03 August 2022
8.	12	Proposed Sections;	Received 03 August 2022
9.	13	Dontakings Plans;	Received 03 August 2022
10.	14	Dontakings Elevations;	Received 03 August 2022

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

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 n/a

*Equality Outcomes
2021-25? Please
specify.*

*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

3 Recommendations

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

