

JordanhillCommunity Council

ADVISORY MESSAGE: JORDANHILL CAMPUS

MEETING

JORDANHILL COMMUNITY COUNCIL (JCC) representatives met with preferred developer, CALA HOMES (West), Agent (7N Architects), and Planning Consultant Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL) on Wednesday 07 December 2016 at 13:00hrs in the David Stow Building, 76 Southbrae Drive G13 1PP. The meeting coincided with the PUBLIC INFORMATION EVENT organised by CALA's DESIGN TEAM and held in the same building between 14:00 and 20:00hrs.

OBJECTIVE

JCC is mandated to take a proactive role in planning matters. Specific to the development under consideration ensure that the community is represented and consulted on issues that have an impact on the area and that their views are communicated to the PLANNING AUTHORITY. To achieve this by proposing a PUBLIC MEETING inviting CALA HOMES (West) and their DESIGN TEAM to present their proposals in order to gauge community feeling and for JCC to respond rapidly to the PLANNING AUTHORITY expressing the views of the COMMUNITY.

BACKGROUND

In 2011 the University of Strathclyde was granted Planning Permission in Principle (PPP) subject to Condition(s) and a Section 75 Planning Agreement preventing development on designed greenspace (City Plan DEV 11 Greenspace) for the erection of a residential development and associated infrastructure including conversion of listed and non-listed buildings, formation of car parking and provision of landscaping. Report by Executive Director of Development & Regeneration Services to PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE dated 15 January 2013 sets-out the CONDITIONS and REASONS (Matters Specified in Conditions MSC) for granting PPP (Copy attached 11/00794/DC). In July 2011 JCC made representation against the Application along with 17 other owner/occupiers.

Constituents are concerned about the proposed density of the residential development and its potential impact on the environment, existing residential amenity and road transport infrastructure. In terms of public transport the Campus is below base accessibility standards that potentially increase car traffic generated by the development. Jordanhill is already experiencing high volumes of peak time traffic flow navigating alternate routes at speed through the residential amenity to avoid congestion hotspots at Crow Road and Anniesland Cross. Westland, Westbrae, Southbrae, Hallydown, Jordanhill, and Helensburgh Drives, Wilmot and Seggielea Roads are all considered high risk to public safety. Junctions at Westbrae Drive, Southbrae Drive and Westland Drive are dangerous during morning and afternoon school runs especially with coaches parked outside St. Thomas Aquinas Secondary School. The Council position of "no accident, no problem" is totally unacceptable. Additionally the inequalities in permanent traffic regulation order enforcement around Scotstoun Stadium combined with the breach of planning control (temporary grandstands erected without planning permission) significantly increases public safety risk during event days.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To advise constituents that CALA HOMES (West) is seeking to convert the PPP consent and imposed conditions by submission of a Matters Specified in Conditions (MSC) full planning application. Listed building consent is required for the conversion of the David Stow Building to ensure that any changes are appropriate and sympathetic to its character to protect what is a rare and unique resource. The David Stow Building is category B Listed and requires a Conservation Management Plan. A Landscape Management Plan is also required. CALA advised that both applications are expected to be made in late January 2017.

JCC in accordance with their statutory obligations proposed that a PUBLIC MEETING be held on Saturday 17 December 2016, 10:00-12:00hrs at Jordanhill School. CALA advised that their MSC (Full Planning Application) Proposals would not be finalised to benefit the event. After initial negativity, CALA agreed to JCC's insistence on a PUBLIC MEETING being vital to ensure transparency of processes. The meeting would focus on presenting an overview of the proposals and establishing a Community Steering Group to interface with CALA/Project Manager throughout the life span of the pre-construction, construction and post construction phases. It was agreed that a PUBLIC MEETING would be held in JORDANHILL SCHOOL a minimum of THREE (3) weeks before the PLANNING APPLICATION (MSC) and LISTED BUILDING APPLICATIONS are lodged. Preferred day and time: Wednesday 19:00 – 20:45hrs. CALA recognises the importance of engagement with the Community Council on the design proposals in progress and invites familiarisation with the PPP consent and conditions.

CALA agreed to give consideration to design and print Public Meeting leaflets and coordinate delivery to all owner/occupiers in Jordanhill. JCC would also coordinate with neighbouring community councils. The organisation of the PUBLIC MEETING and NOTIFICATION would be agreed between JCC and JLL (Planning Consultants).

PUBLIC EXHIBITION

Considered to be limited in value to understand processes associated with the Matters Specified in Conditions associated with the granting of PPP. Information event display boards lacked substance in terms of presenting the design and landscape proposals under development. CALA advised that circa 650 Information Event leaflets had been issued (last weekend) to those owner/occupiers that received Neighbour Notification as part of the PPP process. JCC stated that this was not the case, no leaflets had been delivered anywhere (Hallydown Drive residents confirmed receipt of leaflets at 17:30).

PRESENTATION TO JCC

CALA invited their AGENT - 7N Architects who provided an overview of the design proposals under development. The following design matters were noted:

- (a) Design and Access Statement: The potential impact of the proposed development, namely the retail impact, transport impact, noise impact or risk of flooding invites definition.
- (b) Conservation Management Plan and Landscape Management Plan provides comfort of heritage grading processes.
- (c) The conversion of listed and non-listed buildings appears to be developed in a sensitive manner.
- (d) Retention of the Crawford Building on architectural merit was discussed, but not considered feasible due to condition and structural limitations related to conversion.
- (e) Crawford Building - sunken designed landscape feature that includes a heritage significant sundial and pedestal are being considered for restoration.
- (f) Use of varying new build residential typologies and associated densities.
- (g) Designing Streets – use of home zones for traffic calming.
- (h) The proposal to create distinctive entrances with Gate Houses.
- (i) Benefit to integrate a multi-functional community facility.
- (j) Design Coding - Material Palette being developed including the use of red sandstone and contrasting facing brick. No white render.
- (k) Smart Solutions – street lighting to be investigated to reduce light pollution.

The following transport matters were noted:

- (a) Transport Assessment: Further design consideration to be given to management of the site's primary road junctions and infrastructure (mitigation of rat-run shortcuts within site). CALA were made aware of major changes in public transport base accessibility dynamics since PPP consent was given. Example: The recent First Bus withdrawal of No 4 Bus Service connecting Jordanhill to Byres Road and the University of Glasgow.
- (b) Requirement to identify heavy vehicular routes, alternates and operational times for construction.
- (c) Fragile condition and nature of the existing road infrastructure.
- (d) There is no hope of a new station at Westbrae Drive, the only way this could be delivered would be relocating Jordanhill Station from its current location. Due to the high density of existing residential development around the station it is not considered a viable option.

PRESENTATION TO JCC CONTINUED

Key areas of concern were noted:

- (a) The apparent lack of coordination of Education Strategies.
- (b) Residential development - car parking provision appeared to be limited in relation to density of building typologies.
- (c) Sports Management Plan - risks associated with care and maintenance by Glasgow Life.
- (d) Absence of a District Heating System that potentially could benefit the BREEAM rating and sustainability of the proposed development along with value-benefiting the existing residential amenity including Jordanhill School.
- (e) New build Toilets and First Aid Pavilion potentially contrary to City Plan DEV 11 Greenspace proposed at the SE corner of the site. High risk of vandalism and attracting anti-social behaviour. Would be better integrated within the residential amenity (Crawford Building plot).
- (f) Risks associated with ground remediation works extending the contract term.
- (g) Air borne pollution from demolition waste as recycled aggregates.
- (h) Length of construction programme estimated at FIVE (5) to EIGHT (8) years adversely impacting on the existing residential amenity.

WAY FORWARD

JCC in considering the complexities associated with City Plan principle policy interpretation may wish to consider commissioning a Planning Consultant to provide advice on responding to the planning authority. As funds are limited a significant level of sponsorship would be required to be sourced from the community. Is there an appetite to determine this approach? JCC Agenda for next meeting to be held in Jordanhill School on Monday 09 January 2017 would be dedicated to Jordanhill Campus.

End of Advisory Note.

Issued on behalf of Jordanhill Community Council.



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Report by Executive Director of Development and Regeneration Services

Contact: Mr A Dale Phone: 0141 287 6016

APPLICATION TYPE Planning Permission in Principle

RECOMMENDATION Grant Subject to Condition(s) and S75

APPLICATION 11/00794/DC

DATE VALID 06.04.2011

SITE ADDRESS Jordanhill College 76 Southbrae Drive Glasgow G13 1PP

PROPOSAL Erection of residential development and associated infrastructure including conversion of listed and non-listed buildings, formation of car parking and provision of landscaping:
Potentially contrary to Development Policy Principle DEV 11 Greenspace of City Plan 2.

APPLICANT University Of Strathclyde
John Anderson Campus
181 St James Road
Glasgow
G4 0NT

AGENT Jones Lang Lasalle
150 St Vincent Street
GLASGOW
G2 5ND

WARD NO(S) 12, Partick West

COMMUNITY COUNCIL 02_009, Jordanhill

CONSERVATION AREA

LISTED B

ADVERT TYPE Contrary to Development Plan
Affecting a Conservation
Area/Listed Building

PUBLISHED 22 April 2011

CITY PLAN Residential and supporting uses/Greenspace

REPRESENTATIONS/ CONSULTATIONS

The application was advertised on 13th July 2011 as being potentially contrary to the development plan and as affecting the setting of a listed building. A total of 18 objections have been received including one from the local Community Council. The material representations raised are summarised as follows:-

- Object to the removal of the existing semi-detached property at 55 Jordanhill Drive.
- Object on the grounds of traffic safety and congestion at Jordanhill Drive access.
- Concern regarding overshadowing and loss of privacy at existing neighbouring properties.
- Object to proposed density and overdevelopment of site.
- Object to impact upon Site of Special Landscape Importance.
- There is a risk that protected trees will be removed.

- Proposal will generate noise disturbance.
- Object to potential impact upon natural environment.
- Concern over construction impacts upon ground and structural stability due to steep banked ground at northern boundary of site.
- Risk of flooding.
- Proposal contrary to designation of site.
- Proposal is contrary to various environmental designations.
- Object to realignment of Jordanhill Drive and relocation of junction at Jordanhill Drive as these would represent an increased risk in road safety.
- Object to loss of on street parking on Jordanhill Drive.
- Proposal will lead property adjoining Jordanhill Drive access remaining vacant.
- Object to loss of trees in residential property.
- Object on the grounds of late delivery of neighbour notification and removal of site notices.
- Concern over the failure to establish future management plans for pitches.
- Jordanhill School's Amenities Trust should be given the role of managing the pitches to ensure continued community benefit and ownership of the pitches should be transferred to the school.
- It would be unacceptable for the pitches not currently used by the school to lie unused and be used in an unmanaged manner.
- Suggest a yellow box at the junction at Southbrae Drive and southern site access.
- Construction traffic should not be allowed to use Southbrae Gardens or Jordanhill Crescent.
- The route through the site could become a rat run.
- Hours of construction should be controlled.
- The developer should be liable for any damage to roads caused by construction works.
- There should be a new railway halt at Westbrae Drive.
- The transport assessment asserts that existing parking problems have been caused by users of the college campus, however this is not the case as it is resident's parking caused by a lack of off-street parking. The transport assessment does not address the proposal's potential impact upon traffic on Chamberlain Road.

SITE AND DESCRIPTION

Site and Surrounding Area

The application site is formed by the former campus of Jordanhill College which occupies an area of 16.6 hectares within the Jordanhill area in the west of the city. The site is broadly split between two character areas with an expansive grassed landscaped area occupying the south west portion with mature trees creating a parkland setting. The second area is characterised by the former College buildings, ranging from single storey units to the 3 storey sandstone David Stow building which was the original college accommodation. The developed land generally occupies the western portion of the site, although a further two buildings and a car parking area are situated in the north of the site. Grassed areas and groups of trees are dispersed throughout the developed portion, generally forming the landscape setting for the buildings.

The site's primary access comes off a four arm roundabout which is served via Southbrae Drive and is shared with a relatively recent residential development on Southbrae Gardens along with an access to what was the Rector's House. A second vehicle egress leads to Jordanhill Drive at the north east corner of the site.

The David Stow building is centrally located on the southern part of the site and forms the link between the developed part of the site to the west and the landscaped area to the east. The three storey category B listed building is formed in red sandstone and was the original college building completed in 1922. It faces onto the open landscape which serves as an impressive parkland setting for the building. Two further unlisted historic buildings are situated at the south west portion of the site. These three storey buildings were built after the main college building and used as student hostels. The buildings (Douglas House and Graham House) sit side by side facing south. Douglas House, which is the western of the two is finished in blonde sandstone while Graham House was built in red brick with stone quoins.

The remainder of the western portion of the site is occupied by more modern college buildings, hard surfaced area and landscaping. A further modern college building and parking area is situated in the north east corner. The parking is enclosed by the red brick wall which formed a walled garden area which dated back to the turn of the 19th century. The wall is not listed.

Two vehicular routes run through the site with a north south route linking the two vehicular access points running through the landscaped space. A second route leads off this north south route looping around the western portion of the site providing access to the campus buildings. This loop links to a pedestrian and vehicular access at the western end of the site which is not proposed to be reused in the development.

The landscaped space is occupied by three grass sports pitches on the eastern side and then an open area with groups of mature trees spread throughout. The entire site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

The site is set within a predominantly residential area with low density housing set to the south west and north. To the east is Jordanhill School which was originally the instructional school linked to the college and is now operated and funded directly by the Scottish Government. The school grounds comprise of a mix of large educational buildings and further sports pitches. It should be noted that the school has a long term lease arrangement with Strathclyde University on one of the pitches along with a training area.

Much of the north and the entire western boundary abuts dense woodland situated between the application site and the adjacent residential development. There are substantial changes in levels between the site and the surrounding development with marked drops between the site level and adjacent back gardens, particularly on the northern boundary.

Background

The University of Strathclyde and Jordanhill College of Education merged in the early 1990's and continued to operate as a single institution albeit geographically separated. However, it was recognised that there would be significant advantages if the College were to relocate to the existing city centre site of the University. In light of this the University took the decision that it was going to relocate from the Campus and this process started in 2000 with the sale of part of the Campus site for the residential development which now occupies the land to the south and north of the western portion of the site.

In 2007 a Campus Plan was prepared to promote the change of use of the remainder of the campus to residential and then in 2008 Campus Plan 2 was prepared providing more detailed information on the overall proposals.

The purpose of Campus Plan 2 was to sit alongside the development plan and while it would be non-statutory and carry less weight than the development plan it was intended to act as a material consideration on the determination of any application for the redevelopment of Jordanhill Campus.

Campus Plan 2 set out various broad principles for the design and layout of future residential development on the campus site and also outlined how certain aspects of the site's redevelopment should be considered. Along with the broad principles of residential development two key factors were identified as being important in the redevelopment. These were the future retention of the sports pitches and how public transport would be serve any future development to reduce the number of car journey's being generated.

In respect of the three pitches and associated training area, the Council required the Campus Plan to include a Sports Pitch Management Plan. The Campus Plan identified that talks were progressing on a Sports Pitch Management Plan which would see the land containing the sports pitches transferred to a charitable trust. The Plan identified that Jordanhill School would be the main user of the pitches and meet the costs of maintenance and operation and there would be a requirement for a Charitable Trust charged with ensuring that the pitches would benefit the school, the local community, surrounding residents and local sports groups. The Plan went on to state that the trust arrangement being considered could involve using the Jordanhill School Educational Amenities Trust. The document concluded on the subject stating that the SPMP and necessary legal agreement, which will form a charitable trust, should *"ensure the ongoing retention and safeguard the sports pitches for the benefit of the wider community in perpetuity"*.

Campus Plan 2 also took account of the future redevelopment of the campus in terms of public transport and how this could contribute to making the site more accessible. A study carried out at the time identified that a railway station at Westbrae Drive could potentially reduce car traffic generated by the development. The Campus Plan also identified that SPT had been considering the possibility of providing a new station at Westbrae Drive, although this was recognised as a long term aspiration which would be governed by other issues outwith the proposed development at Jordanhill. In acknowledging the station opportunity the Campus Plan recognised that a station at Westbrae Drive would benefit any future in terms of accessibility and marketability and stated that *"in these circumstances it will be a requirement that the developer provide a financial contribution towards the delivery of the rail halt."* The Plan stated that this contribution towards the delivery of the rail station was expected to be in the order of £1,200 per dwelling.

Campus Plan 2 was presented to Committee for noting in 2008. Subsequent to this the designation of the site was changed in City Plan 2, which was adopted in 2009, to reflect the Campus Plan aspirations. Accordingly the western, developed, portion of the site changed from Education to Residential while the eastern portion covering the landscaped area was changed from Education to Greenspace.

At the time that Campus Plan 2 was reported to committee the assumption was that the University would market the site in 2009 and that the SPMP would be settled during the sale of the site to allow for future development via a planning permission in principle. However, not long after the Campus Plan was presented to Committee the housing market collapsed and the University took the decision not to market the site given the likely absence of any interest at the time.

The campus remained off the market and in 2011 the University took the decision to submit an application for Planning Permission in Principle in order to establish the principle set out in Campus Plan 2 and City Plan 2 before the site is marketed.

In the June 2012 the campus was vacated as the education activity relocated to the University's city centre campus.

Proposal

The University has applied for planning permission in principle for use of the site as residential with the stated intention of formalising the existing City Plan 2 designation. In their supporting documentation they have outlined that the general approach does not deviate from the Campus Plan 2 in that the intention would only be for residential development to take place on the land already designated residential with open space being left undeveloped.

In their supporting documents, the applicants outline that they intend to retain the listed David Stow building along with historic student hostels at the south western corner; Graham House and Douglas House. These have been identified as important to the character of the site and on this basis the intention is to convert these to residential use.

The remainder of the buildings within the site are to be demolished to allow for the introduction of new residential development.

Vehicular access to the site is intended to re-use the existing points with Southbrae Drive being the primary point of access, via the existing roundabout. As part of this the applicants propose to form a second lane on Southbrae Drive to allow for a right hand turn lane onto Westbrae Drive. It is also proposed to alter the existing Jordanhill Drive egress and use it as a secondary access and egress. The applicants propose to move the access approximately 5 metres west of its current location and to realign the route of the road, infilling a corner of carriageway in front of 55 Jordanhill Drive. As this would see part of the existing public road closed the applicant's would need to successfully promote a stopping up order to carry out the proposed works.

As this proposal is for planning permission in principle the description of the proposed development and details of where access is to be taken are the only matters that are to be determined at this stage. However, in order to provide an illustration of the aspirations for the site the applicants have revisited the Campus Plan 2 detail to suggest the parameters to guide how the site could be developed. This includes details of density and mass the treatment of open space as well as site access.

In their supporting documents the applicants describe the future development as being generally low rise and set below the eaves level of the David Stow building to ensure it retains its prominence within the site. They have identified locations of axial importance where they consider that the scale of new building could be raised without harming the setting of the David Stow building.

In respect of open space they outline the intention to retain the existing open space, including the three pitches, on the eastern portion of the site and describe an intention to extend the parkland into the space to be developed to provide a visual and movement connection. They also identify features such as the small pond in the north east as an item that should be retained.

POLICIES

DPP 2 Residential and Supporting Uses

DPP 11 Greenspace

RES 1 Residential Density

RES 2 Residential Layouts

RES 5 Conversion and Subdivision to Residential Use

DES 3 Protecting and Enhancing the City's Historic Environment

ENV 1 Open Space Protection

ENV 2 Open Space and Public Realm Provision

ENV 7 National Regional and Local Environmental Designations

TRANS 2 Development Locational Requirements

SPECIFIED MATTERS

Planning legislation now requires the planning register to include information on the processing of each planning application (a Report of Handling) and identifies a range of information that must be included. This obligation is aimed at informing interested parties of factors that might have had a bearing on the processing of the application. Some of the required information relates to consultations and representations that have been received and is provided elsewhere in this Committee report. The remainder of the information, and a response to each of the points to be addressed, is detailed below.

A. Summary of the main issues raised where the following were submitted or carried out

- i. An environmental statement.

Not applicable to this application.

- ii. An appropriate assessment under the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations 1994.

An ecological survey was carried out in respect of bats and great crested newts which did not find any impediment to the development. SNH have advised that the recommendations made in the report should be followed by the applications once any development takes place.

- iii. A design statement or a design and access statement.

A design and access statement was submitted which revisited many of the themes considered in Campus Plan 2. This looked at the broad layout approach along with potential density and massing. It also looked at the treatment of the opens space including how this was to be retained and extended into any new residential development. As this is an outline application the document was inevitably limited in the scope of detail it could contain.

- iv. Any report on the impact or potential impact of the proposed development (for example the retail impact, transport impact, noise impact or risk of flooding).

Not applicable to this application.

B. Summary of the terms of any Section 75 planning agreement

A legal agreement is required in relation to preventing any future development on the greenspace as defined in City Plan 2 (subject to detailed analysis of the designation boundaries) along with the protection of the sports pitches. This will require that the pitches are retained and maintained in perpetuity and that an appropriate management body shall be formed and management plan prepared and agreed in writing by the Council and then implemented within one year of the of the grant of planning permission in principle under reference 11/00794/DC unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council.

C. Details of directions by Scottish Ministers under Regulation 30, 31 or 32

These Regulations enable Scottish Ministers to give directions

- i. With regard to Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (Regulation 30).

Not applicable to this application.

- ii. 1. Requiring the Council to give information as to the manner in which an application has been dealt with (Regulation 31).

No direction has been made by Scottish Ministers/Not applicable.

2. Restricting the grant of planning permission.

No direction has been made by Scottish Ministers/Not applicable.

- iii. 1. Requiring the Council to consider imposing a condition specified by Scottish Ministers.
Not applicable to this application
2. Requiring the Council not to grant planning permission without satisfying Scottish Ministers that the Council has considered the condition.
Not applicable to this application.

Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 and Circular 5/2009: Hierarchy of Developments.

For the purposes of Circular 5/2009 the proposal represent 'Major' development where, prior to lodging of this application, the applicant was required to undertake pre-application consultations in accordance with Section 35(a) and (b) of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006. A pre-application consultation report has been provided, with further details included in the Design and Access Statement, outlining the consultation measures undertaken and how this exercise has informed the planning application, as require by Section 35(c) of the 2006 Act.

ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires the determination of this application to be made in accordance with the provisions of the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The application site falls within two Development Policy Principles within City Plan 2 as described above. The western and northern, developed portion of the site of the site is designated as Residential and development proposals should be assessed against DPP DEV 2. The remaining undeveloped space, including the pitches, is Greenspace and should be assessed against DPP DEV 11.

As the proposal is for planning permission in principle, there is no defined layout to the development and as a result the scheme has been advertised as potentially contrary to the greenspace designation to recognise that there is the potential for development to be proposed upon greenspace.

DPP DEV 2 Residential and Supporting Uses explains that the Council will support proposals which enhance residential amenity; improve access to/from and within the areas; and preserve and enhance the integrity of the townscape, landscape and green network provision. The proposed development affecting the DEV 2 Principle area is entirely residential which is compatible with the designation. As the proposal is in principle there are no details of layout and it is not possible to consider how residential amenity will be affected both within the development and in relation to neighbouring housing. However, this can be controlled in any applications for matters specified by conditions (MSC). In respect of townscape the removal of the more recent College buildings is not considered to be problematic as these are considered to make a negative or at best neutral contribution to the site's setting. While the quality of what is proposed will need to be considered at a later stage the applicants do illustrate an attempt to control impacts via limiting the height and mass of the new build.

The applicants have illustrated in their masterplan an aspiration to extend the parkland setting adjacent to the residential designation so that it permeates into the site and this illustrates efforts towards enhancing the landscape setting. Again the full detail of impact will only be considered once an MSC application is submitted. Nevertheless, the broad principle of residential development on the site is considered to be compatible with the site's designation.

DPP DEV 11 Greenspace outlines that all green/open space areas (regardless of their size or purpose) are functionally important elements of Glasgow's green infrastructure and that there is a strong presumption in favour of the retention of all public and private green/open space. The applicants have made it clear through Campus Plan 2, the illustrative masterplan submitted with the application and their supporting documents that they do not propose any development upon the existing Greenspace within the site. Given this position it is considered that any future application for MSC could be adequately controlled by conditions and or agreements attached to any grant of planning permission in principle to prevent any development on the Greenspace. On this basis it is considered that, subject to such restrictions, the proposal would not be contrary to the Greenspace DPP.

Policies RES 1 and TRANS 2 are linked in that they deal with the location of traffic generating development and its accessibility to public transport.

Policy RES 1 Residential Density outlines that lower densities of development are appropriate in the outer urban area. It also states that in sites of greater than 5 hectares the density of development will be detailed in guidance provided in a local development strategy, masterplan, etc., for the area. Account will also require to be taken of measures to provide/enhance public transport provision, where appropriate.

Policy TRANS 2 Development Locational Requirements seeks to ensure that new housing developments are well integrated into public transport, walking and cycling networks. It goes on to state that where travel generation is significant, and the required accessibility is not available, then public transport enhancement is likely to be necessary in order for the proposal to progress.

In relation to density Campus Plan 2 and the illustrative masterplan have identified a potential maximum development of 364 new units. Within the entire site of 16.6 hectares this equates to a density of 21 units per hectare. However a more accurate assessment of density should take account of what could legitimately be considered to make a contribution of amenity space to the overall development. To do this it is considered appropriate to exclude the sports pitches which are to be retained for community use but include the remaining greenspace as contributing to the setting of the residential development. The pitches equate to approximately 3 hectares which, once excluded, means that the residential density of a 364 unit development would result in a density of approximately 26 units per hectare.

The maximum density set by Policy RES 1 for site's with base accessibility to public transport is 50 units per hectare. However, the location of the Jordanhill Campus means that much of the site area which is proposed to be redeveloped is considered to have below base accessibility which means that it does not meet the expected accessibility levels for new development. That said, the illustrative density proposed is virtually half of the maximum set for site's with base accessibility, so this reduced density must be recognized in mitigating any policy tension. Nevertheless, even taking this into account, Policy TRANS 2 still identifies that public transport accessibility is likely to need to be enhanced in order for development to progress on the site.

The Campus Plan has outlined the opportunity for a new train station at Westbrae Drive and explained that this would benefit accessibility as well as marketability of the site and on this basis the Plan identified that a contribution of £1,200, secured by legal agreement, should be paid for each dwelling towards the provision of the station. Since then, however, Transport Scotland have advised that for operational reasons there is no scope for a entirely new station at Westbrae and that the only way a station could be delivered would be through relocating Jordanhill Station from its current location. This option has been discounted for a variety of reasons including the high density of existing residential development around Jordanhill Station. On this basis it is assumed that a station will not be delivered at Westbrae and given this position it is unlikely that a legal agreement requiring a financial contribution towards the provision of a station which is unlikely to materialise would satisfy the policy tests for Planning Agreements set out in Circular 3/2012. However, should the position change in the future the Council would reserve the right to investigate the provision of a developer contribution through future applications for MSC should a station become likely in the future.

Assuming that a new station is unlikely to happen and given that the next nearest station at Jordanhill is approximately a kilometre from the site it is considered reasonable to discount proximity to trains as contributing towards accessibility to the site. On this basis the site will need to rely on bus services in order to achieve its accessibility requirements. Base accessibility is defined as being within 400 metres of a bus service which runs 6 or more times an hour at peak times. The current bus service to the city centre which stops on Southbrae Drive near the site entrance has a frequency that achieves at least base accessibility. A further bus service to the city centre stopping on Anniesland Road, to the north of the site, also achieves at least base frequency. Based upon the illustrative layout, around 50 units would be within 400 metres of one of the two bus stops while more than half would be within 550 metres and virtually all would be within 600 metres walk of one of the bus stops.

While the majority of the proposed units would be outwith the 400 metres accessibility threshold, in many cases this is marginal and the assessment against the relevant policies must acknowledge this. Furthermore, the site would present residents with an attractive pedestrian route to the bus stops and it is it considered reasonable to question whether the prospect of walking an additional 100-200 metres to get to a bus stop is likely to make residents significantly more likely to use a car.

Taking these factors into account it is considered that it would be disproportionate to require the applicants to fund diverting the existing bus service to enter the site given that there is a real prospect such a move may not result in any significant reduction in the number of car journeys generated by future development. Furthermore, it would be difficult to justify resisting the redevelopment of a brownfield site on the basis that residents need to walk for an extra 100 – 200 metres to get to a bus service.

The proposal is considered as capable of satisfying the other criteria set out in Policy RES 1 and Policy Trans 2. On balance it is considered that the failure to achieve base accessibility for the full site as described above is not so significant an issue that it would warrant resisting the proposal.

Policy RES 2 Residential Layouts sets out various criteria for assessing new residential developments in respect of delivering adequate infrastructure, protecting residential amenity and achieving a successful layout. As this is an application for planning permission in principle it is not possible to carry out this level of assessment. However, the illustrative information submitted does suggest that the general principles of the policy can be achieved on the site.

Policy RES 5 Conversion and Subdivision to Residential Use sets out the criteria of proposals involving the subdivision of properties to residential use. In this case the proposals for the category B listed David Stow building and the Graham and Douglas buildings have not yet been prepared as these will be the subject of later applications for MSC. The principle of converting these is acceptable and indeed is seen as perhaps the most realistic option in ensuring a viable future for these historic buildings.

Policy DES 3 Protecting and Enhancing the City's Historic Environment outlines the Council's requirements for proposals affecting listed buildings including proposals which affect the setting of listed buildings. There are no details for the interior of the listed building and these will be controlled by a separate listed building consent. However, there is no policy tension with the principle of conversion to residential use.

The policy is augmented by Development Guide DES 3 which contains guidance on assessing proposals which affect the setting of a listed building. The criteria set out that no new development near a listed building should be of the same size or larger than the existing building, principle elevations of the listed building should remain visible, the building's silhouette in the skyline should not be affected and the original landscape setting should be retained. From the details provided in the supporting documentation it is considered that the future scheme will be capable of satisfying these criteria.

National guidance normally discourages granted Planning Permission in Principle for listed buildings, however, in this case the matter has been discussed with Historic Scotland and it is recognised that this proposal relates to the overall site and not just the listed building. Given that there will be adequate control over proposals via applications for MSC and listed building consent both Historic Scotland and DRS officers are satisfied that the in principle application can be determined incorporating the future use of the listed building.

Policy ENV 1 Open Space Protection reinforces the Greenspace Development Policy Principle in protecting areas of formal and informal open space from inappropriate development. It also outlines that there is a strong presumption in favour of the retention of all public and private open/green space.

From the details submitted, including the illustrative masterplan, the applicant's intention is clear in that they do not propose to develop any of the greenspace within the site. Given that this application is merely covering the principle of development (as well as access) there is no detailed layout which can be used to control the extent of development. However, a condition attached to any approval can ensure that future applications for MSC do not show any development on greenspace.

One of the critical elements of the future development of the campus site is how the three sports pitches and associated training area contained within the Greenspace designation are dealt with. Campus Plan 2, as required by the Council, outlined the preparation of a Sports Pitch Management Plan which would see the land containing the pitches transferred to a charitable trust with the broad aim of ensuring the retention and safeguard of the pitches for the benefit of the wider community in perpetuity. At that time the Campus Plan identified Jordanhill School's Educational Amenities Trust as a potential body to own and operate the pitches.

Since the submission of the current application, the school have made representations outlining their case that the Educational Amenities Trust would be the best vehicle for managing the pitches. They state that they already lease approximately 40% of the open space from the University (one pitch and one training area) under a long term agreement. They also explain that the Trust constitution could be amended to ensure appropriate community representation, while it is outlined that they have a proven track record in sustaining high levels of community use and that they are in a position to meet their estimate of annual running costs of £50,000.

At the same time, the University have outlined that it is now their intention to retain ownership of the pitches as they see this is the best means of ensuring they are safeguarded from development and retained for future use. The University has explained that they would not rule out management being transferred to the Educational Amenities Trust, however, they wish to retain flexibility to investigate all avenues for a management body and are therefore have been reluctant to commit to a single approach. The SPMP, which was expected to be agreed during the sale of the site has not materialised. This may primarily be due to the fact that the anticipated sale of the site did not take place due the collapse of the housing market.

Ultimately, the ownership of the pitches is not a material planning matter and it would be inappropriate for the Council to seek to control this. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate for the Council to seek to promote one body over another in agreeing the future management of the pitches. That said it is recognised that the Campus Plan identified an aspiration that the pitches are retained and safeguarded for the benefit of the wider community. In light of this, it is considered appropriate for the Council to request that the management body does reflect wider community interest in the land.

It is expected that the management plan which will be prepared by the management body shall include details of how the long term funding of the pitches shall be delivered and the submission of these details can be controlled via the Sec 75 legal agreement.

In terms of Policy ENV1 and the Greenspace DPP designation, the key criterion is the retention of the pitches and resisting any pressure to see them developed. It is considered that in order to deliver adequate control to achieve this, a legal agreement must be attached to any grant of Planning Permission in Principle. Such an agreement would contain wording ensuring that the pitches shall be retained, in accordance with agreed details, in perpetuity.

Campus Plan 2 is also a material consideration and sets out that the pitches need to be used for the benefit of the local community, Jordanhill School, surrounding residents and local sports groups. These aims can be met through a management plan which can be controlled by the legal agreement. Accordingly, the agreement must require the preparation of a management plan which will ensure that formal and informal access to the pitches is retained and that any management body must be representative of the local community while not excluding other potential users or operators. The management plan must also outline ongoing maintenance obligations.

The school, under their lease, has an obligation to maintain the pitches they use while the University has advised that they continue to maintain the other pitches. This maintenance regime can be accommodated within the legal agreement at least until such time as a formal management body and plan is established.

It is recognised that it would be beneficial to all parties if the management body and plan is established in the short term and that it is not made a suspensive requirement to the submission of applications for MSC which may not take place until the site has been successfully marketed. Therefore the legal agreement shall require the establishment of a management body and submission of a management plan within a year of the grant of planning permission in principle unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council. The plan will ensure that the aims retaining the pitches and enabling beneficial community use are achieved.

Subject to the completion of such an agreement the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy ENV1 .

Policy ENV 2 Open Space and Public Realm Provision seeks to ensure that an appropriate level of open space is provided for new residential development and that a adequate proportion of that is provided within the development site. As this policy is reliant on the number of units proposed to calculate space requirements it is not possible at this stage to assess the proposal properly. Therefore, the full assessment against Policy ENV 2 will need to take place once applications for MSC have been submitted. If it is the case that full provision of the requisite open space cannot be provided on site then the policy does have provisions to allow developers to make a contribution towards off site developments in the vicinity to mitigate any on-site shortfall. If necessary this can be dealt with via legal agreement at MSC stage.

Policy ENV 7 National Regional and Local Environmental Designations sets out policy criteria for assessing proposals which affect site's covered by a range of protective environmental designations. The application site is covered by three such designations. The entire site is designated as a Site of Special Landscape Importance while a Tree Preservation Order also covers the entire site. Along with these designations, a group of trees which occupies a steep bank at the northern part of the site is designated as Ancient, Long Established or Semi Natural Woodland.

In respect of Sites of Landscape Importance applicants are required to demonstrate how the proposed development will enhance the landscape characteristics of the designation. As part of the supporting document they have explained that the proposal would seek to extend the existing landscape into the proposed residential development. It should also be noted that the proposed residential development would only be on land that is already developed or is enclosed by development. While the details are merely illustrative at the moment they do demonstrate that a new development of the scale proposed could be accommodated while achieving a positive impact upon the landscape designation and key landscape features to the east of the David Stow building.

The Woodland designation aims to prevent any new structures or landscape works within the woodland with a view to retaining existing integrity towards biodiversity. The proposals suggest that all new building works will be on brownfield land. However, this cannot be assessed until full details of the layout are submitted. Nevertheless it is concluded that the principle of development, as shown in the illustrative plans, is acceptable.

There is a presumption against the removal of trees protected by TPO. Where a site is covered by a TPO a survey should be produced and designated trees should only be removed under exceptional circumstances and where appropriate re-planting is to take place. Again as this is purely an application for permission in principle the impact of the residential development upon trees is unknown. However the means of vehicular access does form part of this application and the proposed southern access with the additional lane to be formed on Southbrae Drive would have an impact upon the protected trees closest to the road. A detailed survey has established that two trees would need to be removed to accommodate the second lane. The applicants have proposed that these trees are replaced by new trees and the Council's arboriculture office has confirmed that this is an acceptable approach subject to the control over the replacement trees.

Taking the above matters into account it is considered that granting planning permission in principle for residential use, subject to a legal agreement preventing development on designated greenspace, is in accordance with the development plan. Permission should be granted for development which accords with the development plan unless material matters dictate otherwise. The letters of representation are material considerations and are addressed below.

- Object to the removal of the existing semi-detached property at 55 Jordanhill Drive.

Response: There are no proposals to remove the property. The front garden may be increased in size as a result of the amended access but this does not represent any policy tension.

- Object on the grounds of traffic safety and congestion at Jordanhill Drive access.

Response: A transport assessment has been carried out and has been considered by Transport Planning officers who have not raised any objection to the proposed arrangements.

- Concern regarding overshadowing and loss of privacy at existing neighbouring properties.

Response: As this is an application for planning permission in principle no details including proposed building heights have been submitted, therefore there is no scope to make an assessment. It is recognised that there are substantial level changes along the site boundaries to the neighbouring development and that there are existing buildings on the site. All of these matters will be considered when detailed proposals are submitted.

- Object to proposed density and overdevelopment of site.

Response: The density of the proposal is considered to be appropriate to its location and to its size and available amenity space as described in the assessment against policy RES 1 in the main report.

- Object to impact upon Site of Special Landscape Importance.

Response: The proposal, does not show any new development on the key open space in the eastern portion of the site and also proposes to extend the landscape further west in seeking to improve the setting of the listed building. While this is an application for principle and the full layout cannot be known, the impact upon the landscape is considered to be adequately protected via a legal agreement preventing development upon greenspace.

- There is a risk that protected trees will be removed.

Response: Two trees are identified as needing to be removed to accommodate the access works at Southbrae Drive but there is scope for appropriate replacement planting.

- Proposal will generate noise disturbance.

Response: The proposal is for a residential development on a brownfield site within a residential area. There is no policy justification for an objection to the principle of such a proposal and it would be unreasonable to resist approving the application on the basis of noise disturbance.

- Object to potential impact upon natural environment.

Response: In their masterplan and in the supporting documentation the applicants have outlined that there is adequate scope to develop the brownfield elements of the site without causing unacceptable harm to the natural environment within and around the overall application site

- Concern over construction impacts upon ground and structural stability due to steep banked ground at northern boundary of site.

Response: This is not a matter for planning control but will be considered with any application for a building warrant.

- Risk of flooding.

Response: A condition can be attached to any recommendation for approval that a flood risk assessment and drainage impact assessment be submitted with any applications for matters specified in conditions.

- Proposal contrary to designation of site.

Response: The application has been advertised as potentially contrary to the local plan. However, development on greenspace can be prevented by making any permission granted subject to a legal agreement which protects greenspace.

- Proposal is contrary to various environmental designations.

Response: The proposal is for the principle of residential development and subject to the controls outlined for a legal agreement it is considered that this would not conflict with any of the environmental designations covering the site.

- Object to realignment of Jordanhill Drive and relocation of junction at Jordanhill Drive as these would represent an increased risk in road safety.

Response: This has been assessed by Transport Planning Officers who have no objection to the proposed realignment.

- Object to loss of on-street parking on Jordanhill Drive.

Response: The proposal would potentially reduce scope for parking by one or two spaces but this is not considered to be so significant that it would warrant refusal of the application.

- Proposal will lead property adjoining Jordanhill Drive access remaining vacant.

Response: There is no evidence that this is the case. While this may or may not be a material consideration the likely effect cannot be considered as a justification for resisting the application. Particularly given that the submitted scheme identifies potential for the property's front garden to be extended.

- Object to loss of trees in residential property.

Response: There is no loss of trees in residential property shown in the proposals.

- Object on the grounds of late delivery of neighbour notification and removal of site notices.

Response: All submitted representations were submitted prior to the final date for making submissions, therefore all respondents have been taken into account.

- Concern over the failure to establish future management plans for pitches.

Response: The University has stressed that the collapse in the housing market has altered their plans for the disposal of the site which affected the plans for the preparation of the SPMP. The short and long term future of the pitches can be ensured and controlled via legal agreement.

- Jordanhill School's Amenities Trust should be given the role of managing the pitches to ensure continued community benefit and ownership of the pitches should be transferred to the school.

Response: The proposed legal agreement does not rule out a management role, however, it would be inappropriate for the Council to impose such a restriction via a legal agreement. Ownership is not a material planning consideration.

- It would be unacceptable for the pitches not currently used by the school to lie unused and be used in an unmanaged manner.

Response: The proposed legal agreement is designed to accommodate the continued use of the pitches by the school under lease and the wider community.

- Suggest a yellow box at the junction at Southbrae Drive and southern site access.

Response: This would be a traffic operational matter and would be dealt with as part of any application for roads construction consent.

- Construction traffic should not be allowed to use Southbrae Gardens or Jordanhill Crescent.

Response: A condition of any approval is that a construction traffic management plan shall be prepared which will allow the access routes taken to be properly managed.

- The route through the site could become a rat run.

Response: Transport Planning Officers have raised no objection to the retention of the existing internal road.

- Hours of construction should be controlled.

Response: An advisory note can be added to any decision notice granting permission advising the appropriate hours of audible construction works.

- The developer should be liable for any damage to roads caused by construction works.

Response: This would not be a material planning consideration.

- There should be a new railway halt at Westbrae Drive and not a relocation from Jordanhill.

Response: This proposal has been ruled out for operational reasons by Transport Scotland.

- The transport assessment asserts that existing parking problems have been caused by users of the college campus, however this is not the case as it is resident's parking caused by a lack of off-street parking. The transport assessment does not address the proposal's potential impact upon traffic on Chamberlain Road.

Response: Transport Planning officers have assessed the proposal taking account of the submissions and also carrying out their own assessments and site visits. From these it is concluded that the principal of residential development on the site is acceptable.

The points raised in the letters of representation are not considered to outweigh the policy position set out above. On this basis it is considered that the proposal should be recommended for approval subject to the completion of a Sec 75 Legal Agreement relative to protecting the greenspace and sports pitches within the site and subject to the conditions as set out below.

CONDITIONS AND REASONS

01. The development shall be implemented in accordance with drawing number(s):-

Location Plan JRM AL(00)004,

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

Reason: As these drawings constitute the approved development.

02. The development shall not be begun until an application for the following matters has been submitted to and approved by the planning authority by the issuing of a decision notice:-

1. Landscaping of the site.

Landscaping means the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated and includes screening by fences, walls or other means, the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs or grass, the formation of banks, terraces or other earthworks, the laying out or provision of gardens, courts or squares, water features, sculpture, or public art and the provision of other amenity features.

2. Means of access to the site.
Access means inclusive access for pedestrians, cycles and motor vehicles.
3. Layout of the site and siting of buildings and other structures.
4. Design and external appearance of buildings and other structures.
5. Existing and proposed site levels, levels of all accesses and finished floor levels.
6. A flood risk assessment and a drainage impact assessment and a full drainage plan showing a separate drainage system with water discharging to a suitable outlet and details of proposed SUDS.
7. Should the number of residential units exceed 370 then a revised Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with Glasgow City Plan 2 development guide DG/TRANS 1 Transport Assessments. The transport assessment shall cover all transport considerations, including public transport, walking and cycling and issues 1-21 of the development guide as appropriate to the development.
8. An ecological survey report covering protected species. This shall require investigation of whether a bat license will be required prior to any demolition works at the petroleum spirit store and all works will be subject to a method statement to be agreed in writing.
9. Detailed proposals for the upgrade of the internal development road network.

Reason: The application is in principle only and to comply with section 59(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 and regulations 12 and 28 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2008.

03. Vehicular access shall be taken from Jordanhill Drive and Southbrae Avenue in accordance with the detailed drawing numbers unless otherwise agreed in writing:-

Southern Access Option 1 SCT3235-P-001,
North Access Option 1 B063056A/I/DAN/001.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

04. Detailed proposals for the signalisation of the Southbrae Drive / Westland Drive junction (installed after the construction of the 174th dwelling), including proposed locations of signal infrastructure and cable ducting, shall be submitted as part of the Roads Construction Consent application to the satisfaction of Land & Environmental Services and be approved prior to commencement of work. Glasgow City Council will arrange for the supply and erection of all signalling equipment, with all associated costs being recharged to the developer.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

05. Appropriate safe secure and enclosed cycle parking / storage should be provided for residents of flatted dwellings, in line with Policy TRANS 6 of the Glasgow City Plan.

Reason: To ensure that cycle parking is available for the occupiers/users of the development.

06. Details of a construction phase traffic management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing with any application for matters specified in conditions. The plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details for the duration of the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

07. Details of a travel pack promoting public transport usage shall be submitted prior to the determination of any applications for matters specified in conditions. A copy of the travel pack as approved shall be given to the first occupier of each dwelling completed.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable transport.

08. No more than half of the new build residential units shall be occupied before the conversion of the David Stow building is completed and fully available for occupation in accordance with details to be approved. No more than three quarters of the new build residential units shall be occupied before the Graham and Douglas Buildings are complete and fully available for occupation in accordance with details to be approved.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building.

09. Before any work on the site is begun, a detailed plan which shows the exact location of all existing trees on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. An accompanying schedule shall include information on species, height, canopy spread, base level and condition. The plan and schedule, ie the tree survey, shall also indicate those trees which it is intended to retain and those which it is intended to remove.

Reason: To maintain the contribution of existing trees to the landscape quality and biodiversity of the area.

10. With the exception of tree works detailed in the approved application, existing trees on the site shall not be lopped, topped, felled or removed without the prior written approval of the planning authority. Details of such trees and the proposed operations on each of them shall be submitted to the planning authority. Any proposals for felling or removal shall include proposals, including a programme, for replacement tree planting.

Reason: To maintain the contribution of existing trees to the landscape quality and biodiversity of the area.

11. Before any work on the site is begun, a detailed plan which shows the location and details of a method of tree protection to comply with BS 5837 2005, Trees in Relation to Construction, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The approved protection shall be in place prior to the commencement of any work on the site and shall be retained in place until completion of the development.

Reason: To maintain the contribution of existing trees to the landscape quality and biodiversity of the area.

12. Before any work on the site is begun, a maintenance schedule for the landscaping scheme/open space, and details of maintenance arrangements, including the responsibilities of relevant parties, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the continued contribution of the landscaping scheme/open space to the landscape quality and biodiversity of the area.

13. Any trees or plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of five years from the completion of the development shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: To ensure the continued contribution of the landscaping scheme/open space to the landscape quality and biodiversity of the area.

14. The development shall be implemented in accordance with a phasing plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of construction works on site. The phasing plan shall identify the sequencing of infrastructure works and construction activity throughout the site taking account of conditions 4, 6 and 8 above.

Reason: To enable the planning authority to monitor the implementation of the development.

REASON(S) FOR GRANTING THIS APPLICATION

01. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's accordance with the Development Plan.

ADVISORY NOTES TO APPLICANT

01. The grant of planning permission does not remove the requirement for Listed Building Consent for any alterations, either internal or external, which may be required in order to implement this planning permission.
02. The developer should advise each prospective purchaser that residents in this development will not be eligible to purchase a resident's on-road parking permit, in accordance with the provisions of the existing traffic order.
03. The applicant should consult with Land and Environmental Services (Environmental Health) concerning this proposal in respect of legislation administered by that Service which is likely to affect this development.
04. In order to protect local residents' amenity, noise associated with construction and demolition works in residential areas should not occur before 0800 or after 1900 Monday to Friday, and not before 0800 or after 1300 on Saturdays. Noise from construction or demolition works should be inaudible at the site's perimeter on Sundays and public holidays. The planning authority should be notified of necessary works likely to create noise outwith these hours.
05. The applicant should consult Scottish Water concerning this proposal in respect of legislation administered by that organisation which is likely to affect this development. In particular, sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) should be designed and constructed in accordance with the vestment standards contained in "Sewers for Scotland", 2nd edition 2007.

The applicant is advised that, where drainage systems including SUDS are not vested in Scottish Water, it is the applicant's/developer's responsibility to maintain those systems in perpetuity or to make legal arrangements for such maintenance.

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 license Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. The OS website can be found at 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.

