

## JORDANHILL CAMPUS – PUBLIC STATEMENT

---

The Planning Applications Committee (PAC) “Public” Hearing held in the City Chambers on Tuesday 21 November 2017 denied public access to more than 80 Residents’ of Jordanhill who made representations against the development of the Jordanhill Campus Site by the University of Strathclyde and their preferred developer CALA Homes (West) Ltd.

It is significant to note that over 900 representations were made against the Listed Building Consent (LBC-17/00530/DC) and Matters Specified in Conditions (MSC-17/00531/DC) Applications by local residents including Jordanhill and Whiteinch Community Councils, Jordanhill School Board of Managers, Jordanhill School Educational Amenities Trust and Jordanhill Out of School Service Ltd.

The PAC Chairperson, Cllr. Glenn ELDER advised on the day, that only 13 members of the public could be accommodated, due to the fact that the Council did not have a room of sufficient size available for the large numbers attending.

Jordanhill Community Council (JCC) considers this to be unacceptable as prior notification was given to appropriately manage and accommodate all anticipated public interest and community representations. The Council has many facility options at their disposal, but, on this occasion chose not to allow access to the PAC to all concerned members of the public.

This incident is consistent with the dismissive manner in which the Community has been treated throughout the whole planning process, and is inconsistent with the Leader of the Council’s March 2017 public commitment for community engagement to deliver a “fit for purpose” planning system in Glasgow.

We intend to refer the alleged mishandling of this event to the Chief Executive, citing a PAC public hearing precedent of 23 February 2016 (WH Malcolm Ltd: Application 15/00549/DC) where the Chairperson directed Committee Services to relocate the Hearing to the Council Chamber. Everyone who turned up on the day, circa 100 people occupied the public gallery and Council benches.

On Tuesday the Case Officer advised the PAC that a Judicial Review Petition had been served by JCC against the Council and Interested Parties and that there was no reason not to continue with the PAC Hearing.

The PAC subsequently appeared to grant consents subject to Conditions with regards the Applicant’s MSC and LBC.

The PAC disregarded robust recommendations for rejection presented by Victoria Park, Ward 12 Elected Members: Bailie, Ade AIBINU, Cllr. Feargal DALTON and Cllr. Maggie McTERNAN including the representations made by the Communities’ Nominated Speakers.

We and our professional advisors are dissatisfied with the manner in which the PAC was conducted, and remain confused by the lack of administration of material planning considerations that led to the decisions.

The Case Officer apparently failed to provide guidance to the PAC based on relevant principle planning policies that resulted in significant ambiguity on outcomes related to both applications, namely the provision of allotments or growing space and associated open space standards.

The intervention of Bailie, Dr Martin BARTOS established allotments or growing space as an Amendment into the MSC consent. This was deemed to be a condition of his approval.

The inclusion of allotments or growing space within the development is an outcome not previously raised by the Community Council or the residents' of Jordanhill. It would be unacceptable to meet residential quantity standards specific to such provisions, at the expense of designated greenspace that include community pitches along with the removal of more protected trees within the Site of Special Landscape Importance.

In accordance with the relevant policies we expect the Council to engage with the Community to achieve fair and reasonable outcomes.

It is possible that a majority of the PAC may not have approved the MSC application if the allotment amendment had not been adopted. The voting was conducted in such confusion that few if anyone properly understood what had happened. Several Councillors left the meeting after the vote, questioning the final decision with our representatives.

JCC remain of the view that the PAC were misdirected, that there were no planning grounds to justify refusal. The MSC proposals are contrary to policies CDP 1 and CDP 9 of the City Development Plan.

The Case Officer was at pains to ensure that no further committee scrutiny was necessary, requesting that delegated authority be given to draft the conditions, and thereafter issue the MSC and LBC Planning Decision Notices. It is our view that the wording of the proposed condition be drafted, referenced to the correct City Development Plan along with disclosure of the exact requirements expected of the developer, and put before a subsequent planning committee for final approval.

Further confusion can also be attributed in granting Listed Building Consent with regard the conversion of the David Stow Building and the proposed retention of the Council Chamber only for CALA residential use. Again no reference was made to the City Development Plan policy CDP 9 which would be required in order to reach a positive determination.

These outcomes are flawed, unacceptable and do not follow due process.

We have written to the Director of Governance and Solicitor to the Council on these matters. The Director has confirmed that enquiries into the issues raised are being undertaken with a response in due course.

JCC understands that no construction work can commence on the Campus until after the Judicial Review determination has been published, or the expiry of a three-month period taken from the date of issue of any Planning Decision Notices (MSC and LBC) during which these decisions can be legally challenged.

JCC and our Partners are currently considering all options available, including potential legal challenges, related to the Planning Authority's Handling Reports and PAC outcomes.

Rest assured we remain determined to explore every avenue available to the Community in pursuit of a positive outcome to address the current overdevelopment of the Jordanhill Campus.

Tuesday's decision is not this outcome and is unacceptable to our Community.

**Jordanhill Community Council.**