

JordanhillCommunity Council

Chairperson: John Winfield

Address: 133 Essex Drive, Jordanhill, Glasgow G14 9PD.

Email: john.winfield20@ntlworld.com;

GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT & REGENERATION SERVICES

HEAD OF PLANNING & BUILDING STANDARDS

EXCHANGE HOUSE

231 GEORGE STREET

GLASGOW, G1 1RX.

FAO: Ms. Sarah Shaw, Principal, Delegated and Performance

14 April 2017

Dear Ms. Shaw,

Application Ref: 17/00530/DC

Site: Jordanhill College 76 Southbrae Drive Glasgow G13 1PP

Proposal: Internal and external alterations to 'David Stow Building' to facilitate residential development associated with PPI consent 11/00794/DC.

Application Type: Listed Building Consent (LBC)

Jordanhill Community Council hereby makes representation against the application for listed building consent ref: 17/00530/DC submitted by the Applicant - CALA Homes Management Limited.

It is noted that the LBC application 17/00530/DC is validated in parallel to the approval of Matters Specified in Conditions (MSC) Application 17/00531/DC, all being part of a Planning Decision Notice that granted Planning Permission in Principle Subject to Conditions for the erection of a residential development and associated infrastructure including conversion of listed and non-listed buildings at Jordanhill College (11/00794/DC).

The aforementioned consent is deemed to include: Jordanhill Campus Plan 2 (Phase 2) along with Technical Appendices: (1) – Planning Policy Extracts; (2) – Conservation Audit; (3) – Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan; (4) – Tree Survey; (5) – Ecological Survey Report and (6) – Consultation Statement.

The policy references and material considerations made in this letter of objection refer to Glasgow City Plan 2 (2009) not the City Development Plan that was adopted on 29 March 2017.

City Plan 2 Development Principle Policies

LBC Application is contrary to City Plan 2 Development Principle Policies:

- 1 ENV 2 - Open Space and Public Realm Provision
- 2 DES 3 - Protecting and Enhancing the City's Historic Environment.
- 3 RES 5 - Conversion and Subdivision to Residential Use.

ENV 2 – Open Space and Public Realm Provision

The Section 75 Open Space Minute of Agreement between Glasgow City Council, The University of Strathclyde and CALA Homes Management Limited has effectively compromised ENV 2 – Open Space and Public Realm Provision. This has permitted the introduction of intrusive and negative elements that include a large area of car parking and engineered space which detract from the historical and aesthetic significance of the main elevation of the David Stow building.

The site is known to have been a designed landscape since at least the beginning of the 18th Century, and is of considerable local importance.

The critical issue here is the early termination of the Section 75 Open Space Minute of Agreement to maintain the integrity of the east elevation of the David Stow building along with landscape features and vistas established from deep within the site across the playing fields to Jordanhill School and beyond. However, the tarmac area immediately adjacent to the building has a poor appearance and invites replacement with a more appropriate road surface.

DES 3 - Protecting and Enhancing the City's Historic Environment

JOR-DOC-11 LBC Design Statement for the David Stow Building dated 03 March 2017 presents significant and adverse departures from Jordanhill Campus Plan 2 and Technical Appendices that include a Conservation Audit associated with Planning Permission in Principle consent 11/00794/DC. The approach has failed to protect the landscape setting, restoration and conversion of the Category B Listed David Stow building.

The potential for achieving high quality outcomes in the historic environment is not demonstrated in the proposals. The building provides excellent opportunities for conversion for residential use, however dual aspect duplex apartments, and lift wells proposed within the Central Section, accessed directly from the external courtyards significantly conflicts with the grading of architectural significance for such high profile, single volume spaces. The intervention of new door openings and fan lights to facilitate courtyard access can easily be avoided by retention and reuse of these spaces.

DES 3 - Protecting and Enhancing the City's Historic Environment – continued

National and local precedents indicate that it is possible to successfully conserve and reuse heritage buildings to achieve high quality sustainable places that respond and contribute positively to the environment and still retain their heritage values. Modern demands can easily be accommodated by adopting shared-space concepts applied to the Council Chamber and Francis Tombs Hall reflecting their historic character. It is not acceptable to convert these public spaces and hide important architectural features to benefit high density sub-division to residential use.

With greater Employer support for work-life balance more people are working flexible hours. Shared space concepts integrated with smart technologies provide ideal opportunities for employees to work local to their home outwith the constraints of the domestic 'buzz'. This approach can contribute to retain or re-establish the relationship between the heritage place and its use.

The pre-application consultation process that informed Campus Plan 2 recognised the special and often unified character and qualities of the David Stow building that has contributed to its heritage listing. It was generally accepted that intrusive buildings should be demolished to recover the significance of the more important buildings. Community opinion was keenly embedded in the emerging proposal for the restoration and conversion of the David Stow Building to secure the future use of the Council Chamber and Francis Tombs Hall for wider community use, including protecting the vested interest of Jordanhill School. Social integration was considered to add value to the listed building conversion by improving the quality of the proposal to involve the community and confirm local people's aspirations for 'new uses for historic buildings'.

Campus Plan 2, David Stow Building Pg.80 / Item 9.3.95 reads: *'It is desirable that the two most significant rooms in the David Stow Building - Francis Tombs Hall on the second floor and the former Council Chamber on the ground floor - are not converted to apartments but remain intact as civic or community amenities. Such re-use of these significant spaces would enable the protection of their internal fabric and contribute to the identity of the proposed development. All alterations to the David Stow Building will be subject to Listed Building Consent'*.

With regard the Council Chamber Dome it is not acceptable that this important architectural feature is concealed below a new suspended plasterboard ceiling and that a three bedroom apartment is created in this space. To state that: *'This will retain the feature for posterity, (and is reversible,) whilst delivering the residential development which will help enable the restoration of the building'* is an abuse of the community engagement process.

The position and orientation of the David Stow Building in relation to Jordanhill School places some constraints in terms of maintaining elevational cohesion. The existing fenestration imposes constraints on both buildings. The design and profiles of the large metal framed windows that define the aesthetics of the elevations must be unconditionally preserved. Window replacement double-glazed profiles must not be dictated by internal partitioning and be controlled by standards set-by a Conservation Plan.

DES 3 - Protecting and Enhancing the City's Historic Environment – continued

Campus Plan 2, Urban Design Principles – Site Analysis Existing Pg.50 / Item 9.2.3 – Views reads: *'The open views between the David Stow Building, the playing fields, and Jordanhill School represent one of the defining characteristics of the site, and must therefore be protected. Even from within the unattractive open areas of the site, spectacular views are obtained to both the north and the south over the Glasgow conurbation. These should be consolidated and reinforced in the redevelopment of the site'*.

Development interventions require to be redirected away from David Stow's central core to the flat roofed section at the head of the stairs to the centre of the western block provides an opportunity for a single story extension to be built on the roof which would afford views to the south and east. The construction of an extension in this position would not interrupt or spoil the profile of the building from the east.

The Conservation Audit by Simpson and Brown Architects in 2007 recognised that the architectural and aesthetic significance of the site, apart from the open parkland and woodland is largely dominated by the Category B Listed David Stow Building. Red sandstone facades to the east, south and north are matched by spacious and well-designed interiors, particularly the main entrance hall and stairs, which are of considerable¹ significance. Moderate² significance was given to the Francis Tombs Hall and Council Chamber. These large volume and character spaces have significant local interest for shared community use, and present some difficulty in conversion to apartments. It is scandalous that a Conservation Statement published in 2017 by the same specialist architects maintained the original grading and proposed their conversion by sub-division to dual and single aspect apartments. This is not acceptable professional practice and appears to have yielded to developer pressure to maximise commercial gain.

Campus Plan 2 / Building Conservation Principles Pg.24 / Item 4.5.3 reads:

'The existing buildings will be altered to suit a new use. The design of alterations must respect the significance of the existing building. Rooms or spaces that have considerable significance should be altered as little as possible to facilitate the new use. Rooms or elements that have moderate significance should remain intact and legible, but can be altered. An alteration should be innately attractive but it should not be intrusive to the aesthetic or historical appreciation of the historic fabric. The interventions throughout a building should have common character so that they can be interpreted as being part of a single datable campaign of alteration. Respect for the existing interior does not mean that new elements should copy the original style'.

¹ **Considerable significance:** A building or element of importance within Scotland, or a good example of a particular period, style or type with a high degree of intact original fabric that contributes substantially to the importance of the building or site overall.

² **Moderate significance:** A building or element of local (Within Glasgow) importance, or an element that contributes to, but is not a key element to the importance of the building or site overall.

DES 3 - Protecting and Enhancing the City's Historic Environment – continued

The David Stow Building must remain a landmark building with open-space landscape relationships with Jordanhill School. Car parking provision to meet TRANS 4 – Vehicle Parking Standards requires be relegating to the west elevation and concealed. This elevation is considered to be less significant in terms of the built heritage and is already compromised by alteration and removal of the gymnasium blocks

The topography of the Sir Henry Wood site provides the potential for the development of underground parking strategies to benefit innovative spatial relationships with the David Stow building. Cars could arrive at the lower ground floor level, where each house has an integral garage, while the storey above - an open timber deck - provides pedestrian access. This arrangement, by providing a car free, safe street environment, is shall encourage social interaction between neighbours and create a sense of community has not been developed from Campus Plan 2 concepts in the MSC proposals.

Campus Plan 2 identifies this as Plot 10 Stow Court giving opportunity for new architecture in this position which mandates a creative interface with the David Stow building. Stow Court effectively becomes a designed extension of the listed building. This approach is not reflected the MSC proposals.

Pg.77 / Item 9.3.84 Landscaping reads: Provision for public landscaped area is essential; a public landscaped area could be provided above underground car parking, and Private gardens should be provided to the interior of the plot.

Pg.77 / Item 9.3.86 Parking reads: *'It is desirable that parking provision within Stow Court should also cater for some David Stow Building apartments. It is desirable that the site be free from on-street residents parking. It is advisable that private parking be kept within the curtilage of the plot, or in an underground carpark, to ensure minimal visual impact on the shared surface road and landscaped areas. Parking provision should be made behind the building line of the front elevation'*.

RES 5 – Conversion and Subdivision to Residential Use

Proposals to subdivide listed buildings will also have to meet the standards set out in Policy DES 3: Protecting and Enhancing the City’s Historic Environment, supplemented by development guide DG/DES 3 – Design Guidance for Listed Buildings and Properties in Conservation Areas.

The north and south courtyards are limited to provide communal private garden space for residents. To minimise energy use, no provision has been made in these areas for clothes poles, to allow outside clothes drying. Conversion of the building makes the provision of garden space and refuse/recycling space difficult; the possibility of creative alternative solutions, such as shared roof gardens or private terraces of balconies for flats has not been explored.

Opportunities to relieve the policy tension for the provision of private gardens and allotments within the site are not being promoted by the MSC proposals. Policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision requires developments, of more than 10 dwellings, to contribute to allotment/community garden provision.

The Applicant has not demonstrated justification to necessitate a more intensive subdivision from the dual aspect dwelling standard set by the policy. Campus Plan 2 proposed development range between 55 and 71 apartments maintains the integrity of the Council Chamber and the Francis Tombs Hall.

It is significant to note that the LBC application does not confirm the total number and type of apartments, however the MSC Transport Assessment in para 3.24 and 3.25 states that parking provision is proposed at one space allocated and 25% per unit unallocated (as per with the minimum standard in TRANS 4) which for 420 dwellings (instead of the correct 412) gives 525 spaces. The Planning Statement in para 6.7.6 reiterates this statement. Both do not match the MSC Design Statement.

The MSC Design Statement on page 39 states that provision is to be two (2) allocated spaces per unit for house types 2-7 (Mews, Townhouse and Detached) with Apartment blocks, David Stow and Graham and Douglas houses being provided with one (1) allocated space per unit. The resultant car parking provision is summarised in the table below:


| Building Type | Parking Space per Unit | Units Sub Total | Allocated Parking Spaces |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| David Stow, Graham and Douglas Houses | 1 | 106 | 106 |
| Mews and Apartments | 1 | 190 | 190 |
| Townhouses and Detached | 2 | 116 | 232 |
| | Sub-Total | 412 | 528 |
| Visitor Spaces (25% of 412 units = 103) | | | 105 |
| | TOTAL CAR PARKING PROVISION | | 633 |

RES 5 – Conversion and Subdivision to Residential Use – continued

All areas within the site are Below Base Accessibility with inadequate public service transport to allow residential development. For development to proceed requires the enhancement of public transport provision to at least Base Accessibility standards. City Plan 2: TRANS 2 - Development Locational Requirements; DG/TRANS 1 – Transport Assessments; DG/TRANS 2 - Travel Plans; DG/TRANS 3 - Public Transport Accessibility Zones require compliance under MSC Condition 02.7.

Jordanhill Community Council stands-by the recommendations made in the 2007 Conservation Audit. This concluded that the site represents a very significant opportunity if redeveloped according to the masterplan (Campus Plan 2), which recognises design quality and the protection and sensitivity of the significant buildings and landscape elements, then the area stands to benefit considerably.

Yours sincerely,

Handwritten signature of John Winfield in black ink, written in a cursive style.

John Winfield,
On behalf of Jordanhill Community Council.

Handwritten signature of John Grierson in black ink, written in a cursive style.

John Grierson,
On behalf of Jordanhill Community Council.

End of representation against LBC Application 17/00530/DC.