

Jordanhill Community Council

Summary Notes taken from an Audio Transcript of a Public Meeting held by Jordanhill Community Council (JCC). Location: Sunday the 25th March at 2.00pm at Jordanhill Parish Church. Drafted by Kate Still (Vice Chair of JCC)

Opening Remarks: Tom Hamilton, Jordanhill Campus Sub Committee

Tom Hamilton updated on the purpose of the meeting a) Update on the Campus Campaign and b) Next phase – potential Community Value Proposition and Trust Initiative. He provided general housekeeping information.

Welcome & Apologies and Introductions: Charlie Kaur, Treasurer JCC and Chair for the Meeting

Charlie Kaur welcomed and thanked everyone for attending and reiterated purpose of the meeting. She introduced herself and the JCC Campus Sub-committee:

- Tom Hamilton, Euan Miller, Gerry Mather and Jim Osborne

Apologies were received from elected members. Cllr. Maggie McTernan had sent Frances Manning as her substitute. Apologies were noted from John Winfield, JCC Chair and Kate Still, JCC Vice-Chair.

Charlie Kaur gave a vote of thanks to all those that had supported and contributed to the campaign so generously.

- Those that provided the personal pledges for Protected Expenses
- Funding partners: our anonymous benefactor, Jordanhill Out of School Care and the Jordanhill School Education Trust
- All those that had donated time and energy leafleting and fundraising at events
- The Church for hosting events
- Elected Members for their support
- The Campus Sub-Committee

Campus Campaign Update: Euan Miller and Tom Hamilton

Euan Miller began by giving an update on the Judicial Review (JR) Decision – Lady Wolfe’s judgement.

2 main concerns a) protection of greenspace and b) matters specified in conditions.

Protection of Greenspace: relied on City Plan 2 green designation of green open space. Areas of green space did not show as being protected on plans submitted to the JR. Planning Permission in Principle (PPIP) GCC successfully argued at JR that overall map was Glasgow Open-Space Map under planning advice note 65 (this did not show all areas of protected green space) and this trumped the City Plan 2. Court accepted precedence of the Glasgow Open Space Plan (dated 2017) even though this plan had not been referred to in any official preceding papers. Court took decision the plan did exist.

Other ground of JR challenge was about transport. JCC argued bus provision had substantially declined, JCC argument that impact was so material should have gone back to the Council to be taken into account.

Court was clear that as the Council had ignored its own standards in 2013 there was no reason why they should act differently now. Council had ignored its policy in 2013 and therefore could not be held to account now. So Court did not feel it had the power to remit it back. Noted - it was strange that an authority can benefit from ignoring its own policy standards.

JCC was not committed to spending money in court. CALA did come late in the day to make an offer to avoid the Judicial Review. This would have involved a financial benefit to the community and transfer of the pitches. At the 11th hour the University of Strathclyde pulled out of this approach to "protect its legacy".

Despite disappointment of JR believe that some good will come out of it. This process was not in vain will show planning system is broken as an applicant can make all sorts of promises at the in principle stage and then ignore this – system will need to be reviewed going forward.

Matters specified in conditions and listed building consent: Tom Hamilton

Original application lodged by Strathclyde University refers to "matters specified in conditions". More detailed application that was lodged for the overall development of the Jordanhill Campus.

Listed Building Consent application – specifically referred to the development of David Stow building and lands and grounds immediately around the building and manner in which they had a setting on that building.

Significant, unprecedented representations made by the community with over 1,000 lodged and registered against the both matters – referred back to a special planning committee hearing meeting held out-with the regular meetings schedules. JCC Community Council able to make representations against both applications to the Planning Committee. Meeting convened with 3 community representative speakers. JCC Sub-group speakers (Jim Osborne and Ken Robertson) and planning Consultant, employed by JCC/Sub-committee, were able

to make representation against both applications, approx. 5 minutes each (15 minutes in total). Detailed analysis of key criteria for representation but difficult to articulate views of 1,000 people in time provided. The 3 Local Council representatives were also able to speak and all attended and stated they were with the community and raised concerns of over-development of the site. Planning Committee meeting held was held in GCC offices – JCC advised GCC and Clerk in advance of the meeting that anticipated there would be a high level of representation and articulated concerns that the proposed venue would be insufficient to accommodate community representation of over 100 people. Referred to other hearings i.e. Incinerator at Scotstoun hearing where the meeting venue was re-scheduled to accommodate community representation. On the day of meeting over 100 community residents gathered and tried to attend the hearing. GCC advised not able to find any alternative accommodation and no opportunity offered to re-convene. JCC had to identify 15 community representatives to attend all day – no substitutions allowed.

Local Councillors made representation asking the planning Committee to consider refusal of application to reconsider based on a number of matters including; density, traffic, development throughout the site.

Matters specified in conditions application was convened in the morning and the listed building consent in the afternoon. Strongly made representations on behalf of the community and hopes were high the hearing was going in our favour.

“Matters Specified in Conditions” Final Outcome: disappointingly granted in favour of Strathclyde University and CALA Homes. Introduction of new condition for “growing areas and spaces” introduced by a Member of the Planning Committee even though this was not an area of concern raised by the applicant or JCC community. Little or no impact on density of site – one of biggest community concerns.

“Listed Building Consent” Final Outcome: disappointingly decision was granted in favour of Strathclyde University and CALA Homes, subject to conditions. Concerns re density and parking and impact on the David Stow building was raised by the Community. Planners in support of the applicant produced photos taken 1950’s/60’s and argued parking density had precedent. Community argued need for retention of some central/community spaces. A condition was introduced to provide a central resident space for CALA home occupiers within the David Stow building to be retained by the developer. Not a provision for the wider community.

Community very disappointed. The Planning Permission in Principle Decision in 2009-10 was the fundamental process for challenging the principles of the original applications – related to density and the provision of community space. Made it difficult in terms of what could be achieved by the Community in terms of arguing the matters specified in conditions and listed building consent. Reliable information was that CALA were concerned they were going

to lose – but a new application would have been submitted. It would not have overturned the original Planning Permission in Principle – that power lay with the Judicial Review – and Euan explained the unsuccessful outcome of the JR earlier. Thanks for all the community and sub-committee support, those that made representations – it did make a difference, made applicants work harder to get their project over the line. Now want to look forward and hand back to Charlie.

Update on Finances: Charlie Kaur

Will cover finances but firstly, wanted to advise is that during the period of the build when CALA is on site JCC will put in place arrangements i.e. a community liaison officer to raise any community concerns. Any members of the community that have shared concerns (e.g. traffic management or health and safety) are encouraged to email or come along to JCC meetings, usually held in Jordanhill School in the refectory on first Monday of the month at 7pm. Do not have capacity to deal with individual complaints.

Can provide the assurance that finances from the fund-raising campaign to been independently audited by a qualified accountant with a clean report. Campaign income raised was £61,615 and the monies spent £57,915. Remaining monies £3,700 held in bank account for protected expenses order, capped at £5,000. A further £1,200 pledges been made so £100 shortfall. Assurance that 91% of monies were spent on legal and professional/consultancy fees to support and progress the campaign, 6% held in bank for protected expenses and 3% spent on fundraising activities – so good return on spend – pie charts on display showing source of income and expenditure. Request for small donation to cover shortfall and venue hire cost of the Church.

Community Value Proposition (CVP): Jim Osborne

Before dealing with CVP One issue outstanding to planning decisions related to “Growing Space” condition placed on CALA and where it will be located – potential loss of open and accessible greenspace and needs to be resolved. Agreed JCC will write to GCC planning dept. to set up a meeting to discuss need for community consultation.

CVP was an important part of the campaign – two elements to it.

1) *Transfer of management of sports pitches to community control.* This was part of original planning in principle decision – unfortunately latest planning decision was to transfer management of the pitches to Glasgow Life

2) *Creation of a new community centre in Jordanhill*

Both objectives would require the creation of a community development organisation and provided that such an organisation adopts a legal format