

JordanhillCommunityCouncil

Member: Ken Robertson

Address:

Mobile:

REDACTED - PERSONAL INFORMATION

Email:

Date: 05 January 2021

GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION SERVICES
PLANNING REPRESENTATIONS
Exchange House
231 George Street
Glasgow G1 1RX.

FAO: Mr. Patrick Barbour, Planning Case Officer.

Dear Mr. Barbour,

Application Ref: 20/03141/FUL

Address: Site Formerly Known As Jordanhill College 76 Southbrae Drive Glasgow

Proposal: Erection of residential development and associated infrastructure including demolition of non-listed building, formation of car parking and provision of landscaping: revision to application 17/00531/DC.

Stance: Statutory Consultee OBJECTS to the Application.

Jordanhill Community Council (JCC) objects to the proposal to demolish Douglas House as the retention of this building was a condition of the planning AMS Consent 17/00531/DC, which allowed the demolition of the less significant buildings on the site. Douglas House contributes to the historical, social, architectural, landscape, aesthetic and design significance of the site. It is imperative to retain this building with controlled interventions in order to maintain the heritage relationships with the David Stow Building (key historic building within the site), Graham House, the 18th Century Pillar and Open Space designated as being of Special Landscape Importance in the Glasgow City Development Plan.

Our objection is based upon the Applicant's failure to justify the demolition of Douglas House, and specifically the lack of evidence to substantiate the major departure from a core material consideration: JOR-DOC-05 David Stow Building Conservation Statement by Simpson and Brown Architects of February 2017.

The Application questions the due diligence of the Applicant to take appropriate measures to protect and enhance the significance of heritage as described in JOR-DOC-05 that recognised that the wider setting of the listed building to guide and inform the proposals in the context of the overall site. JOR-DOC-05 informed the Planning Decision Notice 17/00530/DC: Listed Building Consent granted subject to Conditions on 4th December 2017.

JCC expects the cultural-heritage significance of the site to be retained, revealed, enhanced or at least impaired as little as possible, in both the present, and in any future proposals. This includes the consented retention of existing open space, the conversion of the David Stow building, Graham House (1919-22) and Douglas House (1931).

Our objection is presented in four parts:

- PART 1** **Type of Application is misleading by not reflecting the Description of Proposal that represents a revision to the previously approved plans cited in the Planning Decision Notice, Matters Specified in Conditions, Granted Subject to Condition(s) and Section 69 Agreement in respect to Application 17/00531/DC.**
- PART 2** **Jordanhill Park Phase 2A Design and Access Statement – 20.10.20 (Rev.01) is misleading, factually incorrect and contradicts a significant material consideration: JOR-DOC-05 David Stow Building Conservation Statement by Simpson and Brown Architects of February 2017 that informed the Planning Decision Notice 17/00530/DC: Listed Building Consent granted subject to Conditions on 4th December 2017.**
- PART 3** **Douglas House Building, Jordanhill Campus, Structural Condition Report fails to provide evidence that Douglas House is beyond effective repair, conversion and restoration.**
- PART 4** **Application fails to address the points raised by the Planning Case Officer in Appendix 1 of the Design and Access Statement – Pre Application Consultation Feedback – 11.08.2020.**

PART 1

Type of Application is misleading by not reflecting the Description of Proposal that represents a revision to the previously approved plans cited in the Planning Decision Notice, Matters Specified in Conditions, Granted Subject to Condition(s) and Section 69 Agreement in respect to Application 17/00531/DC.

Type of application conflict with Description of Proposal.

JCC considers that the type application is a Further application, (including renewal of planning permission, modification, variation or removal of a planning condition etc.). The Description of Proposal reads: *Permission for the reconfiguration of 35 Units within the consented AMC masterplan at Jordanhill. The proposal represents a revision to the previously consented layout. The Douglas House (20 No units) is to be demolished and 18 No terraced properties added to the development in its place, the remaining 17 units included in the submission are already accounted for within the existing AMC however they have been reconfigured to suit layout alterations.*

Possible breach of planning control.

Neighbour Notification requires to have been served to all properties around the site in accordance with the consented AMSC masterplan at Jordanhill.

PART 2

Jordanhill Park Phase 2A Design and Access Statement – 20.10.20 (Rev.01) is misleading, factually incorrect and contradicts a significant material consideration: JOR-DOC-05 David Stow Building Conservation Statement by Simpson and Brown Architects of February 2017 that informed the Planning Decision Notice 17/00530/DC: Listed Building Consent granted subject to Conditions on 4th December 2017.

Refute applicant's claims.

JCC rejects Jordanhill Park Phase 2A Design and Access Statement – 20.10.20 (Rev.01):

There is nothing in the Application/Reports provided which categorically supports this statement. There is also no reason as to why they have not provided adequate protection to Douglas House when its retention was a condition of the original consent.

(a) Executive Summary: *"The proposals represent a revision to the previously consented layout. They have been developed because the restoration of the existing Douglas House building has proven to be unviable due to the extremely poor condition of the building fabric which has become evident through opening up investigations".*

There is NO evidence to justify the demolition of Douglas House.

(b) Section 2: Context Appraisal, Item 2.5 Condition Report Summary.

Conflict with JOR-DOC-05 David Stow Building Conservation Statement by Simpson and Brown Architects of February 2017 is a core material consideration in determining the Application.

(c) 2.2 Existing Buildings & Heritage: *"Since the approval of the AMSC and with further site investigations carried out of both the Structural and Fabric condition of each of these buildings, it has come to light that the previous ambition to retain and revive Douglas House poses great challenges".*

On what authority is this statement made to contradict a specialist conservation architect?

(d) 2.3 Douglas House: *"Is deemed less historically significant than both the adjacent retained buildings on site and it not a particularly notable example of its construction type within the context of Glasgow".*

Conflict with 17/00531/DC

(e) Section 3: Design Proposals, 3.1 Site Layout. The terraced proposals extend significantly beyond the footprint of Douglas House and have a detrimental effect on the heritage relationships.

Not proven

(f) Appendix 1; Pre Application Consultation Feedback 11.08.20. There is no evidence in the application to support the statements:

Unsubstantiated claim.

Overall site: *"While the structural surveys are fairly compressive, it should be made very clear in the submitted application exactly why the retention of Douglas House is not viable and which information from the new surveys has driven this change".*

Unsubstantiated claim.

Open Space / Landscaping: *"There is a loss of the green edge/tree line to the development to the front of Douglas Building, and while this is somewhat mitigated by tree planting (or retention) in the gardens of the mews properties this still includes parking/bin storage and hard landscaped areas. Careful consideration should be given to how to retain this green edge of the site, as well mitigating any loss of existing trees by additional planting on site".*

Unsubstantiated claim.

Transport Considerations: *"The proposed roads will require to be 4.8 metres wide with 2 no 2 metre wide footways/service strips throughout, widening only accepted to accommodate refuse vehicles as to be demonstrated by swept path analysis".*

PART 2 Continued

JOR-DOC-05 David Stow Building Conservation Statement by Simpson and Brown Architects of February 2017 is a core material consideration in determining the Application.

Simpson & Brown Conservation Statement appears to have been ignored by the Applicant to aid appropriate management of the historic assets.

- (a) Application 20/03141/FUL negatively departs from planning consents granted that include assessment of significance intended to inform the conservation, repair, use, management and future alterations of both the site and the historic assets. The demolition of negative and neutral buildings was to reveal or recover the heritage significance of the more important buildings and structures such as the David Stow Building and associated Douglas House and Graham House. Development was to be restricted to existing brownfield sites, made available through the removal of some of the former university buildings, which are deemed to detract from the setting of the historic buildings.

Dominant buildings contribute to site and setting.

The David Stow Building, Douglas House and Graham House are the dominant buildings in views from the south and east. The relationships between these buildings contribute to both landscape and architectural setting.

Burra Charter Guidelines.

- (b) The Conservation Statement, Chapter 4, Assessment of Significance classifies the cultural significance of Graham House AND Douglas House to have "moderate significance" - "A building or element of local importance (within Glasgow), or an element that contributes to, but is not a key element to the importance of the buildings or site overall, or the element to which it is a part, that may have been altered". Chapter 4 also records that Douglas House was, "designed by Andrew Balfour with some care, particularly in the details of the interiors.... Some good quality plasterwork and joinery survives...."

Any deterioration is as a result of the Applicants failure to carry out the recommendations of their Specialist Consultants Report to protect their assets.

- (c) Chapter 5, Item 5.4 Condition and Repairs confirms that: "The condition of the exterior masonry of the David Stow Building, Graham House, and Douglas House, is largely good. These buildings have been built to a high specification and have been well maintained. There is remarkably little repair needed to the masonry of these buildings, considering their size".
- (d) 5.4 at March 2017 reports that: "The condition of the exterior masonry of the David Stow Building, Graham House and Douglas House is largely good. These buildings have been built to a high specification and have been well maintained. There is remarkably little repair needed to the masonry of these buildings, considering their size. Typical for buildings of 90+ years there is more work required to the slated roofs and lead work. The flat roofs to the front elevations of Graham House and Douglas House are to be stripped and renewed in lead, but these are a small proportion of the total roof area".

PART 3

Douglas House Building, Jordanhill Campus, Structural Condition Report fails to provide evidence that Douglas House is beyond effective repair, conversion and restoration.

Refute applicant's claims.

JCC considers that the Douglas House Building, Jordanhill Campus; Structural Condition Report dated 13 October 2020 by Goodson Associates fails to provide evidence that the building is beyond effective repair, conversion and restoration.

Report qualification does not support demolition.

(a) Section 1 Introduction, "1.3 Scope and Limitations of Assessment: At the time of inspection no detailed inspection of any woodwork or other parts of the structure which are unexposed or inaccessible was carried out and we are therefore unable to report that any such part of the property is free from defect. No investigations or calculative checks have been carried out as to the strength of individual structural members, nor was any site investigation works in respect below ground drainage".

Positive structural statement that gives comfort that Douglas House is suitable for conversion to residential accommodation.

(b) Section 2 Description of Building, "2.2 Construction: Internal Loadbearing walls were found to be typically of brickwork construction with some visible cracking in a wall at the front of the building at ground floor level associated with the main support beam bearing in this area"

(c) Section 3 Visual Inspections / Assessments, "3.1.1. External Facades: The roof appeared to be in reasonable condition as viewed from the ground level".

(d) 3.1.3. Conclusions and Recommendations from July 2016 Inspection: Following this inspection, the following conclusions and recommendations were noted: Douglas House [Building] appears generally to be in reasonable structural condition although the building has been affected by dampness in a number of areas, either through rising dampness or defective rainwater goods. There are a number of detailed investigations which will require to be carried out as follows: A full structural inspection including opening-up of the existing structure in key areas at each floor level to determine the nature and condition of the main structural elements, direction of span of floors and roofs, and verification of existing structure against archive information".

No signs of structural distress in the steel girder.

(e) 3.2 Inspection of February & March 2017, 3.2.1 Charles Darley Associates Intrusive Investigations (February 2017): Despite the above, there did not appear to be any signs of structural distress in the steel girder noted at the time of inspection".

Evidence required of the scope of structural repairs undertaken at Douglas House since 2017.

(f) 3.2.3 Conclusions and Recommendations from 2017 Reports: Following the conclusions of the Charles Darley Associates and Wise Property Group inspections, and review of the findings, the following structural repairs were recommended based on the condition of Douglas House Building at the time of Inspection".

Structural Load Testing found to be within the generally accepted limits for deflection.

(g) 3.4 Stanger Testing Services – Load Testing (January 2020): "The recorded deflections were then assessed against the theoretical deflections, and found to be within the generally accepted limits for deflection".

What cyclic care and fabric protection measures did the Applicant initiate at site possession to mitigate deterioration of the David Stow Building, Douglas House and Graham House?

Section 4 Discussion, 4.1 External Facades; "Whilst the external elevations appear to generally be in reasonable condition at the time of inspections, the following points have been noted which if unattended to could lead to further deterioration of the building".

PART 3 Continued

Possible lack of due diligence by the Applicant to protect the historical asset against deterioration of the structural components.

Annual Inspection Reports NOT provided from the date of site possession.

Both points were mentioned in the original Goodson report of 2017. Any deterioration is as a result of the Applicants failure to carry out the recommendations of the Goodson Report and protect their asset.

The only change is the condition of the roof but this is repairable using second hand slate or new CUPA H3 and/or equivalent which is generally acceptable as a heritage substitute.

The significant structural crack is mentioned in the Goodson Report 2017 and would be repaired by "stitch drilling" a cost effective and common practice.

Corrosion of the girder is noted as surface deterioration in the Goodson report.

Lack of Fire Protection is misleading. All buildings of this age are unlikely to have had fire protection.

Nothing of significance to justify demolition.

Douglas House Building, Jordanhill Campus, Structural Condition Report fails to provide evidence that Douglas House is beyond effective repair, conversion and restoration.

(g) *"It is our opinion that whilst the structure was considered to be stable at the time of the inspections, there is a possibility that the deterioration of the structural components will accelerate if left unattended".*

"We would therefore recommend that the building be re-inspected on a twelve monthly basis if it is to remain unoccupied to access the ongoing condition with finishes removed at key elements such as the interface of walls and floors, and junctions of the primary frame with the external wall to expose the main structural components".

(h) JCC refutes other points being used to justify demolition of Douglas House:

- **External Facades**

- **Internal Fabric**

- **Structural**

PART 4

Application fails to address the points raised by the Planning Case Officer in Appendix 1 of the Design and Access Statement – Pre Application Consultation Feedback – 11.08.2020.

- (a) Design and Access Statement does NOT state WHY the retention of Douglas House is NOT viable. There is no structural condition statement from Goodson Associates, the Wise Group or Thomas and Adamson which states the building cannot be effectively repaired and restored. CALA fail to make clear why the retention of Douglas House is not viable and have not provided information from the surveys to support this change.
- (b) Design and Access Statement does NOT justify its removal in the context of the overall heritage value of the site. Douglas House is noted as a building of moderate relevance and is a building of local importance, within Glasgow, equal in status to Graham House. Photograph below highlights the importance of the three retained buildings to the heritage of the site.

Aerial photograph of Jordanhill, Douglas House newly built c 1931.

Important views from the South are significantly compromised by the proposal.



NO evidence that careful consideration referred to by the Applicant has been provided.

- (c) Design and Access Statement does NOT justify WHY the Applicant has not addressed the loss of the green edge /tree line to the front of Douglas House.

Conclusion

JCC, on behalf of the community and in the public interest, objects to the erection of residential development and associated infrastructure including demolition of non-listed building, formation of car parking and provision of landscaping: revision to application 17/00531/DC.

The application, specialist structural reports and unsupported conclusions fail to justify the demolition of Douglas House.

The Jordanhill Park Phase 2A Design and Access Statement – 20.10.20 (Rev.01) by CALA HOMES is misleading, factually incorrect and exhibits bias towards fulfilling alleged market trends. This commercially driven statement to demolish Douglas House is an act of vandalism designed to suppress a significant material consideration: JOR-DOC-05 David Stow Building Conservation Statement by Simpson and Brown Architects published by an accredited practice specialising in the care and construction of the historic environment.

JOR-DOC-05 is considered to be integral to the development of the Jordanhill Place Plan as registered with the planning authority.

We are extremely disappointed that no statutory notification has been received with regard this application. We would also question the timing of the application and the associated period for making representation.

JCC intend to canvas support from our Elected Members to request from the Convenor of the Planning Applications Committee a site visit and public hearing, virtual or otherwise, to reject the application.

Please acknowledge receipt of the representation and stance: Statutory Consultee OBJECTS to the Application.

Regards,



Ken Robertson.

On behalf of Jordanhill Community Council