OPEN MINUTE OF THE MEETING OF GLASGOW URBAN DESIGN PANEL

DATE:	16th July 2009 at 1000hrs
LOCATION:	Committee Room 3, Glasgow City Chambers
CHAIRMAN:	Alistair MacDonald, Glasgow City Council
MINUTES:	Jude Barber, GIA

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alistair MacDonald	DRS, Glasgow City Council (chair)
Gerry Grams	DRS, Glasgow City Council
Guy Pettigrew	New Glasgow Society
Neil Pirrit	Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland
David Martin	Church Buildings Renewal Trust
Ann Laird	Friends of Glasgow West
James Spence Watson	Landscape Institute
Peter Trowles	GSA/Charles Rennie MacKintosh Society
Gemma Wilde	Scottish Civic Trust
Angela Williams	Architecture & Design Scotland
R. Guthrie	Thomson Society
Steve Tiesdale	Department Urban Studies, University of Glasgow
Murray Russell	Glasgow Institute of Architects
David Hasson	GIA/University of Strathclyde
Karin Currie	Pollokshields Heritage
Ombretta Rice (in part)	University of Strathclyde
Jude Barber	Glasgow Institute of Architects

APOLOGIES:

Ranald McInnis	Historic Scotland
Nick Barley	Lighthouse Centre for Design and Architecture
Niall Murphy	Pollokshields Heritage
Gill Stewart	Glasgow Building Preservation Trust
Tom McNicol	Strathclyde Police
Jim Dick	Glasgow Institute of Architects
Angus Kerr	Glasgow Institute of Architects

IN ATTENDANCE:

Kevin McCormack	Planning Dept, Glasgow City Council
Andy Dale	Planning Dept, Glasgow City Council
David Dunlop	Planning Dept, Glasgow City Council

1. OPENING REMARKS

Alistair MacDonald opened the meeting and thanked everyone for their attendance. Mr McDOnald welcomed two new panel members - Ann Laird from Friends of Glasgow West and R. Guthrie from the Thomson Society.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING & REPORTS

The minutes which had been circulated earlier were accepted and adopted as a true and accurate record other than the following item:

2.0 Apologies: Steve Tiesdale noted that his affiliation was not SOCSI but Department Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.

3. MATTERS ARISING

Format of Reports: James Spence Watson suggested that the meeting minutes should include recommendations. It was agreed that recommendations be contained within individual project reports.

4. PROPOSAL: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
AGENT: ID PARTNERSHIP
SITE: OTAGO LANE

This proposal had previously been presented to the Panel but due to insufficient information/early stage of the development it had been suggested that the team be invited to re-present. The architects described the new residential development to Otago Lane. The site sat between Gibson Street/Otago Street and the River Kelvin, incorporating an existing 4-storey tenement block onto Otago Street. The proposed development consisted of primarily residential flats with a section of retail and workshop space at ground level onto Otago Lane. The architect described the development as consisting of 6 sections:
A- Remodelling and recladding of existing tenement block on Otago Street
B- Commercial unit with 3-storeys overlooking Otago Lane South
C- Curved residential block overlooking River/Otago lane South
D- Large curved block overlooking River/Otago Lane North
E – Smaller 3-storey block overlooking Otago Lane North
F- Public Realm/open space to river incorporating pathway and viewing area
The architect described the building's elevational treatment, highlighting the horizontal emphasis with colours derived from the surrounding red sandstone.

Issues raised: -
Relationship between BlocksC/D and the river: Further consideration to be given to the public/private nature of this space and the reality of planting/access to this strip of land, the impact access might have on wildlife/biodiversity and the extent/aesthetic of any retention required.
General Massing Strategy: Integration of buildings and landscape/public realm to be further resolved.
Relationship between new buildings and ground level: Consideration to be given to how this might become more robust and coherent.
Impact on Conservation Area: Consideration to be given to how the building is viewed from around the site, across the river, West end skyline.
Architectural articulation: Building was considered to be more complex than presented.
A simpler, aesthetics approach should be considered. Simplicity of the massing currently lost in the complexity of the facades.

The Panel agreed that this is a complex challenging site and the public realm/river frontage and elevational treatment must be further considered due to its sensitive location in the West End Conservation Area.

5. PROPOSAL: MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT
AGENT: URBAN INNOVATIONS
SITE: SITE BOUNDED BY LANCEFIELD QUAY/LANCEFIELD STREET/ELLIOT STREET

This proposal relates to a dual application for an Outline mixed-use masterplan and Reserved Matters approval for an on-site hotel. The architects described the existing rectangular block overlooking Lancefield Quay and surrounding warehouse and residential uses. Their masterplan proposal contained the following uses: Two hotels, business units/offices, a multi-storey car park, street level retail units and residential units in two separate locations.
The architect noted their aspiration to improve river amenity, remove barriers and regain a street pattern within the area. The proposal orthogonally subdivided the site into four blocks with routes from Lancefield Quay and surrounding streets. A series of squares were formed within each block with a larger square to the centre of the site. The architect explained that the masterplan had been developed to allow individual plots develop in a series of phases. The proposed first phase consisted of a 250-bed Jury's Hotel on the Eastern corner overlooking Lancefield Quay. The architect chose to develop an industrial theme for this building inspired by the nearby Finnieston Crane. This was expressed by a tower to the South-West corner and grid-elevation of steel and glass.

Issues raised:
Phasing: Consideration should be given to phasing and parking implications (Phase 3 car park)
Context and visual impact: The overall context should be better considered and how greater river amenity might be provided. It was suggested that the Glasgow Urban Model be used to further investigate massing/impact.
Massing: The breakdown in overall massing was welcomed but there was the potential to make greater connections to the North eg. ramped car park entrance to be re-considered as this would form a physical barrier.
Connection to river: It was noted that the connection to the river was compromised at street level by the existing buildings to the Quay. It was suggested that roof-tops might be better exploited.
Building references: The literal reference to the Finnieston crane for the hotel facades was questioned.
Width of Streets: The width of streets were considered narrow relative to building height and more active facades should be created to Cross Street.
The Panel accepted that a phased and incremental approach to development would be likely. It was suggested that a Design Guide be prepared with greater contextual analysis to protect public realm aspirations.

6. FEEDBACK: SHAWLANDS TOWN CENTRE

Southside Area Planner David Dunlop gave a presentation outlining the Town Centre Action Plan for Shawlands. This was being developed to investigate how the area might be improved and taken forward. David Dunlop described a series of images outlining the area's strengths and challenges. It was suggested that there was the opportunity to further address the following issues:
- Shop front improvements
- Tenement window replacement
- Lighting to existing key buildings
- Rationalisation of existing Street furniture
- Traffic Management problems
- Improvements to the existing 1960's arcade and associated street level

A local Steering Group was in place but GCC were looking for further Regeneration and Development input.
David Dunlop highlighted that there was an on-line questionnaire on GCC's website and urged all Panel members for forward comments and pass onto any interested parties.

7. AOCB

7.1 **Glasgow Physical Model:** Alistair McDonald reported that the Glasgow City Council physical model was to be displayed within Kelvingrove Museum in the next few years.

7.2 **Process/Feedback:** Guy Pettigrew asked how influential the Panel's comments were with regards to contentious projects such as Elgin Place or Pitt Street/Bath Street which had been awarded planning permission. Mr McDonald highlighted that the issues raised by the Panel were taken on board and assessed internally. The 6-week interval between GUDP meetings, and time taken to receive reports, meant that it was challenging to provide individual project feedback. It was agreed that brief, regular feedback at GUDP meetings would be beneficial.

7.3 **Planning Applications/Amendments:** Alistair McDonald reported that GCC were working to put all planning applications, and any subsequent amendments, onto an external server for wider public access.

8. DATE & TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting is Thursday 27th August 2009 at 10am within Committee Room 3, Glasgow City Chambers.