GLASGOW URBAN DESIGN PANEL

MINUTES OF REVIEW MEETING HELD IN

CITY CHAMBERS FRIDAY 23 JUNE 2006

Present: Councillor Robert MacBean, Convener of Planning Applications Committee, Glasgow City Council
Geoffrey Jarvis, Glasgow Architecture Committee
Samer Bagaeen, Stratchclyde University
Wolfgang Sonne, Strathclyde
Niall Murray, Pollockshields Heritage Society
Neil Pirrit, Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland
Douglas Pritchard, Glasgow School of Art
Gill Stewart, Glasgow Building Preservation Trust
Ewan Curtis, Merchant City Townscape Initiative
Alistair MacDonald, Development and Regeneration Services, Glasgow City Council
Gerry Grams, Development and Regeneration Services, Glasgow City Council
Murray Russell, Glasgow Institute of Architects
Angela Williams, Architecture Design Scotland
Peter Trowles, Glasgow School of Art and Charles Rennie MacKintosh Society
Karin Currie, Pollokshields Heritage Society
Roger Guthrie, Alexander Thomson Society
David Martin, Church Buildings Renewal Trust
Pauline Megson, Historic Scotland

Apologies Angus Kerr, Building Design Partnership
David Porter, Glasgow School of Art

ITEM		**ACTION**
1	AMD welcomed everyone to the session and briefly explained the agenda. Councillor MacBean was introduced to the members who in turn introduced themselves and the organisation they represented. Councillor MacBean stated that he was pleased to attend the meeting and looked forward to the discussion. He also underlined the importance of the work of the Panel in helping to guide development through the planning process and welcomed continued involvement with the Panel.	
2	Geoffrey Jarvis led the opening discussion on the broad remit of the Panel. He had earlier produced a document trying to encapsulate how the panel should operate, particularly in relation to the New Planning Bill and Architecture and Design Scotland.	

ITEM		ACTION
	Certain members felt that early consultation was helpful. They considered that this approach could help to shape the proposal at an early stage.	
	AMD reminded members that whilst agreeing early involvement was beneficial, this would mean that members would need to be clear about responses to projects not fully worked out. A balance had to be struck between engagement and challenging questions.	
	Gill Stewart considered that sub groups could be setup with specialists perhaps dealing with heritage issues. However, this needs tempering against the number of meetings that the Panel can hold and the best thrust for their involvement. All agreed that strategic plans were seen as important to the Panel's remit.	
	David Porter was unable to attend the Review but did raise queries on the remit of the group and how it interfaced with the City Council. He specifically raised the issue of how the Panel's advice is used and its effect.	
	It was acknowledged that better feedback would assist the Panel members as to the outcomes of particular projects and whether or not views had been acted upon.	GCC to action
3	A range of options were discussed as to what would be appropriate for presenters to the Panel. Several members were not impressed by under scaled drawings which were proving difficult to view on the plasmas. It was agreed that AMD would re-draft the guidance given out in order to deal with points such as context, street level perspectives, full street elevations and a proper contextual analysis.	
	Douglas Pritchard also advised the members of the work he was carrying out relative to a computer urban model for the City Council. The aim would be for architects proposals to be viewed using this tool.	GCC to action
4	Discussion centred on protocols which perhaps the Panel Members should agree upon. In particular, this related to project presentation where a Panel Member may have a direct connection with the scheme.	
	The Members were reminded that the Panel consist of organisations and not individuals. If an individual cannot attend a particular meeting, it should be the responsibility of the nominated organisation to arrange a substitute.	
	David Martin agreed to draft a protocol on behalf of the Panel.	Urban Design Panel

ITEM		ACTION
5	All agreed that the production of agendas and minutes should be arranged timeously. It was also acknowledged that the Panel was a voluntary body, staffed by members with a variety of work pressures. AMD agreed that the agenda should be published at least 2 weeks before the meeting in order to prepare members and indeed allow different bodies to send relevant expertise if required. Whilst not discussed at the Review, GCC decided to aid minute preparation by appointing Danielle Stirling to minute the main presentation session of the Panel. These minutes should be posted by e-mail to all members within 2 weeks of the meeting. This would leave the Panel and Glasgow Institute of Architects to agree on minute taking for the Panel's own meeting after the presentations. It was agreed that this should be issued within 2 weeks of the meeting. Some discussion ensued with regards the contents of the final advisory minute. It was considered that this should be a majority view point. Although each organisation can still make its own view known separately if required. A recent issue on the demolition of a non-listed building and its' replacement had led to some debate among the Panel. Some felt that no comment should be made on the new build proposal feeling that the demolition scheme had not been convincing. However, David Martin pointed out the need for the Panel Members to be all encompassing in their response. To not comment on the new building risked the chance that approval could be given through the process without a full involvement from the Panel.	GCC and Urban Design Panel/ Glasgow Institute of Architects
6	The Panel discussed its' relationship with Architecture + Design Scotland. Angela Williams, Head of Design Review for ADS had over the last few months agreed to take part in the Panel presentation. Angela explained the nature of their business. She mentioned ongoing development work with CABE particularly on an enabling project that embedded good design at an early stage in any project's life. Angela mentioned that ADS were now carrying out 2 reviews each month. The first meeting covered that whole of Scotland with the second one dealing with a specific part of the country or topic area. The national body aims to pursue a Design Advisory role for the entire country which will work on specific themes, for instance school, healthcare, national sports buildings to raise standards.	

ITEM		ACTION
	The subject of double handling between ADS and the Panel was discussed. David Martin considered that there would always be some measure of overlap and this co-existence would still inform the debate.	
	The Panel Members still believed that their role should become more strategic in considering masterplans which can guide and inform smaller scale development.	
	It was suggested that Panel Members may benefit from attending an ADS Design meeting to view proceedings. This would be dependent on the nature of schemes being presented and any confidentiality involved.	ADS
7	Gerry Grams explained the background to this section of the agenda. It was an attempt to ensure that the Panel had the correct balance of expertise at any of the meetings. He volunteered to make contact with Fiona Sinclair with particular regard to a landscape architect taking part in the Panel discussion. All agreed that a Panel Member with this background could make a useful contribution to the meeting.	GCC
	The use of substitutes was also discussed with no adverse reaction received to this suggestion (See Item 4).	
8	All Members felt that to have proper engagement and feel that their role was worthwhile it was important that feedback was introduced to update Members on schemes which they had commented upon.	
	Alistair MacDonald agreed that this was important and had made tentative steps to introduce an update chart to inform the membership of decision undertaken and this could be introduced as a regular agenda item.	
	The possibility of linking the minutes to a website was also discussed which would again raise the profile of the Panel.	GCC
9	Alistair MacDonald thanked the Members for the attendance and their willingness to engage in discussions with the various topics.	

AMacD/EG

20 July 2006