

Elaine Murray
Development and Regeneration Services, Development Control, Glasgow City Council
229 George Street, Glasgow G1 1QU
July 2007

Applications 07/02100/DC, 05/03143 & 06/01972 –Tesco Stores Ltd. Beith Street in Partick

Dear Ms. Murray,

I would like to object to these resubmitted proposals to build a Tesco 24-hour superstore, student accommodation, student union, leisure facilities and parking on Beith Street. This scheme affects the Byres Road/Dumbarton Road corridors which are designated low air quality areas. In addition:

- The proposed development will exacerbate unacceptable environmental conditions and is contrary to City Plan Dev 4 Town Centres; the City Plan (Part 2, page 11) which seeks priority for improving the quality of the environment in town centres and enhancing the vitality and viability of their retailing function and protecting the amenity of their residents
- The scale, type and appropriateness of the development in relation to the nearby town centre are unacceptable. The scheme fails to fulfil Policy DEV1 on Quality and Design.
- This scheme is contrary to City Plan Dev 11 Greenspace; the City Plan (Part 2, page 12); The Kelvin corridor is a designated greenspace and this scheme does nothing to enhance its amenity by virtue of limiting access to the river and building an intrusive building on its banks.
- The scheme does not satisfy appropriate landscaping standards and is therefore contrary to policy ENV 12: Landscape Standards in New Development in that it does not provide a good quality of boundary treatment and security on the banks of the Kelvin. The Kelvin Walkway east of the Tesco site on the other side of the Benalder Street Bridge is 12 metres wide and is tree-lined on the banks of the river; the Tesco proposals envisage a 5 metre wide walkway for the use of both pedestrians and cyclists and is not tree-lined.
- The proposed scheme is of such a low standard of design quality and finish. The scheme's treatment of urban design standards also leave plenty to be desired. The Glasgow City Plan (Part 2, page 5, paragraph 1) indicates that the Council will seek to ensure that "development occurs in the right places and to high standards". Paragraph 2 on the same page indicates that Glasgow "aspires to apply high standards to all forms of development" and that schemes are expected to apply the urban design principles outlined in Policies DES 1, 2 and 3".
- By virtue of the extensive use of glazing in the scheme, the scheme does not satisfy appropriate lighting standards and is therefore contrary to policy DES 7 Lighting; City Plan, Part 2 (page 206) states that "the lighting design should ensure that there is no light spillage or glare which would cause a hazard to road traffic or a nuisance to neighbours".
- The submitted Daylight Impact Assessment states that daylight levels in the residential area neighbouring the scheme will be "perceptibly reduced" and that existing housing on Beith and Benalder Streets will particularly suffer from "shading in the winter towards the latter part of the day.
- The proposed density on site is totally inappropriate and is excessive in both height and footprint. Student accommodation is not recognised within planning policy and does not address the requirement for new housing in Partick, as prescribed within the Key Planning Objectives for the area outlined in the City Plan 2003. There is a shortage of social housing in Partick, itself a highly desirable area within the city, and this site should be used to address this.
- The site used to be Partick Central Railway Station making the scheme is contrary to the City Plan: Transport and Parking (4. Former Railway Formations, Part 2, page 174) where there is a presumption in favour of the retention of former railway formations with the potential for transport use, including former track bed, embankments, retaining walls, tunnels and bridges (see map of Transport Route Reservation in the City Plan, Part 2, page 174)
- There are material considerations from the Scottish Executive's SPP8 on Retail and Town Centres which recommends that "designs which fail to integrate the development with its surroundings because of its scale, materials and appearance should be refused planning permission" (page 7; paragraph 27).

I hope that both yourself and the Planning Committee, when they consider this scheme, will take into account this objection and reject the application in its current form.

Yours sincerely,