

## Kara Harrison

---

**From:** 249 WGS Consultation <feedback@249westgeorgestreet.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 06 September 2023 22:44  
**To:** 249westgeorgestreet@iceniprojects.com; Rick Simmonds  
**Subject:** 249 West George Street Feedback

Comments: I am very much in favour of retaining and retro-fitting the existing building. Given that the existing building fits in with the existing surroundings much better than the proposed replacement and is in the Glasgow Central Conservation Area I feel that this would be the only responsible action, especially given the amount of embedded carbon during a climate crisis.

Email Address:

## Kara Harrison

---

**From:** 249 WGS Consultation <feedback@249westgeorgestreet.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 September 2023 15:50  
**To:** 249westgeorgestreet@iceniprojects.com; Rick Simmonds  
**Subject:** 249 West George Street Feedback

Comments: Hi, requesting that you provide some information - any information really - to back up your following statement.

'The design team have investigated numerous options to repurpose the existing building. However, with its dated, non-compliant layout and restrictive ceiling heights it has proven to not be suitable for office or any other use. This, along the sandstone facade proving to be beyond economic repair, has lead us to conclude that a full demolition and construction of a new building to current standards is the only viable option for this property.'

What options? Why is it non-compliant? How can you make it compliant? What height are the ceilings? What options are there to addressing this? To what lengths have you reviewed re-using the existing fabric?

How can we have an articulate consultation process if the elephant in the room doesn't even have a seat at the table? Demolition simply cannot be the de-facto decision for a 50 year old city centre building - transparent justification must be provided to claim the existing isn't fit for use. We're living in a climate emergency, we have a responsibility to the city's urban fabric not to repeat the mistakes of the past and to the natural environment not to pump wholly unnecessary levels of carbon into the atmosphere if we can absolutely help it. I'm not saying demolition isn't the answer but we have a responsibility to act impartially in the stewardship of our built environment.

There's also not a single comment throughout your consultation boards that reference any awareness of climate impact, embodied carbon or sustainable strategies for the proposed, I get it's early in the process but these are fundamentals that have to be present if the proposal is to enact any sense of positive change environmentally. If you're demolishing, whats your strategy to offset the carbon and re-use materials? New build steel frame - how are you addressing the huge embodied carbon in the fabrication and transportation of materials? Energy use - are you considering high airtightness / low energy use priciples? I know you won't have the answers at this stage but please identify and address these issues appropriately so the necessary conversations can be had going forward.

Consultation needs to be about awkward questions, please excuse these few from me.

Regards,  
Kieran

Email Address: kieran@kierandickdoyle.com

## Kara Harrison

---

**From:** 249 WGS Consultation <feedback@249westgeorgestreet.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 26 September 2023 14:57  
**To:** 249westgeorgestreet@iceniprojects.com; Rick Simmonds  
**Subject:** 249 West George Street Feedback

Comments: I am an artist and have a studio in the building at 249 West George Street. I also work for MugStock and have an office in the building. I do not support this proposal and I will lay out the reasons why below.

In the proposal it states that the ceilings are restrictive. This is not the case: the ceiling is of a normal height for office use. The building formerly consisted of Creative Scotland Offices and currently is used for office space as well as other uses. The ceiling height is not at all restrictive, and the building seems to be in a good, usable condition. It could use some modernisation, and this would be at a fraction of the cost of knocking the building down and building an entirely new one.

The energy and resources embedded within the building are significant, and could be easily preserved with appropriate and targeted renovation work. This option should be seriously considered. Knocking down an existing building only to replace it with another comes at a huge environmental cost; one which should be a last option in this time of climate crisis.

The proposal to build student accommodation is a luxury, with most students unable to afford the cost of brand new bespoke accommodation. In fact, students being housed in the private sector is something that students have done for years and is generally a much more affordable option for them. It makes good use of buildings, with all rooms in a building usually let out, thereby making good use of existing urban accommodation. There may be a housing shortage, but student accommodation is not the problem and building luxury student flats will not be the solution.

The building is being occupied by well-established charities, community organisations and artists, who make very good use of the space, and would be glad to keep doing so. The building's structure is in no way restrictive for these purposes.

In summary, I oppose the plans to demolish this perfectly usable building and build a new structure with the associated huge environmental costs and displacement of creative communities and charities.

Email Address: [simply.cannon@gmail.com](mailto:simply.cannon@gmail.com)