

**Report Title:** Lancefield and Anderston Quay, Glasgow  
**Issue Date:** 15 March 2006  
**Client/Developer:** Glasgow City Council Land Services  
**Lead Designer:** Halcrow-Fairhurst JV  
**Local Authority:** Glasgow City Council  
**Location:** Glasgow  
**Planning Ref.:** District Approval  
**Details:** Proposals for for the construction of a new quay wall and flood defence works incorporating landscape and public realm improvements at Lancefield and Anderston Quay, Glasgow



Architecture+DesignScotland  
Ailtearachd is Dealbhadh na h-Alba

## INTRODUCTION

This report relates to designs for the construction of a new quay wall and flood defence works incorporating landscape and public realm improvements at Lancefield and Anderston Quay. Glasgow City Council Land Services have applied to Glasgow City Council Development and Regeneration Services for District Approval, and the application was referred to A+DS by the Planning Authority, and presented to an A+DS Design Review panel on 27 February 2007.

The project was presented by representatives of Glasgow City Council Land Services, and Halcrow-Fairhurst JV.

The meeting was also attended by representatives of Glasgow City Council, Development and Regeneration Services and the City Design Advisor, Glasgow City Council.

## A+DS VIEWS

### 1. Context

1.1 We welcome the incorporation of public realm into the overall design for the flood defence works. However, we are not convinced that the design has been considered relative to the wider context, or in terms of a public realm strategy for the length of the river. A design narrative that explains the project in terms of its wider context and describes the journey along the banks of the waterfront is absent.

1.2 The extent to which continuity and differentiation is to be achieved requires further clarification. The character of distinct areas is not sufficiently clear, particularly when moving from civic, urban spaces to areas that are meant to have a more residential quality.

### 2. Placemaking

2.1 We suggest that a bolder approach is required that considers the design at the scale of the city and the river.

2.2 The possibility of creating linkages to, and locating points of incident along, the river should be further explored. These might include connections with proposed bridges, installation of public art, or pavilion developments. Consideration should also be given to how the various activities and opportunities relate back to the city grid, such as through framed views, and to spaces on the opposite bank of the river.

2.3 It seems regrettable that 'placemaking' appears to be secondary to functional engineering requirements. For instance, the widening of an embankment is seen as the consequence of leaving existing quay walls undisturbed, rather than an opportunity to create distinctive, special spaces.

### **3. Public realm**

3.1 We recommend that the public realm should be conceived across the width of the street and take into consideration the cross section between the built form and the river – demonstrating how buildings activate and respond to the open space network, and how north/south linkages are promoted.

3.2 The success of the public realm will be determined by how safe and desirable it is. We therefore encourage the promotion of river usage and other initiatives to humanise and activate its frontage. Creating a coherent and legible route, populating the spaces, ensuring continuous footfall, and providing natural surveillance through overlooking will all assist in establishing a safe, desirable and pleasant environment. We do not see evidence that these issues are being adequately considered, and are concerned that level changes along the walkway may create safety concerns.

3.3 We recognise that the success of projects along the river frontage will require a critical mass and may result in the ‘clustering’ of activities. We suggest that residential use might be incorporated into riverside pavilions to help activate some areas.

3.4 The riverside has a distinct heritage and this aspect could serve as a stronger reference to inform the design development.

### **CONCLUSION**

Whilst welcoming the Council's intention to integrate a flood defence scheme with major improvements to the public realm, we cannot endorse the proposals as they stand, as we do not think that the public realm issues have been adequately addressed. We are concerned that the level of placemaking does not meet the aspirations of the Scottish Executive as set out in the ‘Designing Places’ policy statement, and fails to meet the Council's own ambitions for a high quality public realm.

As the first of a series of initiatives, this is a vitally important development which will set standards for quality and aspiration in the future. We recognise the importance of engineering in the works; however, as public realm issues are of such importance we consider that the project requires stronger design leadership. We suggest that the design of the public realm should be masterplanned within a city wide context, rather than as isolated sections of river frontage.

We encourage the project team to address our concerns through the internal council process, and would wish to be re-consulted on the project once our concerns have been addressed.

**Report issued:** 15<sup>th</sup> March 2006