



Decision by Trevor A Croft, a Reporter appointed by the Scottish Ministers

- Building listing appeal reference: BDA-011-2003
- Site address: Temple Gasholder Station, Strathcona Drive, Glasgow, G12 0FD
- Appeal by Scotland Gas Networks PLC against the list entry made by Historic Environment Scotland
- The list entry: No. 4 Gasholder and No. 5 Gasholder ("Gasholders")
- Date of site visit by Reporter: 16 May 2018

Date of appeal decision: 7 September 2018

Decision

I allow the appeal to the extent that I direct Historic Environment Scotland, under the terms of section 5C (3) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) to exercise its power under section 1 of the Act to amend the list compiled or approved under that section so that the statutory address for the listing reads:

No. 4 Gasholder and No. 5 Gasholder, excluding tanks and shells and any telemetry, pipework or other items that connect to the gasholders above or below ground and excluding all other structures and buildings on the gasworks site, Temple Gasholder Station, Strathcona Drive, Glasgow

Preliminary matter

The appeal forms and submissions for appeals BDA-011-2002 and BDA-011-2003 are identical other than the name of the appellant. The decision notices for the two appeals are therefore also identical other than the appeal reference and the name of the appellant.

Reasoning

1. The determining issue in this appeal is whether the two buildings as listed are of special architectural or historic interest.
2. The Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014 amends the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 to make the listing of buildings a duty of Historic Environment Scotland (HES). Guidance on the listing process is published in HES's Policy Statement of 2016. Paragraph 2.23 includes that listing is intended to maintain the character of Scotland's built heritage and to guard against unnecessary loss or damage. Paragraph 2.30 explains that legislation allows HES to state, amongst other



things, that any object or structure fixed to the building and/or any part or feature of the listed building is not of special architectural or historic interest.

3. The list entry in this case excludes the tank and shells to both gas holders. My determination in this case is therefore limited to the structural framework that supported the tanks and allowed their rise and fall according to the amount of gas stored within them.

4. Annex 2 of the HES 2016 policy statement sets three principles for selection for listing. These are: a. age and rarity; b. architectural or historic interest; and c. close historical associations. In choosing buildings within the broad principles several considerations are set out. Those relevant here are: that particular attention should be paid to the special value within building types, either for architectural or planning reasons, or as illustrating social and economic history; and authenticity, that is a building's closeness to the original fabric and therefore its ability to convey its significance, and levels of integrity. It need not be the case that a building is as originally built, because changes made to it may have added to its significance. What is added or taken away will be considered for the overall benefit or detriment to its character. With these considerations in mind, I address each of the three principles in turn.

Age and rarity

5. The Gasholders at Temple, located at the west of the site, were built in 1893 and 1900 for the Glasgow Corporation. No. 4 Gasholder, immediately south of No. 5 Gasholder, is the earlier of the pair. While documentation for the building of Temple Gasworks is somewhat limited it was built during the period of William Foulis's tenure as chief engineer to the Glasgow Corporation. The guide frame and holder were built by Barrowfield Iron Works Ltd, gas engineers and contractors of Glasgow. These gasholders dating from the late 19th and early 20th centuries form the earliest remaining gas structures at this site and are among a very small number of surviving structures of this type in Scotland.

6. Both gasholders are of similar design and are of a Type 32 frame. The three-tier circular frame of No. 4 Gasholder is 41.5 metres in height and has 26 steel lattice framed standards, braced by three tiers of steel lattice box girders and three tiers of diagonal bracings. Three telescopic steel riveted and welded sheeted shells are set in a sunken brickwork and puddle clay tank (up to 85 metres diameter and 15.5 metres deep). These were easily seen at my site inspection, with the edges of their domed tops lying roughly at ground level. The tanks and shells are not included in the statutory listing.

7. The three-tier circular frame of No. 5 Gasholder is 44.5 metres in height and has 24 steel lattice framed standards, braced by three tiers of steel lattice box girders and three tiers of diagonal bracings. Three telescopic steel riveted and welded sheeted shells are set in a sunken brickwork and puddle clay tank (up to 71 metres in diameter and 15 metres deep). Of the pair, No. 4 Gasholder has approximately a 10% larger capacity at 155, 742 cubic metres.

8. The structures retain their original plan form. The plan form is standard with a circular plan to accommodate a tank.

9. There have been some later repairs and alterations to the gasholders. Repairs took place to No. 4 Gasholder including the access stairways and walkways fitted in 1970. Selected frame girders, guides and tie replacements were carried out in 1970 following fire damage. Further external framing repairs took place in 1973 and some column guide replacements in 1999. Repairs to No. 5 Gasholder include crown and cup replacement and overhauls in 1984 and middle lift grips repaired and two crown rollers overhauled in 2000. These later alterations and repairs are in keeping with the character of the original design and construction of the holders and have been replaced on a like-for-like basis which is consistent with fabric repair to other similar metal-framed listed structures.

10. The appellant refers to the listing criteria that the older a building is and the fewer the surviving examples of its kind the more likely it is to have special interest. It acknowledges that age is a major factor in the evaluation process but that its weight differs across building types. At the time the two gasholders were being built innovative techniques were being developed across the country in many industries and earlier examples are more likely to hold special interest.

11. The appellant adds the listing of structures such as gasholders is a largely comparative exercise and needs to be selective where a number of buildings of a similar type and quality survive.

12. In terms of rarity list category B is identified by HES as buildings of regional or more than local importance or major examples of some particular period, style or building type, which may have been altered. In this case it is acknowledged that many older gasholder structures have been demolished.

13. The appellant refers to four listed gasholders in Scotland, at Granton, Edinburgh, category B; Biggar Gasworks, which is category A for the site, and in HES's care; and Well Street in Paisley, which is category A. Four others mentioned are two each at Temple in Glasgow and Grange Road in Dunfermline, all of which are subject to separate appeals against listing.

14. Overall I am satisfied that the age and particularly rarity of the Temple gasholders has been satisfied to the extent that justifies the listing.

Architectural or historic interest

15. This principle, set out in Annex 2 of the guidance contains five broad headings. The interior is not relevant in this case as that part of the structure is not listed. The others I deal with in turn.

Plan form

16. It is in the nature of their function and operation that all gasholders are circular. There is no special merit in this respect to the Temple gasholders.

Technological excellence or innovation, material or design quality

17. The technology of the holders is representing a form of storage development that spread across the industry. The materials and design quality appear fairly standard for the

period. I note HES's statement that it is significant in the Scottish context that No. 4 Gasholder is among the earliest surviving examples of multi-tiered gasholders in the country. The appellant also states that it ranks fourth in date after the gasholders at Biggar (1858 and 1879, both single tiered, and at Paisley (1890 multi-tiered). Whilst utilitarian the holders represents a design that was once common, but that is to understate their significance to industrial history, in my view, which is made all the more important by their now rarity.

Setting

18. The appellant claims that the significance of the setting relating to the original context of the gasworks, has now gone because of the latter's' demolition. HES argues that although the turn of the 20th century setting has been altered the 21st century setting is still recognisable as a historical industrial site set broadly within a modern urban townscape. I accept that the wider setting has changed, and arguably does not have any particular significance to the gasholders today. Despite this, in terms of the immediate locality the gasholders, in my opinion, are so distinct as dominant features in the landscape they contribute to their own sense of place

Regional variations

19. As examples of gas storage at the turn of the nineteenth century through to the 1920s the two holders are representative of the wider industry. As such their main local distinction comes from their sheer size.

Close historical associations

20. My attention has not been drawn to any persons or events of particular historical significance.

Other matters

21. In addition to the points raised above the appellant considers there are a number of compelling grounds against listing:

- An error in statutory procedure.
- Lack of precision and ambiguity in the designation.
- Listing contrary to the statutory requirements of a regulator.
- Holders fail to meet listing criteria.
- Only the most representative or significant holders should be listed.
- Impact of designation on economic development of the site.
- Impact on operational requirements of statutory undertaker.
- Impact on council's ability to meet planning policy and development plan objectives for the site.
- Unacceptable environmental and societal costs.
- Unreasonable additional costs.
- Implication that structures should be retained in current form, without health and safety implications, and therefore illogical.

22. Matters relating to procedure and the terms of the designation should be taken up directly with HES. I have found out above that the holders do, in my opinion, meet the listing criteria.

23. The other matters raised are not ones that are directly related to the appeal. This is focussed on an assessment of the listing criteria as they apply to the listed subjects, and therefore whether or not the listing is justified. I am not therefore able to take these other matters into account in making my determination.

24. The fact that a building is listed, irrespective of category, does not necessarily mean that it cannot be altered or modified in some way, or indeed demolished. In the event of any of these being proposed listed building consent would have to be obtained. I would expect the matters raised in paragraph 21 above to be considered both in preparing the submission of a consent application and in the consideration of whether or not such consent should be granted.

25. I note also that three submissions were made in response to the appeal. One, from a member of the public supported the listing. Two others, from Member of the Scottish Parliament and a local councillor sought the recall of the appeals so that a decision could be taken by the Scottish Ministers taking into account wider socio-economic issues. None of these raised matters that have not been dealt with above.

26. The appellant has asked, in the event that the gasholders remain listed, that any telemetry, pipework or other items that connect to the gasholders above or below ground be excluded from the listing. It states this exclusion is critical for the continued operational management of the site.

27. The statutory address for the listing excludes the: "tank and shells (of Nos. 4 and 5 gasholders). Whilst this appears to provide a satisfactory definition, I note that HES states it would be willing to discuss it. I therefore sent HES a further information request asking for comments. In response it submitted a revised statutory address incorporating the requested amendment. The appellant had no further comments on this.

28. I therefore accept the appellant's view that the statutory address should be amended to include its requested wording and will direct HES to make such an amendment.

Conclusions

29. I have found that the gasholders, although altered through repairs over the years, still retain their original form. I am in no doubt that they accord with the broad principles in terms of rarity and architectural interest. They illustrate a significant part of the industrial history of Scotland and through that its role in economic and social development.

30. The gasholders remain close to their original form, retaining almost all the original fabric. This conveys the significance of the gasholders in terms of their special architectural and particularly historic interest. This is emphasised by their rarity. In my opinion the gasholders are of special architectural and historic interest.

31. I accept however that the statutory address should be amended as set out at the start of this notice. This does not affect my conclusions in paragraphs 29 and 30 above.

Trevor A Croft

Reporter