

18

Case Studies and Pilots

1 Introduction

This section picks up and illustrates several of the themes covered in the Toolkit by looking at them in more detail. There are many examples of good and instructive projects that might be used but the emphasis here is on those that are current or of relatively recent date. It is hoped that practitioners will build on this small portfolio by detailing and sharing cases that they are or have been involved in.

The final part is not concerned with a specific building or project but suggests the scenario of how effective, and hopefully successful, buildings at risk service might operate within the local authority context.

2 Compulsory acquisition of a listed building at risk. Sunnybrae Lodge (West), Walkerburn, Scottish Borders.

The village of Walkerburn grew up around the textile mills of Tweedvale and (later) Tweedholm of Henry Ballantyne, the founder of the village. He was also responsible for the earliest workers' housing and laying out the village we see today. By his death in 1865, Walkerburn was a flourishing manufacturing village with a population of just under 800 people. The company and the welfare of its staff were passed to his five sons (until 1870 when 3 of them left to run a mill in Innerleithen. David and John Ballantyne remained in charge of the Walkerburn mills and set about improving not only their own housing, but also the amenities of the village). After his father's death, John built a commodious villa to the east called Stoneyhill.

The building in question is one of similar pair of single storey, entrance lodges. By architect Frederick Thomas Pilkington (1863) they are of a distinct and idiosyncratic Gothic revival style with apsed ends and triple gabled entrance porches and the west lodge also has attached L-plan single storey, multi-gabled stable ranges enclosed by gated walls. As we would expect from this, architect the masonry is of polychromatic appearance, here due to squared and textured whinstone rubble with tooled ashlar dressings, and there is much cared detail of interest.

The structures are listed Category A and are recognised also for their group value with other property in the vicinity. The lodges have a high public profile as they mark an entrance onto the main road that passes through the village at a central location.

The Council's Building Standards team have had to address concerns of public safety in relation to this building since 1998 when works were undertaken to remove slates which were falling into the road and a section of the building. There was also local concern over its appearance as it is in a prominent location in the village.

In 2000 the council brought the lodge, which was then still occupied, to the attention of the Buildings at Risk Service. In 2004 the Planning Enforcement team were asked to look at the condition of the property and this resulted in a paper being present to the Planning and Building Standards committee in 2005 seeking approval to survey the building. During the course of that year the Council met with Historic Scotland and other interested parties to discuss how best to save the structure. In early 2006 Gray Marshall Associates, architects, were appointed to undertake a detailed condition survey and the District Valuer was appointed to provide a valuation on the property. An entry warrant had to be obtained to allow the survey and valuation to be carried out.

As a direct result of the survey it was determined that emergency works were required to address further public safety concerns over the roof and loose slates. As the owner was unable to undertake these works the Council step in a stabilised the roof and applied roofing felt over the exposed sarking boards.

By late 2008 the building was vacant and still deteriorating. It was identified as a priority for action and resources through the Scottish Borders Council buildings at risk strategy and further options were considered for securing its future. The building was prioritised on account of its Category A status, its condition and its prominent location on a public road within the centre of a community. In 2007 and 2009 the council engaged the Alba Conservation Trust (now part of Scottish Historic Buildings Trust) to help undertake an options appraisal but this identified no

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

viable end use that would have justified the cost and draw down of external funding for a standard building preservation trust led conservation solution. The development potential is limited, the only option being a single house with associated accommodation on account of the small scale of the building and site and the form and location of the access onto the main road would not allow intensification of use involving increased traffic. Furthermore, residential use prevents the support of the Heritage Lottery Fund and repairs funding from Historic Scotland would be limited.



In June 2011 a Repairs Notice was served under section 43 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 and around the same time the property was marketed by its owner, without success, at offers over £125,000.

By 2012 the roof structure and the earlier stabilisation works had failed and the roof was once again causing concerns to public safety. A Dangerous Buildings Notice was served on the roof structure (12/00103/SEC30) and due to non-compliance with the earlier Repairs Notice, works were undertaken to responsibly remove the roof structure and safeguard the wall heads to ensure their survival until such time as restoration works could be implemented. A compulsory purchase order (The Scottish Borders Council (Sunnybrae Lodge, Walkerburn) Compulsory Purchase Order 2012) was published by the council in January 2013 and passed to the Scottish Government on 29 May 2013 with the request that it be confirmed by Scottish Ministers. At the time of writing, government approval for the compulsory purchase is still awaited.

On account of the continuing deterioration, a report of 4 March 2013 by the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services authorised further works under sections 29/30 of the Building (Scotland) Act 2003 to remove public danger, make good the wallheads and to provide temporary support to the structure. In accordance with the provisions of the act it was also agreed to recover the costs of the works (estimated at around £43,000) plus an administration fee, if possible from the owner.¹

¹ <http://councilpapers.scotborders.gov.uk/viewDoc.asp?c=e%97%9Dc%95m%81%8A> and <http://councilpapers.scotborders.gov.uk/viewDoc.asp?c=e%97%9Dc%95py%90>

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

As part of its strategy for dealing with this case, a series of confidential reports were prepared and submitted to the Capital Management Group and Executive. This resulted in the inclusion of an allocation of £152,000 in the council's Capital Financial Plan for the lodge in 2013/14. In addition, a single tender action approval was sought from procurement to allow the continued expertise of the same conservation architects as this was cost effective given the previous surveys and appraisal work and brought continuity of expertise.

In early 2014 the council sought listed building consent for repairs and conservation work (14/00158/LBC). These proposals would see the stable block and the link element re-roofed and the boundary wall re-built to a lower height and railings added. The proposals for the interior are intentionally designed to be flexible and not to prejudice the options for the use and layout of the space that is of no special architectural or historic interest. The significance of the listed structure is confined to its exterior and therefore there is some capacity for acceptable change without adversely affecting the asset's character. Also the skills required for the subsequent works are more standard than the enveloping works and as these can also be phased, thus making it attractive to restoring developer. The plan is that should the CPO be affirmed, the council will act as a facilitator during a short period of public ownership of the property when it will implement the consents using the budget allocation. The council can also market the property, seeking a purchaser willing to restore the building in accordance with the consent thus enabling the council to recover a proportion of the costs previously expended. This broadly equates to the substantial cost of the demolition that would be required to remove the public danger as estimated by quantity surveyors. The report commissioned from the District Valuer is used in support of this strategy and the scheme has been brought to tender documentation stage at an early opportunity to reduce time scales after acquisition.

The council's commitment and approach has been driven by public interest leading to a positive solution rather than loss of the heritage asset. It gives the building a fighting by flexibly allowing a purchaser to complete the project, perhaps in a phased manner, and to his or her own choice of internal uses. It illustrates how it can take several years to bring a case to satisfactory completion and the necessity of a consistently applied strategy employing both building and planning legislation, expert advisors, budgetary provisions and a realistic expectation of what might be achieved.

For further information see the following links:

- <http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/details/894444>
- <http://canmore.rcahms.gov.uk/en/site/259147/details/walkerburn+galashiels+road+sunnybrae+lodge>

3 Preservation of a substantial but unused listed building. Ruchill Watertower, Glasgow.

In 1892 Glasgow Corporation purchased the lands of Ruchill for the joint purpose of laying out a public park and building a hospital for infectious diseases. The site was selected for its accessibility from numerous districts occupied by an expanding working population. Its position on a hill with the park adjacent to preserve the amenity, was chosen to ensure fresh air and light within a densely built up industrial area. The hospital opened on 13 June 1900 and it set a standard for local authority infectious diseases hospitals built after the 1897 Public Health Act made the provision of such facilities compulsory.

The hill-top site necessitated the building of the water tower. The structure is a tall square tower of brick with stone dressings and battered pedestal. Elaborately decorated upper section, each face identical. It is composed predominantly of brick from a rusticated sandstone base and rising to an octagonal tower with pyramidal roof, drum of columns, cupola with foliage top and a finial.

In early 1998 Greater Glasgow Health Board confirmed that Ruchill Hospital was to close. It was anticipated that the site would be redeveloped for housing with the retention of the most significant buildings including the water tower. By the following year many of the hospital buildings were already in poor condition and suffering from severe vandalism. Roofs had been stripped of their lead allowing water ingress, and interior fittings removed. Greater Glasgow Health Board entered negotiations to transfer the site to the Glasgow Development Agency, which intended to obtain demolition consent and market the land to private developers.

In 2007 the hospital complex was marketed as a residential development opportunity with potential for 300 units. By this time the tower was in poor condition with the top sections partially supported by scaffolding and infestation by pigeons. A house builder was selected as the preferred bidder but they subsequently withdrew during the downturn in the market.

In 2010 an application (10/00602/DC) was submitted by Scottish Enterprise, successor to the Glasgow Development Agency, to demolish many of the hospital buildings but not the water tower. This did not include any proposals for the reuse of the site. The application was refused in 2011 but secured on appeal in 2012. Scottish Enterprise then gained listed building consent (12/01368/DC) for removal of the water tanks, repair work to the tower and the installation of security and lighting and commenced work under the direction of consultant architects.

This is offered as an example of how a substantial building with a strong local presence but no economic use can be preserved. While this case was undoubtedly expensive, and there will be a need for long term monitoring and maintenance, the principle involved does have wider applicability.

For further information see the following links:

- <http://canmore.rcahms.gov.uk/en/site/256006/details/glasgow+520+bilsland+drive+ruchill+hospital+water+tower>
- <http://data.historic-scotland.gov.uk/pls/htmlldb/f?p=2200:15:0:::::BUILDING:33750>
- <https://publicaccess.glasgow.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=M6QQ79EXW4000>

4 A redundant church of national importance. St Margaret's, Braemar, Aberdeenshire.

St Margaret's Church, which is located in the centre of the Aberdeenshire village of Braemar, was built between 1899 and 1907 to provide a place of worship for the large number of tourists from England who came to Royal Deeside during the summer season in Victorian times. The building is amongst the finest churches in Scotland being of outstanding significance for its architecture and as a major work of the architect Sir John Ninian Comper. It is listed Category A and has local importance as the architectural highpoint of the village.

The church was last used for regular worship in 1997 and since 2003 has been included on the Buildings at Risk Register following a decision by the Bishop of Aberdeen & Orkney to close and dispose of the building. The condition of St Margaret's is poor, with active water ingress and rot.

In late 2011, together with the Prince's Regeneration Trust, the Scottish Redundant Churches Trust (SRCT) began working with a group of local residents to develop a scheme that would achieve two clear aims:

- To rescue a key part of the community's heritage currently lying empty and deteriorating at the centre of the village; and
- To create from this derelict building a new focus for arts activity for visitors and residents of the Cairngorms National Park

A further aspiration, and an important motivating factor for local residents, was that the regeneration of St Margaret's should bring economic benefit to the area by encouraging greater numbers of independent travellers to come to Braemar, stay longer, and return for repeat visits.

This local ambition had been absent in 2003-4 when the SRCT undertook a feasibility study following the decision to make the church redundant. At that time there was little evidence of interest in St Margaret's amongst the community as a whole, and there was a widely held view that the church did not 'belong' to the village, having been built for visitors not local residents. Lack of community support was a contributory factor in the feasibility study's implementation strategy stalling and the project becoming dormant.

Efforts by the SRCT to revive the project led to the Prince's Regeneration Trust carrying out a Public Consultation and Planning Day in 2009 which was attended by stakeholders and members of the community. This included the opening of St Margaret's and engagement with children from Braemar Primary School. Significantly, this was the first occasion on which many long-standing residents had seen inside the building.

A further factor influencing a change in the perception of local people towards St Margaret's was the leasing of Braemar Castle to Braemar Community Ltd which brought a major heritage asset into direct community control. Success in managing and operating the castle brought not only confidence but a realisation that a critical mass of complementary visitor attractions was necessary to build Braemar's reputation as a tourist destination. From within the community, the absence of a local arts centre was recognised and the potential to use St Margaret's for such a purpose was identified.

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

Working with local people, and with support from the Prince's Regeneration Trust, the SRCT led a number of fact-finding visits to other A-listed churches adapted or converted for arts and cultural uses and, in 2012, with the arts-use vision refined, an options appraisal was commissioned. The appraisal assessed the viability of adapting St Margaret's for arts-based activity and its findings published in a report in April 2013.



The appraisal demonstrates that there is a future for St Margaret's as an arts hub, performance venue, and as a home for a new Braemar fiddle school. Costed at £1.3 million, the scheme is shown to be both physically and financially viable, and to have the potential for long term growth. The report indicates that the public benefits of carrying out the scheme would be considerable. Not only would the future of a nationally important building be secured, the regeneration of St Margaret's would deliver very considerable economic and community advantages. The proposed scheme has since attracted support from stakeholders, including Historic Scotland, Scottish Enterprise, Cairngorms National Park and Braemar Community Council.

In August 2013 ownership was transferred from the Scottish Episcopal Church and St Margaret's became the seventh church to be taken into the care of the SRCT. The Trust is now developing the project outlined in the options appraisal through the benefit of a grant for this from the Architectural Heritage Fund. On acquisition, it carried out some essential repairs and maintenance, plus work to stabilise and repair some of the most vulnerable and badly damaged stained glass. A Public Entertainment Licence was obtained for the building and the Trust is working in partnership with a local group that is holding a series of events and performances to pilot arts and performance uses. This technique of a gradual, proving use has been used successfully in a number of other buildings at risk projects and was central to the development of the redundant St Andrews in the Square, Glasgow, as a performance venue.

The Trust have been through a very lengthy process of procurement for a design team following publication on the Public Contracts Scotland web site to progress the project to RIBA stage C,

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

and to undertake the design and preparation of information to support the submission of grant applications. This resulted in more than fifty notes of interest including submissions from other European countries. It sought an architect-led, multi-disciplinary design team highly skilled in conservation projects and with specific experience of sympathetic adaptation of category A-listed historic buildings to new uses. A short list of five teams was drawn from the fifteen that submitted Pre-qualifying Questionnaires and following interviews held in Braemar in February 2014, a final choice was made.

A Buildings Repair Grant application was submitted to Historic Scotland in early 2014 with a view to achieving an indicative offer and it is anticipated that a Round 1 application will be made to the Heritage Lottery Fund in June of the same year.

A number of lessons can be learned from this project:

- Community co-operation and support is essential for success but this also requires ‘ownership’ to be established and cultivated, allowing local people to feel a connection to or investment in the building;
- Lack of understanding or appreciation of the importance of a building can hinder the development of ‘ownership’;
- Excluding people from a building also prevents ‘ownership’. Access must be permitted to allow people to see, experience, understand and share the challenge;
- Building partnerships is important as groups and organisations coming together to work towards a shared goal make for greater strength and resilience;
- Marrying community ‘ownership’ and input with the specialist skills of a regional or national organisation can create a powerful mix. This can also bring valuable credibility to a community group;
- Confidence and success in one heritage project enables and encourages greater ambition and develops capacity and skills for another (but in a small community like Braemar there is a finite number of people to draw on, and the danger of one project competing against the other);
- Those promoting schemes for a building at risk often have to go beyond the immediate needs of a community for solutions. The initial 2004 feasibility study was weak because it only considered the needs and uses of local people, not the wider area of Deeside/Donside, the National Park and NE Scotland;
- Thinking should be ambitious and accommodate the ‘Big Idea’;
- Sometimes, as here, a leap of faith might be required to bring about change. In this case the SRCT Trustees took the view that although taking ownership of St Margaret’s was a risk to the organisation, it was necessary to bring denominational ownership to an end in order to allow the community to feel the building is ‘theirs’;
- It is important to keep a building in use as this enables access and also develops connections between people and place;
- ‘Proving’ uses can be invaluable in creating a reputation, track record and market;
- Those promoting re-use of assets should not be afraid of trying a range of ‘meanwhile’ uses, even if they are not directly associated with an intended end use;
- Ideas and uses should be allowed to evolve over time – fixing plans too early and being too rigid can prevent the taking of new opportunities as they arise;
- Project development can take time – sometimes circumstances and people are just not ready and time is needed to bring about a change in one, other, or both;

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

- As ideas develop it is important to maintain the building to limit deterioration over time, preventing it from reaching the point of no return; and
- A building in poor condition and looking uncared for (especially a church) can become a target for anti-social behaviour and it is important to make it obvious that the place is 'alive' and that things are happening.

For further information see the following links:

- <http://www.scottishchurches.org.uk/sites/site/id/4033/name/St+Margaret%27s+Episcopal+Church%2C+Braemar+Crathie+and+Braemar+Grampian>
- <http://www.srct.org.uk/index.php/projects/current-projects/st-margaret-s-church-braemar>
- <http://www.princes-regeneration.org/projects/st-margarets-church-braemar>
- <http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/details/904025>
- <http://canmore.rcahms.gov.uk/en/site/148567/details/braemar+castleton+terrace+st+margaret+s+episcopal+church>

5 Local authority disposal of a heritage asset to a community group at less than market realisation.

Former Hunter House Museum, East Kilbride, South Lanarkshire.

In 2011 the local authority approved a pilot exercise, using five properties with known community interest, to establish criteria and procedures for managing requests for transfer of Council properties to Third Sector organisations. The outcome of the pilot was subsequently reported back and an approach to assessment of future applications developed and approved. A further three properties were identified as potentially suitable for transfer to Third Sector organisations and were taken forward as Phase 2 of the project. This group included the Hunter House Museum, East Kilbride.

This house was the birthplace of William Hunter (1718 - 1783), anatomist and archaeological collector, and his brother John (1728 - 1793), anatomist and pioneer of modern surgery. The building was converted into a museum in 1996, when the original plan was altered to create exhibition space, video-rooms and offices. The house, single storey and attic range, gatepiers and boundary wall are listed Category A.

The museum was closed in 2011 when it was declared surplus to operational requirements. The property was already included in the lease to South Lanarkshire Leisure and Culture Trust which would require to be the subject of a renunciation and, although in reasonable condition, it was in need of some repair and maintenance. There had been community interest in the property since its closure and marketing details were issued to all parties on the council's property mailing list, all parties who had specifically expressed an interest in the property and to Third Sector Organisations operating in South Lanarkshire. An advertisement was also placed in the local press and on the council's web site to give exposure to the availability of the property.

Interested parties were invited to complete and return an application form by 26 September 2011, expressing their interest in the property and providing additional information that they felt would support their application. A formal legal application was not required at that stage.

Shortly after receipt of submissions, the council Public Asset Transfer Group considered the applications received, and assessed them against the previously established criteria. A total of four applications were received for Hunter House Museum. Two were from property developers and two from community based organisations; East Kilbride Development Trust which wished to develop a museum/history centre and Calderwood Baptist Church which required an additional church annexe and counselling centre. The intended uses of both community based applications were found to be in accordance with the title conditions on usage affecting the property.

East Kilbride Development Trust had been operating as a constituted community group for almost two years and enjoyed support from the Development Trust Association Scotland. The Trust's objectives are community based and wide-ranging in the promotion of social cohesion and benefit in the community. It had already successfully managed two grant funded environmental projects but had not yet taken on responsibility for a building. The Trust saw the primary function of the property as a museum/history centre which would be sustained by

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

leasing some of the rooms for business, enterprise and community use. Its vision was that Hunter House would become a multi-use community hub. The Trust's proposal stated that it wished to take a lease in June 2012 for one year with the option of purchase thereafter, thus giving it time to develop its business case and secure funding.

It was agreed that the Trust met the organisational criteria for asset transfer and that the project was acceptable in principle. However, it was not in a position to take on responsibility for the property immediately. The Council had no budget allocation for servicing, securing and maintaining the property and was concerned that the risks associated with leaving the building unoccupied, particularly over the winter period, were excessive. The preference for a lease for a year followed by a conditional purchase did not offer any certainty over the building's future and, whilst funding opportunities had been identified, these had not been secured.

Calderwood Baptist Church had been established for forty years and operated as a registered Scottish Charity. The church has broad and inclusive church and community objectives and runs various projects in collaboration with Long Calderwood Primary School and Calderglen High School as well as providing counselling services for children and families from East Kilbride. The counselling service is carried out in partnership with Kerith Counselling and the Health Visitor group. The church had used accommodation within Hunter House for two years prior to the Museum closure.

The church provided detailed architectural drawings of its proposed refurbishment of the building to include creating counselling rooms, an event room, a café and a large seminar room. It was envisaged that Hunter House would provide a neutral, off-site counselling venue for children and families in a quality environment that would assist the counselling process. The church was already in partnership with the council and NHS Lanarkshire in social care and wellbeing activities.

The church also met the organisational and project criteria for asset transfer and as the current owner of two other buildings was able to evidence sound governance in managing and operating property. It was able to bring in a team of qualified professional and trades personnel who would be able to undertake repair and refurbishment work on the property immediately allowing the immediate extension and improvement of community services for which there was a proven demand.

In applying the assessment criteria developed by the Council and balancing the risks and benefits of each of the proposals, it was recommended that the Council transfer the listed building to the church organisation. Further discussions initiated to develop proposals with the approved organisation and to establish detailed terms and conditions of sale with terms reported to a future Estates Committee for approval. Meanwhile, the Council continued to be responsible for security, maintenance and insurance of the properties pending the development of terms and conditions for asset transfer.

The council recognised that there was a potential loss to the capital receipts programme if the terms and conditions of transfer were on the basis of less than full market value but at that stage it was not committed to any concession in sale price. The precise terms and conditions and the extent of any loss of receipt was left as a matter to be decided later. The interest in the building from property developers was also noted but as it had already been identified as most appropriate for public asset transfer, formal financial offers had not been requested and these interests were not to be pursued. However, the existence of potential bids would be taken into

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

account when considering the terms and conditions of transfer.

At its meeting on 16 November 2011, the council Executive Committee authorised the Executive Director (Housing and Technical Resources) to take forward negotiations in respect of the transfer of the former Hunter House Museum to Calderwood Baptist Church. A valuation report was commissioned from the District Valuer to establish a basis for negotiation over the purchase price. The opinion of value was £190,000 with the caveat that, in the prevailing market conditions and due to the specialist nature of the property, there remained a high level of uncertainty and a degree of flexibility was required in the use and interpretation of this value.



Following further detailed surveys carried out by the proposed purchaser, discussions were entered into regarding the investment needed in the fabric of the building. It was recognised that the costs had been exacerbated by ongoing deterioration of the property due to water penetration throughout the winter months. The Public Asset Transfer Group subsequently recognised that there should be an element of concession to the purchase price to reflect the community benefits gained from the transfer of the property and the proposed project. The council had, at that stage, not adopted a standard approach to such matters but due to the continuing deterioration and potential costs associated with the Council's ongoing ownership of the property along with the desire from the Calderwood Baptist Church to commence work as soon as possible, negotiations were progressed to an 'in principle' agreement in advance of formalisation of policy.

The purchaser proposed a discount of £70,000 to reflect external works to the property and site, dampness and wet rot treatment and an element of community benefit associated with the educational and community nature of the activities proposed for the facility. After discussion and removal of items relating to the church's specific requirements, agreement was reached,

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

subject to Committee approval, to transfer the property for £142,000.

The transfer of a property at less than market value is covered by the *Disposal of Land by Local Authorities (Scotland) Regulations 2010* that came into force on 1 June 2010. This enables local authorities, in appropriate circumstances, to dispose of assets outwith the Housing Revenue Account at less than 'Best Value' without seeking the prior consent of Scottish Ministers. The local authority is obliged to appraise and compare the costs and other disbenefits against the benefits of the proposal and satisfy itself that the transaction contributes to economic development or regeneration, health, social or environmental wellbeing.

While there was a risk that on acquiring at less than best value, the purchaser might sell the property on market terms it was felt in this case that the level of discount proposed, the current property market conditions, the amount of remedial work required and the community benefit associated with a new counselling would mitigate the risk. It was recognised that disposal would reduce the council's liability in terms of maintenance and management and the risks associated with security and the deterioration of the fabric of the building. The alternative of retaining the property for future sale would have meant uncertainty through the time required for marketing and disposal, the need to obtain necessary planning and listed building consents and the ongoing responsibility for the cost of maintenance, repair and security of a vulnerable property.

It was recognised that the transfer of the property to the church would allow the listed building to be sympathetically restored and that the proposed use of the property would generate social and economic benefits for the community. Furthermore the church had acknowledged the historical legacy associated with the property and intention to reflect this in its redevelopment and management of the building.

It was therefore agreed that the council should transfer its whole interest in the property without restriction and on condition with the purchaser becoming responsible for obtaining any consents required for their proposals.²

This case demonstrates how it can be appropriate to consider disposal of publicly owned property at less than market realisation where it can be demonstrated that there is a clear benefit to the community to do so. It also shows that this is best done in the context of criteria based policies which allow for this. In this case the building was closed, advertised and disposed of before it ever became recognised as a building at risk.

Further information can be found at the following links:

- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hunter_House_Museum
 - <http://news.stv.tv/west-central/220812-william-and-john-hunters-house-re-opened-by-calderwood-church>
 - <http://canmore.rcahms.gov.uk/en/site/171595/details/east+kilbride+maxwellton+road+hunter+house>
- <http://www.calderwoodbaptist.co.uk/HunterHouse/CoffeeShop.aspx>

² Minutes of Executive Committee of 16 November 2011 (Paragraph 14). Minutes of Housing and Technical Resources Committee, 20 June 2012.

6 The ‘mothballing’ of an unused listed building. Garvamore Barracks, Highland.

Garvamore Barracks is a Category A Listed building constructed as a tacksman’s house for the Duke of Gordon’s Estate, around 1740. It is sited beside the military road over Corrieyairack Pass formed by General Wade 1732 from a former drovers road. Though known as a barracks it might have served as a “King’s house”, an inn built on King’s highway for all travellers.

It consists of a long, rectangular south facing two-storey range comprising a three-bay dwelling and slightly later stable range with heated loft accommodation and a further single storey, two-bay range at the east gable. It is of vernacular construction in rubble with tooled rubble dressings and harl pointing.

The buildings are owned by the aluminium business Rio Tinto Alcan, and are included in the company’s Lochaber Smelter, Hydro and Estates portfolio. The smelter, which produces 48,000 tonnes of aluminium per annum, is served by a series of dams including Treig, Laggan and Spey which feed water to its power plant at Lochaber. There is also a hydro scheme at Kinlochleven which uses water from the Blackwater Dam. From Kinlochleven in the south and north through the Mamores and Grey Corries to Laggan in the East, the estates cover an area of 116,000 acres and include a number of designated sites and heritage assets.



By the early 1990s the barracks had already been empty for a number of years, the original local roofing slates having been removed and replaced with felt in the late 1960s. A tarpaulin stretched over the roof had been added in a further attempt to keep it wind and watertight.

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

There was some interest from charitable trust seeking to restore the property as holiday accommodation but this came to nothing.

By 1997 several roof timbers in the stable range had collapsed, and several parts of the complex were not secure. From 1999 repairs were undertaken to the roofs, chimneys and rainwater goods under the supervision of conservation architects The Pollock Hammond Partnership. Conservation works were as follows and were external only, with a minimum of making safe and clearing debris inside.

- Consolidation of external walls.
- Introduction of new windows and doors.
- Setting new granite skewers in place.
- Rebuilding chimney heads.
- Constructing new peg jointed roof structure to match evidence of existing structure.
- Re-slating in second hand scots slate.
- Installation of cast iron rainwater goods.
- Traditional lime harling, finished with coloured lime wash.

While the building still awaits a new use and there will be an ongoing need for inspection and maintenance, the works have been crucial in preventing deterioration.

Further details can be found at the following links:

- <http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/details/893018>
- <http://canmore.rcahms.gov.uk/en/site/24317/details/garvamore+garva+barracks>
- http://www.traditionalmasonry.co.uk/ProjectCaseStudies/ProjectCaseStudy.aspx?id=26#../CmsProjectCaseStudyImages/Project_26_GB_01.jpg
- <http://her.highland.gov.uk/SingleResult.aspx?uid=%27MHG4486%27>
<http://data.historic-scotland.gov.uk/pls/htmldb/f?p=2200:15:0::::BUILDING:6899>

7 An exemplary local authority buildings at risk response.

The following does not describe an actual service, nor is it a realistic proposition. However, in drawing together some of the good practice discussed within the Toolkit it should be of use by those responsible for designing, managing and delivering services and in measuring performance and the quality of their work. It draws upon the views and suggestions expressed by a number of practitioners consulted in the development of the Toolkit texts.

Staff resource, training and expertise

- Buildings at risk is clearly identified in the job description of front line staff and their managers and where possible ascribed a degree of priority in future workload.
- There is access to up to date knowledge of the legislative provisions and their practical application.
- Appropriately qualified and experienced staff are appointed and there is regular continuing professional development via up-skilling and training as required.
- In addition to planning/conservation standards; legal and property professionals (and where appropriate and available, building control and quantity surveying staff for building construction; and accountancy staff for budgetary considerations) are also familiar with buildings at risk matters.
- Where appropriate, technical or legal skills are not available in-house then these are sourced externally.

Sharing of information and good practice

- The service shares advice, experience and information with other councils through forums, working groups and on-line communications.
- There is shared access to a national record of cases, actions and to information resources and good practice examples.

Surveys

- The council is familiar with all buildings at risk in its area, having visited each and recorded its condition. The target is a 100% p.a. sample basis but at worst no less than 20% p.a.
- Cyclical re-survey of all properties is included in forward work programmes. The target is annual, but at an interval of no longer than a five-years.
- Surveys are carried out in a structured and consistent manner based on nationally established good practice.
- Protocols and procedures are in place on issues of rights of entry, health and safety and personal security.
- Authority for use of powers is delegated to officers where appropriate.
- Those undertaking surveys are appropriately trained and experienced.
- Surveys generate efficient and succinct written, graphical and photographic records and such material is included in an appropriate and easily accessible and utilised database.
- Information is integrated with other council information systems including those used in development management, the property gazetteer and the council asset management register.
- Survey information is shared regularly with the Buildings at Risk Register for Scotland.
- Buildings are scored according to condition and occupancy using an appropriate national methodology by which a score of degree of risk is derived.

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

Strategy

- Risk scoring is combined with other factors such as location and community impact to identify priority buildings at risk.
- Buildings at risk considerations are included in the Development Plan through policies and supplementary planning guidance to facilitate their prompt resolution.
- Buildings at risk matters are integrated into Single Output Agreements, Joint Working Agreements, Service Plans, Area Strategies and Historic Environment Strategies.
- The council has an internal, cross-service BAR working group to expedite cases.
- Roles and responsibilities across the council for buildings at risk matters are clearly identified and recognised.
- Progress on buildings at risk data is reported to the Council's management team, elected members and to the public on a regular basis.
- Detailed surveys are undertaken for all priority buildings.
- Council responses to buildings at risk are co-ordinated to avoid issuing conflicting advice and requirements from different services. Special provisions are in place for cases where public safety is a consideration and partial demolition to make safe or total demolition might be proposed.
- There is publication and regular updating of an on-line at-risk Register with photographs on the Council's website.
- 'Game plans' are devised and agreed at a strategic level for tackling priority buildings at risk cases.
- Appropriate budgeting is made to respond to priority cases either by a specific allocation or via a call on the Council's overall contingency reserve.
- There are realistic service and council targets for addressing and measuring buildings at risk performance and for managing general expectations built on recognition that resolution can be a slow process.
- An appropriate existing building preservation trust is a partner in developing strategy and priority setting and where one does not exist, consideration is given to the formation of one.

Action

- The council is aware of or endeavours to ascertain at an early stage, the ownership and or occupiers of all buildings at risk.
- There is an established, staged process for identifying and making and maintaining contact with owners and occupiers.
- There is an established process for identifying and making and maintaining contact with neighbours or community groups who might volunteer keep vacant buildings under observation.
- The council is in regular contact with all owners of buildings at risk.
- The council has a positive approach to liaison with owners seeking, in the first instance, solutions based on an understanding of the aspirations of the owners and the significance and conservation needs of the asset.
- There are established processes for priority cases where deterioration quickly escalates, including the use of standard letters and template notices for use in progressing cases quickly.

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

- Communities are kept informed at regular intervals on action relating to buildings at risk in their areas. This is done through meetings, newsletters, the press, the internet and social media.

Asset Management

- The council identifies all of the heritage assets it has responsibility for as part of its asset management strategy.
- Conservation staff are fully aware of the asset management process.
- The council is aware of the condition and conservation needs of all of its heritage assets.
- The conservation needs of the local authority owned heritage assets are prioritised.
- There are planned maintenance regimes for all council owned heritage assets.
- The council prioritises emergency and immediate works to arrest deterioration of assets at risk as soon as these becomes evident and allocates appropriate budgetary resources until the estate as a whole is in, as a minimum, a uniformly stable condition.
- The council uses holding works, mothballing as a means of arresting deterioration where prompt permanent repair is for any reason not possible.
- The council uses and encourages the use of mothballing, temporary uses and property guardians to keep buildings in use and maintain them or disposed of them, particularly in cases where disposal may be protracted.
- The council maintains its vacant listed buildings while a new owner is being sought, particularly where disposal may be protracted or forms part of a much larger site.
- Council investment in maintenance and security is reflected in the disposal price.
- The council promotes good practice in repair and maintenance on its own assets as an exemplar to private and institutional owners.

Disposal of Assets

- The authority has an adopted strategy for making expeditious decisions on disposal of council own property.
- The council disposal strategy includes protocols for disposal of assets to community groups reflecting both the expertise of the group assuming responsibility for the asset and the transfer to them in good condition.
- The council makes available *pro bono* advice to community groups where necessary so that the skills necessary for successful community asset management are understood.
- The authority has an adopted policy for making decisions on disposal of property at less than market consideration for local social, environmental or economic benefits.
- Planning/conservation Briefs are prepared for all buildings identified for disposal.
- The council has specially tailored marketing methods for the disposal of heritage assets.

The Buildings at Risk Toolkit 18

The above guidance was prepared by The Architectural Heritage Fund for Historic Scotland and is published by the Buildings at Risk Register for Scotland as part of the Buildings at Risk Toolkit. <http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/>

The text contains references to legislation and its interpretation that may contain inaccuracies or be out of date. Ensure you take appropriate professional advice before making decisions relating to property. Feedback, relevant case studies and suggested changes are welcomed.

Principal Author: Stuart Eydmann DipTP PhD MRTPI IHBC
This version: April 2014
