The Egyptian Halls Public Safety is Paramount!

Why the Scaffolding has to stay in place until this is delivered!!!

FEB 2002 GCC ***"You may be aware that there was a potentially fatal building collapse in the City Centre in October 2001 "The general condition of the building overall is much deteriorated and an immediate cause of concern.*** ***This situation will only worsen if the full repairs package as per the terms of the extant Listed Building Repairs Notice, are not effected before the onset of the next winter.***

The legally non variable LBRN states ***"stabilise all elements of the supporting (whole) structure".***

March 2025 Defective Notice states ***"stabilise the distorted parapet".***

There's obviously a massive, fundamental disconnect between both of the aforementioned. And therefore the DBN does not reconcile historical structural/stability - causal public safety issues given GCC itself has stated it's façade centric but would see the Scaffolding removed.

Prepared by Union Street Properties Ltd

Updated version of 29th Aug 2025 & 8th Jan 2026 Submission

8th June 2026

The Egyptian Halls Public Safety is Paramount!

Why the Scaffolding has to stay in place until this is delivered!!!!

Public Safety, Structural Risk, and Scaffolding Removal

A critical omission in GCC's position is the absence of any documented risk assessment relating to public safety in the event of scaffolding removal.

Has GCC disregarded or discounted on-record advice from:

- TMP (its appointed Conservation Burden architect)
- WRD (conservation accredited structural engineers)
- GCC's historic commentary (1995–2016), including specifically 2002, 2008, 2009 assessments

Established Structural Position

Major structural survey undertaken 2009

- The building required comprehensive stabilisation / structural repair and replacement
- Scaffolding should remain in place **until a fully funded repair scheme was delivered**
- The Approved scheme 2010-2105 was not implemented due to grant funding failures

Major structural surveys undertaken 2013-2024

- These studies have reinforced scaffolding has to remain in situ and therefore has functioned as a critical public safety measure, mitigating risks associated with structural instability for 17 years.
- GCC's current position appears to underestimate this established history of structural vulnerability and risk management including its own on record commentary.
- To repeat we have on record GCC statements of known structural – stability issues 1995-2016 supported by expert studies http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/Egyptian Halls Structural Survey Glossary Year 2000-2023.pdf

Liability and Risk Transfer

GCC has been formally asked (via USP lawyers) Aug Oct, Dec 2025, and again in February and May 2026) to confirm whether it will accept **100% public liability** in the event that scaffolding is removed prior to:

- Full discharge of the **1991 LBRN,** or implementation of an equivalent stabilisation scheme
- No clear or satisfactory response has been provided as yet

Public Safety Implications

The fundamental issue is straightforward:

- The scaffolding is not merely protecting the façade or parapet
- It's a critical public safety measure,
- mitigating risks associated with structural instability for over a decade
- It is contributing to the overall stability of via protective crash top deck

Without full structural remediation (LBRN or equivalent)

- the removal of the scaffolding raises serious questions
- How can pedestrians safely access and move along Union Street?
- How can partial stabilisation (e.g. façade-only works) address the risk of **progressive structural failure**?
- If scaffolding is removed prior to full structural resolution, there is a credible risk that the building could meet the definition of a **dangerous building** under statutory frameworks.

Handover Risk to USP/USI

There is also a fundamental issue of acceptance and liability:

- How can USP/USI reasonably accept return of the building from GCC
- If scaffolding has been removed
- While their remains at risk of progressive collapse via an unknown trigger event
- While there remains the "potential" for a "fatal building collapse"- GCC Feb 2002
- And with significantly reduced public safety protection given the Protective Crash Top Deck has been removed

This is especially concerning given that GCC has been aware of these risks for approximately **30 years** via its own commentary as well as expert studies/reports, yet its March 2025 Defective Notice does not appear to fully reconcile or address them.

Conclusion

In the absence of:

- A transparent and robust public safety risk assessment
- A fully funded and implemented structural stabilisation scheme
- Clear acceptance of liability by GCC

Any proposal to remove the scaffolding appears **premature and potentially unsafe**, with significant implications for public safety, legal liability, and the structural integrity of the building

The Egyptian Halls Public Safety is Paramount!

Why the Scaffolding has to stay in place until this is delivered!!!!

Context - Firstly we recommend all at GCC and e.g. GCBPT, SCT, GCHT watch the following

- **Gold Standard Conservation Approach** *http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/TMP-ExpertStatementAppendices-GCCMarch2025DefectiveNotice.pdf*

- **Potential for Progressive Building Collapse** *http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/buildingcondition.html*

- **Structural Interconnectivity** *http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/page17.html*

- **LBRN Discharge Visual Aide Memoire** *http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/E-Halls LBRN Repairs Aide Memoire-June2023.pdf*

Context Firstly given I did experience the effectiveness of Building Control and their very steady, pragmatic approach to Public Safety at first hand mid Jan 2025- Storm Eoymn . and of course currently regarding Union Corner where real time complex structural and public safety decisions are being made using effectively their core expertise professionalism, decision making to deliver solutions short and to come medium and long term. Their competency is therefore not doubted what we have here is the impact of knowledge gaps that have built up, compounded and changes in personnel and internal organisational change over 26 years and which has accrued to allow the wider comprehension of the building, it's structure and causal public safety to become misformed.

This document therefore relates to the Egyptian Halls only; It's a unique structure, which has complex structural interconnectivity with a history of identified architectural challenges and also GCC's on record advice 24 years ago(Feb 2002) how to reconcile these via discharging the extant 1991 LBRN. Therefore we believe 100% that GCC 2015-2025 onwards lost "track" of this assessment. As if not it would have been factored by GCC into the ongoing dialogue . Again if GCC had indeed early 2025 as stated Dec 2024 "*will gather our thoughts*" then there would have been a detailed structural/architectural/conservation assessment between GCC/HES/WRD/TMP. **And without doubt GCC does not need a 2nd major project across the road**

And therefore the current DBN is not comprehensive enough to reconcile what HES Feb 2020 defined as "*There are some complex issues around Egyptian Halls. Solving those issues will need some creative solutions. It needs creative approaches to design and engineering, but also creative approaches to funding. It also needs a commitment from all involved to continue to discuss and test a wide range of options.*

Context – Extract from 18th Dec 2025 email to GCC NRS. ***Further to the meeting yesterday can I reinforce that I'm massively much more perplexed (gobsmacked!) at the Defective Notice being implemented without assessing known for 24 -30 years Public Safety issues that GCC had identified as far back as 2002 (attached) than with not "winning" the Development Proposal pitch. And which given the scale of our investment reinforces our commitment to protecting Public Safety. GCC cannot state the same with any conviction given what USP has uncovered compared to what GCC has not disclosed.***

Context GCC 2024-2025 is unaware of its 1991-20016 assessments/ statements reinforcing identified Public Safety issues and what is needed to reconcile these i.e. *stabilise **all** elements of the supporting structure* as per 1991 LBRN, which is in lock step with TMP/Addison Conservation advice **1998-2025**

FEB 2002 GCC advise *"You may be aware that there was a potentially fatal building collapse in the City Centre in October 2001 "The general condition of the building overall is much deteriorated and an immediate cause of concern.* ***This situation will only worsen if the full repairs package as per the terms of the extant Listed Building Repairs Notice, are not effected before the onset of the next winter*** **the legally non variable LBRN states *"stabilise all elements of the supporting* (whole) *structure".***

Yet GCC March 2025 Defective Notice states ***"stabilise the distorted parapet".***
There's obviously a massive, fundamental disconnect between both of the aforementioned

Note GCC warned of a "*potentially fatal building collapse*" Feb 2002 as did TMP 2009 , 2016 and WRD same in 2019 which GCC discounted summarily. And again WRD warned of similar July 2024 but which GCC has overlooked to focus on a frontage centric Defective Building Notice can somehow also see the Scaffolding removed without any consideration of what are Public Safety issues GCC 2025 was apparently unaware of dating back to 1991, 1995, 2000, 2002, 2009, 2016, 2019

The Addison/TMP and WRD surveys reinforce potential/probable/actual Public Safety issues

- The floors are circa 33% of the required commercial strength and cannot be used/walked upon safely.
- The massive dead weight Parapet is balanced atop the structurally weak façade and is not tied to the floors or structure.
- Therefore, Nov 2019 a protective Crash Deck was designed and constructed as a safety feature should the parapet move forward onto the scaffold.
- The Roof requires to be replaced
- The Rear Wall requires to be replaced
- For a visual reinforcement of this, use this link *http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/page17.html*

Requested Public Safety Clarification - Is the Egyptian Halls now a Dangerous Building? Or would be if the Scaffolding was removed before the LBRN or equivalent was discharged?

USP has now asked for GCC's advice since November 2023 on whether the Egyptian Halls are in effect

1. Now a Dangerous Building? (***Click for PDF Link***)

2. Are not, but would be if the Scaffolding was removed before the 1991 LBRN is discharged to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning?
3. Could it become one if the Scaffolding is not upgraded timeously?

To date, no response has been provided

Public Safety Risk Assessment Scenarios GCC should consider ASAP

- What happens if this defined ***unpredictable structure which is prone to a trigger event caused (partial, internal?) progressive collapse*** (WRD Dec 2019 /July 2024) and it knocks out the electricity substation in the basement of No 88 before or during the Commonwealth Games?

- Can the current Defective Building Notice (DBN) somehow afford the Scaffolding removed given the Public Safety issues require to ***stabalise all elements of the supporting* (whole) *structure are NOT just the distorted parapet***

- How can pedestrians walk past, walk up and down Union Street safely when it's known to GCC (up to circa 2016), USP, USI and respective core professional team the full LBRN has to be discharged e.g ***stabilising all elements the supporting structure;*** not just the façade/parapet? Or indeed the current DBN is supplemented with additional support DBN's..

- **How can pedestrians walk up and down and past the Egyptian Halls if there is no Scaffolding in place 100% SAFELY when it's known to GCC the building is a) not Insured b) can't be insured c) is uninsurable until the LBRN or DBN (with additional Notices) is implemented fully and to the satisfaction of GCC, Architects/Structural Engineers.**

- **One asks again where the GCC Risk Assessment is given the advice USP and USI have is this cannot be contemplated until this is actioned or both companies and Directors would be KNOWLINGLY breaching Fiduciary Duty**

- What if GCC steps in and finds the Egyptian Halls is in fact a Dangerous Building or would become one if the Scaffolding was removed. If so then Demolition is likely and that would close Union Street and the surrounding environs (Mitchell Street- NCP) before/during the Commonwealth Games?

- What further massively negative impact would this have for the now underway Union Street Corner Recovery Initiative?

- What impact would this have on a GCC Building Control who've been flat out and more working to stabalise- yes that word stabalise all of Union Corner?

- What is the potential cost of this; community, safety, financial? And who is then liable/held liable?

- Would the Scottish Govt be so ready this time to step in with another £10M+ tranche of "extraordinary funding"?

- Can as per **GCC March 2025 Defective Notice states *"stabilise the distorted parapet"* (be achieved SAFELY by somehow tying this to the structure?).**

- **Is Scaffolding the only cost-effective method to protect public safety until the extant 1991 LBRN is discharged or New Build is approved and implemented? Yes/No**? And before anyone blows steam out of their ears, **keeping the Scaffolding in place has cost USP £700k**. And USP would welcome its removal tomorrow if what was left would not immediately endanger public safety. Ms MacDonald has the financials for this and further assessment to prove this would be most welcome.

- When there must be a way to continue to protect public safety, to slim down the Scaffolding; keep the protective crash deck, afford greater and safe pedestrian flow whilst a full scheme is scoped/funded and then working access/scaffold goes back up for 18-24 months**. This then allows for remedial works to be actioned timeously**

- **Make it a massive PR/Social Media opportunity.**
  https://www.facebook.com/share/v/14KCmWDsySY/?mibextid=wwXlfr

Knowledge Gaps; all key stakeholders have them; just don't know them or when they'll appear

One assumes 100% GCC 's statement Oct 2025 ***Nor do we consider from the information in our possession there are any technical or safety reasons why the works required by the Notice could not be undertaken and that the structure of the building is well enough understood to bring forward proposals .*** Obviously this does not include GCC's own on record assessments including the requirement to discharge LBRN or GCC 1995,2000, 2008 and 2009 structure assessments – see overleaf and ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/Egyptian%20Halls%20Structural%20Survey%20Glossary%20Year%202000-2023.pdf*****. The aforementioned** submitted studies, reports and surveys circa 1100+ pages and details the following painstakingly over a 25 year + period. Further this is also we believe of relevance on Page 2 of the GCC Feb 2002 letter the following were copied in

- **Mr G MacDiarmid, City Solicitor, Conveyancing/, Legal Services, City Chambers**
- **Mr K Crookston, Building Services, 266 George Street**
- **Leigh Johnston, Historic Scotland, Longmore House, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh, EH9 1SH**
- **Ms S Thorne, Case Manager, Grants Division, Historic Scotland, Longmore House, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh, EH9 1SH**
- **Mr R McArthur, Divisional Manager, N.West/C. Centre, Building Control and Public Safety**

So, evidence that not only GCC DRS had briefed USP it had also briefed relevant stakeholder and what I assume to be the 2002 iteration of GCC Building Control. And then of course we were informed of the following by GCC Building Control Oct 2025 ***Nor do we consider from the information in our possession there are any technical or safety reasons why the works required by the Notice could not be undertaken and that the structure of the building is well enough understood to bring forward proposals*** So, a proven and DIRECT KNOWLEDGE GAP between Building Control Feb 2002 and Oct 2025 when GCC refused summarily USP's Defective Notice proposal, which reinforced known Public Safety issues, which GCC's March 2025 Defective Notice did not reference therefore not afford any time to assess?

Evolving Structural Changes from 100% Conservation to Façade Retention; Development Chaos

- **1997: GCC/HS approved the removal of the cast iron frame, would have caused Demolition. minimal structural alteration DEFINTELY NOT achieved".**
- **2000: brilliant TMP/Add Cons 100% Conservation scheme retains cast iron frame; "minimal structural alteration achieved".**
- **2013: Another brilliant TMP/Add Cons scheme, but now the cast iron frame is structurally too weak, so structural cellularisation is developed by passing the cast iron frame. "minimal structural alteration achieved".**
- **2026-2027- TMP to work on the only realistic option: Façade Retention, which then means the unique cast iron frame is lost. And of course "minimal structural alteration NOT achieved".**

Context -GCC is on record decades before as follows which casts doubts; likely very significant doubts on this specific requirement, which is not founded upon any detailed expert study that including specialist testing.

- And of which the 1991 LBRN has a key requirement as follows ***repair or otherwise stabilise all elements of the supporting structure, where necessary, leave in a wind and watertight condition; all works urgently required for the preservation of a listed building and to be carried out to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning"***

- **24 August 1995**: Also the Buildings at Risk Register states as follows The Scotsman reports that consent has been granted for restoration. The building currently suffers from ***weakened concrete floors*** **and rotten windows and** ***the external walls require stabilisation***. Proposed works include stone-cleaning, re-roofing and rot eradication This is 30 years ago not FIVE YEARS AGO!!! Not December 2024 onwards

- Incontrovertible proof GCC had expressed there were identified public safety concerns from let's be clear 24 years ago **FEB 2002 GCC advise** ***"You may be aware that there was a potentially fatal building collapse in the City Centre in October 2001 "The general condition of the building overall is much deteriorated and an immediate cause of concern.***

  This situation will only worsen if the full repairs package as per the terms of the extant Listed Building Repairs Notice, are not effected before the onset of the next winter **the legally non variable LBRN states "*stabilise all elements of the supporting* (whole) *structure*"**

- **GCC March 2008-** *the original investigation found this material to be very weak to the extent that some of the attempted cores could not be obtained because they fell through when they started to core the concrete.* ***The addition of any loading onto the existing foundations would have to be very carefully considered*** *and independent foundations for new elements may be a less risky option*

- **GCC DRS - Dec 09:** ***In terms of the "floors" i.e. the concrete infill, in my opinion, that has never been entirely safe to walk on anyway****. If you recall when they tested the material, some years ago (****circa 2000****), some of it was unable to be cored and fell through onto the floor below. It is clear from the original construction that it was never intended for that purpose anyway;* ***however, its continuing security/stability is indeed an issue.***

- **GCC Feb 2016:** ***https://www.glasgowtimes.co.uk/news/14285327.warning-over-calls-for-egyptian-halls-facade-to-come-down/*** ***The proposed works on the Egyptian Halls will both preserve this building and promote public safety – always our greatest priority*** *- by making the building weather tight and arresting the rate of its deterioration. "These works are considered urgent for the building's preservation, and entirely unrelated to future work on Union Street ".* **GCC later confirmed no Risk Assessment had been carried out.**

- And refer to Feb 2020 **Halls Potential Progressive Collapse Scenario** *http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/StructuralMovie.html*

- Not given enough time for public safety research. No allowance for what has taken now NINE months. Given what GCC stated Feb 2016 what it's stating a decade on fails is nearly identical. Apart from ZERO reference the obviously growing existence of public safety issues caused by identified, known causal structural/stability issues agreed by GCC and TMP/Addison Conservation.

WRD 1&2 Combined DRAFT July 2024 Report GCC "concurs with" as pre-cursor to CPO Review and DBN

Can I update that the "engineer's report" GCC Building Control concur in the Feb 2025 CPO Review is a **DRAFT** report. And was prepared only for the use of one Union Street Properties by Will Rudd Davidson. Therefore whether GCC can look to rely, found upon or concur and use in any way to scope/shape the March 2025 Defective Notice will be assessed forensically. This **DRAFT** owes GCC no Duty of Care It may thereafter be an option for GCC to re-submit this Defective Notice in parallel with potential additional Defective Notices referenced in Mr Barlow's 27th October email to USP and USI.

This **DRAFT** report is to be amended to reinforce the fundamental objective of the discharge of the extant 1991 LBRN, which to repeat requires the stabilisation of all elements of the structure; not just the frontage to reconcile identified Public Safety issues. And reference the requirement to discharge the 2008 GCC created Conservation Burden. All of which is dictated by the actual structural condition; structurally unpredictable, prone to a trigger event that

WRD state that the Deterioration is similar to its 2019 findings/opinions and which reinforce the requirement for an overall project not a partial attempt to somehow only stabalise and also repair the façade

The **DRAFT** report does also state any Temporary Works scheme needs also a permanent scheme also approved or being approved which would have to implemented timeously to enable this **DRAFT** option to be considered seriously. Also required is detailed risk analysis of possible , probable and potential public safety issues (See further on). Plus to be able to be achieved requires the recommended holistic architectural review including physical load tests and updated specialist testing to establish what is possible/feasible?

Key Quotes WRD 1&2 Combined (Draft) July 2024- apparently GCC does NOT reference "concur with"

WRD 1 & 2 Combined (Draft) - July 2024: *Designed by world famous, Alexander 'Greek' Thomson in 1871, one of his most celebrated remaining completed works which has unfortunately deteriorated significantly due to a lack of intervention over the previous 40 years and has now reached the point where appropriate measures need to be taken to save the building from being lost forever through material deterioration that is beyond feasible recovery. Elements of the structural fabric are now considered to be in an unsafe condition and structurally unpredictable which has primarily been caused by the deterioration of the roof and the upper floors from continued water ingress over a prolonged period of time, and the fundamental lack of robustness in the structure with the potential for a trigger event to cause a structural failure which could have serious consequences with the risk to public safety and damage to surrounding buildings.*

WRD 1 & 2 Combined (Draft) - July 2024 scope a re-assessment of work to date including updating specialist testing "*Alongside the works to restore the building's structural integrity, a full holistic architectural feasibility study should be commissioned to develop a concept design for the building conservation project. There are now key decisions that will need to be taken as a result of the structural investigations. Whilst these decisions may be a difficult compromise for some parties, it is no longer possible to leave the building in its current condition" ."Prior to the completion of the required permanent works, the scaffolding would have to remain in place along Union Street to provide a suitable protection platform to prevent any large parapet stones falling and posing a risk to the public. The long-term permanent solution will require appropriate restraint to be introduced at the head of the parapet stones to tie it back to the structural frame"*

9.13 Conditional Appraisal Summary

As outlined in the main body of this report there are several key issues which will need to be addressed with appropriate remedial works implemented to ensure the legacy of the Egyptian Halls. however as noted previously the building needs to be reviewed holistically as a sum of its parts as they are all interconnected and working as part of one complete stability system.

Structural Frame

The floor is no longer suitable to act as a structural diaphragm to transfer lateral loads to the stiff stair core and party walls. There is a lack of appropriate ties between the floors and vertical load bearing elements which presents a potential risk of disproportionate collapse. The cast iron columns and connections do not have sufficient tensile capacity to resist tying forces to suit the modern code of practice robustness requirements

Parapet

Until the required permanent works have been completed, the scaffolding should remain in place along Union Street to provide a suitable protection platform to prevent any large parapet stones falling onto Union Street. The long-term permanent solution is to carefully dismantle the parapet stones locally where they have moved historically so they can be cleared of vegetation, reset with appropriate mortar joints and then restraint introduced at the head to tie the parapet back to the new roof structure.

9.75 Scaffolding/Shroud

Until the permanent works (or specifically designed temporary works to allow removal of the scaffolding) have been implemented the scaffolding, the double layer of external shroud / advertising hoarding should remain in place for the following reasons: It provides access to inspect the façade to fully determine remedial measures to allow the stonework to be conserved appropriately for future development proposals. It provides some level of protection to the stonework against the effects of weathering and pollution helping to reduce the rate of decay. It provides shelter to the parapet against wind loading.
The top protection platform will be enhanced to protect against any larger parapet flag stone falling onto Union Street and risking public safety. The lower deck platforms provide protection against smaller sections of the stonework becoming loose and falling onto Union Street and risking public safety.

12.23 Parapet Tieng

The scaffold also currently provides a temporary crash deck for the potentially spalling/failing stone at parapet level. The parapet wall is currently displaying a lean, and the top course of decorative stone has been removed due to safety concerns. The parapet needs to be tied back to a suitable structure that can be relied upon and can withstand the accidental and temporary load paths it will be subjected to in a temporary loading scenario. Any system employed must not cause any permanent damage to the façade (TMP states the Defective Notice would cause this this- 2912-2025 expert statement*). This was a specific concern expressed by Historic Environment Scotland during recent dialogue* (HES now have TMP's 2912-2025 expert statement for comment). *A short-medium term "cradle" solution is proposed to tie the parapet/cornice back to other elements of structural fabric that are deemed suitable - the stair core/lift overrun and the flank party walls .*

Section 12.0 then draws on the conclusion of each of the preceding sections to provide commentary on the next steps of the building – with both a temporary (short term) solution to remove the Scaffolding on Union Street and a permanent solution designed with addressing the buildings inherent issues in mind. ***It is Will Rudd's opinion that a temporary / short term solution is not appropriate, is it will likely have significant cost to implement without solving any of the inherent condition issues within the building fabric faces and does not remove any barriers to bringing the building back into service***

To repeat this is an only a **DRAFT** option that is proposed and had not been assessed within the parameters of historic stability issues combined with causal public safety .Further GCC failed to *"gather its thoughts"* early Jan 2025 for discussion then these issues would have been assessed and agreed or not by all key experts together; GCC Building Control, WRD, TMP, HES. And of course Public Safety would have been the primary

fundamental factor, which GCC's March 2025 Defective Notice does not reference. Neither does GCCs 27th October rejection of USP's submission reference potential and actual Public Safety issues.

Yet the CPO Review believes "***stabilising the distorted parapet***" will allow the scaffolding to be removed safely despite no reference to the Public Safety issues (identified nearly 24 years ago) that have not been reconciled and have increased significantly. Also given GCC's Defective Notice provided no current Risk Assessment so TMP began to scope this in more detail. Given when USP/TMP references these in its August 2025 submission GCC dismisses summarily. And now we hear GCC are to use "Emergency Powers" to procure contracts and likely cause irreparable damage and not reconcile in the slightest the stated for 24 years identified public safety issues that could cause a "***fatal building collapse***" Note GCC Feb 2002 states this and USP similar Feb 2020- 18 years apart. Takes GCC to Feb 2025 to reference obliquely public safety in the CPO Review (Point 3.4) yet the March Defective Notice fails to reference Public Safety, Risk Assessment, Historic Deterioration? Surely an inconsistency and potentially a fundamental one.

Yet GCC will step in, do these works, attempt to recharge for these works and who knows what will be left given the absence of the conservation accredited expertise required to reconcile the complex engineering and design issues identified by HES Feb 2020 (see overleaf).

USP and USI's lawyers have explained legal letters of August October, December 2025 that the works in the defective building notice cannot be carried out without undertaking full risk assessments and carrying out most if not all of the works specified in the 1995 Listed Buildings Repair Notice (as reissued). This is founded upon a) on record GCC commentary b) GCC's Feb 2002 letter c) it's 2005 and 2009 letters detailing the LBRN specification is legally non variable and again d) reinforced by the aforementioned significant chronology of studies that GCC has been submitted.

Further Section 12 Temporary Works NOTE 6 ***"Any intrusive fixing for temporary tied methods must be acceptable and agreed with HES. No long lasting/further damage to the façade will be acceptable"*** **HES have been approached and updated over to HES to respond as to whether it believes TMP's Gold Standard Conservation Approach detailed since Year 2000 is to be not implemented and would lead to irreparable damage to the Grade A façade**. So it's clear the issues to reconcile are far more complicated than façade issues and asked for parapet stabilisation And in response an expert statement from TMP scheme architect since 1998 and also who are the GCC 2008 specified Conservation Burden architect will be provided for assessment.

Why is GCC for the DBN not founding upon its own specialist Reports; April 2018 and May 2025

USP and USI had believed GCC was to found upon the Narro 2018 Report and then refer to the May 2025 Narro Conditions Report, which of course came after the March 2025 DBN. However it appears GCC are adamant they're "concurring with" a DRAFT report that owes GCC no Duty of Care and therefore how could GCC scope this Defective Notice? Is therefore the only evidence underpinning the March 2025 Defective Notice a 2 hour site tour 3rd Dec 2024 building tour.

May 2025 Condition Survey, prepared for GCC by Narro Associates states ***From our last full structural survey conducted between March and July in 2018, and our further site visits in February 2020, November 2023 and now May 2025, the building does not appear to have deteriorated significantly.***

And compare this with **Addison Conservation Nov 2014**: *"**Standing on the scaffolding with only an hour of background reading and then handing out suggestions is unprofessional and incompetent**. Regarding the overall frame, we might sympathise with a Building Control statement based on the old adage that if it looks stable, it is stable. But this is a dangerous assumption set against a potentially wobbly matrix of 1000001 chemically interacting components, including lime concrete, wood, nails, iron, steel, rivets and iron lathes. **We have used radar, boreholes, probes and stone analysis to help us understand!".***

And which after this (late Dec 2025) GCC stated by email to WRD they were to "*gather their thoughts*" and revert for discussion. See as follows Post 3rd December Site Tour meeting - comms from GCC; WRD email to USP 23rd Dec 2025 "*Raymond Barlow followed up with an email afterwards (attached) mentioning the whaling beam that has been installed on the rear of the building, instructing that a repair should be made*.

You will see from his email that GCC are going to "gather their thoughts" and come back to us, which they haven't yet done as of the writing of this email. Why GCC never did "gather their thoughts" and revert back to WRD? This did not as it happens transpire, which is perplexing as there was then no combined assessment of the aforementioned site tour. So can GCC confirm if it is only relying on this site tour as the basis for the March Defective Notice.

Also we have **3RD JULY 2024 EMAIL,** which was discussed 10th July 2024 at a meeting

From: MandyMacDonald<Mandy.MacDonald@glasgow.gov.uk>**Date:** Wednesday,3July2024at 13:56
To: Gerard Carson<Gerard.Carson@ruddconsult.com< **Raymond Barlow<Raymond.Barlow@glasgow.gov.uk>," Cc:** Alastair Wood<awood@savills.com>, >

Subject: RE: G8540 Re: Egyptian Halls (OFFICIAL) "*Gerard, Thank you for sharing the document which will be useful to inform our discussion next week. At first glance it seems comprehensive, and I am sure once GCC colleagues have had time to review there will be further discussion. I note your request to limit distribution which will only be shared with those directly involved in EH*. Kind regards Mandy - Mandy MacDonald Head of Infrastructure and Development Programme

But given **GCC Building Control stated 27th October 2025** *Having considered your correspondence we would note that no suitable proposals have been submitted to satisfy the steps required to be taken by the Notice.* ***Nor do we consider from the information in our possession there are any technical or safety reasons why the works required by the Notice could not be undertaken and that the structure of the building is well enough understood to bring forward proposals***.

Is GCC therefore stating it's unaware of all these studies, its own on record assessments, the Buildings at Risk Register part or in aggregate? Then again this is a 25 year timespan; many, many GCC Officers have been involved and left over this period; in excess of 100+

Further this report is clearly marked as a **DRAFT** and also noted is **Section 14 Report Limitations Egyptian Halls | Combined Volume 1 + 2 Report | G8540-WRD-*This report has been prepared for the sole benefit of Union Street Properties Ltd. The report shall not be relied upon or transferred to any other party without the written authorisation of Will Rudd Davidson Glasgow Ltd*** also in the 2019 WRD Study GCC refers too.

So which or what report(s) is GCC relying on for their technical/safety assessment? Given it's apparently not also taking cognisance of the earlier stated comments re structural stability and public safety. And to then state USP/USI should ***understand the structure well enough to bring forward proposals*** is perplexing given the "engineers report" GCC concurs with is only for USP Ltd? Therefore USI Ltd is not included in this assessment.

However USP and USI have submitted the August submission mindful of their Directors onerous fiduciary duties to assess and implement expert advice principally by GCC's specified 2008 Conservation Burden architect whom GCC is on record **February 2016**: stated the following in conservation-related correspondence: "The *Council acknowledges that George Morrison and John Addison have considerable experience, expertise and knowledge of this building.* Yet GCC rejected all of this this Oct 2025 without explanation or collaborative discussion. Also TMP have prepared a detailed expert statement, which was submitted Dec 2025 to GCC, HES, Culture Minister, local Heritage Groups and media (*http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/TMP-ExpertStatementAppendices-GCCMarch2025DefectiveNotice.pdf*)

So given GCC historic assessments now provided by USP, GCC should reassess the DBN timeously and update or add additional DBN's. Further the **DRAFT** "engineers report "GCC "concurs" with does not as yet have commentary on Public Safety nor any Risk Assessment .Further although this (**DRAFT**) "engineers report" outlines parameters for Temporary Works, which are predicated on the requirement for a permanent solution to be in place to follow it on; this is not what GCC defines is required to remedy identified public safety issues. And also the July 2023 and 2024 Reports also state ***It is Will Rudd's opinion that a temporary / short term solution is not appropriate, is it will likely have significant cost to implement without solving any of the inherent condition issues within the building fabric faces and does not remove any barriers to bringing the building back into service.***

From the forgoing discussion and evidencing it has been concluded that; in order to conserve the building, some degree of intervention is required. The stability of the structural frame has been compromised as the floor is no longer in a suitable to act as a structural diaphragm to transfer lateral loads to the stiff stair core and party walls. There is a lack of appropriate ties between the floors and vertical load bearing elements which presents a potential risk of disproportionate collapse. The cast iron columns and connections do not have sufficient tensile capacity to resist the resultant tying forces to suit the robustness and disproportionate collapse requirements of the modern codes of practice for buildings.

Prior to the completion of the required permanent works, the scaffolding would have to remain in place along Union Street to provide a suitable protection platform to prevent any large parapet stones falling and posing a risk to the public. The long-term permanent solution will require appropriate restraint to be introduced at the head of the parapet stones to tie it back to the structural frame.

Does the current DBN take cognisance of protecting Public Safety

- GCC site tour and follow up emails early December 2025 GCC were "to gather their thoughts"
- GCC March 25th, 2025 Defective Notice served without GCC providing what its "thoughts were"
- USP and USI's submitted proposal 27th August 2025
- GCC's 27th October 2025 response; e.g. issued without any discussion
- How relevant are GCC's on record assessments e.g. Feb 2002 -Public Safety issues compared to GCC's 2025 as yet non disclosed assessment that led to the March 2025 Defective Notice
- Does GCC have a case to answer 1991-2012 re non implementation of the LBRN before the 1996 CPO. And during the CPO period1996-2010 when it had a legal responsibility for Repairs/Maintenance?
- Does GCC/ Scot Govt have a case to answer re refusing New Build when both had stated the preservation of the building was non-viable when both knew of the increasing public safety issues 2010, 2016, 2019 and Aug 2025 USP submission- Option B.

Context- A Defective Notice is served prior to Conditions Survey; very confusing and perplexing

For the record GCC had stated it would "gather its thoughts" early Jan 2026 for discussion with WRD and TMP after Dec 2024 "tour". It did not and went straight to CPO Review-2nd CPO 28th Jan 2025.GCC then served the DBN March 2025 without disclosing any "thoughts it had gathered" and before its latest May 2025 Conditions Survey; very confusing and perplexing. So if we accept the premise this a world renowned Grade A architectural masterpiece which requires expert analysis, assessment and recommendations, which both GCC and HS/HES have had since TMP/Add Cons performed an intervention circa 1998 to save the structure right up to Dec 2024. And we all know there is in place a since 1991 a legally non variable LBRN. Yet GCC has decided to impose a Defective Notice after spending less than an hour touring the Upper Floors. And prior to an updated Conditions Survey being carried out surely out of kilter. GCC also does not have in-house specialist Conservation accredited structural engineering/ architectural expertise. But are attempting to leverage a DBN to somehow replace/supplant a complex range of interconnected structural/stability repairs that we're not sure can still be accomplished safely.

Deterioration Evidence-Disagreement between GCC Building Control and Narro Associates

GCC has since stated March 2025 the following *At the end of March the Council served a defective buildings notice in terms of the Building (S) Act 2003 on the owners of Egyptian Halls. This sets out work which the Council considers is necessary to rectify defects in the building and bring it into a reasonable state of repair. This would also result in the removal of the scaffolding which has been located in front of the building since 2010. These repairs are necessary to prevent a further deterioration, but they are not the comprehensive and long term solution which is required to secure the future of the building.* So the latter sentence should be taken cognisance of and defined as a requirement given the believed counterproductive component which would see much of this work requiring re-done hence a Contingent Liability should be estimated. Also there has obviously been no risk expert risk assessment by GCC regarding Public Safety.

May 2025 The latest Condition Survey, prepared for GCC by Narro Associates. provides the following commentary: ***From our last full structural survey conducted between March and July in 2018, and our further site visits in February 2020, November 2023 and now May 2025, the building does not appear to have deteriorated significantly.***

Note GCC has provided no Risk assessment of the removal of the Scaffolding. And is ignoring/discounting both on record expert advice from its specified Conservation Burden architect, WRD and also GCC's own commentary specifically Feb 2002 see above. Does this then mean GCC will accept 100% all Public Liability issues if the Scaffolding is removed before the full LBRN discharge or the equivalent? If so this needs to be unequivocally stated.

It's now a moot point, that this Conditions survey was after the 21 day deadline to appeal the March 29th DBN. And further reinforces the current DBN is not comprehensive enough to reconcile what HES Feb 2020 defined as "*There are some complex issues around Egyptian Halls. Solving those issues will need some creative solutions. It needs creative approaches to design and engineering, but also creative approaches to funding. It also needs a commitment from all involved to continue to discuss and test a wide range of options.*

And again assess these links dating back 46 years not since 2024!

Deterioration Timeline 1980-2022
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/Deterioration-Timeline1980-Oct2022.pdf

LBRN Discharge Visual Aide Memoire
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/E-Halls LBRN Repairs Aide Memoire-June2023.pdf

Further the DRAFT engineers report GCC references in the CPO Review also states the following but GCC has ignored this and much, much more; basically cherry picking to suit a narrative.

Exec Summary- Page 3- middle spread- 2nd para

Prior to the completion of the required permanent works, the scaffolding would have to remain in place along Union Street to provide a suitable protection platform to prevent any large parapet stones falling and posing a risk to the public. The long-term permanent solution will require appropriate restraint to be introduced at the head of the parapet stones to tie it back to the structural frame.

9.75 Scaffolding/Shroud

Until the permanent works (or specifically designed temporary works to allow removal of the scaffolding) have been implemented the scaffolding, the double layer of external shroud / advertising hoarding should remain in place for the following reasons*: It provides access to inspect the façade to fully determine remedial measures to allow the stonework to be conserved appropriately for future development proposals. It provides some level of protection to the stonework against the effects of weathering and pollution helping to reduce the rate of decay. It provides shelter to the parapet against wind loading. The top protection platform will be enhanced to protect against any larger parapet flag stone falling onto Union Street and risking public safety. The lower deck platforms provide protection against smaller sections of the stonework becoming loose and falling onto Union Street and risking public safety.*

Section 12.0 It is Will Rudd's opinion that a temporary / short term solution is not appropriate, is it will likely have significant cost to implement without solving any of the inherent condition issues within the building fabric faces and does not remove any barriers to bringing the building back into service
On record Public Safety Commentary Feb 2002-2016 but NOT REFERENCED 2025; As Perplexing as Dangerous!

The Egyptian Halls is Uninsured due to LBRN and won't be until LBRN or equivalent is discharged

USP/USI do not have any insurance in respect of the property, as they cannot obtain any cover 2010 due to the disclosure that the property has to repeat an extant 1991 LBRN in place of which a key requirement is *repair or otherwise stabilise all elements of the supporting structure, where necessary,; all works urgently required for the preservation of a listed building* So the removal of the Scaffolding without this being actioned would be incredibly dangerous and increase significantly known public safety issues, whether this would negligent due to no risk assessment as has been recommended for legal assessment by USP and TMP.

And to repeat again GCC's letter to USP Ltd Feb 2002 makes it abundantly clear its concerns from 24 years ago and how to reconcile them *"You may be aware that there was a potentially fatal building collapse in the City Centre in October 2001* ***"The general condition of the building overall is much deteriorated and an immediate cause of concern. This situation will only worsen if the full repairs package as per the terms of the extant Listed Building Repairs Notice, are not effected before the onset of the next winter.***
And as has been pointed out by the independent Buildings at Risk Register deterioration and decline has been increasing since 1980 - **Buildings at Risk Register:**

https://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/search/keyword/Egyptian%20Halls,%20Glasgow/event_id/892661/building_name/egyptian-halls-84-100-union-street-glasgow

GCC are also on record as follows GCC DRS Dec 2009: *In terms of the "floors" – the concrete infill, in my opinion that has never been entirely safe to walk on. When the material was tested **circa 2000** some of it was unable to be cored and fell through to the floor below. It is clear from the original construction that it was never intended for that purpose,* ***however, its continuing security and stability is indeed an issue***

So we have **30 years, 25 years 15 years ago** GCC assessments that reinforces these key structural issues /public safety issues. That in 2025 GCC have not taking cognisance of this? Given its Defective Notice is frontage centric and makes no reference to stabilising the whole structure and causal Public Safety issues. GCC states should *"understand the building well enough to bring forward proposals",* which is materially flawed due to the long term, ever increasing Public Safety issues that have developed as a consequence of an unchecked process of deterioration that is confirmed as beginning 1980; that's 45 years ago. USP did not get control of the Upper Floors until 15 years ago. What did GCC do in the intervening years?

GCC have realised the March Defective Notice requires additional works and GCC are now stating this was always likely and need to use Emergency Powers. But already in place is the 1991 LBRN legally non variable and proven to be Non-Viable since 1996 (30 years ago).

\So how different from this specification from 1991 will the GCC's developing panoply of works actually be? Yet GCC claim this via Feb 2025 CPO Review *It appears to Glasgow City Council that the above building has defects that require to be rectified in order to bring the building into a reasonable state of repair having regard to its age, type and location, the Council therefore require that the defects specified below are rectified***.**

Feb 2025 CPO Review states "*it appears to GCC that there are defects*". That's why the 1991 LBRN was scoped, served and why GCC has stated **the LBRN had to be discharged** And today some 24 years later GCC appears looks to confect a narrative that "***defects***' have just been discovered and by GCC of course!!!!.

Yet WRD **- Dec 2019: states** *The building is now in an unsafe condition and structurally unpredictable, which has primarily been caused by the deterioration of the roof and upper floors from continued water ingress* ***over a prolonged period and the fundamental lack of robustness in the structure, with the potential for a trigger event to cause a structural failure which could have serious consequences, with the risk to public safety and damage to surrounding buildings****. Key decisions now need to be made. While these decisions may be a difficult compromise for some parties, it is no longer possible to leave the building in its current condition.*

And in response GCC **Feb 2020 discounted this entirely and state:** ***A spokesman said a survey, carried out by the authority around 18 months ago, found "no danger of imminent collapse". The building's structural condition is the responsibility of the owner, and they look forward to viewing proposals for future uses of the property*****.**

Stated then despite GCC being on record, reinforcing Conservation schemes are all non-viable, all grant funding refused by the GCC-HES/Scot Govt triumvirate. And it refused Demolition/New Build 2010-2011, and on record refused to revisit Feb 2016, April 2019 and Aug-Oct 2025.

Given the March 2025 Defective Notice states ***"Stabilise the distorted parapet wall and associated stone cornice*** *below* is **nowhere near comprehensive enough to compared to the Feb 2002 GCC assessment to repeat "stabilise all elements of the supporting structure where necessary" not just the frontage, which is predicated upon discharging the legally non variable 1991 LBRN, which again is an integral component of the 2008 Conservation Burden**. So the Defective Notice requires review by all; GCC/HES/TMP/WRD.

For the record USP and USI cannot accept back from GCC a building with the Scaffolding removed that is also then at even more risk of progressive collapse and to repeat with no scaffolding in place to offer Public Safety protection given the protective crash deck will have been removed) despite known for nearly 24 years by GCC that there are identified public safety risks that their March 2025 Defective Notice will not reconcile.

If GCC disagree provide the evidence! GCC could endanger the future of the Egyptian Halls via this Defective Notice because they'll need to seek to extend the works; no architect/ no structural engineer whilst ignoring the legally binding Conservation Burden. In the GCC-DV Valuation Report these works are costed at £250k. Yet now appear to be massively more than that. Yet Mr Barlow stated 28th Jan meeting he had not been given the Temporary Works budgets/report Sept 2002, which Mr Gibson (former GCC Senior Officer had been submitted)

The **DRAFT** Engineer's report to repeat GCC "*concurs with"* has as yet no cogent Public Safety- Risk Assessment nor has it the amendments from the scheme architect; also GCC's specified Conservation Bond architect, which was in the August 2025 submission and is now detailed in the Expert statement submitted 29th Dec 2025.

An uninsurable building with the Scaffolding removed and still a 35 year old LBRN obligation and prone to progressive collapse is a Definite Public Safety Risk and should be assessed forensically.

Given it's been an uninsurable building since 1996 we believe and given what GCC has stated re "potential fatal building collapse" and what is needed since 2002. USP and USI does require GCC to clarify it will it then take on the responsibility and liability for any public safety incidents and issues post removal of the Scaffolding prior to the full discharge of the extant 1991 LBRN as recommended by GCC Feb 2002.

Without the Scaffolding it's believed this known to be uninsurable building will become an immediate Dangerous Building. The August 2025 submission reinforces that but GCC's October response as we interpret it ignores not only GCC's own commentary but also the chronology of studies and reports, which details the accelerating decline of key elements reinforcing the inherent structural interconnectivity and WHY the 1991 LBRN has to be discharged.

The current Defective Notice if implemented and Scaffolding removed still means the building is uninsurable and uninhabitable. Additionally extra we assume bolt on Defective Notices would do same . GCC is unaware of its 2002 assessment and request to USP is we believe due to "knowledge gaps". And given it's a DRAFT Report which GCC has no locus over its inadmissible to found upon it. Or use the "generalist" comment "concur" with it. This statement lacks specification, clarification and detail.

And can I draw your attention to Aldi V Inverclyde
https://www.scottishconstructionnow.com/articles/aldi-wins-costs-in-dispute-over-dangerous-building-notice and reference that GCC had served the 1991 LBRN and had control over the 1996 CPO up to Jan 2010 and had a responsibility for Repairs and Maintenance, which it details in it's Feb 2002 letter. USP and USI have asked GCC many times to detail specifically what works it carried out via correspondence and FOI requests the latter being refused due to estimated costs? GCC have also attempted to claim in correspondence (2019) because it never took title to the Upper Floors it did not have any Repairs/Maintenance Liability, which the 1996 CPO details GCC has.

And e.g. the Feb 2002 LBRN letter reinforces GCC was discharging that responsibility 1996-2001 but then just stopped completely. And as we know between 1998-2013 the development options declined from 100% Conservation to very expensive process of bypassing the cast iron frame. And now in 2025 it's very likely to be Façade Retention at best. GCC and Scottish Govts since Year 2000 have to be asked to account for this destruction of this Grade A *"architectural masterpiece"*.

Also we have this from July 2023. There was to be a meeting to look to discuss scheme options. GCC then cancelled, and then the Officer left. However the GCC agenda for this cancelled meeting was as follows:

- *GCC would welcome constructive dialogue on the future of the building*
- *GCC may be interested in acquiring the building and allowing all parties to move on*
- *GCC would like to have an in-person meeting to discuss potential routes forward.*
- ***GCC currently of the opinion the scaffolding can be removed without creating a safety issue.***

Note all the aforementioned ignores 1995 B@R, Feb 2002 commentary, Dec 2009 commentary and contradicts expert advice from the GCC-specified Conservation Burden architect years before the Defective Notice was served**.** Given GCC Building Control has stated additional bolt on Defective Notices are to be served these would be appealed whether emergency powers can be appealed is for a much, much higher mind than this writer has. Therefore GCC should scope and serve ASAP for assessment alongside the current Notice as surely its competent to assess the entire scope of works given it's a fair deduction that the TMP/USP submitted proposal 27th August has prompted this further internal GCC assessment, which again

GCC has potentially decided further works are likely to very likely to be required. Again GCC failed to discuss with its 2008 Conservation Burden specified architect. Whose specific obligation is to develop a scheme that would discharge the extant 1991 LBRN. And a fair and reasonable assessment would be the more these Notices combined begin to replicate the legally non variable LBRN all the more reason to objectively assess.

GCC Feb 2025 CPO Review Extract- requires urgent revision

3.4 Building condition

3.4.1. A report by the structural engineers employed by the building owners (July 2024), notes the continuing *decline in the condition of the building. It notes that since the engineers' involvement from 2019, although there have not been any drastic changes, there has been an ongoing incremental decline, and the risk of a significant failure will only increase without appropriate intervention* F

And again GCC does not apparently have on file for active use the actual historic deterioration despite being submitted every report listed here.

http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/Egyptian-HallsStructuralSurveyGlossaryYear2000-2023.pdf

e.g. for reference

- 2009 - A Do or Die Review
- 2010 - TMP/Add Cons report, "Water the Engine of Decay"
- 2011- How This Unique Structure has Worked for 150 Years
- 2014 - Scale and Complexity of the Conservation Works required
- 2015 - Joint Structural Survey GCC-TMP/Add Conservation
- 2015-2016 - Structural - Parapet Review requested by GCC
- 2021 - LBRN Discharge Visual Aide Memoire
- 2022 - Temporary Works Costs/Safety Factors
- 2022 - Deterioration Timeline 1998-2022

With many being integral to the forensic assessment of the to date FOUR approved Planning Applications 1997, 2000, 2005, 2013. And of course would be referred to if USP and USI are involved in a FIFTH Application. So there are immediate concerns, worries and genuine head shaking regarding GCC's "product/project knowledge" not only of the expert reports submitted but GCC's own historic assessments.

It does seem very like GCC is attempting to position that somehow after over 34 years it's GCC that has made the following assessment ***the risk of a significant failure will only increase without appropriate intervention.*** And this is wholly untenable given GCC are stating there is the potential for fatal building collapse 23 years earlier unless the full LBRN is discharged and TMP/Add Cons and latterly WRD have been saying similar since 2008; hence why the Scaffolding is in place. Does GCC really believe it's track record would not be raised for assessments both objectively and forensically especially given this?

One could also conjecture why post Feb 2002 onwards GCC did not exercise the rights to step in and carry out LBRN related works as that would have raised the FACT GCC were breaching the Dec 1999 contract and could not convey the Upper Floors titles as contractually agreed and would have seen GCC face 100% Damages claim from USP.

Regarding GCC's stated belief Oct 2025 ***Nor do we consider from the information in our possession there are any technical or safety reasons why the works required by the Notice could not be undertaken and that the structure of the building is well enough understood to bring forward proposals***

This increasingly requires re-assessment given the historic stability/public safety assessments GCC has both misfiled and is also unaware of? Given the following 2010 GCC statement to then Culture Minister Hyslop to repeat somehow MYSTEROUSLY OVERLOOKED – by GCC 2019-2026 one can only wonder why? And allow GCC the leeway to clarify ***"and the developer has committed very significant expenditure on bringing the building into a single ownership, on preparing a range of technical and conservation studies, and in completing both option and development appraisals for a variety of potential end uses."*** Why is GCC unaware of all this? Could it be a combination of knowledge gaps caused by massive personnel turnover, lack of experience and no clear management and causal organisational structure

3.4.2. A recent inspection of the property by Building Standards in December 2024 concurs with that position. And incredibly this ignores completely that stability/structural issues had been put on record numerous times e.g. 1995, 2000, 2002, 2008, 2009, 2016. And drilling down further to GCC's own Feb 2002 position regarding the extant legally non variable 1991 LBRN has to be discharged to reconcile identified public safety issues e.g. ***by stabilising all elements of the supporting structure, where necessary.***

Yet GCC did not post Dec 2024 to as per follow up email "gather its thoughts" for discussion. And then GCC just scoped a Defective Notice that won't reconcile the identified by GCC, TMP, Addison Conservation and TMP/WRD stability/structural- public safety issues on record and documented since 1995.
Plus assess this "site tour" with the following **Addison Conservation Nov 2014**: ***"Standing on the scaffolding with only an hour of background reading*** *and then handing out suggestions is unprofessional and incompetent. Regarding the overall frame,* ***we might sympathise with a Building Control statement based on the old adage that if it looks stable, it is stable. But this is a dangerous assumption set against a potentially wobbly matrix of 1000001 chemically interacting components, including lime concrete, wood, nails, iron, steel, rivets and iron lathes. We have used radar, boreholes, probes and stone analysis to help us understand!"***

Structural Chronology Confirmation of Submission

GCC Building Control stated 27th October 2025 *Having considered your correspondence we would note that no suitable proposals have been submitted to satisfy the steps required to be taken by the Notice.*
Nor do we consider from the information in our possession there are any technical or safety reasons why the works required by the Notice could not be undertaken and that the structure of the building is well enough understood to bring forward proposals.

Yet GCC and HES have been submitted the following? So on what basis is GCC claiming the aforementioned?

The Egyptian Halls Structural Survey Glossary Year 2000–2026

http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/Egyptian-HallsStructuralSurveyGlossaryYear 2000-2023.pdf

Body of Reports/Surveys/Commentary Chronology 2000-2018 - Addison Conservation/TMP

- Year 2000 - Approved Scheme
- Year 2005 - Year Scheme planning approval extended
- 2009 - Structural Review - End Uses Assessment - requested by GCC
- 2009 - Conservation Plan - requested by GCC
- 2009 - A Do or Die Review
- 2010 - TMP/Add Cons report, “Water the Engine of Decay”
- 2011- How This Unique Structure has Worked for 150 Years
- 2011-2013 - Full Planning and Listed Building Consent Application and Approval
- 2014 - Joint GCC/TMP/Addison Conservation Updated Building Review - requested by GCC
- 2014 - Scale and Complexity of the Conservation Works required
- 2015 - Joint Structural Survey GCC-TMP/Add Conservation
- 2015-2016 - Structural - Parapet Review requested by GCC
- 2016 - Premature Scaffolding Removal Would Cause Public Safety Issues, Feb 2016
- 2016 - Several Structural/Scaffolding/Urgent Repairs assessment reports - requested by GCC
- 2017-2018 - SEVEN Scheme Options requested by, developed, and presented to GCC/HES
- 2018 - Additional structural assessment linked to Scheme Options - requested by GCC

Body of Reports/Surveys/Commentary Chronology 2019-2026 - WRD/TMP/Savills

- 2019 - WRD 1 Covering Letter
- 2019 - WRD 1 Structural Survey
- 2021 - WRD 2 Covering Letter
- 2021 - WRD 2 Structural Survey
- 2021 - LBRN Discharge Visual Aide Memoire
- 2022 - Temporary Works Costs/Safety Factors
- 2022 - Deterioration Timeline
- 2023 - WRD 1&2 Combined Building Survey Reports
- 2024 - WRD 1 & 2 Combined Study (DRAFT)
- 2024 - TMP Conservation/Construction/Cost Commentary
- Aug 2025 - Draft Defective Notice Response
- Dec 2025 - TMP Gold Standard Conservation/Public Safety is Paramount

Forgotten/Overlooked Historic Assessments; Clarification Asked For

1. **Were GCC unaware of past assessments 1995 onwards re; stability/structural-public safety?**
2. Were GCC unaware specifically of the on-record Feb 2002 GCC assessment?
3. Were GCC unaware this 2002 assessment reinforced the 2009 agreement the Scaffolding had to stay in place until the LBRN was discharged?
4. Why did GCC not ask for the input of its specified Conservation Burden architect
5. Were GCC unaware the 1991 LBRN states *stabilise all elements of the supporting structure, where necessary?*
6. Were GCC 2025 unaware the 1991 LBRN is legally non variable? And cannot be implemented in stage or piecemeal; e.g. façade/parapet only
7. What Conservation accredited architectural/ structural experience does the Building Standards Dept/Personnel have?
8. Is GCC demanding USP (and USI) breach the 1991 LBRN, the 2008 Conservation Burden, and ignore GCC's 2002-2009 public safety advice and ignore the expert advice from TMP/Add Cons and also TMP/WRD regarding the building is structurally unsafe, prone to a trigger event, that could cause progressive collapse and create massive public safety issues, which GCC have not factored in?
9. GCC discounts key interconnected structural issues that have been highlighted to GCC since the year 2000 detailed Structural commentary TMP/Addison Cons and from 2019 WRD/TMP

However please do take cognisance of the following, HES Feb 2020 "*There are some complex issues around Egyptian Halls. Solving those issues will need some creative solutions.* ***It needs creative approaches to design and engineering, but also creative approaches to funding. It also needs a commitment from all involved to continue to discuss and test a wide range of options***. which reinforces the complexities and complications presented due to pivotal structural interconnectivity that the GCC March 2025 Defective Notice has not taken cognisance of because it's unaware of this.

How did GCC find evidence of "*immediate Public Safety issues*" Feb 2025? Given the same (99%+) detailed evidence was discounted by GCC Feb 2020? And GCC was unaware of on record assessments?

- Dec 2019 WRD *Elements of the structural fabric are now considered to be in an unsafe condition and structurally unpredictable has primarily been caused by the deterioration of the roof and the upper floors from continued water ingress over a prolonged period of time,* ***and the fundamental lack of robustness in the structure with the potential for a trigger event to cause a structural failure could have serious consequences with the risk to public safety and damage to surrounding buildings***

- Feb 2020 USP submits this to GCC **Egyptian Halls, Potential Progressive Collapse Scenario** ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/StructuralMovie.html***

- Feb 2020 USP reinforced the aforementioned "*Egyptian Halls is under "real threat of structural collapse*", ***which stated the building could potentially collapse*** *due to a number of "trigger events", including the failure of floors slabs, columns and beams*. based on a detailed study underpinned by specialist testing (19 years later) GCC dismiss it out of hand

- Feb 2020 GCC stated via A spokesman said a survey, carried out by the authority around 18 months ago, found ***"no danger of imminent collapse***" So what expert assessment had GCC made or been made aware of that allowed it to 18 years later of unchecked and accelerating deterioration?

- Also for the record Feb 2020 GCC contacted Savills and asked them to persuade USP to take down the Potential Progressive Collapse Scenarios Movie. And now it's all apparently USP and USI's fault? When any objective assessment of on record evidence proves unequivocally the opposite.

- Note GCC warned of a "***potentially fatal building collapse***" Feb 2002; 24 years later GCC is silent on this or was unaware of this? And other significantly relevant assessments.

Compare With

- **July 2024 - WRD 1 & 2 Combined (Draft) - July 2024:** *Designed by Alexander 'Greek' Thomson in 1871, one of his most celebrated remaining completed works which has unfortunately deteriorated significantly due to a lack of intervention over the previous 40 years and has now reached the point where appropriate measures need to be taken to save the building from being lost forever through material deterioration that is beyond feasible recovery.*. ***Elements of the structural fabric are now considered to be in an unsafe condition and structurally unpredictable which has primarily been caused by the deterioration of the roof and the upper floors from continued water ingress over a prolonged period of time, and the fundamental lack of robustness in the structure with the potential for a trigger event to cause a structural failure which could have serious consequences with the risk to public safety and damage to surrounding buildings.***

So Very little difference 2019 to 2024 but not according to GCC

- **GCC now attempts Feb 2025 FIVE YEARS later to somehow ignore 2019 opinion whilst stating** *in the approved CPO Review 5th Feb in order to prevent a significant deterioration occurring, which would result in* ***an immediate public safety issue*** **so somehow action is NOW needed ASAP**

- Note despite GCC stating this was not an immediate issue Feb 2020? But as we've now uncovered this was an urgent issue 23 years earlier , yet GCC have been apparently unaware of this ?

Non Evidence based Scaffolding Removal; Consequences- Immediate Dangerous Building Dilemma?

Everyone wants the Scaffolding down bit somehow GCC believe USP wants to keep it up? Despite proving it's cost USP **£800k** to protect Public Safety, which GCC has ignored/denied but now the Feb 2002 correspondence states Public Safety has been an issue since then. And GCC and the Scottish Govt went to court denying and/or disagreeing with TMP's evidence the Scaffolding was protecting public safety. Again we have to believe GCC 2018-2025 was unaware of this Feb 2002 assessment? If not who knows? Given GCC's track record of non-disclosure dating back to mid 2002 again to repeat who knows?

And the central premise for GCC to comment on is if GCC had disclosed the true legal position mid 2002 onwards a scheme would have been delivered 20+ years ago. And the Scaffolding would have been up and down by 2004-2005 and not still in place circa 20 years later. And it would of course as GCC has been briefed on numerous times it's premature and unsafe removal would create even greater public safety issues 24 years later if the Scaffolding was removed before the full/ extant 1991 LBRN was discharged? Yes/No?

If one accepts the accuracy of GCC's Feb 2002 advice. And the Scaffolding went up 2008 for the first major Structural Survey, which then also revealed massive deterioration, which reinforced GCC's Feb 2002 assessment. And it was then "agreed" between TMP/ Add Cons and GCC DRS it would stay in place until the expected 2010 scheme was eventually approved 2012 but of course GCC then failed to fund its "agreed" gap funding. And we're back to the old story of *there's a hole in your bucket Dear Liza, Dear Liza.*

USP also cannot get a Scaffolding Permit due to Inability to Insure the building due to repeat the presence of the extant 1991 LBRN. GCC have known this for many, many years yet have not or never engaged pragmatically favouring an aggressive, attritional approach, which takes no cognisance of GCC and causal Scottish Government's role in creating this increasingly problematic, complex architectural/structural problem. And given GCC is on record stating Public Safety is paramount then risk assessment needs to be factored in. Refer to Feb 2016 ***https://www.glasgowtimes.co.uk/news/14285327.warning-over-calls-for-egyptian-halls-facade-to-come-down/***

Again as earlier these works won't reconcile the potential for a structurally unpredictable trigger event, which could cause progressive collapse e.g. **Potential Progressive Collapse Scenario** ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/StructuralMovie.html***

GCC however has believed the Scaffolding can be removed without reconciling known public safety issues but again has not provided any proof of risk assessments or agreed to indemnify USP and USI. GCC also states it will be handing back the building to the owners once a) Defective Notice and after the bolt on /additional Defective Notices are implemented.

- August 2018 GCC's Susan Connolly ***DRS does not agree with your view that the scaffold cannot be removed, providing appropriate measures (i.e., maintenance works) are undertaken to ensure the façade is secure. I'm sure the ward councillors are aware of your arguments for the retention of the scaffold from your correspondence.***

- October 2018 GCC's Susan Connolly ***It's not just my unqualified opinion but the opinion of the Service with appropriate repairs to the façade the scaffolding can be removed safely***

- April 2019 Raymond Barlow ***"it's a building, walls-floors-façade, sort the façade and the rest can follow".*** And it would be if it was a traditional/normal tenement but it's not; see the following from the 29th August submission Proven by expert advice -discovered in the archives, which supports the Addison/TMP/WRD body of work and now to a fair degree the May 2025 Narro study also

- July 2023 GCC Carole Connolly- cancelled meeting – agenda point "***GCC are currently of the opinion that the scaffolding can be removed without creating a safety issue. "***

Note this ignores all earlier GCC commentary including that to avoid a potentially fatal building collapse the 1991 LBRN has to be discharged within 10 months, which has at its core the requirement "***repair or otherwise stabilise all elements of the supporting structure***". And the expert advice from the GCC-specified 2008 Conservation Burden architect, which GCC agreed that the Scaffolding had to stay in place post the crucial 2008 Structural Survey, which detailed the extent of and accelerating rate of deterioration.

Apparently GCC 2025 is wholly unaware of this earlier but fundamental work. Which does explain the GCC 27th Oct quote ***Nor do we consider from the information in our possession there are any technical or safety reasons why the works required by the Notice could not be undertaken*** *and that the structure of the building is well enough understood to bring forward proposals.*

Again we don't know who GCC is referring to here a) TMP/WRD or GCC or HES as can't be a combination GCC also did not "gather its thoughts" for assessment. Again a further reinforcement of the knowledge gaps that are still are bedevilling this project. Basically if GCC can't recall what it's had submitted then it does not take that into account. Therefore it forms assessments based on imperfect knowledge. And also does not ask its specified Conservation Burden architect for advice due to not being willing to accept this advice.

- **Nineveh on the Clyde 1999** ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/page12.html***

Gavin Stamp/ Charles Jencks/ David Page (Page & Park) explain, praise and praise some more Thomson's genius. Apparently the building was designed to be upside down as all the weight is on the parapet and not as was the established practice the Ground Floor.
Again reinforces why the structural interconnectivity of TMP's 2012 movie is so accurate ***How This Unique Structure has Worked for 150 Years. "The façade can't stand without the support of the floors, walls and stairs - not today's modern orthodoxy but it works."*** ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/page17.html***

- **Thomson – Glasgow's Master Builder-BBC 2017** ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/page11.html***

And look at 1.15 to 2.27 secs; how can the Scaffolding be removed? It can't be until the full scheme is scoped, funded and delivered (It's a 4-minute extract from BBC2 Scotland's recent excellent programme "Greek Thomson - Glasgow's Master Builder.) which again mirrors the earlier and of course the Feb 2002 GCC assessment. GCC has currently not commented on the following
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/The-EgyptianHallsPublicSafetyClarificationRequest.pdf

GCC remove the Scaffold it will be liable for all Public Safety going forward. USP and USI continue to stress such is the complexity and 45 year project gestation nobody has the full picture. And they include themselves and have maybe 85%+ on a good day but only after detailed research and assessment hence the 21 day deadline for an appeal was impossible to achieve. TMP'S Expert Statement took nine months+ since the March DBN and three months since the August 2025 submission,.
GCC can of course engage contractors to carry out any works that it decides to do but have to be competently scoped and respectful of a Grade A Listing .GCC would be liable for all public safety before ,during and after.

And require to indemnify USP and USI, in respect of claims for injury, death, loss or damage.

And can it be suggested/recommended strongly that early 2026 GCC should meet with TMP/WRD and HES to address all issues especially those of structural interconnectivity, Listed Building Consent, Gold Standard Conservation Best Practice (façade/stonework especially and therefore impact directly on both Public Safety and causal Risk Assessment

Written without prejudice to the statutory rights of both USP and USI Ltd

Yours sincerely

Derek J Souter **Director**
cc James Gillespie- GCC NRS, Raymond Barlow, Ken Donoghue- GCC Building Control, Michael, George Morrison- TMP, MJ O'Shaughnessy- WRD, Michael Wells- Thorntons

- 2022 - Deterioration Timeline
- 2023 - WRD 1&2 Combined Building Survey Reports
- 2024 - WRD 1 & 2 Combined Study (DRAFT)
- 2024 - TMP Conservation/Construction/Cost Commentary
- Aug 2025 - Draft Defective Notice Response
- Dec 2025 - TMP Gold Standard Conservation/Public Safety is Paramount

The Egyptian Halls Public Safety is Paramount – Support Appendices

- 1991 Listed Building Repairs Notice
- Feb 2002 GCC Letter to USP
- March 2025 Defective Notice
- Aug 2025 USP/USI Submission
- Oct 2025- GCC 1 page response