

**Glasgow City Council****Contracts and Property Committee****Report by George Gillespie, Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability****Contact: Mandy MacDonald      Ext: 78503****APPROVAL OF A PREFERRED DEVELOPER IN CONNECTION WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT OF EGYPTIAN HALLS, 84 – 100 UNION STREET, GLASGOW AND CONTINUATION OF CPO POWERS.****Purpose of Report:**

To seek approval of a (1) preferred developer; enter into negotiation of terms for a back-to-back CPO agreement and to continue the investigation of the use of CPO powers in relation to Egyptian Halls, 84 – 100 Union Street, Glasgow.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that Members:

- (i) Consider the contents of the report.
- (ii) Note the outcome of the marketing process and evaluation of submissions.
- (iii) Approve the selection of Ediston as preferred developer; and
- (iv) Authorise officers to enter into negotiations with the preferred developer to agree terms for a back-to-back CPO agreement and to continue investigating the use of CPO powers.

Ward No(s): 10 Anderston/City/Yorkhill    Citywide:

Local member(s) advised: Yes  No     consulted: Yes  No

**PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:**

Any Ordnance Survey mapping included within this Report is provided by Glasgow City Council under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to make available Council-held public domain information. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey Copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. The OS web site can be found at <http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk> "

If accessing this Report via the Internet, please note that any mapping is for illustrative purposes only and is not true to any marked scale

## 1 Introduction

This report seeks the approval of a preferred developer for the repair, repurposing and future active re-use of Egyptian Halls, 84-100 Union Street, Glasgow. This process forms part of the investigation into the use of CPO powers in respect of the property. As the recommended preferred bidder does not own the property, these investigations will now progress to the next stage.

## 2 Background

- 2.1 On 6th February 2025, a detailed report was brought to this committee, which approved the investigation of the use of CPO powers in respect of the property at 84-100 Union Street (Egyptian Halls). This included approval to seek proposals for the repair, repurposing and future active re-use of the property, and the development of an open, fair and transparent process, aligned with statutory tests, with which to assess proposals.
- 2.2 Following approval of that report, the Council began a marketing process via Ryden which invited proposals from the open market for the repair, repurposing and re-use of the property.

## 3 Site Survey and District Valuer

- 3.1 As part of the process, an updated structural fabric condition survey was undertaken, and an associated digital survey laser scanning of the property was carried out with reports being provided to the Council in May and June 2025. The full survey information was made available to all interested parties. The survey also enabled the Council to note defects in the property.
- 3.2 An updated valuation was also carried out by the District Valuer; this was also made available to all interested parties.

## 4 Marketing of the Opportunity

- 4.1 Following a procurement process, the Council selected Ryden to act as agent to facilitate the marketing of the opportunity on the open market; the marketing commenced on 24.7.25 with a closing date set for 17.10.25.
- 4.2 Over the marketing period, Ryden received over 20 notes of interest asking for access to the data room where relevant information, including a development brief, was made available.
- 4.3 Additionally, interested parties were provided with the Evaluation Framework to be used by the Council to assess and select a preferred proposal and developer.
- 4.4 The Evaluation Framework consisted of five categories, with each category carrying an agreed weighting. The five categories were as follows:

Part	Content requirement	Weighting	Scoring approach
Strategic case	Clear proposal for adaptive re-use of the building that addresses the objectives of	50%	Case assessed against 5 sub-criteria each

	Glasgow City Centre regeneration.		scored out of 10 producing a total score out of 50.
Commercial case	Clear commercial case for the proposal including a Development Appraisal and viability assessment.	20%	Case assessed against 5 sub-criteria each scored out of 4 producing a total score out of 20.
Economic case	Clear plan for ensuring the economic viability and impact of the proposal.	10%	Case assessed against 4 sub-criteria each scored out of 2.5 producing a total score out of 10.
Financial case	Clear financial case for the viability of the proposal.	10%	Case assessed against 7 sub-criteria each scored out of 1.4 producing a total score out of 10.
Management case	Clear project management plan for the delivery of the project.	10%	Case assessed against 8 sub-criteria each scored out of 1.25 producing a total score out of 10.

- 4.5 Each submission would therefore achieve a total score out of 100 by aggregating the combined score achieved for each category.
- 4.6 During the process, the closing date was pushed back by ten days to 27.10.25 to allow all parties more time to submit their proposals.

## 5 Evaluating submitted proposals.

- 5.1 At the closing date submissions were received from

LPT/Lola Ltd  
 USP/USI (the current owners) and  
 Ediston.

- 5.2 Each submission was assessed against the Evaluation Framework.
- 5.3 The evaluations were carried out by officers from NRS teams including Planning and Heritage, Economic Development and Property Asset Management.
- 5.4 Following the independent evaluations, each party's aggregated score was calculated by adding the score received by the party for each category. This resulted in one party having scored substantially higher than the other two.

## 6 Scoring and Recommendations

6.1 The combined average scores for each submission were as follows:

LPT/Lola Ltd: 1.9 / 100  
USP/USI: 39.3 / 100  
Ediston: 77.5 / 100

6.2 Officers used the Evaluation Framework to assess and score submissions against the weightings of each category. They carried out their assessment and scoring independently. At the end of the comparison exercise, the average score was taken forward.

6.3 The submission from Ediston proposes the redevelopment of the building for mixed uses including leisure and hotel use. The proposal retains the listed building and would include minimal alteration to the structure. The submission also has a clear project management and team structure and includes a defined timeline for development, which includes various assumptions.

6.4 Additionally, the proposal contains an in-principle commitment from proposed new occupiers for both the leisure aspect at ground and first floor, and an international hotel operator on the upper floors.

6.5 Ediston's submission states that their proposed redevelopment would be funded by a mixture of commercial and public funding. They have identified commercial funding which will cover a substantial portion of the development costs. Ediston's team includes members with substantial experience in fundraising for historic assets. Their proposal includes a description of the anticipated sources of public grant funding. It should be noted that this funding has not been applied for or approved at this stage. Further work will also be required to identify additional sources of funding (which are likely to be public) and to assess prospects of securing both these and the other funding. The table below provides a breakdown of indicative funding sources.

Proposed Funding Streams	Percentage of Development Costs Covered
Ediston Commercial Funding	60%
Public Grant Funding	30%
Additional Funding (still to be sourced)	10%

6.6 The submission from LPT/Lola Ltd consisted of a cash sum offer but did not provide any detailed proposals or viability assessment.

6.7 The submission from USP/USI was assessed against the Council's advertised evaluation framework however it achieved a lower score because the content did not adequately address the requirements set out against each of the categories listed. In particular it did not contain a clear deliverable proposal or viability assessment.

- 6.8 It is therefore the conclusion of the evaluation team that Ediston's submission represents the strongest proposal to achieve the proper planning of the area, contribute to the regeneration of the surrounding area and secure the future of this A-listed building.
- 6.9 Ediston do not own the property, and if a voluntary purchase cannot be agreed with the current owner's compulsory acquisition may still be required.
- 6.10 Before making a CPO, the Council needs to satisfy itself on a range of factors, these include being satisfied that the proposed scheme can be delivered within a reasonable timescale. This will involve an assessment of the likelihood of planning permission and listed building consent being granted and the likelihood of funding being available to cover both the costs of the CPO (including compensation costs) and the development costs.
- 6.11 As mentioned at 6.5 above, Ediston's submission identifies that public grant funding is required, with the potential source of a proportion of that funding still to be identified. It should also be noted that no grant funding has been applied for or secured, which is to be expected at this early stage. If Ediston is approved as preferred developer, officers will work with them to investigate and address these issues, and this will form part of any future report to committee seeking authority to conclude a back-to-back agreement and to make a CPO.

## 7 Next Steps

- 7.1 Both the Council's CPO Framework and the report to committee on 6.2.25 envisage one report to committee seeking approval of the recommended proposal and authority to (1) enter into a back to back agreement with the preferred developer and (2) proceed to promote the CPO. In order to allow the preferred developer to further develop their proposals, and to work towards securing the necessary funding, authority is being sought now to select Ediston as the preferred developer.
- 7.2 Following approval of Ediston as the preferred developer, the Council will continue to investigate the justification for a CPO and will enter into negotiations with Ediston to agree terms for a back to back agreement for any CPO. Once terms are agreed between the parties and a sufficiently robust justification for a CPO is in place, the approval of this committee will be sought in order to enter into a legally binding back to back agreement and proceed with the promotion of a CPO.
- 7.3 The Property and Contracts Committee Paper dated 6.2.2025 provides further details of the next steps: [Authority To Investigate The Use Of Compulsory Purchase Powers \(CPO\) And To Seek A Development Proposal For Egyptian Halls](#)

## 8 Policy And Resource Implications

### Resource Implications:

*Financial:*

There will be costs accrued at the CPO stage for legal resources. This will be kept under review and any back to back agreement will require the preferred bidder to indemnify the Council against such costs.

*Legal:*

All transactions will be subject to review and conclusion by Glasgow City Council's Corporate and Property Law section with the assistance of any external legal advisers, as required.

*Personnel:*

No anticipated impact on personnel

*Procurement:*

The proposals as currently anticipated would not give rise to relevant procurement issues. This will be kept under review at later stages. A satisfactory subsidy control assessment will be required in advance of any grant being paid.

**Council Strategic Plan:**

Specify which Grand Challenge (s) and Mission (s) the proposal supports. Where appropriate the relevant Commitment can also be listed.

Grand Challenge 1: Reduce poverty and inequality in our communities

Mission 1.4 – Support Glasgow to be a city that is active and culturally vibrant.

Grand Challenge 2: Increase opportunity and prosperity for all our citizens.

Mission 2.1 – Support Glasgow residents into sustainable and fair work.

Mission 2.2 – Support the growth of an innovative, resilient and net zero carbon economy

Grand Challenge 3: Fight the climate emergency in a just transition to a net zero Glasgow

Mission 3.2 – Become a net zero carbon city by 2030

Grand Challenge 4: Enable staff to deliver essential services in a sustainable, innovative and efficient way for our communities.

Mission 4.1 - Create safe, clean and thriving neighbourhoods.

### **Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:**

*Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2021-25? Please specify.*

EqIA screening has been completed and will be reviewed at regular intervals.

*What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?*

No significant impact at this stage but to be re-considered and assessed as appropriate in due course including by reference to specific proposals once developed.

*Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio-economic disadvantage.*

N/A at this stage but to be re-considered and assessed as appropriate in due course including by reference to specific proposals once developed.

### **Climate Impacts:**

*Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions? Please specify:*

Yes, as part of the evaluation criteria included the requirement of a Sustainability Strategy statement.

*What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?*

To be assessed and reported on at a later date

*Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?*

To be assessed and reported on at a later stage

### **Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:**

None

Are there any potential data protection impacts as a result of this report Y/N

## **9 Recommendations**

9.1 It is recommended that Members:

- (i) Consider the contents of the report;
- (ii) Note the outcome of the marketing process and evaluation of submissions.
- (iii) Approve the selection of Ediston as preferred developer; and
- (iv) Authorise officers to enter into negotiations with the preferred developer to agree terms for a back-to-back CPO and to continue investigating the use of CPO powers.