

Thornwood Community Council
Minute of meeting on 03/12/2024
Partick Free Church Hall
2-4 Thornwood Terrace Glasgow G11 7QZ (6.30pm)

1. Welcome and apologies

Shaun gave a particular welcome to our two new members Allan Smith & David Garfield

Attendees

TCC Members

Shaun Conroy (Chair)
Jamie MacBrayne (Treasurer)
Colin Price (Secretary)
Allan Smith
David Garfield
Geraldine Ross-Hargreaves
Madeline Jansen
Nicolas Dear
Stephen Marshall

Ex Officio Members

Councillor Lana Reid-McConnell (Scottish Green Party)

Other attendees

3 members of the public

Apologies Received in Advance

Séamus Gallagher (member)
Councillor Eunis Jassemi (Scottish Labour Party)

Not present

Councillor Feargal Dalton (Scottish National Party)
PC Andy McKay (Police Scotland)

2. Ratification of new members — Allan Smith & David Garfield
Unanimously approved

3. Minutes for previous meeting (5th November 2024)
Both sets of minutes were approved
Proposed: Jamie Seconded: Shaun

4. Matters arising

a. Website

Stevie confirmed that the discussion forum was now operative.

CP said he thought the website looked really good but wondered if the website was functioning as originally intended.

Stevie said that the website is performing exactly as intended despite there being a need for TCC members to provide more content.

CP suggested it was difficult to discuss the website without seeing it at the same time and suggested either having a projector or a small group of interested people meeting somewhere to discuss things.

Nic proposed that there should be a small working group. This was agreed and Stevie, Madeline, Shaun, & Colin will meet before the next TCC meeting.

b. Restricted Parking Zone [See note 1]

CP thanked Eunis for following up on this matter. It was noted that of all the topics that have come before TCC this one probably affects more people than any other so far and, consequently, TCC has a responsibility to interrogate the proposals thoroughly.

A response has now been received from ParkingServices re. the DVLA data.

This was dismissed on the basis that people being registered doesn't mean they still live in the area and the survey undertaken in June 2023 showed that parking was only at 80% capacity.

CP responded that although registered people may have left the area it is entirely reasonable to assume the reverse is also true, so the figures should not be so lightly dismissed. In addition, a claim that parking was only at 80% capacity simply did not reflect the reality of the parking situation in Thornwood and should not, therefore, be relied upon.

CP to pursue this matter with Parking Services and to keep Eunis informed.

A member of the public opined that there should be transparency on where the money raised is being spent.

c. Abandoned developments [See note 2]

The Proposal of Application Notice has now been circulated to all members and it says that in addition to meeting with TCC in February there will be public consultations on 21/01/25 & 13/02/25, 3-7pm, Free Church Hall.

CP stressed that the purpose of all these consultations was, a. To meet legal requirements, and, b. To reduce chances of misunderstanding or misinformation.

They were not to approve or disapprove of the plans.

There followed a general discussion in which a range of opinions were given both by members and the attending public.

- A member of the public expressed the view that there was enough student housing in Glasgow already and that what was needed was more affordable housing. He also referred to other developments which, although starting as student accommodation, allowed those students to stay on after their studies and become ordinary residents.
- Nic pointed out that since it was a private developer on private land there was little the council could do to force it to be a certain type of housing. Student housing would be far better than the current situation and would also likely free up other local accommodation for non-students.
- In answer to a question Colin clarified that the consultation did not replace the right to object once formal planning permission had been sought.
- Lana acknowledged that there were some technical issues with the planning portal and said she should be contacted if anyone ran into specific difficulties.
- Lana added that the City Development Plan due for 2027 currently had no requirement for affordable housing. Various organisations are campaigning on this and anyone interested should contact one of them.

On the Apsley St. development Lana was still awaiting a reply on whether there was any possibility of rejuvenating the boards surrounding the development.

d. Migrating stone chips

At the time of the meeting we were still awaiting a response from NRS on this.

5. Victoria Park Area Partnership & NIIF [see note 3]

In Séamus absence CP gave a brief report on the last VPAP meeting. He noted

- a. The police gave reasons why they don't like to issue specific crime statistics as it leads to unintended emphases and even leads to unwanted changes in criminal

behaviour.

[In response to this, at the TCC meeting, two members of the public pointed out that other Community Councils did publish statistics. CP asked for those details to be passed to him as we have most definitely been told not to share specific statistics.]

- b. The reduced expenditure on festive lighting was approved but TCC's desire to still see details of this funding was not noted.
- c. It was approved that WCC should receive an extra £100 from VPAP for their bench.
- d. There was discussion on how to move forward on spending the NIIF allocation.

CP gave some background to the NIIF and gave an update on how VPAP intended to manage the NIIF, the next step being to submit the two lists (see note 3) to Lana.

Colin said that some Area Partnerships were simply dividing the funds between the relevant Community Councils whereas others, of which VPAP is one, is looking at the ward as a whole.

Colin cautioned that distributing "according to need" might be problematic if the wrong definition of "need" was used. It wouldn't make sense to say something like, 'because people in this area are in receipt of more benefits we'll fix those pavements', "Need" must be related to the purpose of the fund, i.e. infrastructure needs.

Nic thanked Colin for his explanation and proposed the lists that had been circulated should be submitted. This was agreed.

There followed a general discussion in which it was emphasised that TCC should remain actively engaged in the process of seeking funding for needs within the community. A view was expressed that because TCC had not been particularly active until recently it may be that it had been overlooked in funding matters in recent years.

6. Elected Representatives Update

Lana mentioned the following:

- There was still VPAP funding available in this financial year and it was possible to make awards up to £500, so if there was a need people should be encouraged to apply.
- We are still awaiting a date for the updated roundabout design.

- Progress in dealing with the bike rack at Partick Interchange has been hampered due to there being multiple ownership of the property.
- Dealing with an issue at Crow Road Retail Park has been delayed due to there being a new factor.
- Access to the residents' parking at the top of Thornwood Park is sometimes blocked by parked vehicles. It is hoped that white lining will be used to deter such parking. (Yellow lining would require a TRO process and would take much longer.)

7. Police Scotland Report

There was no Police report this month.

Nic explained that Andy had been unable to attend recent meetings as they had coincided with other specific police work.

8. Report on CC Development session, Saturday 23rd November. - Colin

- a. The talk from the British Toilet Association was both interesting and very informative. CP referred to the presentation that has been circulated as a pdf.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1OrzSQMqv3o7SuVLI06BF6E8IVOA253c1/view?usp=sharing>

The nearest public toilets to Thornwood are in Victoria Park and the Botanic Gardens. CP suggested that there was a need at Partick interchange and that if it ever became a possibility TCC should support such a proposal.

- b. The second session was on Community Council development and support.

This still has some way to go.

9. Planning & Licensing - Jamie

<https://tellmescotland.gov.uk/tellmescot/pages/notices?mode=postcode&pCode=G117QZ>

There has only been one planning application this month, a refrigeration unit at the Crow Road Retail Park. TCC raised no objections.

10. Treasurer Report - Jamie

Jamie presented the monthly report and noted that the Bank of Scotland is introducing an account admin fee of £4.25 / month. This was thought to be a lot given the little activity there is on the account. Options were discussed and it was agreed that Jamie should seek to open a fee free account at another bank and one that worked best for him as Treasurer. Virgin Money looked like the most suitable. Jamie will continue to

research the matter and it was agreed that this was something that could be agreed outwith the normal meeting so that arrangements could be in place before the BoS charges started.

11. Authorised and unauthorised banners.

It was noted that various advertising banners were appearing in the area. Some from businesses and some from GCC.

With regard to banners placed by businesses some felt they detracted from the visual amenity of the area and if they were unauthorised they should be removed as there was a danger of proliferation. Others felt there was no significant visual impact and it was understandable that the business would want to shield their customers from the busy traffic and that the banners would be preferable to having to see the constant flow of cars. No consensus was arrived at but all were agreed that TCC wants to support businesses and wants them to be successful.

With regard to the banners from GCC attached to the railings of Thornwood Park, CP agreed to investigate the matter further with NRS.

12. Questions from the public

- a. A member of the public pointed out that the information folder in Partick library didn't contain any information about TCC. It was agreed that this needed to be addressed and it was agreed that the issue of publicity should be put on the agenda for the next meeting.
- b. A member of the public asked if all businesses were required to have a contract for the removal of refuse as there was a suspicion that some were using domestic facilities for the disposal of business refuse. CP said he would enquire about this with NRS

13. AOB

- a. Nic asked that it be minuted that TCC didn't have CC meetings in the month of January.

The next meeting will be on **February 4th 2025**

Additional note 1 — Restricted Parking Zone

With regard to the timing of the public consultation we have been informed that:

...we are currently considering making some modifications to the initial Broomhill/Thornwood RPZ draft design, following a recent meeting with a number of stakeholders. Once the design has been amended, all properties within the proposed zone will be written to, advising how they can view and provide feedback. A 6-week period for response will be allowed to give all affected locals adequate time to provide valuable feedback before we commence the statutory Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process.

As we would not wish to include the festive period in the consultation window, we will be aiming to write out to the properties within the boundary during Quarter 1 of 2025, to advise them on how they can view and provide feedback on the design.

With regard to the fact that there appear to be more vehicles registered in the Thornwood RPZ area than proposed spaces, Parking Services were unaware that such information could be obtained from DVLA. There has been no answer as to what happens in such circumstances.

Additional note 2 — Abandoned developments

We have been contacted by Alex Orr, of Orbit Communications, on behalf of student housing developer, Primus Property Group, who are seeking planning permission for high-quality student homes on Meadow Road. As this is a major development, the prospective applicant is required to submit a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), which outlines what community consultation activity will be undertaken, including the holding of a minimum of two public consultation events.

Alex Orr has arranged to come to our February meeting to explain more about the proposed development and answer questions.

In terms of expectation management the GCC website (albeit in an archived document) gives the following information about a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN):

...New statutory requirements have been introduced to ensure that communities are made aware of, and have an opportunity to comment on, certain types of development proposals before a planning application has been made.

...The objective is for communities to be better informed about major and national development proposals and to have an opportunity to contribute their views before a formal planning application is

submitted to the planning authority. The purposes of PAC are to improve the quality of planning applications, mitigate negative impacts where possible, address misunderstandings, and air and deal with any community issues that can be tackled. The proposals, if adjusted, should benefit from that engagement and assist the efficient consideration of applications once submitted.

...PAC is an additional measure and does not take away the right of individuals and communities to express formal views during the planning application process itself. Nor does it remove the need for people who wish their views to be considered by the planning authority to make formal representations on applications. This should be emphasised by the prospective applicant during PAC. **The prospective applicant is under no obligation to take onboard community views, or directly reflect them in any subsequent application.** It is important for communities and others to follow their interest in a proposal through to the planning application stage, which provides the statutory opportunity for individuals to make representations on proposals before the planning authority.

<https://webarchive.nrscotland.gov.uk/20190120132744/http://www2.gov.scot/Publications/2009/07/03153034/5>

Additional note 3 — Victoria Park Area Partnership & NIIF

For those unfamiliar with the Neighbourhood Infrastructure Improvement Fund (NIIF) a good introduction can be found in the Neighbourhoods, Regeneration & Sustainability & Head of Communities report to the Hillhead Area Partnership.

(I'm not aware of a similar document for the Victoria Park Area Partnership)

<https://onlineservices.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDN81812U0G2U>

Each of the four CCs in the VPAP has agreed to send two lists to Lana for Friday 13 December.

1. An infrastructure 'maintenance' list, and
2. An infrastructure 'improvement/transformational' list.