

Thornwood Community Council
Minute of meeting on 04/02/2025
Partick Free Church Hall
2-4 Thornwood Terrace Glasgow G11 7QZ (6.30pm)

1. Welcome and apologies

Attendees

TCC Members

Shaun Conroy (Chair)
Jamie MacBrayne (Treasurer)
Colin Price (Secretary)
Allan Smith
Madeline Jansen
Nicolas Dear
Séamus Gallagher
Stephen Marshall

Ex Officio Members

Councillor Eunis Jassemi (Scottish Labour Party)

Other attendees

2 members of the public

Apologies Received in Advance

David Garfield (member)
Geraldine Ross-Hargreaves (member)
Councillor Lana Reid-McConnell (Scottish Green Party)

Not present

Councillor Feargal Dalton (Scottish National Party)

2. Student Accommodation development - Alex Orr on behalf of Primus Property Group.

Shaun welcomed the team who had come to speak about the proposed development, namely,

Alex Orr, Managing Director Orbit Communications, on behalf of Primer Glasgow Ltd.
Fraser Littlejohn who is the planning consultant for the project, from Montagu Evans, and
Mari Tosi from AECOM who are the project managers.

The team gave an interesting and informative presentation about the proposed development and then responded to questions.

Although various details were discussed the key take-aways for TCC were:

- Although there are some strong feelings in the community to there being more student accommodation there is no evidence that this is particularly widespread. The majority seem comfortable with it being student accommodation and are mostly pleased with the prospect of the site being at last properly developed. Some of the opposition to student accommodation isn't opposition to student accommodation *per se* but is prompted by the lack of affordable or social housing.
- TCC were pleased to hear that there are no longer any plans for the ground floor to contain retail or commercial activities and that it would contain various activity rooms for the residents with the possible inclusion of bookable rooms. TCC encouraged the team to think about ensuring that there was some community access as such space is sorely lacking in the area.
- TCC were pleased to hear that 24/7 management meant 24/7 **active onsite management** and that this would be year-round including covering the 'short-stay (non-term time) accommodation'.
- There were some concerns about the number of units (300-350) in a relatively small space and in particular the implications for constant deliveries. It is hoped that the developers will do what they can to mitigate this problem by, for example, ensuring that there is sufficient space for vans to be parked off road.
- It was confirmed that this was a non-car development and residents (presumably both term time and non term time) would have to agree to this in their contract.
- The starting point for defining 'ample' provision for cycles is one space for each bedroom. However, the exact number would be decided in discussion with GCC. There will also be some provision for the charging of ebikes, etc.
- It was expected that the non term time lets would still be university related.
- It was confirmed that, if at some time there was an oversupply of student accommodation, at least some of the units would be capable of being repurposed for other kinds of non-student accommodation.
- Although there will be some green space associated with the development and the developers expect to be undertaking some landscaping, the developers also expect that they will have to make some contribution to GCC in lieu of providing enough green space. It is understood that this contribution should be spent in the locality.

It was noted that there will be a second public consultation on Thurs 13th February which will allow attendees to view updated proposals and that updated information will also appear on the website <https://meadowroaddev.co.uk/>

2a. Police Scotland (item added to the agenda)

An officer from the Community Policing Team joined us to update us on the changing relationship between the team and Community Councils. It was reported that we should hear shortly as to who will be the named liaison person for TCC.

The problematic shoplifting with threats of violence has continued but is easing

compared to what it was.

TCC reported an increase in vandalism and graffiti in the area.

3. Minutes for previous meeting (3rd December 2024) — approved

Proposed: Jamie Seconded: Maddie

4. Matters arising

a. Information folder in Partick library

Shaun thanked Carol for raising this in the last meeting and reported that information has been added to the library folder and is also on their noticeboard.

b. Migrating stone chips (see note 1)

c. Authorised and unauthorised banners (see note 1)

Shaun wondered if banners addressing the litter issue in the area might be worthwhile.

d. Businesses using domestic facilities for refuse disposal. (see note 1)

5. Pitches update

Jamie gave an update reporting that the group are in the process of forming a constituted group and to register as a charity and this needs to progress before any applications can be made for funding.

6. Victoria Park Area Partnership & NIIF

Prior to the meeting Colin circulated an update on how decisions regarding the NIIF were being made. See additional note 2. Decisions will ultimately be up to VPAP. Their next meeting is on 12th February.

7. Victoria Park Community Trust - quarterly members meeting report.

Colin reported that he had attended the recent quarterly members meeting. He gave a brief report on the work of the Trust and said he would circulate a list of projects from the VPCT 3 year Action Plan.

8. Elected Representatives Update

Eunis shared his concerns about the application from Burger King for extended opening hours through to 5 a.m.

Nic shared that an informal survey at Glasgow Harbour, the residential development most likely to be affected one way or another, showed a mixed response but with a small majority in favour of the extended opening. Various pros and cons were mentioned but there was no strong feeling that TCC should do anything other than record that the application for extended hours had been received. It was noted that if any individual did have strong feelings they were, of course, still free to respond as an individual.

9. Planning & Licensing - Jamie

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

There were no objections to the proposed installation of a base station in Crow Road.

10. Treasurer Report - Jamie

Jamie spoke to the report circulated prior to the meeting detailing the various sums into and out of the account.

It was noted that the change to an account at Virgin Money to avoid the monthly charges at Bank of Scotland was almost complete. The new account was open and the majority of funds have been transferred to the Virgin Money account, with enough remaining to cover any fees from the Bank of Scotland. GCC have been informed of the change of bank details. The mandate to close the Bank of Scotland account has been completed and signed, and will be emailed in the coming days

11. Questions from the public

There were no new questions from the public.

12. AOB

Items for AOB were deferred to the next meeting.

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

Additional note 1 — Response from NRS on three issues

1)Do we have an update on the stone chips? Even if it is just that a letter will be sent to the property owners to remind them of their responsibility to keep the path clear.

Please be advised that this query is currently sitting with our Roads team who are investigating, as you can appreciate due to inclement weather and time of year the team have a large volume of works and queries that they are currently working thru, if you could advise the Community Council rep that it is under investigation at present this would be appreciated.

2)is there an answer to the question about banners? In particular the GCC banners on the railings of Thornwood Park. Once these are put up is there a process for removing them? Or are they up there forever? Can we remove them?

Please be advised that these banners have been installed by our Public Health team to discourage engine idling within the area, the banners are on Glasgow City Council property and is not flyposting. Could I ask what particular issue the Community Council have with the banners? They will not be up forever, it is a targeted campaign by Public Health Officers to reduce engine idling in the local area and this is an initiative that I presumed the Community Council would be in support of.

3)A member of the public asked if all businesses are required to have a contract for the removal of refuse as there is a suspicion that some businesses are using domestic facilities for disposing of their refuse. What should a member of the public do if they become aware of a business doing this?

Businesses of every kind have a responsibility under Environmental Protection Act 1990 to ensure the proper disposal of their waste using an approved waste contractor.

Businesses who are currently using an approved waste contractor for disposing of waste should have a waste transfer notice.

I have included a link below to our commercial waste enforcement team who regularly carry out compliance checks on businesses city wide to check that they are disposing of waste with an approved waste contractor.

[Commercial Waste Enforcement - Glasgow City Council](https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/cwe)

<https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/cwe>

Additional note 2 — Update on the NIIF process for TCC meeting on Feb 4th 2025

Since the last meeting there have been three meetings to move the NIIF process forward and many emails.

You will recall that we were asked to compile two lists – maintenance and improvement/transformational. Since then we have been told to remove all maintenance 'business as usual items' from the list. Also, it has now been clarified that everything to do with the roundabout will be considered in a process that will be funded separately from the NIIF.

The process now consists of a list of items that are important to the Ward as a whole. In essence this means dealing with the flooding in Victoria Park and improving the underpasses to Victoria Park. Some speed limits were mentioned but it is difficult to see how this requires much NIIF funding.

After this, each community council had to take three or four of their items and rank them according to **urgency** and **impact**. Seamus and I did this for our items with input from two people from the 'third sector'.

In order of priority we ended up with:

1. **Upgrading the footpaths on Crow Road from Dumbarton Road up to the shopping precinct.** This should include:
 - Full resurfacing of the pavements to bring them up to standard.
 - Replacing the bus shelter at the foot of Crow Road with one that doesn't block pedestrians. Currently the gap left for pedestrians is considerably less than the 1.5 meters normally required. The kerb should be raised and road markings renewed.
 - Having raised red bitumen for the crossing of Norval Road so that pedestrians have one continuous pavement.
 - The renewal/repair of the tactile paving at the junction of Crow Road with Dumbarton Road (both corners).
2. **Develop a community green space next to the MUGA on Thornwood Drive.**
This should include:
 - Installing a proper entrance
 - Steps with a handrail from the entrance to the level area.
 - Resurfacing of the slope for vehicle access
 - Improving the pavement and driveway access.
 - Funds reserved for benches, planters, and appropriate storage.
3. **Develop the public realm at the junction of Rosevale Street and Dumbarton Road.**
This might include (details to be decided):
 - Installing a curved wall to delineate the public space
 - Seating

- Stone planters
- Resurfacing of the public area
- Relocating the flyposting facility (possibly to Partick interchange) so that it is no longer the dominant feature
- Relocating the cycle storage to the side of the area
- Planting a tree

4. **Renovate the Meadow Road underpass.** This should include:

- Repainting & fixing lighting
- Replacing the damaged bollards on exit to Meadow Road.

Remember, each CC will be putting forward a list and which projects get selected will be down to some process as yet to be determined by the Area Partnership. It has been suggested that the selection process will ensure that the funds are 'appropriately' spread around the four CC areas although what this means is unclear. If the above doesn't spend all the funds that might be allocated to Thornwood it would be easy enough to find other things that haven't yet been suggested, e.g. adding seating to Thornwood and Cross Parks. I am unclear if the process would allow adding items like this at a later stage.

Costing will obviously also be a factor in how many and which projects get selected.

It has also been suggested that some community consultation will be involved in the selection process. This will be a matter for the Area Partnership to decide. It has been argued that Ward wide voting would be problematic. Even in the workshop it was felt that commenting on projects in other wards would be a largely meaningless exercise. Some CC areas feel that consultation in their area has already been carried out through Liveable Neighbourhoods or Place Plan. A simple vote on our four possible projects would leave me wondering why we went through a workshop with the 'third sector' to rank them in order of importance. In any case, ensuring a vote is truly representative of the wider community is a non-trivial matter.

Although the process is clearer than it was, there are still a number of issues to be resolved.

ColinP