



# Dennistoun Community Council

[hello@dennistouncc.org.uk](mailto:hello@dennistouncc.org.uk) [www.DennistounCC.org.uk](http://www.DennistounCC.org.uk)

## DCC comments and questions on GCC proposals for Traffic Management and Parking Controls as published in December 2025

11<sup>th</sup> January 2026

### Contents

	Page
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Restricted Parking Zone / Loading Only places</b>	<b>3</b>
On point 1 (commuter parking, and indiscriminate and obstructive parking practices)	3
On point 2 (central aims of the Glasgow Transport Strategy)	4
<b>Carers</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Disabled vehicles parking places</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Motorcycle parking places</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Car Club vehicles parking places</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Electric vehicles parking places</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>One-way operations</b>	<b>6</b>
Through Traffic	6
Contraflow Cycling	6
<b>20 mph speed limit</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Supplementary Infrastructure improvements</b>	<b>7</b>
Onslow Drive / Craigpark junction	7
Whitehill Street / Duke Street junction	7
Armada Street / Duke Street junction	8
Wood Street / Ballindalloch Drive junction	8
Meadowpark Street at Nursery and School	8
Armada Street at School	8
Whitehill Street path opposite 259	8
<b>Timing and Communication</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Scope</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>10</b>

## **Introduction**

Dennistoun Community Council (DCC) recognises the multiple benefits of better streets for all: achieved by providing safe and accessible high-quality infrastructure.

DCC has been consistent in working towards that aim: by actively promoting and engaging with consultations carried out by Glasgow City Council (GCC); holding regular meetings which are open to input from the public, with traffic parking and road safety on the agenda; and by seeking support from all our elected city councillors.

Comments provided below are made on the proposals published by GCC in December 2025. They follow on from comments and discussion that took place during the development phase of these proposals, as identified by the following post to the DCC website:

[dennistouncc.org.uk/2025/12/17/dennistoun-traffic-management-and-parking-controls-proposals](https://dennistouncc.org.uk/2025/12/17/dennistoun-traffic-management-and-parking-controls-proposals)

## Restricted Parking Zone / Loading Only places

The GCC website states two reasons for the introduction of the proposed parking controls:

1. *"The Dennistoun area have been identified as being negatively affected by commuter parking and indiscriminate and obstructive parking practices."*
2. *"The proposals support the policies and central aims of the Glasgow Transport Strategy (GTS) in prioritising residential parking and in delivering the cities transition to a net zero carbon, clean and sustainable city and enable the cities target to reduced car vehicle kilometres by at least 30% by 2030."*

### **On point 1:**

Extensive measures already exist (tickets or vehicle removal for double yellow parking and pavement parking for example) that with proper enforcement from GCC will reduce, or even eliminate, indiscriminate and obstructive parking practices in the area.

Enforcement of the these existing measures would not, by itself, create the better safer streets we desire. But they would benefit the neighbourhood in hugely in terms of road safety, particularly for pedestrians, in accordance with the sustainable transport hierarchy.

David Ferrier (Project Manager, Transport Project Delivery, Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability) provided the outcome of a parking survey completed by GCC in May 2025 to DCC. A summary is in the table provided by GCC below:

SURVEY PERIOD	02:00 - 04:00			14:00 - 16:00		
	PARKING CAPACITY	TOTAL VEHICLES PARKED	% OCCUPANCY	PARKING CAPACITY	TOTAL VEHICLES PARKED	% OCCUPANCY
TOTAL	3600	2622	72.8%	3378	2681	79.4%

These figures clearly show that there is ample capacity for residential parking and also provide no evidence of the area being negatively impacted by commuter parking.

The results of the 2024 Community Survey, with 1520 responses, very clearly oppose the proposed measures:

- 67% of respondents **did not** think that parking needs to be managed and controlled in the Dennistoun area, for example introducing parking bays
- 72% of respondents **opposed** the introduction of shared use parking bays – Permit Holders and Pay & Display

It is evidently the case based on GCC's own data that there is no majority support for the proposals within the community. And that the measures which are already in place have not been effectively enforced such that parking practices can be said to be adequately controlled in Dennistoun. Why

not? The answer to that fundamental question, and all relevant detail, needs to be clearly communicated to the community before widespread acceptance of the RPZ can be expected. This has not yet been achieved.

### **On point 2:**

A freedom of information request was submitted on behalf of DCC to GCC in October 2025 requesting information to support the claim from GCC that similar parking restrictions in other areas have helped to reduce vehicle use and kilometres travelled.

The response to our request from GCC is that the council, nor anyone else on their behalf, holds any data that shows there is any reductions in volumes of annual or visitor permits supplied in other parking zone areas. The full response is available upon request.

If the council does not know, or keep track of any relevant data, how can the council justifiably claim that the proposed restrictions will reduce the number vehicles or kilometres travelled?

There has been no clear evidence or justification provided by GCC that supports the reasons given by GCC for the introduction of these restrictions on the Dennistoun Community.

DCC requests GCC urgently provides clear, objective, evidence and data that demonstrates why the proposed parking measures are 1: required and 2: justified.

On page 24 of Part 2 of the Transport Strategy, GCC acknowledges that controlled parking zones aren't necessarily required by default, and that measures should be appropriate to the pressures and requirements of that area. This returns us to the question of why parking on yellow lines and on pavements is a frequent and persistent issue, despite GCC having existing measures in place and powers to mitigate against them.

### **Carers**

A particular concern about the proposals as presented is the situation for carers. The GCC FAQ offers the following:

***For disabled residents relying on different friends or carers for transport, can a permit be made transferable between vehicles?***

*Resident permits are not transferable between vehicles. Vehicles are required to be registered at an address within the zones. Residents with a disabled badge are exempt from the charges and the badge is issued to the person, not the vehicle and can be moved accordingly.*

GCC also appears to run a scheme of 'medical parking permit' exemptions applicable to a wide range of formalised jobs.

But that doesn't satisfactorily cover the scenario of unpaid and/or informal carers. To subject them to the full pay and display tariff, or require use of a 6-hour period visitor permit, is unduly inflexible and to fall short of being reasonable, with a gap existing between the blue badge and 'normal' visitor scenarios. Should/could the blue badge requirements be relaxed within RPZ areas to cover this? Should/could there be an additional category of permit (or exemption) to cover this?

Carers employed for multiple daily calls could end up having to pay ridiculous amounts of money. At proposed short stay rates, an already disadvantaged person a carer calls on four times daily for fifteen minutes would have to fund £33.60 per week (£1747.20 annually). How is this remotely fair or reasonable? That just covers paying for employed carers. Family members and friends caring for the elderly and infirm would be inflicted with similar burdens while simultaneously saving the Glasgow Council untold amounts in care fees.

### **Disabled vehicles parking places**

Enforceable disabled parking is a positive proposal. There is some concern about the proliferation of sign poles required.

It would be useful to have confirmation that any necessary future additions and removals will be carried out as and when required. Will a TRO be required to achieve this in each instance?

### **Motorcycle parking places**

No objections.

### **Car Club vehicles parking places**

Only one new bay/vehicle is proposed. The GCC report says "Statistics show that every Car Club car replaces up to 12 privately owned cars". So why aren't additional bays/vehicles proposed?

If the Car Club is 'part of the solution' then their use should be encouraged and made as attractive as possible. So why should these vehicles be subject to the same pay and display rates as private vehicles (or any rates at all) for the inevitable loading/unloading closer to the home that is required (because the existing four Co-wheels vehicle bays are toward the edge of residential areas, rather than at the heart of them)?

Even accounting for this modest addition of one car, bringing the total to five, Dennistoun and the East End remains underserved by Car Club availability, compared to comparable areas in the West End and Southside.

### **Electric vehicles parking places**

No new bays proposed. The proposal shows two EV spaces opposite 187 Reidvale Street, at the junction with Garfield Street. This represents a reduction from the existing four spaces served by two chargers at that location, leaving a 'stranded' charger serving a single general shared use bay (or removal of an existing charger). This requires to be clarified or corrected.

An expansion of the provision of EV charging points has recently been announced. It is noted that multiple EV charging points have been installed on public roads in Dennistoun without applying best practice standards: i.e. footway/pavement space taken unnecessarily, and insufficient minimum clearance left. This is the case at the Reidvale Street location mentioned above but also, notably, on Craigpark outside Dennistoun Library where a new EV charger was installed adjacent to existing cycle stands, with the cycle stands then removed due to insufficient clearance for pedestrians (but the cycle stands were not relocated to anywhere in the near vicinity).

### **One-way operations**

#### **Through Traffic**

One-way streets, alone, cannot be expected to adequately control or reduce through-traffic. You don't get safer residential streets by allowing drivers to use them as a shortcut to avoid the junctions and traffic lights on nearby distributor roads.

Removing vehicular through-route and short-cut routes along residential streets, between main roads such as Duke Street and Alexandra Parade, would calm traffic within those densely populated areas. It is considered a fundamental flaw that there are no proposals for preventing these vehicular movements. The selection of one way streets being proposed will not prevent through-traffic. Indeed, it will still be possible to drive in a direct straight line along Armadale Street, from Duke Street to Alexandra Parade.

Craigpark is an existing two-way through route between Duke Street and Alexandra Parade that would continue to provide use local residential streets as a direct access route between main distributor roads. Similarly, the Firpark Street/Hanson Street to Westercraigs route will remain in place as a through route. Retaining through routes such as these does not represent a holistic approach to traffic management toward the aim of road safety and better streets.

A further example central to this issue is school-related traffic: the proposals don't credibly deal with it. Flows of traffic trying to get to and from the three primaries are coming into conflict with one another, whilst pedestrians get caught in the crossfire.

Physical restrictions and/or modal filters are required. Sword Street at Reidvale Street is an illustration of how this type of restriction has been implemented locally. When DCC made this point previously, the GCC response lacked detail, accuracy and coherence; and the 2020 'Spaces for People' scheme was referenced. That scheme was insufficiently planned, partially installed, and largely removed weeks later. It was not a credible attempt to address the issue of through-traffic. The 2020 scheme, and the inevitable negative responses to it, should not be used as justification for avoiding a proper traffic calming solution. 'More speed bumps' is not the solution, either.

#### **Contraflow Cycling**

One-way streets without contraflow cycling create unnecessarily extended and diversionary routes for cycle users. This is a downgrade to active travel provision.

Most residential roads within the area are currently in operation as two-way streets, but in reality only have sufficient width available for one vehicle at a time in either direction. But they are freely allowed to operate currently with vehicles and cycles able to travel in opposite directions. If converted to properly signed 20 mph one-way streets for vehicles with contraflow cycling permitted, these same residential streets would retain the same geometry: clearly an upgrade to provision compared to the existing arrangement. This contraflow arrangement was proposed and installed on various streets as part of the 2020 'Spaces for People' measures. The cycling contraflows were then subsequently removed without any clear justification being provided.

GCC have previously responded to these points stating that Police Scotland cite “safety grounds and risks involved” and “the potential increase in road traffic accidents” without adequately providing detail or data to substantiate those claims. GCC reports that reasons suggested by Police Scotland “include: narrow road widths resulting in close passing between motor vehicles and contraflow pedal cycles”. But the existing streets have these issues; and the GCC proposals do not substantially remove these issues; whereas properly signed 20 mph one-way streets for vehicles with contraflow cycling permitted would provide an upgrade to provision.

### **20 mph speed limit**

A 20 mph proposal is indicated on the RPZ signage on the drawings. This is welcomed. But it should be extended to include all roads within the extent of proposals, i.e. Duke Street, Alexandra Parade, Cumbernauld Road, Alexandra Park Street, Bellgrove Street, etc.

It is a concern that the introduction of this measure is not mentioned at all in the GCC report or the press notice, potentially suggesting that the 20 mph limit signage shown on the drawings may not be a formal part of this proposal, and is instead an element of a previous draft carried through unintentionally. This requires to be clarified.

### **Supplementary Infrastructure improvements**

#### **Onslow Drive / Craigpark junction**

The detail provided is very minimal, and a proper assessment cannot be made. The proposal appears to be a potential improvement over the existing layout. However, the corner radii still seem far in excess of similar nearby junctions, and pedestrian routing is still seemingly deferential to vehicular movements rather than maintaining the desire line.

#### **Whitehill Street / Duke Street junction**

The detail provided is very minimal, and a proper assessment cannot be made. The proposal appears to be insufficient to effectively resolve the severe and persistent issues of unregulated parking and poor sight lines at this location. There's no need for this junction to retain two lanes on the approach to the give way line. The footway extension should be extended further on both sides of Whitehill Street, extending up toward the parking bays (i.e. as per the Armadale Street / Duke Street, or Meadowpark Street / Roslea Drive proposals), such that the carriageway is only one lane

wide (narrowed to minimal permissible lane width), with the result that vehicles are physically unable to park just south of the Car Club bay (i.e. bollards should be provided along the kerbline of the corner), rather than continuing to rely on double yellow lines (which are routinely ignored).

#### **Armadale Street / Duke Street junction**

The detail provided is very minimal, and a proper assessment cannot be made. The proposal appears to be a potential improvement over the existing layout.

#### **Wood Street / Ballindalloch Drive junction**

The detail provided is very minimal, and a proper assessment cannot be made. The proposal appears to be a potential improvement over the existing layout.

#### **Meadowpark Street at Nursery and School**

The detail provided is very minimal, and a proper assessment cannot be made. The proposal appears to be a potential improvement over the existing layout. However, traffic and parking issues around the school at start and finish times are significant and it is not clear that the proposals adequately provide solutions to that set of issues. The proposal appears to show an available carriageway running lane width comfortably in excess of requirements and should be narrowed to the minimal permissible running lane width. It is presumed that the planters will be retained and the redundant pedestrian barrier will be removed.

#### **Armadale Street at School**

The detail provided is very minimal, and a proper assessment cannot be made. The proposal appears to be a potential improvement over the existing layout. However, traffic and parking issues around the school at start and finish times are significant and it is not clear that the proposals adequately provide solutions to that set of issues. The proposal appears to show an available carriageway running lane width far in excess of requirements and should be narrowed to the minimal permissible running lane width. It is presumed that the planters will be retained and the redundant pedestrian barrier will be removed.

#### **Whitehill Street path opposite 259**

The detail provided is very minimal, and a proper assessment cannot be made. The proposal appears to be a potential improvement over the existing layout. Good to see the acknowledgement of this as a key pedestrian route requiring improvement. Installing a signalised crossing on Alexandra Parade, safely and conveniently connecting users of this path to the retail and bus stop facilities on the other side of the Parade would be a huge improvement to pedestrian safety. The location sits at the midpoint of a 355 metre distance between controlled crossings, which is double that typically found elsewhere along the Parade and comparable roads in our area – a significant gap in provision.



## **Timing and Communication**

Although the publication and closing date for comments on these proposals may well meet with established requirements for consultation time periods, the consultation process has been carried out in clear contradiction to the Council's own guidance. On page 8 of the Consultation Guidance Version 2 (Annex 1), it states unequivocally:

*"Consideration should also be given to particular times of the year when the public and stakeholders might not be able or will be less likely to respond. Holiday periods, particularly Christmas and New Year, should definitely be avoided."*

Why has GCC conducted this process in contravention to its own guidance?

The Southside is also going through a similar process. There has been direct communications and community engagement with letters sent out and drop-in sessions arranged for the public to scrutinise the plans and ask questions or clarifications of council officials.

Why has there been no similar letters or sessions for the Dennistoun community?

The Council's lack of communication and any willingness to engage with people demonstrates very clearly that the council does not care and is not interested in what the people of the area think about the proposals.

## **Scope**

Most of the proposals in this scheme require a Traffic Regulation Order. But there are various road safety and traffic management measures that would improve the streets in our area and would not necessarily require a TRO, and which would benefit from being consulted on in a more collaborative way with the community.

Some such measures are included within the proposals (e.g. kerbed footway extensions and reductions in corner radii to improve line-of-sight visibility for pedestrians and to reduce time spent on the carriageway when crossing roads at junctions).

Other beneficial improvements are not included (e.g. dropped kerb and step-free pedestrian access locations and routes were requested from DCC by GCC, but the suggested locations provided by DCC are apparently almost entirely absent from these proposals, even though their introduction would make the area much more navigable for people in a wheelchair, with a buggy/pushchair, or other vulnerable road users with mobility issues).

The Liveable Neighbourhood (LN) reporting was positive in its recommendations for what road safety and traffic interventions ought to be considered and how their development should be based on proper ongoing engagement with the community. GCC subsequently provided assurances that proper engagement would take place. However, the Road Safety, Traffic and Parking questionnaire published by GCC in October 2024 did not fulfil that assurance, and was significantly

flawed in various ways (question format, topics covered, presentation format, claimed distribution, etc).

The end result is that it is all too easy to view these proposals as a 'parking permit scheme with a few additions tacked on'. The case for parking permits has not been adequately communicated. There are too few 'additions'. And delivery of those 'additions', whilst welcome, ultimately appears to be contingent upon delivery of the core parking permit scheme.

There are apparently no specific proposals at all in this scheme for cycling as transport (though e.g. the extension of the cycle hangar scheme is acknowledged). The possibility of quieter streets with less traffic as a result of these proposals is welcome. But it is an underwhelming offering in a scheme of this type, when stated aims include the outcome of promoting safer travel for vulnerable road users, and for people to seek more sustainable methods of transport.

### **Conclusion**

**Without clear and accurate answers to the problems raised in this letter, and proper community engagement and consultation beyond plastering the neighbourhood with announcements, Dennistoun Community Council cannot support the TRO in its current form.**

We would expect an open public meeting to address our concerns before any further progress on the TRO. We would also expect all our elected officials to weigh in on behalf of the community they represent to ensure these problems are addressed in a democratic manner rather than accept the imposition of what very much looks to be a stealth tax on the entire local community.