

Minutes of the Dennistoun Community Council Ordinary Meeting

held on Tuesday 12th May 2026, from 7:00pm,
at St Andrews East Church Hall, 685 Alexandra Parade, G31 3LN.

Cllrs Present Liz Allan (LA); Robert Dawson Scott (RDS); Tom Dickson (TD); Brian Johnston (BJ); Ruth Johnston (RJ); David McDonald (DM); Frank Plowright (FP) [*Chair*]; Cliff Shearer (CS); Valery Tough (VT); Wesley Wright (WW) [*Minute taker*]

Others Present: Cllrs: Anthony Carroll (ACar). Bill Stark, Save Whitehill Pool (BS). Five members of the public.

		Actions
1	Welcome / Introductions / Attendance / Apologies - Apologies received: Cllr Elaine McDougall (EMcD). Paul Sweeney MSP. Police. David McCready, Glasgow Life community liaison. - Absent, no apologies received: Cllrs Allan Casey (ACas); Greg Hepburn; Cecilia O'Lone; Linda Pike; George Redmond. Maureen Burke MP. NB: Election of MSPs took place week ahead of this meeting. - New Cllr LA noted as a result of the recent interim election.	
2	Approval of Minutes - March minutes: FP requested absent elected representatives be noted. Otherwise, proposed by: BJ; seconded by: DMcD. - April notes: no amendments.	
3	Police - Unable to attend. >>> To be invited to the June meeting.	WW
4	Commonwealth Games Kat Heron gave a presentation. 73 days to go. Minimal to zero cost to GCC. 10 sports at 4 venues across the 'Games Corridor': Tollcross Pool, Velodrome, Indoor Arena, Scotstoun Stadium, Armadillo/SEC campus. Opening and closing ceremony at the Hydro. Community roadshows are to be held, with invites sent to CCs. Feedback can be submitted via Kat. Acknowledged the issues raised about Whitehill Pool remaining closed with no certainty about future, and encouraged these issues to be fed back to GL. No plans for a major deep clean and tidy up of the city in advance, largely due to budget restrictions. High price of tickets noted by a Cllr - acknowledged, in the context of commercial constraints, but expectations that there will be some 'fan zone' type events and tickets to opening/closing ceremony rehearsals dispersed via e.g schools/orgs. 'All-in' initiative, free to sign up to, to spotlight community events (sport or otherwise) and encourage community dialogue and co-operation.	
5	Alexandra Park No-one available to speak on this until July. >>> DCC will endeavour to get some updates in advance of that.	FP
6	Matters Arising - Whitehill Pool (Bill Stark): 2 months ago, while awaiting a business case to be approved, GL had a meeting on 10 March to move this forward. BS enquired after the meeting, with GL and GCC claiming they were planning a joint statement, but this did not transpire. A meeting was held on 31 March with two MSPs (IMcK and PS) in attendance and 3 Dennistoun Cllrs also, but no further info came from GCC/GL. Three weeks later, a meeting held by Living Rent was	

attended by three Dennistoun Cllrs, but no MSPs, with no further info from GCC/GL. Not even any confirmation available that Whitehill Pool was discussed at the meeting. BS requested Cllr ACar enquire as to when information will be made available. Cllr ACar has already been chasing this up, and will continue to do so. It is hoped that George Hunter, the new GL Director of Libraries, Sport and Physical Activity and Communities, will be the impetus for better comms. FP spoke in person with George Hunter to note poor comms from GL and the expectation that this should improve. He was open about some matters like lack of money, and agreed to provide updates regarding Whitehill Pool.

- Parking/Traffic proposals: Kevin Argue noted on 17 Mar an intention to update within 3 weeks. End of May is the overall target deadline set for responses to be sent out. FP approached Cllrs ACas and EMcD about a lack of response to email enquiries.

- 'Taskmaster' schools event for P5 primary kids: May need to be postponed from originally mooted 20 May date until June to accommodate arrangements for the running of the event, per suggestion from one of the school heads (FP submitted 23 game suggestions, five were knocked back and two aren't viable without RAPA equipment, but 16 activities ought to be enough). The revisions/postponement may be beneficial in terms of borrowing equipment from RAPA, rather than buying.

- Joint CC group: 75 active CCs invited to 3 meetings (NB: 18 are dormant), with plan in place for a federation of CCs (per proposals developed by a committee of five Ccs). Each CC to discuss at their next meeting to confirm and minute agreement to be a part of the group by end of May. Approximately 30 have shown intent (others possibly not getting an update due to, amongst other reasons, a lack of updates to the list of contact details posted by GCC). The Edinburgh Association of Community Councils is noted as a comparable org with a lot of info online. The main initial aim in Glasgow is to improve comms between member CCs, and also between CCs and GCC.

7 Officer Updates/Report

a. Chair/Vice-chair

- None additional to points covered elsewhere.

b. Secretary

- Not present. WW noted that the Holyrood Election Q+A was received positively.

c. Treasurer

- Balance of £3,319.31 as at end of April 2026. WW went to a branch in response to a request for updated details. Email and phone number updated to WW info. For some reason, FP is not yet a signatory, despite the mandate submitted. >>> **WW, VT and FP to look into arranging this in branch in due course, if required.**

**WW/
VT/FP**

d. Planning and Licensing

- BJ submitted written update. See Appendix A attached below.

- Various minor submissions. Proposed conversion of part of City Park to flats >>> **BJ to discuss in person with applicant.** Monopole and cabinets adjacent to Onslow Square - objection. Wishart Street - objection submitted.

BJ

e. Area Partnership formal documentation [on GCC website here](#)

- RJ submitted written update. See Appendix B attached below.

- Xmas lighting costs seem excessive. £15,510 projected cost. £3,600 centrally funded. £11,910 balance being asked for from Area Partnership funds. That's close to a fifth of the £67,823 total DAP budget for 2026/27. This has been approved. No vote apparently. An example of the DAP charring and transparency yet again falling short of our expectations. Cllr ACar has suggested a permanent tree to reduce costs.

- Site visit planned regarding the proposal for Todd Street (north end) zebra crossing.

- Little to no progress on other DCC NIIF proposals (e.g. Ark Lane accessibility; Alexandra Parade pedestrian crossing at Co-op/Whitehill Street).

- Full minutes of 28 April meeting available at

onlineservices.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/Agenda.asp?meetingid=20903.

8	Consultations <u>Glasgow City Council</u> via glasgow.gov.uk/consultations - None specifically noted. <u>Scottish Government</u> via consult.gov.scot - None specifically noted.	
9	Current Local Issues <u>a. Local Amenities / Glasgow Life / Whitehill Pool</u> - Covered elsewhere in this meeting. <u>b. Homes / Housing Associations / Cleansing</u> - Covered elsewhere in this meeting. <u>c. Transport / Roads / Parking</u> - Covered elsewhere in this meeting.	
10	Public Input - Circulation of draft minutes was requested. DCC notes that salient and time-sensitive points are usually communicated via the DCC website and/or social media channels shortly after meetings. Circulation of draft minutes is usually to standard invitees (generally limited to elected representatives), rather than general or wider circulation, due to the potential for correction and/or misinterpretation of the draft ahead of the finalised version as determined at the subsequent ordinary meeting.	
11	Elected Member Updates <u>Cllr Anthony Carroll</u> - Gully deep cleaning. Developer contributions to Wellpark. GCC decision to do nothing with the derelict sheds at the school. Correspondence provided below in Appendix C. >>> considered unacceptable by DCC, and will be followed up. Necropolis entrances and Alexandra Park Street CCTV. Lack of NIIF updates chased. Extra DAP meeting scheduled to review funding applications. Friends of Alexandra Park being pursued. Saracen fountain repairs being pursued. Duke Street Avenue delayed to mid summer due to water main being in an unexpected location. Pride in Place citywide fund available for £25-75k projects. Golfhill School enquiry to GCC Planning due to lack of progress - possible CPO?	DCC
12	Any Other Business - No time available.	
13	Next Meetings - Ordinary Meeting on 9 Jun 2026, St Andrews E Church Hall, 685 Alexandra Pde, G31 3LN. - Agenda/invites will be circulated in advance and published to Dennistouncc.org.uk/dates . - Apologies to be submitted via hello@dennistouncc.org.uk.	Invitees

APPENDICES ATTACHED

A – Planning Report from Brian Johnston (pages 4 - 6)

B – Dennistoun Area Partnership Report from Ruth Johnston (page 7)

C – Alexandra Parade Primary shelters correspondence to Cllr Carroll from GCC (page 8)

APPENDIX A – PLANNING REPORT

Reference: 26/00565/FUL

Address: Site Formerly Known As 148 - 160 Wishart Street Glasgow

Proposal: Erection of key worker housing (Sui Generis) and associated ancillary works.

18.03.2026 Date Valid: 26.03.2026 OBJECTION SUBMITTED - **OBJECTION NOTED BELOW**

Reference: 26/00519/FUL

Address: 7 Seton Terrace Glasgow G31 2HU

Proposal: Formation of doors to front and rear of garage and external alterations to dwellinghouse.

Applicant Details: Mr Kevin Loder

Representation Expiry Date: 22.05.2026 NO OBJECTION

Reference: 26/00528/FUL

Address: 109 Reidvale Street Glasgow

Proposal: Alterations to tenement pend to form flatted dwelling (Sui generis), includes installation of boiler flue and gas meter box to front, and vent to rear.

Applicant Details: Reidvale HA

Representation Expiry Date: 25.05.2026 NO OBJECTION AS IT IS A H/A

Reference: 26/00686/FUL

Address: Site To The West Of 92 Craigpark Drive Glasgow

Proposal: Installation of streetworks monopole, 6 no. antennas, 3 no. radio units, 2 no. 300mm diameter dishes, equipment housing and other ancillary development.

Applicant Details: JET Infrastructure

Representation Expiry Date: 25.05.2026 CONSERVATION AREA ONSLOW GARDENS - **OBJECTION NOTED BELOW**

Reference: 26/00495/FUL

Address: Flat 1 38 Circus Drive Glasgow

Proposal: Demolition of garage, landscaping works and widening of entrance.

Date Received: 09.03.2026

Date Valid: 23.04.2026

Representation Expiry Date: 29.05.2026 CONSERVATION AREA NO OBJECTION

Reference: 26/00671/LBA

Address: City Park 368 Alexandra Parade Glasgow

Proposal: Internal and external alterations associated with part change of use from office to residential.

Representation Expiry Date: 29.05.2026 'B' LISTED IN CONSERVATION AREA - **MEETING NOTES BELOW**

Reference: 26/00729/LBA

Address: 5 Annfield Place Glasgow G31 2XQ

Proposal: Internal and external works associated with change of use to dwellinghouse.

Representation Expiry Date: 29.05.2026 'B' LISTED IN CONSERVATION AREA – NO OBJECTION

Reference: 26/00730/FUL

Address: 5 Annfield Place Glasgow G31 2XQ

Proposal: Use of office (Class 1A) as dwellinghouse (Class 9) with associated works.

Representation Expiry Date: 29.05.2026 'B' LISTED IN CONSERVATION AREA – NO OBJECTION

Application for Existing Licence for House in Multiple Occupation.

Reference No:- HMO06741 Applicant:- OWNER Reservoir Engineering Systems Ltd

Address of Living Accommodation:- Flat 0.1, 5 Firpark Court, Glasgow, G31 2GA

Occupant Capacity:- 3 - No. of Rooms:- 3

Last Date for Objection/Representation:- 29 May 2026 NO OBJECTION EXISTING LICENCE

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Objection to Planning Application 26/00565/FUL

The proposal fails to comply with National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4), in particular Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places) and Policy 14 (Design, Quality and Place).

The submitted Design Statement makes no meaningful reference to the site’s immediate adjacency to the Glasgow Necropolis, a Category A listed Victorian garden cemetery (HES Ref: LB33890), nor does it assess the impact of the development on its setting, significance, or key views. NPF4 Policy 7 requires proposals affecting nationally important historic assets and conservation areas to be supported by a proportionate assessment; this has not been provided.

The Glasgow Necropolis forms a key component of the City Centre Conservation Area, alongside Glasgow Cathedral and Provand’s Lordship. The scale, height and massing of the proposed development—particularly the absence of a stepped reduction along the Wishart Street edge—would result in an abrupt and over-dominant “cliff-edge” form adjoining the cemetery. This would cause unacceptable visual harm, undermining the character and setting of an internationally significant heritage landscape, contrary to Policy 7.

The proposal also fails to meet NPF4 Policy 14, which requires development to respond sensitively to context, topography and landscape character. The excessive bulk and height are incongruous with the more significant neighbouring heritage asset and would compete visually with the Necropolis rather than defer to its prominence.

In addition, the daylight analysis appears inadequate, raising concern that impacts on outlook and enclosure have not been properly assessed.

For these reasons, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the historic environment and should be refused.

~~~~~

**Objection to Planning Application 26/00686/FUL**

Site to the west of 92 Craigpark Drive, adjacent to Onslow Gardens, Dennistoun Conservation Area. Proposal for a streetworks monopole, antennas, dishes, equipment housing and associated works.

We object to this proposal because the monopole and associated equipment would have an obstructive, intrusive and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Dennistoun Conservation Area, particularly in the streetscape around Onslow Gardens.

The height, engineered appearance and ground equipment would add visual clutter to a historic townscape whose special interest lies in its coherent tenement architecture, traditional street pattern and relationship between buildings and public space. In this location, the development would not preserve or enhance the conservation area.

The Council should also consider the cumulative effect on visual amenity and pedestrian experience from additional street furniture and equipment in a sensitive location. I am not persuaded that this site has been shown to be the least harmful option, or that less intrusive alternatives have been fully assessed. The application should therefore be refused as contrary to the statutory duty to preserve or enhance conservation areas, relevant Glasgow City Development Plan and historic environment guidance, the Dennistoun Conservation Area Appraisal, and National Planning Framework 4 policies supporting high-quality places and protection of local historic assets.

~~~~~

Comments and responses on Proposal 26/00671/LBA put to the meeting of BJ + RJ with Ahsan Afzal representing the developer on 18 May 2026

1. Overdevelopment: Converting half of the building into 129 apartments appears to be an intensive form of development for this site and its surrounding area, particularly given the relatively limited number of 2- and 3-bedroom flats. The proposal would accommodate 212 residents, with 12 three-bedroom flats, 53 two-bedroom flats, and 69 one-bedroom flats.

2. Parking provision: Providing 97 parking spaces for 129 apartments appears inadequate and may increase pressure on surrounding streets.

Response noted: It was stated that 75% parking provision is apparently considered sufficient. The basement is not available for parking and is to be used as a plant room.

3. Pressure on local services: A development of this scale would increase demand on schools, GP surgeries, and dental services, with no clear evidence of how that additional pressure would be addressed. Also noted that the 1-bedroom flats have little space for laundry.

Response noted: It was stated that the number of residents would not be sufficient to require an in-house pharmacy or other dedicated services. The commercial part of the building currently includes a fitness studio and nursery. It was also stated that there will be a dedicated laundry area for the one-bedroom flats.

4. Waste and bin storage: It remains important to clarify whether the application includes adequate bin storage and waste collection arrangements for a scheme of this size.

Response noted: a dedicated space for waste disposal is proposed completely separate from the commercial side of the building.

5. Private and communal amenity space: The available amenity space appears limited in relation to the number of proposed residents.

Response noted: it was stated that there will be two internal courtyard communal spaces completely separate from the commercial side of the building.

6. Shared space arrangements: Clarification is needed on how shared spaces will operate within the development.

Response noted: it was stated that the residential and commercial sections will be entirely separate, both internally and externally.

7. Access concerns: Access arrangements remain a concern and need to be clearly understood.

Response noted: it was stated that there would be no access through the building to the front north entrance, either internally or externally.

8. Future use of the remaining office space: They are losing both Sky and Dell. There is a wider question about whether the remaining office space could in future also be converted to residential use. Currently they will be slightly upgrading the current spaces and subdividing some of the larger spaces to accommodate smaller businesses.

Response noted: it was stated that the intention is to retain the remaining office space for at least five years, although future conversion remains a possibility. If that were to happen, additional dedicated services such as pharmacy, GP, and dental provision may be required. It was also stated that the flats are currently intended to be rented, though they may be sold in future.

9. Heritage and design: Subdivision into flats may not be a sufficiently sympathetic use for a listed Art Deco building of this character.

Response noted: it was stated that attention has been given to the building's fenestration across the various elevations so that window openings can remain consistent with the original layout. HES had been consulted.

Timescale – if granted Planning permission they have funds in place and would start onsite in June and it would take 18 months for the conversion. There will be a dedicated manager onsite and the management of the whole building is retained by the owner/developer.

Happy to allow use of some of the space for DCC meetings or events.

CONCLUSION: NO OBJECTION TO BE SUBMITTED

APPENDIX B – Dennistoun Area Partnership Report from Ruth Johnston

Festive Lighting:

Festive lighting £11,910 approved as it was last year. Costs were requested for Artificial trees for future re-use. DCC sent an objection to this ahead of the meeting as the representative could not attend

NIIF – Costs For The Following To Be Brought To The September Meeting:

Outdoor exercise equipment for Sighthill Park

Ground clearance of Tertius – still mentioning 'Business as Usual' to enable to refuse the application for funds

RJ comment this is building demolition waste dumped in this cemetery. Not 'Business and Usual' works within a cemetery.

Remedial works at the Monteath Mausoleum

Update To Be Provide On:

Crossing at Iceland on Alexandra Parade

CCTV Alexandra Parade/Onslow Drive

Todd Street – see note at the end. DCC sent an objection to this ahead of the meeting as the representative could not attend

Dennistoun Mural Trail

Saracen Fountain Alexandra Park

Greenspace works at Coll Place

Bollards at Coll Place

Ark Lane no further forward

Eastern Entrance – no Planning Application or request for Building Consent yet

Lighting in Alexandra Park – Costs to be provided based on costs of £150k approved for Queens Park

Approved CCTV at Duke Street/John Knox Street £9,500

DCC Proposal For Crossing At Todd Street: *(Green comments were submitted ahead of the DAP meeting.)*

"The council do not install zebra crossings at this time as they do not support the needs of visually impaired users."

The implication is that a Puffin push-button crossing is required, which is significantly more expensive (3x or 4x), so the result is that instead of something that benefits most pedestrians, we end up with nothing because it doesn't benefit all pedestrians.

"This crossing would also be too close to the junction."

It would absolutely fit geometrically. A 5 metre setback from the junction is enough (to fit the zig zags in, basically). There's 20 metres between the give way lines and the existing unmarked crossing point where the dropped kerbs are at the gap between the pedestrian barrier. So I presume 'too close' means there'd be a risk of traffic momentarily slowing down or stopping on Cumbernauld Road if more than three or four southbound cars were required to wait on Todd Street for someone to cross. So it's inconvenient to drivers but just forget the pedestrian again.

DCC ask the meeting to note that in other parts of the UK there are proposals for zebra crossings on side roads.

These crossings will support the 2022 amendments to the Highway Code requiring drivers to give way to pedestrians who are crossing or waiting to cross a road into which they are turning.

A side road zebra crossing uses black and white zebra markings and give way lines but does not have the other features of the crossings people are more used to such as Belisha beacons or zig zag markings. Side road zebra crossings can therefore be installed on the pedestrian's desired walking line, directly across the mouth of the junction and are significantly cheaper and quicker to install and maintain.

The trials in Cardiff and similar trials undertaken in Manchester and Westminster found no evidence that using a side road zebra crossing would have a significantly greater risk than one using the full range of features and showed a significant increase in drivers giving way to pedestrians compared to a junction without them.

The bigger issue here is the whole junction just north of Todd Street. It's a massively vehicle-dominated mess with only the minimum pedestrian provision and an absolute sea of space used for islands between traffic lanes doing absolutely nothing. The junction at the other end of Todd Street is similarly poor (as is the entire length of the road).

2023 DCC's pedestrian proposals included an ask for a zebra at the mid-point with the saving grace of it being a signalised junction at the south end.

APPENDIX C – ALEXANDRA PARADE PRIMARY SHELTERS CORRESPONDENCE TO CLLR CARROLL FROM GCC

Sent to Cllr Carroll on behalf of Cat Smith, Assistant Group Manager, Property & Consultancy Services, NRS, GCC

16 Sep 2025 (NRSMLU 2510507)

Thank you for your enquiry regarding proposed repairs and maintenance of the sheds at Alexandra Parade Primary School.

A structural engineer has inspected the sheds and is preparing a report with recommendations for required action depending on their findings on the overall condition of the sheds. It is hoped that the report will be available before the schools' finish for the October week break on Friday 10 October, at which time an officer from Property and Consultancy Services will arrange a quotation.

An update on the proposals will be provided once the report is available.

I trust this update is helpful.

19 Nov 2025 (NRSMLU 2542115)

Thank you for your enquiry of 11 November regarding an update on behalf of the Parent Council at Alexandra Parade Primary concerning the proposals for repairs to the playground sheds.

An officer from Property and Consultancy Services received the structural report on Wednesday 12 November. The report has now been submitted to our contractor to provide a quotation for the recommended repairs for our consideration. Quotations can take up to 21 days to be returned.

Once the quotation has been reviewed and a decision taken on which works are approved, an update will be provided.

I trust this update is helpful.

14 Jan 2026 (NRSMLU 2566430)

Thank you for your enquiry regarding the structural report and proposals for the sheds at Alexandra Parade Primary School.

The contractor's quotation for the structural repairs was received on 12 December 2025 and has been forwarded to our structural engineer for assessment. Once the quoted scope of works has been reviewed, we will consider the most appropriate way forward.

An update will be provided once a decision has been made on the most viable option for remedial action.

I trust this information is helpful.

30 Apr 2026 (NRSMLU 2622963)

Further to your request for an update on the proposals relating to the structural issues with the sheds at Alexandra Parade Primary School, and the previous update provided by Property Services (attached), I can now update as follows.

Following the recommendations of the structural inspection and the subsequent quotation, alternative options for the sheds were explored, including demolition. We have now considered these findings in the context of our service priorities and decided not to progress any further works to these sheds at the current time.

We will of course keep this matter under further consideration and may undertake works at a future time.

I trust this update is helpful.