



Southside Community Council Meeting, Monday 8th January, 7pm, Nelson Hall

Present: Joan Carter, Liz Logie, Stephen Rodger, Nicholas Oddie, Malcolm Montgomery

Observing: Mandy Cumpstie

Councillor: Tim Pogson

Speaker: George Gilbert

Apologies: Daniel Fisher, Philip Pinsky, Betty

1. Welcome and apologies for absence, declarations of interest.
2. Ascertain issues brought by members of the public: determine when and how to deal with them.
 - a. None seem to be declared. No members of public present
3. Councillor's report – Tim Pogson
 - a. Budget setting processes – seeking to fix the budget in February
 - i. Just had Scottish Government funding – looks like a 1% reduction, on top of inflation
 1. Council Tax Freeze is apparently going to be “fully funded”, but that depends on various assumptions that might not have actually applied to local situation
 - b. Housing – Council declared a Housing Emergency (as has Glasgow)
 - i. 5000 households in temporary accommodation every night, and that doesn't include overcrowding, unsuitable housing etc
 - ii. Starting to have meetings to prepare an action plan to approach it
 1. TP thinks this will involve getting the various bodies together around the table to coordinate them
 2. Council has somethings it has to look at internally – prioritisation of housing, getting empty properties refilled
 - c. STL issue – Council has lost a couple of court cases over the policies, practices and guidelines put into place to manage this
 - i. No appeal on the case from November
 - ii. But doesn't actually make any practical difference to the policy. STL policy still there and being implemented.
 1. Problem was around the presumption that anyone that has been running a STL for a year that it would constitute a change of use and so a change of use application would have to be made.
 2. Applications now have to be assessed individually – some properties *may* have had a previous similar use and so would not count as a change of use
 - a. Resourcing issue to process the applications now

- iii. **JC** – will it make a difference?
 - 1. May do in some individual applications, but not overall policy
 - d. Pavement parking will be enforced from 29th January
 - i. Parking at a dropped curb, crossing and double parking – wardens will now have the capacity to enforce
 - 1. Fine will be as for any other parking infringement - £100, reduced to £50 if paid promptly.
 - ii. **LL** – what will the raised funds will be used for? Repairing pavements?
 - 1. **TP** – doesn't know if it is ringfenced or if it just went into general council funds.
 - 2. **LL** – Haddons Court pavements in very bad condition, has complained, but told there is no money – **TP** – there is more money coming
 - e. Q&A
 - i. **LL** – Bollard at the end of East Crosscauseway regularly damaged (thinks likely by bin lorries), but right hand bollard now completely gone, cars been driving onto Nicolson street
 - 1. **ACTION** - **TP** will report that
 - 2. **NO** – maybe worth someone looking at the rubbish situation with the bins if the bin lorries are the ones causing the problem
 - a. **TP** – that zone will be looked at next for Communal Bin review
 - i. **JC** – might be worth writing to them to look at the bin hub arrangement there
4. Hardwell Close Hostel – George Gilbert from the architects
 - a. Current holders (Hardwell Holdings) the owners of the Thrums Boutique Hotel, bought site in 2023 as a tenanted office
 - i. Current leaseholders lease to end in a couple of months. Owners don't want to put it into temporary usage, want something more sustained
 - ii. Owners want to make a sister location to Thrums
 - b. Previous application refused, likely due to a breakdown of communication between the architects and the community
 - i. Wants to clarify intentions of client, clarify misunderstandings
 - ii. Wants to work collaboratively with the local community, wanting to modify proposals to make proposal more acceptable
 - iii. Planning process works a little against being able to proactively address community concerns. Don't get to see the objections until the decision on planning permission is made
 - c. Client wants to resubmit a planning application, taking into account some of the concerns of objections
 - i. Owners wants to make a “room only facility” – provider does not have to provide the catering facilities, only a breakfast package
 - ii. Plan was to convert for 21 rooms, plus a management suite for the staff to man the facility, and an “active frontage” on Hardwell Close – more occupied rooms and windows looking onto the Close
 - iii. Concerns about occupants congregating outside the building. Suggested alteration is to reduce the number of internal rooms and put a TV lounge inside so as to encourage any socialising to occur inside the building

- iv. No catering provision in the building, so concerns about deliveries, waste and disturbance resulting from a kitchen are not necessary
- v. Close could receive managed supervision from management suite in the building through CCTV
- vi. Previous description of the application as a “hostel”, which may have raised concerns about the clientele of the hotel, preferring the term “Guest House”

d. Q&A

- i. **JC** – investigated Thrums to see what facility could be like, but couldn’t book a room, which raised concerns about what the hotel was being used for (and hence what the new – **NO** checked their website and it is still the case.
 - 1. George Gilbert will investigate, but is sure they are currently taking standard bookings, surprised not available online at the moment
- ii. **JC** – Thinks modifications sound helpful. 19 rooms, all self-contained? How many can it sleep?
 - 1. George Gilbert – 24 possible occupants, all self contained en-suite
- iii. **LL** – will it be manned 24 hours?
 - 1. George Gilbert – yes, a 24 hour manned management suite
- iv. **LL** – Hardwell Close very narrow, how would a fire engine get up there? Normally send 3 tenders for such a place
 - 1. An engine wouldn’t fit. But a variety of measures of in place, and it is in range of firefighting equipment
- v. **LL** – concerned about the access to the building on a narrow lane – narrowness, lighting of the lane, dark late night. Doesn’t think the situation is not conducive to the proposed usage.
 - 1. Amendments to the lane can only be done with cooperation with other ownerships on the close, but would like to see something done about the lighting
- vi. **LL** – question about description as “boutique hotel”
 - 1. Prefer name Guest house, meant to expand the owner’s market, not the same as it’s existing property, but also not really a “hostel” either.
- vii. **LL** - Objections it was refused on?
 - 1. Believed it was primarily the potential of noise breakout from the building and disturb local residents, particularly if there was external activity late at night. – given the 24 hour management, does not believe there will be
- viii. **LL** – smokers?
 - 1. Would have to provide a smoking area outside the back of the building, but there are commercial premises there, not residential, would not be allowed to smoke out the front.
- ix. **JC** – thought the internal space and CCTV does make it more amenable.
- x. **TP** – suggested clients offer to keep the back close in a better condition than it currently does?
 - 1. Active frontage overlooking a thoroughfare is a deterrent to further graffiti etc.
- xi. **TP** – What else to reach out to immediate neighbours?

1. Wasn't sure if we would invite the general public to this meeting, but sees we have not. Wondered if the Community Council would be able/willing to facilitate a meeting with relevant residents?
 2. The objectors names are anonymised so can't contact them specifically.
 3. 12 representations for this level of project is relatively small
 - a. **JC** some of the objectors she was aware of it was partly to get more information
- xii. **JC** – how would we could contact the neighbours?
 1. **TP** thinks the best way to do that would be a physical letter
 2. Likely could get support of a staff member from Thrums for delivery
 3. **ACTION** – organise a day and venue for the meeting
- xiii. **LL** – Lighted signage?
 1. Separate process for signage, but it would be directed signage on the street and on the building, but believes it would be relatively discreet, not “Las Vegas”
- xiv. Thanks given to GG for coming to the meeting to answer questions
- xv. The application would not be resubmitted until consultation has been completed
 1. **MM** – would it be possible to advertise at the street stall?
- e. Discussion after –
 - i. Where to hold meeting? – Southside Community Centre, Charteris Centre, or Nelson Hall?
 - ii. Still concerns about the status of the Thrums Hotel, still not being able to booked, what's happening?
 - iii. **TP** – puzzled about the fact most of the rooms are single rooms, rather than double rooms which you would think would provide more business, but there is a need for cheaper hotel accommodation
 - iv. **NO** – concerned that the clientele might attract noisy people that might disturb neighbours.
5. Reports from office bearers.
 - a. **SRB** – a number of STLs objected to during Christmas break – two had very short feedback times and were missed
6. Reports from Committees and meetings attended
 - a. None
7. Planning and Licensing applications.
 - a. Already covered
8. Mailbird for Secretary's email
 - a. Philip suggested using that for the emails
 - b. **ACTION** – SRB to check the Mailbird service, try it out
9. Public Question time
 - a. None
10. Any Other Business
 - a. **NO** - Website – need to update the minutes for November, dates not on the website, Need to update Philip with the dates and stuff – **JC** - Getting urgent
 - b. Stall – need to discuss it at next meeting
 - i. **ACTION** – need to contact CC members to see availability.

- c. We do not have enough members – Website not even correct on membership – **JC** encouraged members to try and recruit new members
 - d. Mandy introduced herself to the Community Council.
11. Date for Next Meeting: February 12th 2024