



John Mackie
Transport and Regeneration
Broomhill Industrial Estate
Kilsyth Road
Kirkintilloch
G66 1TF

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

e-mail: campaigning@gobike.org

web: www.gobike.org

Ref: BW1014

6 October 2014

Please reply to:

Richard McKinlay
Go-Bike! East Dunbarton
20 Dougalston Crescent
Milngavie
Glasgow
G62 6HP

Dear Sir/Madam,

A81 Milngavie Rd/Main St. Cycle Lanes etc.

Go- Bike! would like to comment on the most recent proposals for cycle provision on the above routes. These comments are prefaced by the following general points:

- We understand the origin of this plan to enable cycling over this stretch for a cohort of cyclists currently wary of sharing road space in proximity to vehicular traffic and are aware of the extensive consultation which has taken place.
- Aspects of the proposed measures replicate bi-directional cycle lanes which have been introduced recently in other local authority areas. Many of these have been constructed to a minimal or sub-standard level. These have received considerable criticism from the cycling community.
- If there is an assumption that fast cyclists will stay on the road and the design is only for slow cyclists, then the scheme will be a failure. It has got to be built in a way that is attractive for ALL people on bikes, not some sort of dual-network approach.

A totally segregated cycle lane may attract new cyclists, which is clearly welcome, but it is likely to be ignored by confident cyclists who currently use the road, especially when the lane is on the wrong side. The reduced width of the

main carriageway will make it more dangerous for them. This is recognised in the FAQs.

There would be a strong case for segregated uni-directional cycle lanes on this stretch, but if it is decided to implement segregated bi-directional lanes we would expect the standards applied to be consistent with current 'best-practice'.

We would make the following specific points in relation to the published plans:

Contd...

1. Width. A bi-directional cycle lane should ideally be to a width of 4 meters (3.5m minimum).
2. Bus Stops. Positioned to allow unimpeded progress to cyclists.
3. Kerbs/Boundaries. These should be 'forgiving' and not a barrier to cyclists forced to cross them.
4. Surface Quality. The current lanes were constructed with an uneven surface and 'ridges' every 5m due to the surfacing technique. The surface has also broken up fairly quickly. It was never a suitable surface for fast cyclists on high pressure tyres.
5. Maintenance Agenda. This is required to ensure cleanliness of the lanes and adequate snow/ice clearance.
6. 'Switchover' at Kelvin Timber. The point where the crossover is must allow for minimal delay to cyclists. For motorists, it will just delay them joining the queues further along the road, but for cyclists it is loss of momentum in addition to real non-recoverable delay. We would recommend retaining the cycle lane in front of Arnold Clark to facilitate cyclists coming South from the A81. If also bidirectional, this could feed the new shopping centre (Waitrose) on the East side.

Failure to meet points 1-3 to an acceptable standard of 'best-practice' would trigger further representation at the statutory notification stage.

I hope these comments are viewed as constructive and would welcome any opportunity for further input to this development.

On behalf of Go-Bike!

Yours sincerely,

Richard G McKinlay