

Land and Environmental Services
Glasgow City Council
Exchange House
231 George Street
Glasgow
G1 1RX

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

e-mail: campaigning@gobike.org
web: www.gobike.org

Ref: TF/CPG/GCC

E-mail: SustainableTransport@glasgow.gov.uk

04 February 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Glasgow City Council Colleges Cycle Route, Phase 2 (Traffic Regulation) Order 201_RESPONSE

Thank you for your reply dated 27 January to our letter of objection dated 29 September. Also, many thanks for attaching the updated drawing of the eastern part of the scheme, which is significantly clearer than the one originally published on your website. Would it be possible for you to forward a drawing of this same quality to show your intentions for the remainder of the scheme? A third thank you for responding to each of our points in turn.

We will now respond to your comments in turn in *italics*. You will see that we have not included your response in full but hope that you agree that we have fully considered it.

1. The proposals have been produced with no reference to an overall plan for Glasgow or even for this part of Glasgow. We have recently commented, again with an objection, to the proposals for increased parking in part of Dowanhill. This piecemeal policy of increasing parking, "squeezing in" cycle lanes and giving only cursory attention to active travel is not robust and we object to the way it is being done.

LES: The above statement is erroneous. The Council's transport policy completely supports the development of this project

We are in danger of a pedantic argument on this point. We understand that there is a "plan", but no overall map of routes that follow desire lines and the main cycle flows, and no immediate connectivity between neighbouring schemes. However, we realise that our objection is outwith the immediate scope of this TRO and thus we regrettably accept that it does not technically apply.

2. We note that the maximum width of cycle lane to be installed is 1.5m; this is the absolute minimum width in the design standard that we understand Glasgow City Council works to. We object to the absolute minimum being considered as the standard.

LES: As you are aware, the design conforms to the standards set in the national guidance document 'Cycling by Design'. Some parts of the road corridor are particularly narrow. etc

Thank you for confirming that the design is to "Cycling by Design". Our overall concern at the use of the absolute minima being used as a standard remains but we withdraw the objection in this case where the existing infrastructure is a controlling factor. However, we are very interested in the alternative layouts you considered and would be pleased if you will share these ideas with us.

3. Throughout this scheme we object to the car door zone being the absolute minimum of 0.5m. In conjunction with the cycle lanes being at the absolute minimum, with many cars and vans exceeding the parking bay width, the situation is hazardous for cyclists who may well have to

move out of the cycle lane to avoid car doors being opened in their path. This zone width must be increased to the desirable minimum of 1.0m throughout so that cyclists do not need to deviate from the lane should a car door be opened fully in front of them.

LES: See above regarding width.

We maintain our objection on this point. Car parking should not be allowed where there is no safe allowance for the offside door to open. Too many cyclists have been injured by drivers ignoring safe practice and opening their doors into the path of an oncoming cyclist.

4. The proposals start only at North Gardiner Street; to the east of this point on Highburgh Road, the cycle lanes were reduced some years ago and we consider that from North Gardiner Street to the junction with Byres Road they should be increased to the desirable minimum width in conjunction with this scheme. We object to your proposal to have a change in standard part way along a road; it will cause confusion for all road users.

LES: There are no proposals to widen the cycle lanes between ...

We withdraw the objection on this point as it is outwith the area covered but our concern remains.

5. The footway extensions at either side of Hyndland Avenue appear to create a narrowing of available road space. What width is the westbound cycle lane here? Please will you clarify so that we may submit a reasoned comment?

LES: The footway extensions and cycle lanes are existing. I can confirm the westbound cycle lane is 1.0m wide. etc.

Since this is technically outwith the scope then we must withdraw our objection, but it is very disconcerting that GoBike's objections to the earlier changes to this section of the cycle route were not taken into account.

6. The footway build out for the bus stop in the westbound direction to the east of North Gardiner Street, opposite Crown Road South, in conjunction with the bus stop, will push cyclists out into the centre of the road. The tight eastward turn for motor vehicles from Crown Road South, with the tendency for vehicles to swing wide, added to the likelihood of vehicles travelling east also being in the centre of the road because of the footway build out on the north side of Hyndland Road, adds to the risk of collision at this pinch point. We object to the way the road has been narrowed at this point, on a bend, with an acute junction, creating a hazard for all road users.

LES: should cyclists choose to overtake the bus, space is available to do so. Etc

This does not create a safe environment in which people may cycle with confidence. However, we accept that there is limited space for improvement in this area and withdraw our objection.

7. Your proposals are unclear for the length of Hyndland Road from the bus stop to the east of North Gardiner Street through to Turnberry Road in the direction heading west. What width is the cycle lane here? Please will you clarify so that we may submit a reasoned comment?

LES: I can advise that the cycle lanes are 1.5m wide.

Thank you for this confirmation. We have no objection at this point but we would ask that your drawings for future consultations contain no ambiguity.

8. Two members of the cycling community attended a ride out with your staff earlier this year to the area covered by these proposals and we offered constructive comments as to how the scheme could be strengthened. It is very disappointing that you appear to have ignored the suggestions given. A particular area of concern was the westward direction on Hyndland Road towards the top of Clarence Drive. The cycle lane suddenly stops short of this junction, giving cyclists no protection as they try to enter the Advance Stop Line (ASL) to either turn left or continue straight on. We object strongly to this decision to stop the cycle lane rather than

taking a decisive step to promote active travel and safeguarding cyclists by providing continuity.

LES: At present, other than the short approach into Nonetheless, our engineers will consider whether the links to the ASLs can be improved.

Thank you for looking at this again. We look forward to hearing from you further.

9. We object to the lack of provision of a cycle lane on either side of Hyndland Road from the junction of Clarence Drive through to Great Western Road. This piecemeal provision gives no security to any road user and does not encourage good road behaviour. Although this is not what is considered as the "Colleges Route" it is a natural desire line of travel and the opportunity should be taken to consider Highburgh Road with its natural extension into Hyndland Road in its entirety.

LES: As stated, this section of road does not form part of Colleges Cycle Route etc

We acknowledged that this was not part of the route, but it is an opportunity missed. We withdraw our objection and look forward to discussing your future proposals for this area with you.

10. We object to the lack of provision of a cycle lane on the south, or westbound, side of Clarence Drive from the junction with Hyndland Road to Dudley Drive. This gives no continuity, means that cyclists travelling from the Great Western Road end of Hyndland Road, or travelling from the shops on Hyndland Road have to share a downhill lane with all other road traffic, and gives no encouragement at all to pupils at Hyndland Secondary to travel to or from school by cycle. This does not support the council's active travel to schools policy.

LES: The above observation is erroneous, a cycle lane exists for the majority of this length, i.e. between Lauderdale Gardens and Dudley Drive.

You agree the substance of our objection. There is no cycle lane to protect cyclists as they turn from Hyndland Road into Clarence Drive for the first part of their journey. We apologise if we misinterpreted your earlier drawings, but you are aware that we were unable to view them as apparently you intended. We maintain our objection on this point.

11. The intended diversion of westbound cyclists via Turnberry Drive is laudable to some extent, but gives no cognisance, as noted above, of journeys starting/terminating on Hyndland Road to the north. To be usable as a serious diversionary route the minimum enhancement required would be the installation of dropped kerbs at either end of the footpath section joining the two sections of Turnberry Road. However, although this length of footpath might just meet the desirable minimum of 3m for a shared path, we suggest that at school entry and departure times pedestrian and cycle flows will make this section very congested. It is very disappointing that cyclists and pedestrians are put in conflict with each other in this way when nothing is done to reduce the road space allocated to motor vehicles. We object to the parsimonious nature in which this has been proposed.

LES: The above observation is erroneous, dropped kerbs already exist at the closure on Turnberry Road.

We have not seen the dropped kerbs, perhaps they were obscured by parked cars. If they are there please accept our apologies. We maintain our objection to this as a formal route, while we accept that some people may choose to use it.

12. It is potentially hazardous for cyclists to rejoin Clarence Drive from Dudley Drive. Motorists in the westward direction will be going at not inconsiderable speed here and will have to contend not only with vehicles on their offside travelling in the opposite direction on what is a blind curve but also cyclists on their nearside. We object to this potential zone of conflict being introduced.

LES: Since cyclists are coming out of a minor road, they and all other traffic require to give way

We withdraw our objection to this point; it was based on the reading of your drawing, as per point 10 above. We were unaware that the westbound cycle lane started at Lauderdale Gardens and not at Dudley Drive.

13. On Clarence Drive as it passes under the railway it is disappointing to note that on-street parking will continue. This presents a hazard to cyclists at present and will continue to do so if your current proposals are implemented. This is a blind bend and cyclists are not always able to see far enough to take evasive action to avoid a parked vehicle; a situation made worse on a busy road with vehicles travelling in both directions. We object to this part of your proposal on the grounds that parking should be banned at this location and full-width cycle lanes and door opening zones should be installed.

LES: The above observation is erroneous. The TRO drawings show that it is proposed to prohibit parking at this location.

As you are aware, since we asked for this TRO to be discussed at 09 October meeting of the Transport Strategy Group, your drawings as published on the Council website did not show this prohibition. As mentioned above, if you could supply a drawing that clearly shows this, we will gladly withdraw our objection.

14. We note that the carriageway width varies on Clarence Drive but object to the allocation of the extra width being given to motor vehicles. We have already commented that the cycle lanes have been designed to the absolute minimum, likewise with the door opening zone. To attempt to meet the desirable minimum standards the additional width should be allocated to the cycle lanes and door opening zones.

LES: The widths of the traffic lanes do vary, primarily at the S bends. etc

Thank you for further reviewing our concern. We look forward to discussing this with you.

15. We note that parking is to be allowed directly outside Broomhill Primary School Annexe and that no attempt has been made to encourage these young primary pupils to cycle to school by providing suitable facilities. This is in contravention of council policy and we object to this failure.

LES: Broomhill School Annexe is scheduled to close

We were not aware that the Annexe was to close. Could you please clarify the extent of the parking to be allowed southbound and its proximity to the cycle lane? Thank you for clarifying that there will be restrictions for northbound parking.

16. We object to the lack of provision of a right turn from the westbound cycle route to Woodcroft Avenue, or to the lack of any provision for pupils, staff or visitors to Broomhill School to directly access Woodcroft Avenue from the west side of Crow Road. This is a missed opportunity and does not assist any pupils, staff or parents who wish to walk or cycle to either of the school buildings.

LES: As above LES would welcome any further views on improving this link though.

We look forward to discussing this with you, and in the meantime we withdraw our objection.

17. We are disappointed to see that parking will be allowed for all of Crow Road from the Cross to Balshagray Avenue, and that this is to the detriment of cyclists using this route, since some of this parking, as it is now, will completely cover the cycle lane. This is a well-used commuter route and facilities for cyclists should be high on the council agenda. We object to this part of your proposals.

LES: The above observation is erroneous.

We apologise but were unable to read your drawings as presented. If you could provide current drawings we will be pleased to withdraw our objection to this point.

18. Throughout this scheme we object to the reduction of footway width to accommodate parking. The promotion of active travel is stated to be an important aim of the council and both cycling and walking should be encouraged in this primarily residential area with two busy schools.

LES: Where kerblines alterations are to take place, the remaining footway widths are still in excess of minimum standards.

We find this regrettable but withdraw our objection to this point.

19. Throughout the scheme we object to parking being allowed at any time where there is a cycle lane; this will deter many from cycling, to the detriment of their health and in contravention of stated council policy.

LES: [The design of the cycle route complies with national cycling technical guidance](#)

Our interpretation of Cycling by Design, table 5.1, is that motor vehicles are not allowed to drive or park in a mandatory cycle lane, which we understood these to be. Again this objection point was based on the lack of clarity in your original drawing. The opening remarks in your e-mail of 27 January imply that the lanes are advisory. Please will you clarify.

To summarise, apparently some of our concerns were founded on our inability to decipher the drawings published on your website. This was compounded by the lack of any discussion on this route either with the volunteers who attended the site ride-out or at the Transport Strategy Group.

However, we can confirm that we withdraw our objection to points 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 16, 18.

We look forward to receiving revised drawings that give no dubiety as to your current proposals and to discussing your changes to date and proposed changes with you.

Yours sincerely



Tricia Fort
Convenor, GoBike!