



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

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

e-mail: [campaigning@gobike.org](mailto:campaigning@gobike.org)  
web: [www.gobike.org](http://www.gobike.org)

Ref: GCC/CPG

By e-mail to: [safeparking@glasgow.gov.uk](mailto:safeparking@glasgow.gov.uk)

09 March 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

**The Glasgow City Council, Partick, Traffic Management and Parking Controls, Traffic Regulation Order: Partial Agreement and Significant Objection**

Thank you for your e-mail of 10 February inviting comment on the proposals for the Partick area.

We applaud your moves to control parking in this area; the current levels of uncontrolled parking are spoiling the amenity of the area for the residents, most of whom choose to travel by foot, cycle or public transport rather than by private car. We are disappointed, however, that we have received no response to our e-mail of 01 March outlining our concerns about the restrictions on cycling and looking for discussion with you. Thus we repeat much of the content of that e-mail here to confirm our objection to the restrictions on cycling given in this TRO:

GCC Sustainability and the Environment Policy Development Committee Agenda - 03 February 2016 and Executive Committee 03 March

Glasgow's Strategic Plan for Cycling was discussed at this meeting last month and was approved when it was discussed on Thursday 03 March by the Executive Committee. The paper for the Executive Committee meeting included the statement: *"the Council seeks with the Scottish Government to transform Glasgow into the most cycle friendly city in Scotland"*

Glasgow's Strategic Plan for Cycling:

The Strategic Plan was launched last week with a fanfare that Glasgow is a cycling city. I repeat here 2 quotes from the document:

Page 28: *"Cycling by Design will be used as a minimum standard"*

Page 30: TROs would seek to *"exempt cyclists from any road closures, one way streets or banned turns where appropriate to improve accessibility for cyclists."*

Cycling by Design

As per above this is the design standard that the Council uses as the base for its designs. It is a conservative document but it does state at 5.1.5, Contra-flow Cycle Lanes: *"The default position should be to permit two-way cycling on one-way streets"*.

GCC Sustainability and the Environment Policy Development Committee Agenda - 03 February 2016

The committee also discussed the implementation of 20mph across the city and the minutes state:

*"After consideration, the committee noted the report and that the Council was now implementing mandatory 20mph zones in accordance with new guidance issued by the Scottish Government."*

Thus, having considered these policy documents and statements from the City Council, we have the following comments to make about the Partick proposals:

### Car Parking

We understand that this is the main thrust of your proposals for the area and we applaud your moves to reduce commuter parking in this residential area and your intention to reduce or remove parking at street corners/junctions.

### Cycling and Walking

There is no mention at all of cycling in the proposals, nor of any improvements for people walking along these streets.

### 20mph?

The area is currently under a 30mph speed limit and apparently no speed surveys have been carried out. We suggest that it is very likely that should a survey be done, the speeds recorded would permit the introduction of a 20mph limit without traffic calming as per current GCC policy. It was thus disappointing to hear at the recent Consultation Session in Partick Library that the plan currently is to introduce the one-way system and then carry out a survey of traffic speeds. This is unfortunate, not only because the residents are concerned now about the speed limit but because it is the case that speeds will most likely increase once the streets are one-way. Thus additional and significant expenditure might then be incurred to construct the traffic calming required or desired.

### Contraflow Cycling and Consistency

In late 2014, you consulted on a one-way system for the Dowanhill and Byres Road area, very close to this Partick area, where contraflow cycling was to be introduced with no traffic calming, no significant road markings and only signage to indicate the contraflow. Again, the main thrust of this proposal was to manage parking, rather than implement policies to improve active travel. The view then was significantly at odds with the view I acquired from the Consultation Session on 27 March. For this current Partick scheme, I understand, the one-way system will be introduced, with parallel parking on both sides of some streets, before the Cycle Unit becomes involved to consider contraflow cycling. In 2014, as our letter of 18 September 2014 demonstrates, we had concerns that although it is in Cycling by Design, it was a new venture for Glasgow to introduce contraflow cycling with very little signage or widespread publicity. You replied to our letter on 18 December and our second letter to you was on 31 December 2014, in which we stated that we are keen to see the policy of exemption for cyclists from one-way streets extended across the city.

We have heard nothing more of that scheme, and I assumed that it had gone ahead. I was thus surprised when I visited the area today to see that there are no signs in place to indicate that contraflow is permitted, although I did see one cyclist travelling in a contra direction. Has contraflow cycling been legally introduced in that area, or not?


Thus the situation is confusing, to say the least.

If contraflow cycling is not introduced then people who choose to cycle are being disadvantaged, albeit by the laudable aim of managing parking, but nevertheless cycling is seen as secondary to the car. This is very much at odds with the Council's stated aim of increasing journeys by cycle.

We are very aware of the, at times, chaotic parking that takes place in busy areas such as Dowanhill and Partick, and we certainly agree that this needs to be addressed, but we do not see why this should be at the expense of the active traveller.

We would thus be pleased if you will reissue the plans demonstrating that there are routes through the area for cyclists that are to a good design standard. We look forward to discussing this with you further.

Yours sincerely,



Convenor, GoBike!