



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/AW/GCC

E-mail: les@glasgow.gov.uk

29 September 2014

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals.

Go Bike applauds the efforts of the City Council's engineering staff in their attempts to improve cycling provision along this route in the face of what appears to be overwhelming political support to maintain and extend the freedom given to those who wish to drive, park and store their motor vehicles on our streets. This bias towards the use of the motor vehicle contradicts any publicly voiced aim of the City Council to increase active travel, contradicts the council's aim of 10% of journeys in the city to be by bike by 2020, contradicts its aim of encouraging children to walk and cycle to school, but in its place encourages the "school run" and contradicts its aim of improving public health. This bias has not allowed the cycle route to be designed in a consistent manner. The only bit of segregation and meaningful road design is the existing left turn from Crow Road into Clarence Drive; the remainder is merely a slight upgrade of the existing paint lines, with no demonstrable moves to encourage children and new cyclists to use the route.

That said, it is with some pleasure we see that you propose to extend the fire path and cycle lane at the junction of Marlborough Drive and Crow Road; a positive move.

However we object to the proposals overall on the following grounds:

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.
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.
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.
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.

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?
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.
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?
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.
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.
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.
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.

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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

In summary, we are extremely disappointed that you have not taken due cognisance of the available design guidance and the evidence that is available to promote active travel. With a strong lead from the council this part of the city could again become a pleasant area to walk, cycle and shop. The current proposals simply promote it as a car route to the detriment of the health, safety and welfare of cyclists and all road users. We look forward to receiving, and approving, your revised proposals.

Yours sincerely



Tricia Fort
Convenor, Go Bike