



Group Manager
Traffic and Road Safety
Glasgow City Council
231 George Street
Glasgow
G1 1RX

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

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

Ref: TF/AWJR/GCC

E-mail: safeparking@glasgow.gov.uk

18 September 2014

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Glasgow City Council (Dowanhill & Byres Road) (Traffic Management and Parking Controls) Order

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals.

Go Bike is delighted to see that it is proposed to introduce contraflow cycling in the Dowanhill and Byres Road area. Such schemes, if implemented appropriately and correctly, improve road conditions for cyclists, encourage people to cycle and thus improve the health and welfare of the population. As you will no doubt be well aware, this should be the default position according to the design guide that we understand to be used by Glasgow City Council.

However, it would seem that, in this case, the contraflow cycling is merely an afterthought, with the main aim of the proposals being to maximise parking for motor vehicles and thus encourage such vehicles to come into this area, which is primarily residential but contains three schools. Thus, we wish to object to the proposals on the following grounds:

1. The proposals relate only to a part of Dowanhill, rather than all of the area. For those of our members who live in Dowanhill, it is essential that we see your proposals for the whole area and indeed, for those of us who live in other parts of the city, who visit or cycle through Dowanhill, we need to have input to, and be able to comment on, a city-wide plan for increased on-street parking, the extension of one-way streets for motor vehicles and the introduction of contraflow cycling, should such a plan or strategy exist. Such matters can not be considered in isolation, otherwise inconsistencies will arise leading to confusion for all road users.
2. The covering letter and the notice of proposals give no indication of the proposed amendment to the cycling regime; this will encourage non-cyclists to approve, or otherwise, the proposals without giving due regard to their interaction with cyclists.
3. The Order refers only to Traffic Management and Parking Controls and it appears that, of the two, Parking Controls is the more important and Traffic Management is subsidiary. We are unaware of any road design guidance that recommends there to be parking on both sides of a street with two-way cycling and one-way driving? Perhaps you could clarify which design document you are using? Standard practice is for parking to be on one side of the road only, although it may alternate from side to side, with the purpose of introducing traffic calming. Parking on both sides of the road, albeit with motor vehicles going in one direction only, introduces a significant hazard for cyclists unless they are consistently able to cycle clear of the door-opening zone, ie a minimum 1m clear of the outer edge of a car. It must be borne in mind that many cars are significantly larger than the traditional "standard", eg a Vauxhall Zafira is 1.801m wide (excluding mirrors) and thus the current minimum width of parking bay of 1.800

is unrealistic. Could you please confirm the width of parking bay in your proposals and the allowance you have used for the door opening zone?

4. In your efforts to maximise vehicle parking, you propose to allow parking effectively to the end of the majority of streets, for example on both sides of Lawrence Street at the junction with Hyndland Street and on both sides of Ruthven Street at the junction with Byres Road. There is no evidence shown on your drawings that you intend to follow good practice and design guidance by building out the footway at all these locations. The purpose of such construction is to define a clear end to the parking zone, to allow cyclists and other vulnerable road users a clear view of the junction and to allow space for pedestrians to assemble prior to crossing a road while still allowing throughput on the footway. By not following good practice your proposals, if implemented, will put cyclists and vulnerable road users at risk.
5. In addition to not informing residents and other interested parties of the proposed cycle changes in your letter and notice, it would seem that you do not intend to inform them should implementation of the current proposals occur. There is no information on your drawing of any road signs to inform cyclists that they may use a one-way street in each direction or to inform motorists that they might meet cyclists travelling in a contra-direction to themselves. We understand that members of your staff have discussed such omissions with concerned residents but we must object to the proposals until such time as you include the appropriate signage on your drawings. Your failure to do so to date shows a poor regard for the safety and welfare of cyclists and other road users. Could you please clarify whether you are following the detailed guidance in page 152 et seq of Chapter 3 of the Traffic Signs Manual? If so, why hasn't this been included in the Order?
6. Your plans give no indication as to how you intend to promote the City Council's policy of active travel to the two schools in this area, Notre Dame High School and Notre Dame Primary. Parking in bays is allowed very close to these schools thus making it hazardous for children crossing the road when accessing and exiting the schools. We propose that parking is banned on Havelock Street and Elie Street around Notre Dame Primary and the footways widened to encourage children to walk and cycle to school. The junctions near Notre Dame High should all have extended footways, as discussed above.
7. Your plans continue the parking allowed on Byres Road and you have failed to take advantage of the opportunity to promote active travel on what was a very busy retail street, now losing its market share to other parts of the city. A major reduction in parking, widening of the footways and the introduction of cycle lanes in each direction would enhance this area for businesses, for residents and visitors and increase footfall to the shops and restaurants. The not-inconsiderable revenue from the increased parking could be used to support the improvements noted in this and the previous point and to finance cycle infrastructure.
8. It is Glasgow City Council policy to install Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs) for cyclists at all signalled junctions during maintenance and upgrades. ASLs currently exist at some of the junctions in this area, but none are shown on your proposals. When you re-issue your drawing will you please correct this omission?

In summary, while we applaud your proposal to introduce contraflow cycling, we are extremely concerned that you propose it to be done without due cognisance of the available design guidance and to the potential 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