



Andrew Brown
Projects Manager
Land and Environmental Services
Glasgow City Council
By e-mail to allan.maclean@glasgow.gov.uk

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

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

Ref: TF/BD/GCC

28 October 2014

Dear Andrew,

PROPOSED NEWLANDS TO SILVERBURN CYCLING & WALKING ROUTE

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preliminary plans for this route, and for the previous opportunity to join the ride-out to look at the site.

We are pleased that attempts are now being made to improve conditions for cyclists in this area but disappointed by the lack of ambition shown.

Barrhead Road is a fast road, which is unpleasant to cycle and, while we are disappointed that there is no will within the Council to install cycle lanes, we accept that, in the current circumstances, the shared footway is an improvement that will be welcomed by many.

However, we are concerned at the lack of consistency with the footway. The majority, if not all, of the footway on Barrhead Road and Boydstone Road is going to be excavated and resurfaced. So why will it not be a standard width throughout? The overall width of the footway is proposed to vary from 3.0m on Drg 108 to 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 4.0, 4.1 to 4.3m along Barrhead Road, all, of course, reduced by a buffer strip of 0.5m, or 0.8m on Drg 106 and the shared use signs plus whatever other street furniture there is. This will cause confusion.

We object to the lack of priority given to the shared use footway at the entrances to the car parks on Boydstone Road and to Cowglen Golf Club on Barrhead Road. Those using the shared footway should have the same priority as other road users who are continuing straight along those roads.

A more ambitious solution could be found to allow cyclists to cross Boydstone Road at the junction with Barrhead Road than a toucan crossing, which causes delay to cyclists.

We object to the introduction of a toucan crossing on Kennishead Road. In the proposals, on Drg 104, the footway reduces to 2.5m on the west side of Kennishead Road, which is insufficient for the storage of cycles waiting to cross and for pedestrians and cyclists proceeding along Kennishead Road. Priority at the junction should be given to all road and footway users continuing along Barrhead Road.

If the above concerns can be remedied, then we consider this to be an acceptable solution.

We are not as relaxed, though, about the proposals east of Kennishead Road. Measures to avoid the Auldhouse Roundabout were discussed at some length on the ride-out and it is now clear that there is no feasible, natural route. The proposals, as presented, will make an improvement for residents and visitors to the area to the south of Auldhouse Road, bounded by Thornliebank Road to the west and Kilmarnock Road to the east, and will enhance the opportunity for pupils and staff at both Hillpark and Tinto schools to use a bike, rather than a

car, but they do very little, if anything, for those people who wish to cycle from Barrhead Road to Kilmarnock Road.

There is thus the opportunity to address the Auldhouse Roundabout and, if Glasgow City Council does wish to change the modal split from car to bike, this must not be missed. Upgrading the roundabout to a "Dutch" style with a cycle lane for the full circumference, will allow people to cycle north, south, east and west at this location, ie it will enhance both the radial route into the city centre and the route from Shawlands and Newlands across to Silverburn. It would encourage many to get their bikes out and use them.

We look forward to hearing back from you and to now entering discussion with you at the Transport Strategy group to amend and upgrade these proposals.

Yours sincerely

Tricia Fort
Convenor, Go Bike