



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

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

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

Ref: GCC/AM/NL

By e-mail to: Land@glasgow.gov.uk
Cc: Councillor Bill Butler
Councillor Michael Cullen
Councillor Chris Cunningham
Councillor Eva Murray

06 December 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

**THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL, (YOKER TO KNIGHTSWOOD)
(REDETERMINATION OF MEANS OF ACCESS OF PUBLIC RIGHT OF PASSAGE)
ORDER 201_ Objection**

Thank you for your e-mail of 03 November and the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We have already informed you of our concern at the lack of information contained in the TRO and we are grateful for the drawings that you sent by post. However, it was not easy to reconcile these posted drawings with the drawings on-line; for example for Archerhill Road, the on-line drawing, PMD/325128/R01-03 shows redetermined footways both sides whereas paper drawings RTKP/325128/LINT/04 and RTKP/325128/GAT-04 show a redetermined footway on the south side crossing to the north. None of your drawings includes a key.

You pointed out on 06 November that “An online public consultation including technical drawings was held from the 7th of August until the 8th of September 2017, this was supported by a community consultation event on the 15th of August ... This technical / engineering consultation has now closed.”

GoBike was not formally informed of this consultation and, although some of our members in the locality were informed, its significance was not clear. We are thus grateful to be able to contribute at this stage but could we please be informed of all local consultations in the city where there is a potential impact on the space available for cycling?

We note that this Traffic Regulation Order applies only to the Redetermined Footway part of the overall scheme, ostensibly to improve cycle access to Knightswood Park for the 2018 BMX European Championships, and our comments below relate only to that part:

1. GoBike notes that Glasgow's Strategic Plan for Cycling 2016 – 2025 states that [Cycling by Design](#) will be used as the minimum standard when designing cycle facilities throughout the city. This statement guides our comments below.
2. GoBike objects to shared footways in busy residential areas as they do not increase the space for active travel and, unless designed generously, lead to conflict with pedestrians, particularly for the elderly, young children and people with restricted

mobility or poor eyesight. They are, according to your guide, [Cycling by Design](#) Table 2.1, the last option to be considered when designing cycle facilities

3. Shared foot/cycleway widths: your design guide, [Cycling by Design](#) states, in Table 6.2 that the Desirable Minimum for a shared footway is 3.0m. Your drawings show a width of no more than 1.5m in all cases, albeit with a 0.5m buffer zone. Your design guide states that this will create conflict with other users and it is unacceptable to us as responsible road users.
4. Buffer Zones: as in point 3 above, your drawings show a 0.5m buffer zone between the shared footway and the roadway. You also show a 0.5m buffer zone on the outer edge of a parking place. This width is otherwise known as the door opening zone, or clearance zone and Table 5.3 of [Cycling by Design](#) gives the desirable minimum of 1.0m, with 1.5m suggested where access for disabled people is required. A buffer zone of 0.5m narrows the effective width of your proposed shared footway, already unacceptably narrow to us.
5. Parking bay widths: while some of the parking bays shown on your drawings are 2.0m, your drawing RTKP/325128/GAT-02 for Alderman Road shows parking bays as narrow as 1.8m, with, again, a clearance zone of only 0.5m. Given the parlous state of parking around the city it is extremely likely that not only will vehicles be left at the side of the road impinging on the clearance zone, but some will impinge on the cycle lane itself.
6. Cycle lane widths on road: your drawing RTKP/325128/GAT-02 for Alderman Road indicates an on road cycle lane width of 1.5m. As in point 5, this will be reduced by poor parking but, according to your design guide, it is below the 2.0m desirable minimum width set out in Table 5.2 of [Cycling by Design](#). An on road cycle lane of only 1.5m width, when already compromised by an inadequate parking width, with no protection from adjacent moving motor traffic endangers people on bikes and will not encourage young people, ie the very audience to be attracted by BMX cycling, to get on their bikes.
7. We note that "advisory" cycle lanes are shown on drawing RTKP/325128/GAT-03 on Lincoln Avenue. Is parking to be banned in these areas? If not, then the cycle lanes, going on the practice of motorists elsewhere in the city, will be used for parking; ie they are an ineffective measure.

We are disappointed by these proposals, which do not meet the standard set in your modest design guide, or by the Strategic Plan for Cycling or the ambitions of the current administration. Bicycles are traffic, but we fail here to gain space because of the desire to give space to cars. Both the previous administration and the current one vowed to improve cycling facilities and get more of the population to be active and yet, if implemented, these plans will not achieve that.

Yours sincerely,



Convenor, GoBike!