



Andy Waddell
Head of Infrastructure and Environment
Land and Environmental Services
Glasgow City Council.

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

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

By e-mail to: land@glasgow.gov.uk
Cc: Councillor Anna Richardson

Ref: TF/D6

01 May 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

**THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL, (CLYDE PLACE, TRADESTON)
(TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT) ORDER 201_ Comment and Objection to part**

Thank you for your e-mail of 13 April and the opportunity to comment on the proposals for Tradeston and Clyde Place, which we understand are driven by the proposed development of the area.

We have little comment on the majority of the road changes, apart from the observation that one-way systems increase road speeds, thus making life more hazardous for those of us who cycle, but we do have two areas of concern:

Clyde Place: the separated cycle lane along Clyde Place is recognised as one of the best, if not the best, cycle routes in Glasgow and we want no reduction in its standard, be that in width, surface material or separation. We understand that the developer's intention is to work in line with active travel guidelines, which we fully support and are encouraged by, but the South West City Way is a valuable asset, which we do not wish to see diminished. We accept that many areas in the city have been made attractive by the use of granite setts and planters and are open to both pedestrians and cyclists but there is constant concern by both parties of misuse by the other. We wish to minimise conflict by maintaining the high quality cycle route for those who wish to use it, while accepting that local residents and visitors, young and old and in between, might be happy within an adjacent mixed use area.

While we aren't too sorry to see the demise of the diagonal crossing on West Street, we do hope that the direct route along the South-West city way, upgraded by one straight crossing, ie remaining on the east side of West Street, doesn't disappoint us when it reaches Clyde Place. We do wish to see good continuity of both the route from Clyde Place to the South-West City Way on West Street and from Clyde Place to Paisley Road. We look forward to discussing these points with the developer to ensure the maintenance of a high standard of cycling infrastructure.


Our second area of concern and where we object to part of your proposals is in your continuation of the very hazardous route from Eglinton Street towards the River Clyde and into the city centre. Eglinton Street is shown, by analysis of the available data, to be the most heavily cycled route in the city, yet, with just the protection of an advance stop line, a cyclist is expected to join the 2 lanes of traffic turning left into Nelson Street and then, with no protection at all, join the 2 right-hand lanes to turn right into Commerce Street in order to continue into the city centre. At the very least your proposal could include advance traffic light signals to allow

cyclists to move off first, but basically your proposal ignores the ethos of the opening statement of Glasgow's Strategic Plan for Cycling 2016 – 2025, "We want Glasgow to be one of the most sustainable cities in Europe. Creating a cycle friendly city can not only help achieve that, but can also help to create a better urban environment for all with fewer cars and lower levels of congestion and pollution."

The clear desire line for cycling is to continue due north from Eglinton Street along Bridge Street and then over Glasgow Bridge, where there is already a segregated cycle lane, and on towards Central Station and the city centre. You have the relevant cycling data and we have previously intimated our ambition for such a direct route to you. One lane of Bridge Street between Nelson Street and Kingston Street is currently used for double parking of motor vehicles so the street capacity exists and such a cycle route, with lanes in each direction, ie with flow and contraflow, and segregated from motor traffic, fits neatly with your stated intention to reduce the number of vehicles entering the city and to increase the number of journeys by bike.

We have been told that such a route is outwith the terms of the current TRO, showing what could be seen as a lack of foresight, but in light of your proposals to encourage higher traffic speeds by changing two-way streets to one-way, with scant regard for the safety and comfort of those who cycle, we have no alternative but to object to these proposals. We do, though, look forward to the opportunity to discuss and agree a robust alternative with you.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tricia Fort', written in a cursive style.

Tricia Fort
for Consultations, GoBike