



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](mailto:consultations@gobike.org)  
web: [www.gobike.org](http://www.gobike.org)

By e-mail to: [LandServices.Mailroom@glasgow.gov.uk](mailto:LandServices.Mailroom@glasgow.gov.uk)

Ref: TF/SI/D15

Cc: Aidan O'Meara, Michael Gallardo

19 August 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

### **THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL, North East Active Travel Routes Consultation**

Thank you for the opportunity to attend the public consultation event on 08 July and to discuss the proposals for active travel routes in the north east of the city with the members of staff who were there. These three people were particularly helpful and courteous, explaining the proposals in great detail.

We are encouraging our members and supporters to respond to the on-line survey but hope that you appreciate this fuller response.

We are pleased to see these proposals for a cycle route of significant length to bring people into the city from the Balornock area, but we do have some comments that we hope you will take into consideration when finalising your plans:

1. Placing parking adjacent to motor traffic is a feature we welcome but we have some concern about the driveway access points and the side road junctions. We do not want to see cycle traffic being delayed by home owners and other drivers taking priority across the cycle lanes. It is essential, in our view that active travel is given priority and that pedestrians and cyclists have priority, ie a continuous route, at side road junctions and domestic accesses throughout this, and any future, scheme. To clarify, the stop or give-way road markings should be for motor vehicles and not for cycles, or pedestrians, on the through route. A raised crossing for pedestrians at these locations will not only assist people with wheelchairs or prams but will provide additional advice to motorists that they do not have priority.
2. While we can understand the preference, in this age of fast-moving motor traffic, for controlled pedestrian crossings, we consider that zebra crossings should be used wherever possible to allow people who are walking or cycling to cross the road. Zebra crossings have the advantages of being cheaper than signalised crossings, they cause less frustration to the active traveller and they reduce the speed of motor traffic.
3. We trust that there is flexibility in the design to allow for widening of the cycle lanes in future? We note that the design uses the desirable minima from Cycling by Design, but there are instances in Glasgow and other cities where cycle traffic has grown on popular, well-sited routes and there is congestion at times.
4. Could you confirm, please, that there will be no reduction in cycle lane width at the bus stops? It is a little difficult to tell on the drawings.
5. It is of concern that there are no details as yet as to what will happen to the cycle route on Petershill Road as it crosses over the railway. Has a feasibility into replacement or widening of the bridge been commissioned, or are plans being developed to allow cycles continuous access over the existing bridge while motor traffic is restricted by traffic signals?


6. We trust that the cycle route along Cobden Path will be clearly delineated from the pedestrian traffic and again, we would be pleased if you could confirm the width available to both pedestrians and cyclists?
7. It is disturbing that the proposed works appear to come to an abrupt halt on the east side of the A803 Springburn Road. We are aware that works are progressing in Sighthill but it is essential that there is continuity from the Cobden Path over Springburn Road with minimal delay for cycle traffic. To facilitate this we suggest that a signalised crossing, with cycle recognition, be installed directly at the western end of Cobden Path. It is important that the signal phasing responds promptly to the presence of cyclists and that pedestrians get a prompt response after pressing the signal button. It is an impediment to active travel if pedestrians and cyclists have to wait a full cycle before gaining a green signal.
8. We have been made aware of cycle provision in the Sighthill redevelopment and we trust that this is of an equivalent standard to these current proposals from Wallacewell Road. It would be disappointing if people using what we hope is a busy route are delayed when they reach Sighthill.
9. Also of concern is the lack of cycle provision from Baird Street and Kyle Street into the city centre, although we understand that this is under consideration currently?

While many of us will be responding as individuals to the on-line survey, here are our general responses to the main questions in that survey:

- **Are you in favour of the proposals to improve provision for active travel (walking and cycling) along this route? Yes**
- **Are you in favour of the proposals to introduce additional controlled pedestrian crossing points along this route? Yes, but as above, our preference is for zebra crossings.**
- **Are you in favour of the proposals to introduce traffic calming along this route? Yes**
- **In order to reduce bus journey times and improve traffic flow there is a proposal to reduce the number of bus stops in the local area from 35 to 31. Are you in favour of this proposal? Not sure (or not applicable)**

While we do have some concerns, as outlined above, our overall view is that these proposals are a significant move forward in the provision of cycle facilities in Glasgow, but we remain concerned that there appears to be no overall plan, with each of the schemes such as this fitting neatly into the bigger picture of active travel in the city.

Yours sincerely



Tricia Fort  
for Consultations, GoBike