

Subject: Fwd: The Glasgow City Council (City Centre)(Traffic Management) Order 2010 (Amendment No.18)(Sauchiehall Street) Elmbank Street (OFFICIAL) CYCLE ROUTE?
Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2018 12:52:20 +0000
From: Patricia Fort <consultations@gobike.org>
To: Hubbert, Brian (LES) <brian.hubbert@glasgow.gov.uk>, Andy Waddell <andy.waddell@glasgow.gov.uk>
McDonagh, Stephen (LES) <Stephen.McDonagh@glasgow.gov.uk>, Christy Mearns <christy.mearns@scottishgreens.org.uk>, Millar, Angus (Councillor) <angus.millar@glasgow.gov.uk>, Bolander, Eva (Councillor)
CC: <Eva.Bolander@glasgow.gov.uk>, Philip.braat@councillors.glasgow.gov.uk, Richardson, Anna (Councillor) <anna.richardson@glasgow.gov.uk>, garnethill.cc@gmail.com, Brown, Andrew (LES) <Andrew.Brown@glasgow.gov.uk>, GoBike! Convenor <convenor@gobike.org>, babccglasgow@gmail.com

Dear Messrs Waddell and Hubbert,

We have no record of receiving a reply to our message below of 13 February and we note that construction work is now ongoing on Elmbank Street. In your response, dated 06 February, to our initial objection to the removal of northbound cycle traffic from the northern section of Elmbank Street between Bath Street and Sauchiehall Street you quoted some safety concerns. The removal or mitigation of those safety concerns is fully within your control by good design of the Sauchiehall Street cycle lanes and associated road works.

In our reply below, dated 13 February, we listed our concerns about the options for people who wish to cycle from the area around Charing Cross Railway Station, with its NextBike hire station, to Sauchiehall Street and the many destinations that are available there and will become available as the Avenues work proceeds. These "concerns", which I have now highlighted in red below of travelling with relatively fast-moving motor traffic on multi-lane, one-way roads become major safety issues for people who are relatively new to cycling or who are visiting Glasgow from overseas. The mitigation or removal of these safety concerns is fully outwith our control, but it is within your control. Indeed it is your responsibility.

We would be very pleased to meet you, and/or your representatives or the people copied into this email, on site, so that we can explore the opportunities available for cycling from Charing Cross Railway Station to Sauchiehall Street.

Please accept my apologies if you have sent a reply, but could you please, in that case, forward a copy?

Thank you

Tricia Fort
for Consultations, GoBike, Strathclyde Cycle Campaign, www.gobike.org

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: The Glasgow City Council (City Centre)(Traffic Management) Order 2010 (Amendment No.18)(Sauchiehall Street) Elmbank Street (OFFICIAL)
Date: Tue, 13 Feb 2018 17:07:29 +0000
From: Patricia Fort <consultations@gobike.org>
To: Hubbert, Brian (LES) <brian.hubbert@glasgow.gov.uk>
CC: McDonagh, Stephen (LES) <Stephen.McDonagh@glasgow.gov.uk>, Christy Mearns

[<christy.mearns@scottishgreens.org.uk>](mailto:christy.mearns@scottishgreens.org.uk), angus.millar@glasgow.gov.uk, Bolander, Eva (Councillor) [<Eva.Bolander@glasgow.gov.uk>](mailto:Eva.Bolander@glasgow.gov.uk), Philip.braat@councillors.glasgow.gov.uk, Richardson, Anna (Councillor) [<anna.richardson@glasgow.gov.uk>](mailto:anna.richardson@glasgow.gov.uk), garnethill.cc@gmail.com, GoBike! Convenor [<convenor@gobike.org>](mailto:convenor@gobike.org)

Dear all,

This second response to LES, further to our objection in February 2017, to the lack of access for cycles between Elmbank Street and the forthcoming Sauchiehall Street cycle lanes, is being copied to the 4 Councillors for Ward 10, City Centre, the City's Convenor for Carbon Reduction and Sustainability and to Garnethill Community Council, whose area borders on Sauchiehall Street. While we very much welcome the transformation of Sauchiehall Street we are extremely concerned about the lack of permeability for cycles to reach the street. We hope you will read on:

Dear Brian,

Thank you for your response of 06 February to my message of 30 December, in which you again refuted our view that there should be a contraflow cycle lane northbound on Elmbank Street from Bath Street to Sauchiehall Street. In my message of 30 December I quoted some city centre examples of contraflow, but I could easily have quoted Dalnair Street in Yorkhill, where parking is allowed both sides of the street, albeit without the nibs you propose to install in Elmbank Street. However, your design guide, *Cycling by Design*, quotes in 5.1.5 that "The default position should be to permit two-way cycling on one-way streets". The city centre streets are already predominantly one-way, making the area very impermeable for cycling and acting against the City Council's stated aim of 10% of journeys being by bike by 2020, ie 2 years to go. We remain concerned too, about the proposal to limit egress from the Sauchiehall Street cycle lanes into Elmbank Street for southbound cycle journeys, potentially leading to significant destinations around Charing Cross.

It would be far better for the City Council to manage contraflow cycling, formally introducing it where permeability is impaired, rather than the informal system being adopted by some people as they cycle, generally by using the footway to get to their destination.

With a Convenor for Carbon Reduction and Sustainability now in position in the Council, it is astonishing that approximately 50% of a city centre street is now to be used for the storage of stationary private cars rather than for active travel. There is a large multi-storey car park at Charing Cross, with on-street parking allowed on Elmbank Street south of Bath Street, so it is counter intuitive to prevent cycling access from Bath Street north on to the very welcome new cycling facility on Sauchiehall Street for the sake of just a few stationary cars.

We have looked at possible routes from the Charing Cross station area, which includes several work places, the Kings Theatre and the Nextbike station, to Sauchiehall Street should your proposed blockage of Elmbank Street to northbound cycles go ahead. These are:

- **Westbound on Bath Street to North Street, then northbound on North Street to join Sauchiehall Street just to the west of the motorway. This is a route with currently no cycle infrastructure and involves a set of manoeuvres that even the hardest of city cyclists would balk at in busy times.**
- **Southbound on Elmbank Street, eastbound and uphill on St Vincent Street, northbound and uphill on Pitt Street to West George Street and then either westbound and downhill to Holland Street or uphill and eastbound to Douglas Street. Again, there are currently no cycle facilities on these streets and this is not a set of manoeuvres for the faint-hearted.**

- **Northbound, using an informal and illegal route on the footway or carriageway of Elmbank Street.**

It may be, however, that you already have a solution to this conundrum, of a long-awaited avenue with good cycle facilities on Sauchiehall Street, with access from a significant origin of city centre cycling prevented?

As before, we would like to withdraw our objection but find it impossible given the current circumstances. We would be pleased to meet you to explore whether this situation may be resolved.

Yours,

Tricia Fort

for Consultations, GoBike! Strathclyde Cycle Campaign, www.gobike.org

On 06/02/2018 16:04, Hubbert, Brian (LES) wrote:

OFFICIAL

**MESSAGE SENT ON BEHALF OF ANDY WADDELL
HEAD OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT
LAND AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

Dear Patricia Fort

**The Glasgow City Council (City Centre)(Traffic Management) Order 2010
(Amendment No.18)(Sauchiehall Street)**

Thank you for your email regarding the proposed amendments to the layout of Elmbank Street. I note your preference to look at existing examples of contraflow cycle lanes and note that while the implemented infrastructure is appropriate for the specified locations I note that there are differences between specified locations and the existing site conditions at Elmbank Street as detailed below:

- On Gordon Street the contraflow cycle lane is westbound, with no waiting or loading permitted on the south side, leaving the cycle lane clear at all times.
- On Argyle Street again the contraflow cycle lane is westbound, with no waiting or loading permitted on the south side, leaving the cycle lane clear at all times.
- On Howard Street the contraflow cycle lane is eastbound, with no waiting or loading permitted on the north side, except for a short section at the west end adjacent to the commercial premises.

The proposal for Elmbank Street has nibs at either end, with parking or loading bays contained within each nibbed section. Each nibbed section is 2.5m wide, leaving two “running” lanes. The provision of a contraflow cycle lane northbound would result in cyclists having southbound traffic on their right hand side and parked vehicles on their left hand side, also facing south. The sight lines of the drivers of the parked vehicles, with regards to northbound cyclists, may be reduced by other parked vehicles, thereby

increasing the possibility of conflict with cyclists heading north. The parking / loading bays formed on the west side of Elmbank Street are the result of the removal of parking / loading facilities on Sauchiehall Street, to allow the narrowing of Sauchiehall Street and the provision of a two way cycle route along the length of Sauchiehall Street.

The width of carriageway at the junction of Elmbank Street and Sauchiehall Street has been reduced to minimise the crossing distance for pedestrians while allowing large vehicles to manoeuvre into Elmbank Street. As a consequence a contraflow cycle lane would have to be curtailed a distance from the junction to permit turning manoeuvres to be undertaken safely. This in turn would require cyclists to mount the footway prior to crossing Sauchiehall Street to join the two way cycle lane. This manoeuvre would bring cyclists into conflict with pedestrians travelling east/west along Sauchiehall Street prior to crossing the carriageway at the controlled crossing point.

Consequently, a contraflow cycle on Elmbank Street was deemed unsuitable for inclusion within the works on safety grounds. I trust the above information is helpful and clarifies the methodology used in the design process and enables GoBike to remove their objection to the Sauchiehall Street Avenue proposals.

Having considered the above, should you wish to withdraw your objection I would be pleased if you would inform me by writing to Brian Hubbert or e-mailing brian.hubbert@glasgow.gov.uk.

If you do not wish to withdraw your objection then there is no requirement for you to write to us again.

Your objection will be considered and included within the final report which will inform the decision. Once a decision has been taken in regards to these proposals I shall write to you again and advise of the outcome.

Yours faithfully



Andy Waddell
Head of Infrastructure and Environment
Land and Environmental Services

Brian Hubbert

Engineering Officer
Glasgow City Council
Land & Environmental Services
Exchange House
231 George Street
Glasgow G1 1RX

Telephone 0141 287 9174

Brian.hubbart@glasgow.gov.uk

www.glasgow.gov.uk

From: Patricia Fort [<mailto:consultations@gobike.org>]

Sent: 30 December 2017 11:52

To: Hubbert, Brian (LES) <Brian.Hubbart@glasgow.gov.uk>

Cc: GoBike! Convenor <convenor@gobike.org>

Subject: Fwd: Fwd: The Glasgow City Council (City Centre)(Traffic Management) Order 2010 (Amendment No.18)(Sauchiehall Street) (OFFICIAL) Elmbank Street

Brian, hello,

First of all, Happy New Year to you, and second, apologies for our e-mail system being down. We think it's sorted now.

Thank you for the message below and the attachment. We would like to withdraw our objection but we are intrigued as to what the health and safety reasons for opposing a contraflow cycle lane on Elmbank Street are? I note your quote about Cycling by Design, which might be quite an old one from Transport Scotland, leaving "We will continue to implement routes and facilities using Cycling by Design as a minimum standard." from page 28 of Glasgow's Strategic Plan for Cycling 2016 - 2025 as, in our opinion, the more appropriate guide.

However, rather than quibble about quotes, let's look at the existing examples of contraflow lanes in the city centre and, of these, 3 come to mind: Gordon Street and Argyle Street, both westbound and Howard Street, eastbound. We are not aware of accidents on these streets. Admittedly, someone new to cycling would be reluctant to use them and one would not allow a child on their own to use them, but that is the case for most of the cycle lanes in the city, and these contraflow lanes are very useful to those of us who cycle regularly around the city.

In the case of Elmbank Street, motorised traffic is simply being removed from the northbound lane. It is not as if there is to be a wholesale change. Thus, if you could

clarify your health and safety concerns, we will confirm whether or not we wish to withdraw our objection.

Best wishes,

Tricia Fort

for Consultations, GoBike! Strathclyde Cycle Campaign, www.gobike.org

PS: please note that we have had some changes within GoBike, which are reflected in our e-mail addresses.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Hubbert, Brian (LES)" <Brian.Hubbert@glasgow.gov.uk>
Date: 20 December 2017 8:03:32 am
To: "GoBike! (Convenor)" <convenor@gobike.org>
Cc: Patricia Fort
Subject: **The Glasgow City Council (City Centre)(Traffic Management)
Order 2010 (Amendment No.18)(Sauchiehall Street) (OFFICIAL)**

OFFICIAL

GOBIKE

Strathclyde Cycle Campaign

PO Box 15175

Glasgow G4 9LP

**MESSAGE SENT ON BEHALF OF ANDY WADDELL
HEAD OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT
LAND AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

Dear Patricia Fort

**The Glasgow City Council (City Centre)(Traffic Management)
Order 2010
(Amendment No.18)(Sauchiehall Street)**

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the above named Traffic Regulation Order.

I welcome your approval of the overall scheme with the exception of the proposal for the alteration of Elmbank Street to one way southbound without the introduction of a northbound contraflow cycle lane. I confirm your point in relation to adoption of Cycling By Design as the chosen design document for the implementation of cycling works and note that this document 'is commended to local authorities and other developing infrastructure in Scotland'. In this instance the Project Team determined that the provision of a contraflow cycle lane would present issues in terms of health and safety and therefore the decision not to implement was taken.

Having considered the above, should you wish to withdraw your objection I would be pleased if you would inform me by 26th January 2018 by writing to Brian Hubbert or e-mailing brian.hubbert@glasgow.gov.uk.

If you do not wish to withdraw your objection then there is no requirement for you to write to us again.

Your objection will be considered and included within the final report which will inform the decision. Once a decision has been taken in regards to these proposals I shall write to you again and advise of the outcome.

Yours faithfully



Andy Waddell
Head of Infrastructure and Environment
Land and Environmental Services