



Ian Elder
Development and Regeneration Services
Glasgow City Council
231 George Street
Glasgow G1 1RX

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

e-mail: consultations@gobike.org

web: www.gobike.org

By e-mail to: ian.elder@glasgow.gov.uk

Ref: TF/BL/D31

05 April 2019

Dear Mr Elder,

THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL, BROOMIELAW DISTRICT REGENERATION FRAMEWORK

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the Broomielaw District Regeneration Framework consultation. GoBike is a voluntary organisation campaigning in the Strathclyde area for better infrastructure, policy and political support for cycling to be a safe, efficient, clean and healthy mode of active travel for people of all abilities and ages and using every variety of cycle. The comments which follow are made in the context of these aims, and of the need to create conditions for cycling which are attractive to the large numbers of people for whom it currently seems much too risky.

GoBike strongly supports the ambition of the proposals for a regenerated, people-friendly Broomielaw area. In particular, GoBike supports the following:

- *Glasgow should ... change its 'modal split' to more sustainable modes of transport. By intelligently moving the car to the periphery of the city centre, and by creating a seamlessly integrated public transport and cycle network, the city will become more attractive, more liveable and it will attract new investments. ... Work on a new ambitious transport strategy for the City of Glasgow that considers all modes of transport needs to be started as soon as possible (Updated Mobility p 124).*
- *To make ... active travel ... a serious alternative (over the car), routes/networks need to be **safer, faster, more intuitive, reliable and comfortable** (GoBike emphasis) (Great Streets and Spaces p 98).*
- *Re-thinking of car access on a city scale. Vigorously promote the national hierarchy of modes; pedestrian, cycle, public transport, servicing, private car (Updated Mobility p121).*
- *A key element ... [is] ... improving (historic) pedestrian and cyclist links to make a **fine-grained comfortable and logical** network (GoBike emphasis) (Great Streets and Spaces p 96).*
- *Streets should be laid out to slower design speeds / There are less/few pedestrian guardrails, longer 'green man' periods and pedestrian (and cyclist) priority traffic light sequencing... (Updated Mobility p144).*
- *[Make] more space for separate bike lanes, wide pedestrian footways with enough space for external café/bar terraces and trees (this is a welcome change from the*

planning application a few years ago to fill the current quay space with fast food pavilions), *through car traffic should be discouraged, road carriageway and design speeds reduced, Fastlink reviewed, crossing points on desire lines, pedestrian and cycle priority, improved north-south connections* (River Park p 52).

- *T[he riverside] is the best place to make a long distance East-West link for cyclists and pedestrians (flat land, less cars, attractive green environment)* (River Park p 54).

GoBike recognises the political challenges in changing the perceptions of those who see only disadvantages to themselves in the proposed changes. The statement midway down on the far right of p 261 must be embraced by decision makers: “As demonstrated by other **high performing cities** this (the city centre becoming more walkable / pedestrian / bicycle friendly) is liable to require bold, ambitious and integrated concepts to optimise the benefit of Glasgow’s urban grid”.

The following comments are intended to support and strengthen the Broomielaw DRF’s proposals.

1. The future conjured by the consultation document is a wonderful one. It is disappointing that the action plan is so heavy on inactive verbs: review, consult, develop, approve, confirm, consider, assess, etc. It’s understandable that there are formalities and legal processes to be observed, but the addition of language calling for immediate action in the form of experiments and trials would help kickstart change.
2. The third action point on p 232 should be clarified as ‘Ensure continuous, safe and attractive routes **for people walking and cycling** along ... both banks’. The DRF or the resulting guidance must contain strong language to ensure that the design of new cycle infrastructure keeps up with the best international standards.
3. The document’s admirable aims include many strands whose inevitably differing rates of progress may produce conflicting actions. The DRF or its subsidiary guidance must include language which ensures that existing provision for people walking and cycling is never compromised. This would happen if, for example, the north quay were used for pavilions or special events before space had been reallocated from the Fastlink carriageway
4. The document makes a convincing case for better use of the city’s street grid to create a hierarchy of street functions – ‘The Tartan Grid’ (Updated Mobility, p 124). The only relevant action point appears to be the second one on p262-3, where ‘quick wins’ focusing on high impact missing links/conflict points are not programmed until Years 2 to 4. GoBike urges that real ‘quick wins’ are found much sooner by ‘vigorously promoting’ the already existing ‘national hierarchy of modes; pedestrian, cycle, public transport, servicing, private car’ (quoted in Updated Mobility, p 120 and 124), and by taking seriously the council’s stated policy of permitting contraflow cycling on one-way streets as the default arrangement.
5. While GoBike welcomes all proposals for better infrastructure for people who cycle, reference to ‘cycle routes’ or ‘mapping cycling routes’ (eg p 262) creates the risk of decision-makers considering cycling only in allocated corridors. To create the conditions in which transformative numbers of people choose to cycle for transport complete door-to-door journeys must be attractive. Planning guidance needs to include strong language requiring that city centre road design (side turnings, crossings) sends the unmissable message to drivers that people on foot and cycles have priority.

6. The action plan includes several calls for traffic modelling. Traffic modelling is a task for specialists, but it's clear to the lay person that the results depend heavily on the input assumptions and the definition of the system bounds. As has been overprinted in the Urbanised M8 and Updated Mobility sections, *'Measures can only be assessed in wider city context'*. The document and derived guidance must be clear that the policy for reducing private car use in the city centre sets the parameters for the modelling rather than vice versa. The decision must first be made on how road space is to be reallocated for pedestrians, cycle infrastructure and buses, then modelling can predict the volume of private car use that can be accommodated.
7. City centre traffic congestion must be cleared to enable bus services to be fast and reliable and to allocate safe, pleasant space for cycling and walking. Congestion is caused just as much by electric and (eventually) autonomous cars as by petrol/diesel cars with human drivers. The section on Smarter Parking (p 136) appears to include electric cars among those requiring priority (on-street?) parking. As LEZ charges encourage substantial switching to electric cars logic requires that charging points are removed from the streets and provided only in the city-edge multi-storey car parks (second action point, p 260).

Yours sincerely

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

Tricia Fort
for Consultations, GoBike