



Glasgow City Council, Glasgow Life

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

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

By e-mail to:
PollokCountryParkTransformation@glasgowlife.org.uk

Ref: TF/SI/D43/RL/BL

19 September 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL, TRANSFORMING POLLOK PARK

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the outline proposals for works in and around Pollok park to support the reopening of the Burrell collection.

Glasgow was recently announced as the host for the COP26 climate conference in 2020. Glasgow City Council's stated view is that we face a climate emergency, and must therefore act. It is therefore imperative that high profile projects such as this, within the scope of the council, reflect these events.

Whilst GoBike is supportive of the stated goals of the project to prioritise and incentivise non-car based visits to the park and to open up access to the park to more people from across Glasgow, we have a number of concerns in the outline proposals.

1. Internal roads and paths

1.1. Continued use of Burrell car park

We recognise the need for provision of blue badge, bus and minibus parking close to the Burrell, but we are **concerned the proposal envisages continued use of the Burrell car park, internal to the park, for private cars**: this is one of the very things we understood these proposals were endeavouring to address.

We feel this has the strong possibility of the access road being excessively busy as private vehicles attempt to park as close as possible to the Burrell, and indeed, creates a self-sustaining need for two access roads, rather than simply widening the existing road to be two-way.

A busy access road will be detrimental to active forms of travel. A large and expansive amount of car park provision paints a picture of capacity to be used.

We are aware that it is important that access to the Burrell Collection should be available to all visitors, not just those fit enough to walk from the new car park, and suggest that the use of the car park nearest to the Burrell Collection is retained for blue badge holders, coaches, and those unable to walk great distances, but without a formal blue badge. The car park should be signed as “accessible car park and coaches only”.

1.2. Riverside car park, and route from Dumbreck Road

It is not clear how traffic will be prevented from continuing from the Riverside car park, past Pollok House.

We request that the proposal includes a bike permeable traffic gate, adjacent to Pollok House/Riverside car park.

1.3. Overflow car parks

The *existing* Burrell car park has informal overflow car parking on grass areas. The proposed Netherpollok car park suggests an unused area between the car park, and the road.

We would expect any anticipated overflow car parks, and their anticipated capacity, to be included on detailed plans. Car parking charges should be enforceable to all public motorised vehicles within the park.

We request physical restrictions to be installed to ensure any use of any overflow car park areas is under controlled and managed circumstances only.

1.4. Two-way east-west cycle path

It is not clear from the outline proposals how far the two-way cycle route extends to the park.

We request it extends through to link up to NCR 7/75.

We request standard colour schemes for any tarmac differentials.

1.5. Internal park paths

Whilst improving east-west is to be welcomed, we request that **signage and markings through the park supports and reinforces mixed use of paths including for pedestrians and cyclists.**

Many internal paths are in a poor state of repair, with potholes and accumulations of mud, which pose a danger to pedestrians and cyclists. We request remedial works are included in planned works.

NCN route 7/75 from Pollok House, towards Corkehill road is narrow. **We request it is widened.**

1.6. Traffic calming

All existing speed humps, throughout the park, offer no cyclist bypass, eg. Dumbreck road to Lochinch and Pollok House, along NCR7/75.

We request that all park speed humps offer cyclist bypass wide enough to allow passage of all bikes including wider accessible tricycles.

1.7. Managed access/traffic gates

We request that managed access include bypasses suitable for all kinds of bike (eg. wider/longer than usual).

We request **they are 24 hour**, and not only in operation when attractions are open. The park can be very busy late into the evening.

We request that the number and use of passes by groups/organisations based within the park are appropriately limited and enforced.

All parking available to members of such organisations should be securely behind traffic gates.

1.8. Parking/traffic enforcement

Parking outside of marked areas impedes and endangers pedestrians, and cyclists, at busy times.

We would welcome off-road raised kerbs/stones to prevent attempts to park on verges, outside of marked areas.

We request that **parking outside of marked areas is enforced, at all times of day, including weekends and public holidays, and particularly aggressively during the anticipated busy opening months of the Burrell Collection. Similar penalty considerations should be given for driving in pedestrianised/cycle areas, without an access permit.**

1.9. Lighting

We welcome the lighting that you propose to install and would particularly like to see the installation of bright, sustainable and substantial lighting on cycle routes into, and through, the park to extend the hours when people will feel safe passing through the park.

In support of this we would highlight that Glasgow Green remains well used through the evening in winter months and is very popular for active travel and exercise.

1.10. Car park pricing

If the goal of the scheme is to reduce travel by car and encourage alternative means of transport, we would expect pricing to be consistently applied across all cars within park bounds.

Outwith blue badge, we would **expect all class or type of vehicle (including electric), to be subject to parking charges.** Similarly membership of organisations such as NTS, or for those attending events within the park, should contribute if the goal of discouraging private vehicles in the parks is to be consistent.

Exclusions would undermine the stated goals to act as a disincentive to travel by private vehicles.

We would expect private coaches and minibuses to be charged commensurately.

We note that the proposed charges are significantly less than the cost of public transport to the park, particularly if the car or other private vehicle contains more than one person. In

consideration of the intention to increase the use of active and public transport, we would not support any reduction in the proposed charges. Should any alteration be suggested, we would prefer an increase to bring them in line with public transport costs.

1.11. Electric Vehicle Charging Points

We understand the desire to encourage electric rather than fossil-fuel powered vehicles, but we are concerned that the provision of charging points in the Burrell Car Park might prove to be an attraction in itself, with a visit to the park or the museum being secondary. Visitors, who might otherwise walk, cycle or use public transport might decide to use the car so that it may be recharged. We suggest that the cost of charging, or parking at the charging points, reflects the cost of maintenance and is set so as to act as a deterrent to lengthy stays. This concern would, of course, be minimised should access to the Burrell Car Park be restricted as we suggest in 1.1 above.

2. External roads and junctions

Throughout the park it is important for planners to consider that people on bikes can and will use all routes provided for motor vehicles, as well as the quieter paths being considered. For this reason, the roads through Pollok Park where driving is permitted, should also provide space for safe passage for those on bikes.

2.1. Egress at Haggs Road

There appears to be no consideration in the plan for cyclists entering or exiting by this route.

Proposals contain no detail about proposed road layout changes at Haggs Road/Shawmoss Road. This is a very busy junction, with limited visibility when exiting the park.

We would request:

1. **Space for cyclists to filter traffic, when exiting via this route to join the mixed use path along Haggs road.**
2. **Crossing at lights to include pedestrian+cyclist indicators.**
3. Careful consideration of light sequences to prioritise active travel.
4. Responsive traffic lights at busy times, to allow queues to clear, but not delay foot and bike users excessively.
5. If continuing to use motion triggered lights, to use a system that recognises people on bikes as well as cars.
6. Installation of red light cameras.
 1. Cars jumping red lights is endemic at this junction.
 2. This poses a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists, particularly with the reduced visibility the park boundary pillars/buildings create when exiting the park.
7. System is brought into 'phase' with proposed new Netherpollok entrance, existing Haggs Gate and Pollokshaws Road junction so traffic can flow freely and help reduce congestion/driver frustration.
8. Clear double-yellow lines, including pavement markings, along entirety of Pollokshaws Road, Haggs Road, Dumbreck Road.

2.2. Proposed entrance at Netherpollok

Retention of on-street parking on Haggs Road effectively removes one lane from traffic heading towards Pollokshaws Road. This should be reflected in modelling.

The junction crosses a signed, on-pavement, cycle route.

We would request:

1. Visible marking/layout to ensure cars entering the park, crossing a pavement route, give way to pedestrians and cyclists using the mixed-use pavement along Haggs Road.
2. Tight kerb curvature to reduce speed of traffic turning into the park.
3. **Exemption to cyclists to turn in to Herries Road, allowing bypass of busy Shawmoss/Haggs road junction.**
4. Yellow hatching extends across entrance to Netherpollok.
 1. Current outline shows yellow hatching only for Herries Road exit.
 2. No enforceable restriction for cars blocking road or even pavement.
5. Pavement on East-side of Haggs road made mixed use to Pollokshaws Road, to match/compliment west side of Haggs road, unless on-road cycle lanes are to be constructed.

2.3. St Andrews Drive/Titwood Road

There is no current bike consideration in the junction at St Andrews Drive, leaving bike users entering or exiting via this route in significant difficulty when crossing to/from St Andrews Drive, or Titwood road. This is currently extremely dangerous for the large number of cyclists using this route, and is likely to become worse should the proposed segregated cycle lanes on St Andrews Drive come to fruition.

Currently a cyclist wishing to cross to/from St Andrews drive must either join traffic at a busy junction, or on foot pass over *six separate lights*.

We request cycling consideration at this junction by creating a pedestrian and cyclist crossing over Dumbreck Road, towards St Andrews Drive, and replacing lights (and barriers) to support/enable cyclists.

Better signage and enforcement is also required here to deter the large number of vehicles currently entering the park here and parking at the gatehouse, despite the no access signs. These vehicles are currently creating a danger at the junction when exiting despite their lack of traffic light phase.

2.4. Dumbreck Road

The width, and condition, of the mixed-use pavement along from Haggs Road, to Dumbreck Road and to M77 junction/entrance to the park makes it entirely unsuitable for the shared use, and **is in urgent need of repair**

There is frequent pavement parking along Dumbreck Road. **Installation of double yellow lines, together with pavement markings is required.**

2.5. Pollokshaws Road

This section of road is not detailed in the proposals. We would anticipate the proposed cycle route entrance/egress here would merit TRO consideration..

The current pedestrian crossing sequence to/from the park to/from Pollokshaws (Riverbank Street) is **excessively slow**, and takes many minutes to cross each side of the road. **The crossing should be modified to allow for more dynamic active travel, or at least be responsive to appropriately prioritise active forms of transport.**

3. Cycle parking

It is unclear clear how much bicycle specific parking space is to be provided, or what form it would take.

Current space is insufficient, particularly at weekends, even with a closed Burrell Collection. There is currently only limited, poorly located and maintained racks in the Riverside car park.

We request at least as much cycle parking provision, as for cars, in prominent and highly visible locations, near to the Burrell Collection building, near to Pollok House, and near the overflow car park, away from cars.

We request solid, functional, standard “Sheffield” U-racks as seen throughout Glasgow city centre.

We would **actively discourage any temptation for decorative/stylised-first bike storage**, however tempting that may be to designers on the project. Such storage is frequently unsuitable for thief-deterrent locking to the frame and wheel, under-utilised, or even confusing in intended purpose.

Some, or all, covered storage is desirable.

Signage to direct people on bikes to the bike parking should also be a big consideration.

Some **provision for e-bike charging**, outwith cycle rental schemes, would be welcomed at both the Burrell Collection and Pollok House.

4. Bike rental scheme

We request that plans are advanced to provide bike rental through the existing Next bike hire scheme at the Burrell Collection and/or Pollok House.

This must ensure that parking spaces for rental bikes are *in addition to* cycle parking space. Too readily they are counted together, and this diminishes the provision for private bike use.

5. Changes in use

5.1. Blaes pitch informal use by groups

The Blaes pitches area proposed to change to car parking are regularly used by a number of cycling support and advocacy groups as a safe, visible, off-road area to develop cycling proficiency and competency within the community.

We request provision/consideration of similar expansive areas in the park to allow these groups to continue to support cycling proficiency in a safe environment.

Overflow car parking, if planned and suitably restricted from general car access, could support that continuation for these groups.

6. Funding model

The proposal states that funding is derived from car-parking charge revenue, rather than capital funds. It is unfortunate that the capital funding for the Burrell Museum and immediate environs does not extend to the improvements that you so rightly wish to see in the park itself.

We are concerned this serves to drive, or reinforce the importance, of car-driven visits to grow revenue, and sits entirely counter to the stated aim of reducing visits by this means.

We trust that future publicity will see the museum upgrade and the associated works within (and hopefully around) the park as one, so that all users of the park will feel a vested interest in this revamped asset to the city.

Yours sincerely

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

Tricia Fort
for Consultations, GoBike