

Christine Francis  
Head of Technical Services  
Exchange House  
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: [land@glasgow.gov.uk](mailto:land@glasgow.gov.uk)

Ref: TF/CC  
28 October 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Glasgow City Council, Queen Margaret Drive, TRO, Cycle Lanes**

GoBike welcome the opportunity to comment on the Queen Margaret Drive project, and we support the traffic regulations necessary to enable better cycling facilities on this key route. We are pleased that the Council continues to push forward with reallocating road space for segregated cycle paths.

However, you will be aware that GoBike has been in protracted correspondence with the council regarding the design of priority junctions. We are deeply concerned to again see designs, like those we have already criticised on the South City Way, that make it unclear whether people cycling have priority across side roads.

Consider the extract from the Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic (CROW, 2007, p.237), used in the Netherlands, attached to this letter. Examples of cycle paths crossing side roads all show a continuous cycle facility with no interruption by kerb lines or markings of any kind. Motorists must also negotiate tighter corner radii. That this communicates priority for cycling far more clearly than the council's proposed designs for Queen Margaret Drive is beyond doubt.

To reiterate, priority for cycling across side roads on Queen Margaret Drive, and all future schemes, must be absolutely clear. There is no reason this cannot be done. Designs that introduce ambiguity are not best practice and as such must not be built.

Regarding the other aspects of the Queen Margaret Drive project, we note that a bidirectional cycle path is proposed. GoBike has a strong preference for one-way cycle paths; if a two-way design is retained, it must be possible for people cycling southbound to formally access the path via the crossing at the northern extent of the scheme. We are also keen to see how this project integrates with the forthcoming redesign of Byres Road, and to see it extended to meet Great Western Road and Maryhill Road.

Finally, we request that the proposed width of the cycle paths, both in general and at the bus stops, is clarified. We look forward to seeing all these points addressed in the final designs and the built scheme.

Yours sincerely,



Tricia Fort  
for Consultations, GoBike

**V 36**

Description	Continue bicycle facility pavement at the side road
Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improving conspicuity of cyclists</li> <li>• clarifying right of way situation</li> </ul>
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• district access road and estate access road with bicycle facilities</li> <li>• (2), (3) and (4) not with traffic lights control system</li> </ul>
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• continue (colour of) pavement of bicycle facility across the side road (if the bicycle facility has the same colour and texture as the side road, give a short section of the bicycle facility a different colour)</li> <li>• equal right of way status of cycle track and carriageway</li> <li>• for marking, see facility sheets V4 and V17</li> </ul>
Dimensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for width of bicycle facility, see facility sheets V16 and V19</li> <li>• <math>c = 0.00 - 2.00</math> m (inside built-up areas)</li> <li>• <math>c = 6.00 - 7.00</math> m (outside built-up areas)</li> <li>• <math>e_1 \leq c</math> and <math>\leq 5.00</math> m</li> <li>• <math>e_2 = 5.00</math> m</li> </ul>
Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• continuity of roadscape</li> <li>• good visibility of bicycle facility</li> <li>• support to right of way regulation</li> <li>• (2), (3) and (4) speed reduction of motorised traffic</li> </ul>
Combination options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• bend cycle track slightly outward</li> <li>• transverse central islands</li> <li>• partially different paving of partition shoulder in (2): rumble splay (Q)</li> </ul>

