

Sent 11 November 2019

For the attention of Michael Brady,

Hello,

Thank you for your further reply below and I now write in respect of 3 parts that I have coloured in red.

### 1. Angled parking

- Could you please detail the particular part of The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 that prescribes angled or echelon parking?
- Your view that drivers might or might not change their habits, is curious given that, in your original email of 27 August, you state that "there is a desire from the local community to park their vehicles at an angle facing into the kerb on one side of the road in order to maximise parking provision.". Thus it seems likely that they will change their habits and, not only that, park facing the kerb! Yet you hope that they will do otherwise! As we have stated and as is recommended in all the guidance, see for example this 2008 Cycle Infrastructure Design document: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/329150/ltn-2-08\\_Cycle\\_infrastructure\\_design.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/329150/ltn-2-08_Cycle_infrastructure_design.pdf) where it states on page 39 "Echelon parking always needs careful consideration, regardless of whether the road is oneway or not."
- Should there be a collision with a vehicle reversing out of one of these unmarked parking bays with either another vehicle (motor or cycle) or with someone walking, would the City Council be able to defend its decision to have what might be described as a "free for all" parking scheme?

### 2. Motor vehicle access to businesses

These proposals, while we accept your comments that the local community express a desire to maintain, and increase, the current levels of motor parking outside their businesses, fly in the face of current Glasgow and Scotland policies on reducing motor travel and the reliance on the private car and increasing public and active travel. You are ignoring the studies that have been done into shopping and business streets that have introduced cycle lanes or even had motor traffic removed for all or part of the day - witness the success of Buchanan Street, or the studies that were done for the Byres Road changes that show that it is the minority of visitors to Byres Road who arrive by car. For further information please see this Sustrans publication: <http://cidadanialxmob.tripod.com/shoppersandhowtheytravel.pdf> and other similar studies that are available on-line

### 3. One way streets reduce permeability for people cycling

Basically, it is a nonsense to say that the introduction of one-way streets with no cycle contraflow does not reduce access or permeability for people cycling. One way streets reduce access for all users apart from pedestrians, albeit that they potentially suffer because of the increased traffic speeds brought about by one way traffic. However, for motor traffic the difference is perhaps one or two minutes time difference, for bikes the difference is far greater. Far more effort is required to go that extra distance on a bicycle and the extra effort and distance work to reduce the attractiveness of cycling. One recent publication that covers this is Designing for Cycle Traffic by John Parkin, in Section 3.6, see <https://www.gobike.org/designing-for-cycle-traffic-the-new-essential-read-6046> and other documents that we list on the [Design Guides](#) page of our website.

GoBike would be pleased to discuss our concerns about street design and accessibility with you, your staff and colleagues. We want Glasgow to reach its targets or reducing

pollution, meeting carbon reduction targets and increasing active travel and the health of the population. While we know that many projects are designed to do this we are concerned that some, such as these proposals for Mount Florida will have the opposite effect.

Tricia Fort  
for Consultations, GoBike, Strathclyde Cycle Campaign, [www.gobike.org](http://www.gobike.org)

On 30/10/2019 10:19, Mailroom, Land Services (NS) wrote:

**MESSAGE SENT ON BEHALF OF MICHAEL BRADY  
GROUP MANAGER – TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY**

Dear Ms Fort,

Thank you for your email dated 24 September 2019 relating to the above proposed traffic regulation order.

**Angled/echelon parking on Clincart Street and Bolton Drive**

I note your comments relating to vehicles reversing blind out of an echelon parking bay, however, angled parking bays are prescribed within "The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016" legislation. It is hoped that if vehicles do change their parking habits and park at angle, they will do so in a manner that they would reverse into parking spaces thus allowing them clear visibility when driving out of the space.

It should be noted that the Council would not be introducing marked parking bays within these streets or any other residential street in Mount Florida, however, the local community had expressed a desire that residents are likely to maximise the parking capacity in certain streets wide enough to accommodate echelon parking, following the introduction of a one way road.

I would add that this traffic regulation order (TRO) has been promoted with the primary aim of reducing parking restrictions on Cathcart Road and **to facilitate business activities by allowing all classes of vehicles to utilise loading bays on Cathcart Road**. In addition, the Council are taking this opportunity to improve parking practices and road safety within the adjoining residential streets. This includes ensuring crossing points are accessible, sightlines at junctions are sufficient and general parking practices are safe and not obstructive.

With regards to your request to be invited to future meetings with the Council and Police Scotland, unfortunately this is not something that I can consider. I would advise that you raise any specific concerns you have with Police Scotland directly.

In terms of contra-flow cycling, whilst the Council's default position is to propose two-way cycling on one way roads, this does not mean that this will be proposed where the Council do not believe it is safe to do so. This has also been the stance that has been taken by Police Scotland when commenting on proposals in recent years.

The Council will only propose this practice where our traffic and road safety team feel that it is safe to do so and as explained in my previous response to you, this will only be proposed where the carriageway width on one way roads for vehicles/cyclists to pass one another is at least 4.7 metres.

**Buildouts**

As explained above, **these proposals have been developed to improve business accessibility for deliveries and customers**. Introducing buildouts on Cathcart Road will create additional capacity for parking and deliveries to local businesses and residents.

**Restricted Parking Zone surrounding Hampden Stadium**

The majority of the Mount Florida area to the west of Cathcart Road is predominantly tenement

properties therefore similar to other areas in Glasgow, these areas tend to have a high level of parked vehicles belonging to residents. Introducing restrictions on one side of highly populated residential areas which are already saturated with parked vehicles would likely have resulted in a high number of objectors given that half of the streets parking capacity would have been removed.

I can confirm that no daytime or night time parking surveys were undertaken within the Mount Florida area. Generally, the Council will only undertake parking surveys in areas where there are high levels of commuter parking and where Restricted Parking Zones are being proposed.

**I do not agree with your conclusion that these proposals reduce cycling access within the overall area.** These proposals should also make it safer for pedestrians to cross roads given that there would no longer be vehicles parked at junction corners. This in turn, will also improve visibility for cyclists when approaching junctions.

**Michael Brady**  
**Group Manager - Traffic and Road Safety**  
**Neighbourhood and Sustainability**