

Re: (THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL (HYNDLAND, HUGHENDEN AND
Subject: DOWANHILL WEST) (TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING CONTROLS)
ORDER 201_

Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2018 09:52:45 +0100

From: Patricia Fort <consultations@gobike.org>

To: LES - Safer Parking <LES-SaferParking@glasgow.gov.uk>
martin.bartos@councillors.glasgow.gov.uk, martin.rhodes@councillors.glasgow.gov.uk,

CC: Curtis, Tony (Councillor) <tony.curtis@glasgow.gov.uk>,
kenny.mclean@councillors.glasgow.gov.uk, Richardson, Anna (Councillor)
<anna.richardson@glasgow.gov.uk>, GoBike! Convenor <convenor@gobike.org>

Dear LES Safer Parking,

We in GoBike have considered your response to our views on this TRO and our comments are below in purple. We reiterate that we do not object to controls on parking but, in summary, your proposals run counter to the transport heirarchy put forward by the Scottish Government and Transport Scotland, and supported by Glasgow City Council public documents and statements. For example, in its document, [Transport Appraisal Guidance](#), Transport Scotland gives this guidance on Scottish Planning Policy (SPP): "*Mode Hierarchy 18. SPP supports integration of land use and transport planning and promotes the principles of mode hierarchy. Adopting a mode hierarchy approach requires consideration to be given to meeting demand via walking, cycling and public transport first before considering the extent to which the private car use should be accommodated, reducing the need to travel and encouraging travel by sustainable modes.*"

We are disturbed to note that our objections to the poor designs for cycling in the TRO in 2014 failed to lead to the suggested improvements in the design, but rather, an abandonment of the plans, with our objection now being used as a reason for further downgrading safe cycling in the area. As a cycle campaign you will be aware that it is our responsibility to ensure that plans do consider safe cycling, and where they do not, we must object. The onus must be on the council to consider the reasons for the objections and use that information to make improvements. We are aware that the current TRO process reaches consultation too late within the design stage to make this easy, and we are pushing for improvements to this process, but until that happens it is our responsibility to continue to react when plans do not reach design standards or consider a safe space for cycling.

Yours,

Tricia Fort

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

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

RE: FW: (THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL (HYNDLAND, HUGHENDEN

Subject: AND DOWANHILL WEST) (TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING
CONTROLS) ORDER 201_

Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 14:19:27 +0000

From: LES - Safer Parking <LES-SaferParking@glasgow.gov.uk>

To: Patricia Fort <consultations@gobike.org>

Dear Ms Fort,

Thank you for your enquiry regarding the proposed traffic management and parking controls for the Hyndland, Hughenden and Dowanhill West scheme.

The Council undertook a number of parking surveys during daytime (11am – 1pm) and night time / early morning hours (3am – 5.30am) in order to establish how many vehicles are parking within the Hyndland, Hughenden and Dowanhill West areas. The daytime surveys would indicate the level of commuter parking which occurs and the early morning (overnight) survey would give an indication of the number of vehicles which likely belong to residents.

We understand that it is Glasgow City Council policy to reduce commuter parking and we fully agree with that.

Within the Hyndland area at night time, illegal parking and unsafe obstructive parking practices were observed and in some cases blocking access to lanes and severely restricting movement at junctions. It was clear from the early stages of the development of these parking controls that this issue must also be tackled. It is essential, in our view, that illegal parking must be tackled and this was the main reason behind our support of this Traffic Regulation Order. It was also observed that residents have no alternative but to park on Clarence Drive overnight which is why parking has been permitted overnight to cater for that specific demand. We are astonished that you can say "that residents have no alternative but to park on Clarence Drive overnight". Every resident has the responsibility to respect the needs of others, ie other road users, and all of us should ensure that we buy or rent a property that is adequate for our needs. It is not Glasgow City Council's responsibility to provide storage space for the private car. A significant part of GoBike's objection to the 2014 proposals for the Colleges Cycle Route was the continuation of parking on the cycle lanes on Clarence Drive and the inadequacy of the proposals put forward at the time to protect and upgrade the cycle lanes.

I can advise that the section of Clarence Drive between Hyndland Road and the railway bridge currently has a No Waiting Monday to Friday 8 – 9.30am, 4 – 6.30pm and No Loading Monday to Friday 8.15 – 9.15, 4.15 – 6.30pm which only protects the cycle lanes for a small proportion of the day during the morning and evening peak times only. The remaining length of Clarence Drive between the railway bridge and Crow Road is currently unrestricted and therefore cannot be enforced by Council parking attendants but is experiencing obstructive parking practices on a daily basis. Yes, we completely agree. The cycle lanes on Clarence Drive are utterly inadequate.

The Council promoted Colleges Cycle Route Phase 2 Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in 2014 as part of a proposed cycle infrastructure enhancement scheme along Clarence Drive and Crow Road between Hyndland Road and Balshagray Avenue which proposed to replace this restriction and prohibit waiting and loading along the entire length of Clarence Drive. The cycle scheme received over 200 objections including one from a prominent cycling body which unfortunately led to the scheme being abandoned. GoBike, as a responsible and prominent cycling campaigning group, objected to the 2014 proposals because of their inadequacy and I attach a further copy of our letter of 29 September 2014 to confirm that. To summarise, the route was not continuous, the car door zone was inadequate and on-street parking was to continue on the route. We were looking for a significant upgrade of the route; it was disappointing that nothing was done and your current proposals downgrade it further.

Under the parking control scheme, it is proposed to introduce more stringent restrictions on Clarence Drive between Hyndland Road and the railway bridge through a densely populated residential area which would prohibit parking Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm and restrict loading to Monday to Saturday between 9.30am and 4pm. This will ensure the cycle lanes are free from obstruction during the peak times with minimal obstruction during the daytime. People cycle at all times of the day, with schools finishing before 4pm. Glasgow City Council and the Scottish Government have been actively encouraging children to cycle to school but we doubt if any parent would allow their child to cycle on the Colleges Cycle Route.

It is also proposed to prohibit parking and loading at all times on Clarence Drive between Crow Road and the railway bridge with a small section of parking with parallel cycle lane and buffer strip to cater for the local parking demands. There is a demand for cycling; where is this being addressed? It is Glasgow City Council and Scottish Government policy to promote cycling and active travel, and to reduce the use of private cars. Your current proposals run counter to this. This will eradicate the obstructive and indiscriminate parking practices currently being

experienced. We fully agree that irresponsible parking must be eradicated and we would be pleased to see a considerable increase in warden patrols to ensure that it is done.

With regards to the Hughenden area, the private parking areas to the rear of the flats within Hughenden Gardens and Hughenden Lane are for residents only. The proposed parking spaces being provided on Hughenden Gardens and Hughenden Lane would act as an overspill for residents, residents' visitors and tradesmen etc. Whilst I note that the properties at the northern end of Hughenden Lane have their own garages and block paved 'driveways', additional parking has been provided opposite these properties in order to cater for visitors, tradesmen etc. It should be noted that a number of vehicles park at this location at present. Again, your proposals do nothing to limit the use of the private car but actively encourage it. This is a popular route for cycling and, by allowing parking, you are making it more hazardous both for people cycling through and for children playing outside their homes.

On Hyndland Road there are vehicles parked on both sides throughout the day and night between Clarence Drive and Great Western Road. Again, this highlights the extreme parking pressures which exist within the Hyndland area given the high number of residential properties located on this stretch of road. You are putting the storage of the private car above the need for active travel. Parking restricts the ability of residents to both walk and cycle along their streets and is counter to both local and national government aims to increase active travel and improve the health of residents.

The Council are committed to providing high quality cycle infrastructure as part of its sustainable transport policy where appropriate however, on this occasion due to the extreme parking pressures within this densely populated residential area, the removal of parking on either side of Hyndland Road would unfortunately not be considered at this time. Further sustainable transport infrastructure could be investigated under a wider strategic cycling project once these new schemes have settled and a clearer picture of parking demand is ascertained. You are actively suppressing demand for active travel with these measures. By pandering to "demand" for parking, ie the assumption that an owner may leave their vehicle on the street for little or no charge, you are depriving others of the use of that space for travel.

With regard to your concerns about the signalised junction at Hyndland Road / Great Western Road, my officers have previously considered altering the traffic signal staging to allow each arm of the junction to run separately. However, computer modelling indicated that the effect of this would result in a significant congestion increase on all arms of the junction. The intergreen period was instead extended by 2 seconds, allowing conflicting traffic between Cleveden Road and Hyndland Road longer to clear. (Please note that an intergreen period is the time between one traffic or pedestrian phase losing right of way and the next traffic or pedestrian phase gaining right of way).

Whilst there is a left turn filter and arrow marked on Hyndland Road, the arrow road marking is not mandatory therefore it is not an offence for drivers to travel straight ahead to Cleveden Road during the traffic stage from this lane.

In view of the above, I regret to advise that it is not possible to alter the traffic signal staging at Hyndland Road / Great Western Road at the present time. Perhaps now is the time to put policy into practice, to give priority to buses and cycles at the junction and allow congestion to build for the private motor vehicle? This would deter people from using their private vehicle for what are probably short journeys and encourage them to switch transport mode - all in line with your written policy. Currently the junction is dangerous.

Finally, I can advise that the Council proposed contraflow cycling on one-way streets within the previous consultation stage, however Police Scotland advised that they would not support this proposal due to a number of streets having insufficient road width to accommodate parking on both sides and a vehicle and cyclist passing one another within the live carriageway. As such, the Council felt that without the support of Police Scotland, the proposed exemption of cyclists within one-way streets would have to be removed from the proposals. However, as previously stated future cycle priority infrastructure / measures may be investigated in the future following the completion of these schemes. Glasgow City Council's default policy is to allow contraflow cycling on one-way streets, see [Cycling by Design](#) clause 5.1.5. I have spoken to a senior officer at Police Scotland who has no objection to contraflow cycling, so it is curious that you put forward another view. It is also curious that there are so many examples of contraflow cycling in the city which the City Council have installed. Any observer of cycling in the city will note that

there is a demand for contraflow cycling; given your argument above for providing parking, we would be grateful if you will now legitimise it with evidence of the Police Scotland advice.

Unfortunately during the first week of the proposals being available to view online, there was an error within the drawing legend which stated one way operation except cycles. This was rectified and removed to state one way operation, as per the official press advertisement. The documents we downloaded from your website clearly show contraflow cycling will be signed for Westbourne Gardens. Are you now saying this drawing is incorrect?

I trust the foregoing is of assistance at this time.

LES Safer Parking

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

Sent: 25 June 2018 09:15

To: LES - Safer Parking <LES-SaferParking@glasgow.gov.uk>

Cc: McGregor, Scott (LES) <Scott.McGregor@glasgow.gov.uk>; Curtis, Tony (Councillor) <Tony.Curtis@glasgow.gov.uk>; Bartos, Martin (Councillor)

<Martin.Bartos@glasgow.gov.uk>; Rhodes, Martin (Councillor)

<Martin.Rhodes@glasgow.gov.uk>; McLean, Kenny (Councillor)

<Kenny.McLean@glasgow.gov.uk>; GoBike! Convenor <convenor@gobike.org>

Subject: Re: FW: (THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL (HYNDLAND, HUGHENDEN AND DOWANHILL WEST) (TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING CONTROLS) ORDER 201_

Hello,

Please find attached GoBike's response to the consultation on this proposed TRO.

Tricia Fort

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

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

Subject: FW: (THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL (HYNDLAND, HUGHENDEN AND DOWANHILL WEST) (TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING CONTROLS) ORDER 201_

Date: Wed, 23 May 2018 15:37:06 +0000

From: McGregor, Scott (LES) <Scott.McGregor@glasgow.gov.uk>

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

LAND AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Dear Sir / Madam,

**THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL
(HYNDLAND, HUGHENDEN AND DOWANHILL WEST)
(TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING CONTROLS) ORDER 201_**

The Council propose to consider the introduction of the above named Traffic Regulation Order.

Please find enclosed a copy of the press notice of the proposed Order, relevant map, statement of reasons, detailed report and FAQs.

Details of the proposals will also be available on the Glasgow City Council website at www.glasgow.gov.uk/saferparking from 9.00am on Thursday 24 May 2018.

As stated in the attached documentation, any person wishing to object to the proposed Order should send details of the ground for their objection in writing to **Andy Waddell, Head of Infrastructure and Environment, Land and Environmental Services, Exchange House, 231 George Street, Glasgow, G1 1RX** or by email to saferparking@glasgow.gov.uk by Monday 25 June 2018 .

Yours faithfully



**Andy Waddell
Head of Infrastructure and Environment
Land and Environmental Services**