



Land and Environmental Services
Sustainable Transport
Glasgow City Council
231 George Street
Glasgow
G1 1RX

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

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

Ref: GCC/AM/NL

By e-mail to: Land@glasgow.gov.uk

17 November 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL, (YOKER TO KNIGHTSWOOD) (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT ROUTE) ORDER 201_ General support but with severe reservations

Thank you for your e-mail of 16 October and the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We have already informed you of our concern at the lack of information contained in the TRO and we are grateful for your e-mail response of 06 November to our questions to you of 04 November. Thank you also for the engineering drawings that you sent by post. You pointed out on 06 November that “An online public consultation including technical drawings was held from the 7th of August until the 8th of September 2017, this was supported by a community consultation event on the 15th of August ... This technical / engineering consultation has now closed.”

GoBike was not formally informed of this consultation and, although some of our members in the locality were informed, its significance was not clear. We are thus grateful to be able to contribute at this stage but could we please be informed of all local consultations in the city where there is a potential impact on the space available for cycling?

We note that this Traffic Regulation Order applies only to the Segregated Cycleway part of the overall scheme, ostensibly to improve cycle access to Knightswood Park for the 2018 BMX European Championships, and our comments below relate only to that part:

1. GoBike welcomes segregated cycleways in busy areas as this is the layout most conducive to encouraging people of all ages and abilities to cycle, either with others or alone.
2. We note your comment that the segregation will be by “orca”, a less expensive and less intrusive method than concrete kerbing.
3. We welcome the proposal to ban waiting and loading in the cycleways; this is to us an obvious and necessary component of such a scheme but it is sadly lacking in other parts of the city.
4. We welcome the proposal to protect junctions from parked vehicles to improve visibility and the safety of all road users.
5. Could you please confirm that the necessary liaison with Police Scotland and the City Council’s Parking Wardens will be carried out to ensure that there will be compliance with, and enforcement of, the parking and loading restrictions?
6. Floating bus stops: please amend your proposal to ensure no reduction in width of the cycle lane behind the bus stops. Reducing the two-way width to only 1.5m is dangerous and outwith the standard; it could lead to collision. The “absolute” minimum width of a

two-way cycle lane in Cycling by Design is 2m, but that is not appropriate here. The “desirable minimum width”, of 3.0m, which you appear to use as standard, is the minimum to be used at these locations throughout the scheme. You are including a zebra crossing at each location; this is the correct way to slow down people who are cycling.

7. Corner arrangements at the junction of Lincoln Avenue to Archerhill Road? What is the outer edge arrangement of the cycle lane here? The orcas appear to stop just short of the corner, ie they are absent at the very place where protection from motor vehicles is most needed! We insist, as a minimum, that bollards are placed at the corner to both protect people using the cycle lane and also to allow access to and egress from the cycle lane at the junction.
8. We are pleased to see that the orca separation will be reinforced at 50m intervals by bollards on Lincoln Avenue and Archerhill Road but this arrangement is not shown on your drawing for Dyke Road. We consider it essential that the orcas are reinforced with bollards throughout and we also advise that you review the spacing of the bollards once the scheme is constructed and in use. You will be aware, perhaps, that the orcas segregating the cycle lane on Glasgow Bridge that takes Bridge Street over the River Clyde are suffering degradation from motor vehicles impacting on them?
9. Your drawings appear to show the bollards protected by concrete kerbing. Please confirm that this obstruction will not narrow the cycleway that is already at the minimum width of 3.0m. Any protection to the bollards must encroach on the roadway width thus encouraging motor vehicles away from the cycleway.
10. While GoBike campaigns for good cycle facilities we are also very aware of pedestrians and wheelchair users etc who use footways. The footway outside the old Blawarthill Hospital at the south end of Dyke Road is very narrow; your drawing shows it as under 1m wide, ie more an edging strip than a footway. What arrangements will you be putting in place to ensure that prams, wheelchairs and pedestrians can move along the footway without encroaching on the cycleway?
11. It is clear that good cycle facilities are needed throughout the city so that all those people who wish may access shops, schools, medical centres, workplaces etc as well as parks by bike. The segregated cycle lane stops abruptly at the south end of Dyke Road. Do you have an ongoing plan to extend the facility at this and at the other extremities of the scheme?

Please confirm the action to be taken in response to points 5 – 11 inclusive.

We will respond to your second TRO in respect of the shared footway element of this overall scheme in due course and we look forward to a constructive and continuing dialogue with you to provide good cycle facilities in the city.

Yours sincerely,



Convenor, GoBike!