

FW: GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL (UNIVERSITY AVENUE AND UNIVERSITY  
**Subject:**PLACE) (TRAFFIC REGULATION AND PARKING CONTROLS) ORDER 201\_ mail  
id no 385062 (OFFICIAL)  
**Date:**Tue, 13 Aug 2019 08:12:09 +0000  
**From:**Mailroom, Land Services (NS) <[LandServices.Mailroom@glasgow.gov.uk](mailto:LandServices.Mailroom@glasgow.gov.uk)>  
**To:**[consultations@gobike.org](mailto:consultations@gobike.org) <[consultations@gobike.org](mailto:consultations@gobike.org)>

**MESSAGE SENT ON BEHALF OF ANDY WADDELL**  
**DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS**  
**NEIGHBOURHOODS AND SUSTAINABILITY**

Dear Ms Fort

**THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL**  
**(UNIVERSITY AVENUE AND UNIVERSITY PLACE)**  
**(TRAFFIC REGULATION AND PARKING CONTROLS) ORDER 201\_**

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the above named Traffic Regulation Order.

With regards to your concerns:

The University of Glasgow's proposals for University Avenue and University Place were developed in consultation with Council officers and following consideration of all options available, including the incorporation of segregated cycle lanes in University Avenue and the introduction of bus gates at either end of the Avenue.

Options investigated the requirements for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport provision, University and local access issues and wider traffic management issues in line with the established hierarchy.

The resultant proposal significantly improves pedestrian passage both along and across University Avenue and has removed all existing parking. However, it was necessary to accommodate public transport routes in both directions as well as larger bus stops at the University. The two way traffic corridor will also accommodate emergency service vehicles and local service access. To mitigate other traffic access, a supporting Traffic Regulation Order will reduce the speed limit to 20mph. More severe traffic restrictions e.g. bus gates, were found to have a detrimental impact on adjacent streets such as Byres Road and were therefore discounted.

Unfortunately, due to land availability, local topography and a number of listed structures, it was not practicable to accommodate fully segregated cycle lanes in both directions. This is demonstrated in your own proposals which resulted in a single 3m one-way traffic lane and would not be supported by the Council, and would be likely to raise objections from other stakeholders including emergency services and bus operators. When considering the 20mph speed limit, the need to accommodate bus stops for large numbers of passengers and the sharp gradients, up to 8%, and campus cycle access available at either end of University Avenue, it was concluded that the mandatory cycle lanes would be provided only on the uphill sections.

The University has also taken a number of steps to improve the local campus environment for pedestrians and cyclists. The campus will be opened up with a number of signed routes, routes will remain accessible after hours. Car parking on the campus will be significantly reduced and other vehicle access controlled. Public realm including cycle storage facilities will be improved.

Addressing your specific observations:

### **1. The painted cycle lanes are dangerous.**

Painted lines are a recognised means of cycle lane provision. It is noted that they are not ideal but they are the best that can be practicably achieved in this particular location. The university will investigate the practicability of introducing forms of light segregation, however there are concerns that this in turn may introduce a trip hazard.

### **2. The design of the painted cycle lanes within the TRO makes cycling even more dangerous.**

Bus stops are located on either side of the crossing at the junction with Hillhead Street and, as there was insufficient road width to provide lay-bys, without the loss of pedestrian space, this made any opportunity to provide cycle lanes over the entire length of University Avenue impracticable.

The designers were required to work within the bounds of the existing public road limits. Unfortunately, as noted above, segregated cycle routes cannot physically be accommodated in both directions. Due to the grades it was determined that segregated cycle lanes on the downhill sections would be a greater risk due to the lack of width and proximity of pedestrians on narrower footways.

### **3. Painted cycle lanes on University Avenue do not prevent waiting, loading or parking.**

The formalisation of the cycle lane means that if a vehicle crosses over the solid white cycle lane for any reason – for example, to drop off a passenger - they are in contravention of the Highway Code and this would be a police enforcement matter.

Practically, a vehicle stopping for any reason would block the carriageway and would be likely to be moved on by other road users. Equally a segregated lane would not completely deter dropping off activities.

### **4. The plans are in contravention of the Transport Hierarchy.**

The plans are in accordance with the Transport Hierarchy as they prioritise pedestrian safety above all others by widening the footways and improving crossing facilities. It is necessary to maintain the route for two-way public transport, and private vehicle use has been affected with the removal of all parking spaces on University Avenue as well as the reduction to a 20MPH speed limit zone. Whilst full segregation has not been provided, the reduced speed limit and removal of vehicle parking spaces will benefit cycling. These measures are consistent with Cycling by Design.

Cycling by Design (2010) Hierarchy of Measures, *"It should be recognised that measures are more easily accepted and implemented if they directly benefit the wider community, not simply existing cyclists. Strategies that emphasise safety in terms of motorised traffic restraint and speed reduction while promoting health and sustainability will aid the development of cycling."*

### **5. The plans fail to recognise Climate Change Emergency status.**

University Avenue has to maintain accessible for public transport in both directions. Modelling was carried out on potentially making University Avenue a bus only route; this was not feasible due to the level of disruption that would be created on Byres Road, Great Western Road and Dumbarton Road, and the

associated side streets in the area. Similarly, a one-way street would not be possible either.

## **6. The plans fail to recognise recommendations made within the Connectivity**

### **Commission Report.**

Policies can only be applied within the context of the local situation and if delivery is reasonably practicable in terms of issues such as physical aspects, user priorities, essential requirements and wider cost implications. Where you are seeking to adapt an existing streetscape it is not always possible to accommodate all aspirations in one situation. In the case of University Avenue, the reasons why it was not feasible to reallocate road space in strict accordance with the user hierarchy -which would see a larger portion of the road being dedicated to cyclists - are derived from the presence of physical constraints (level change, gradient and pinch point) which, if a segregated route was to be introduced, would compromise the safety of the most vulnerable road users i.e. pedestrians.

## **8. Double yellow lines with kerb marked lines are not legally compatible with mandatory cycle lanes.**

The double yellow line marking restrictions apply from the heel of the footway to the centre of the carriageway. As previously mentioned, the solid white line marked cycle lanes are the boundary in which a vehicle cannot cross over. A vehicle is still within their right to drop off a passenger without crossing over the white solid line marked cycle lane. Any form of waiting beyond the reasonable amount of time for a passenger to board or alight is a traffic offence.

Glasgow City Council do not have a policy on the use of red line markings; there is potential for future implementation around the city with red line markings, however, the policy would have to be created to allow for this.

## **9. The TRO drawing is inconsistent with other approved planning drawings.**

Whilst the omission of the drop off lay-by on the TRO drawing is noted it does not affect the actual restriction. The lay-by is for drop off only and parking would be an offence as it would on the rest of the carriageway.

## **10. Lack of public support.**

The TRO process allows the public to formally object to the proposals and I can advise that the Council received 26 formal objections to the TRO. Several of these objections were supportive of the 20 mph speed limit.

Considering that staff and students of the university alone amount to almost 40,000 people, a figure increased significantly when considering local residents and businesses in the Hillhead / Byres Road area, the level of objection is relatively low in terms of other TRO consultations.

Having considered the above, should you wish to withdraw your objection I would be pleased if you would inform me by 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2019 by writing to Andy Waddell, Director of Operations, Neighbourhoods and Sustainability, House, Glasgow City Council, 231 George Street, Glasgow, G1 1RX or by e-mail to [land@glasgow.gov.uk](mailto:land@glasgow.gov.uk)

If you do not wish to withdraw your objection then there is no requirement for you to write to us again.

Your objection will be considered and included within the final report which will inform the decision. Once a decision has been taken in regards to these proposals I shall write to you again and advise of the outcome.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in grey ink, appearing to read 'A. Waddell'.

**Andy Waddell**  
**Director of Operations**  
**Neighbourhoods and Sustainability**

**(Mail ID 385062)**