



Kevin Hamilton
Head of Roads
Neighbourhoods and Sustainability
Glasgow City Council.

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

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

By e-mail to: LandServices.Mailroom@glasgow.gov.uk

Ref: TF/SI

02 September 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

**The Glasgow City Council
(Kingsland Drive) Traffic Calming Scheme 20__**

Thank you for your email of 20 August and the opportunity to comment on the proposals for traffic calming to reduce the speed of motor traffic on Kingsland Drive and Thurston Road.

GoBike is fully supportive of reducing the speed of motor traffic and has supported all proposals for the introduction of 20mph speed limits in the city, although we would prefer a city-wide default speed limit of 20mph.

However, we are concerned that where speeds consistently above the speed limit are observed just one method of traffic calming is proposed, irrespective of location, road width, gradient or alignment or the density and demographic of the local population.

We recognise that speed cushions are effective at reducing the speed of motor vehicles and we support the use of raised tables at junctions to give pedestrians priority but these measures are reactive. They are slowing traffic down but they are not proactively encouraging active travel, ie walking and cycling. If measures are introduced that support active travel then motor drivers, rather than complaining about the damage speed cushions inflict on their cars might just get their bike out of the shed or walk to the local shops.

Measures supportive of active travel are being introduced in the Avenues Projects in the city centre and the current Development Regeneration Framework documents are highlighting the need, for the sake of the city's health, to reduce the number of motor vehicles, introduce more green space and get people using public transport or a bike or their feet to get around.

In the case of Kingsland Drive and Thurston Road, it seems clear that this area was planned and developed before the increase in car ownership. Although car ownership is low in Glasgow we are aware that reductions in the quality of public transport and the increase in ticket prices are making some people find it necessary to buy a car and, if they can only afford an inexpensive one, ie an old, used one it probably won't have the low emission features of newer models and the pollution caused will be adding to any ill-health they suffer because of lack of exercise.

However, most of the properties on these two streets appear to have room to store a vehicle off-road, rather than leave it straddling the footway and the nearside edge of the road. Such parking makes it difficult for people, particularly people with sight impairment, to walk on the footways and for people to cycle on the road.

We suggest two options to address the situation:

1. You supply dropped kerbs to all properties where there is room off-road to store their car and you install build outs, incorporating cycle bypasses, on alternate sides of the road to form chicanes allowing alternate one-way access for motor vehicles. The buildouts must

incorporate planters or bollards to prevent parking and on-road parking must be strictly prevented. This is our preferred option since it will allow people to walk on the footways and will not impede cycling.

2. You formalise on-road storage of motor vehicles on alternate sides of the road, again forming chicanes with bollarded (or with planters) buildouts at each end. This will introduce longer sections of alternate one-way traffic and impact on cycling at times but it will free the footways of vehicles.

We suggest that these points, and any others from residents, particularly the non-car-owning residents, are considered before installing speed cushions.

We note that the minimum distance of the cushions from the kerb is only 0.6m. This is below the minimum quoted in the DfT Local Transport Note 2/08, Cycle Infrastructure Design, which, in Clause 5.6.2 states that a gap of between 0.75 and 1.0m allows a bike to get through. We had understood that the City Council was using a gap of 1.2m as standard and it's regrettable that this is not the case as it would allow tricycles and cargo bikes to get through.

It is of concern to us that there might be parking on the cushions, should they be installed, which will force anyone cycling to move to the centre of the road to avoid the possibility of car-dooring and the discomfort of cycling over the speed cushions.

We are, as stated above, fully supportive of the need to reduce the speed of motor vehicles, but we must do this by designing our streets for people. We must provide for people to walk and cycle in comfort, we must emulate the proposals of the Avenues projects and we must cut sight lines by installing chicanes or planters.

In summary, we are disappointed that the option of installing speed cushions for the minority of the population who drive, and who drive at speeds over the speed limit is your first resort in this residential area. We object to the proposal in its current form.

Yours sincerely



Tricia Fort
for Consultations, GoBike