



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

Ref: TF/SI/AW/D69

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

15 September 2020

CC: Councillor Anna Richardson

Dear Sir/Madam,

**THE GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL,
Ashgill Road (Extension), Cleeves Road, Ruchazie Road, Ryehill Road and Victoria Park
Drive North Traffic Calming Proposals**

Thank you for your 5 emails of 10 September and the opportunity to comment on the proposals for traffic calming by the use of speed cushions at these locations. Thank you also for your email response of 01 September to our letter of 18 August. Sadly, we find that response very depressing. At a time when the City Council, and indeed, your department of that Council, is responding so positively to the Covid-19 pandemic and increasing the space for distancing with all the new cycle lanes, it is counter-intuitive to propose all these speed cushions, which act against comfortable and safe cycling. We are very pleased with the new cycle lanes, albeit a wee bit uncomfortable with the steep bus boarders, but are looking forward to more such lanes and improvements at junctions.

We confirm our opposition to these schemes, particularly in the light of the City Council progressing work on Liveable Neighbourhoods and much discussion on Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. Would it not be more productive to trial the principles of such neighbourhoods now, since that is the way society is going? The use of active travel and public transport is being encouraged at the expense of private motor traffic; speed cushions act against that trend.

Below, as in our letters of 18 August and 01 September, we give a few thoughts as to how the 5 streets currently in question could be treated:

Ashgill Road (Extension)

We cannot understand why this north to south section of Ashgill Road is a dual carriageway and one option to reduce the speeds of motor traffic would be to make the 2 inside lanes into "pop-up" type cycle lanes. This would help people cycling northbound on what is quite a steep gradient and would remove the very uncomfortable experience of cycling southbound. Is the hatched area meant to be traffic-free? To cycle down the hatched area would be uncomfortable with the ridges of paint, but to cycle in the right hand lane would risk being undertaken by fast moving motor vehicles. We suggest you consider all traffic when proposing a suitable solution here.

Cleeves Road

Cleeves Road has a primary school on it so should be considered as a car-free school zone in line with current City Council thinking. It is also, we suspect, being used as a rat run with motor vehicles cutting through between Nitshill Road and Glenmuir Drive. The adjacent Cleeves Quadrant was proposed for the speed cushion treatment last September. This justifies a move

towards Liveable Neighbourhoods, where areas are treated as a whole; unfortunately, such thinking was not mentioned in your email of 01 September.

Ruchazie Road

Again, the neighbourhood around Ruchazie Road should be considered as a whole, with through traffic directed to a higher category road, such as Carntynehall Road (certainly south of Edinburgh Road) Preventing through motor traffic in residential areas should be the aim, rather than impeding cycling and only very debatably slowing down motor traffic with speed cushions. We also note that speed cushions do nothing to help pedestrians cross a road.

Ryehill Road

Barmulloch is more or less a self-contained area bounded by Broomfield Road in the west Wallacewell Road in the north, Robroyston Park in the east and the M80 in the south. Plus, Ryehill Road forms the east side of an oval circuit with Rye Road forming the west. It is the southern part of Ryehill Road, running downhill to the roundabout, where motor traffic speeds are excessive, but why can't the whole area be treated as a Liveable Neighbourhood? Where is the assistance to people cycling or walking?

Victoria Park Drive North

Your email of 01 September refers to consultation with "local road users" who complained about ineffective speed cushions. At these 2 mini-roundabouts in Jordanhill there has been significant action by local residents, culminating in a small [demonstration](#) on 28 April 2019. If you follow the link you will see that local residents, ie road users, wish to see this junction redesigned with zebra/pelican crossings. The father of 3 children referred to in the article is a GoBike member who certainly wants to see the traffic islands enlarged; he was recently taking his youngest child home from nursery on the back of his bike when they met a woman in a wheelchair. The traffic island was, and is, too small to take them all. We approve of that inclusion in your proposal, but we also understand that a member of City Council staff spoke to these local road users. Given that we all pay for our roads under current taxation, it would be hoped that local views would be taken into account.

We hope that, in conjunction with others in Neighbourhoods and Sustainability and with Councillors responsible for Active Travel, you are able to take a wider look at reducing motor traffic overall rather than covering our streets with speed cushions, which have a debatable influence on motor traffic speed.

Yours sincerely



Tricia Fort
for Consultations, GoBike