



Stantec  
9 George Square  
Glasgow G2 1QQ

PO Box 15175, Glasgow, G4 9LP

e-mail: [consultations@gobike.org](mailto:consultations@gobike.org)

web: [www.gobike.org](http://www.gobike.org)

Ref: TF/SI/Tw/BL/AP

By e-mail to: [canniesburntoll@stantec.com](mailto:canniesburntoll@stantec.com)  
Cc: [Christopher.McGeough@eastdunbarton.gov.uk](mailto:Christopher.McGeough@eastdunbarton.gov.uk)

14 June 2021

Dear Canniesburn Toll roundabout team,

**EAST DUNBARTONSHIRE COUNCIL, STANTEC  
Canniesburn Toll Signalisation Study**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals for the signalisation of Canniesburn Toll roundabout.

GoBike is a local group of people who cycle and who campaign for good cycle infrastructure to improve cycling not only for us, but also for the many people who have taken to active travel during the pandemic and anyone who wishes to cycle in and around greater Glasgow.

It is encouraging to read that East Dunbartonshire Council seeks to support a shift towards more sustainable modes of travel for all journey types, and recognises the population health benefits of increasing walking and cycling rates. Motor traffic dominated roundabouts such as Canniesburn Toll are a major barrier for people who would like to walk or cycle more, and the right changes to it will make walking and cycling through the area much more attractive for everyone including, importantly, residents of the proposed neighbouring development.

**Option 1: Cycle lane round the outside of the roadway**

It is shocking to see this option offered to the public. It's well known that people cycling round the outside of a roundabout are at risk of being left-hooked by exiting vehicles, see for example [LTN1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design](#), 10.7, specifically 10.7.7. LTN1/20 obviously does not have the status of formal guidance in Scotland, but the risks created by annular cycle lanes are the same whatever the location of the roundabout.

Option 1 is dangerous by design and must be rejected.

**Option 2: Cycleways on shared (white line) segregated footway**

Option 2 is safer for people cycling but must be improved for cycling to be an attractive option.

- There is no buffer between the cycleway and the (fast moving) motor traffic, or between the cycle and pedestrian parts of the footway. The cycleway will be used in both directions by people taking the shortest route to their exit so comfortable space for bi-directional cycle traffic (some of it fast) is needed as well as buffer strips between the different modes of traffic.
- There is no provision for cycling at the north end of the roundabout. A relatively narrow footway with short stay parking and activity round shops is the worst place for an unsegregated shared footway.

- The parsimonious allowance of space for cycling means many tight turns are required by people using the crossings (which will no doubt also have extra obstacles such as railings, junction boxes and signal posts). The need for repeated stops and position adjustments to press buttons is tiring for people using conventional cycles and may rule out use by those with unconventional cycles and those who use a cycle as a mobility aid.
- The ASL box shown on Milngavie Road is anomalous.
- Cycle crossings must be positioned and managed so that the waiting time for people cycling (which has a relatively bigger effect on journey times than for those driving) does not depend on the signal timing for the entire roundabout.

There is plenty of space at this roundabout for a design that would take account of future cycle traffic growth and make a real, positive contribution to increasing walking, wheeling and cycling rates. It should set the standard for future works on the routes radiating out from the roundabout. The design team should consider:

- Providing straight-across, quicker routes for active travel, since the decision to signalise has already been made
- Reducing the size of the roundabout island, releasing space for safer, more attractive provision for cycling
- Consulting LTN1/20 for ideas. The corresponding guidance for Scotland, *Cycling by Design*, dates from 2010 and has been under review for an extended period. It would be irresponsible, possibly negligent, not to consult more future-proof guidance for cycle infrastructure
- Finding inspiration from leading UK examples of cycle infrastructure at roundabouts, for example the Edmonton Green roundabout, Enfield( <https://tinyurl.com/huxbm2xm>. Sheet 18)
- Considering complete redesign of the junction, eliminating the roundabout.

GoBike will be delighted to discuss our concerns with you and look forward to hearing from you

Yours sincerely



Tricia Fort  
for Consultations, GoBike