



Andrew Mollon
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/TP

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

30 July 2021

Dear Sir/Madam,

**GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL,
(GARNETHILL) (TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING CONTROLS) ORDER 20__**

Thank you for your email of 16 July and the opportunity to comment on the proposals for motor vehicle parking in Garnethill in the city centre.

As per our response of 08 January 2020 to the preliminary, Stage One, consultation, GoBike objects to the majority of the changes you propose and, in particular, we object to the underlying reasoning of your proposals. You state in your Press Notice: "There is also an existing one-way system which will be retained. This facilitates traffic flow in the area whilst maximising parking where possible .."

There is an assumption implicit in that statement that "traffic" means motor traffic and you completely ignore cycle traffic throughout these proposals and give only a passing nod to pedestrian traffic. This is at a time when Glasgow is preparing to host COP26 and we are living in a climate emergency.

The GoBike response to the points raised in your Press Notice, taking cognisance of the explanatory notes in your email, is as follows:

- *Replace the existing voucher system for short-term visitors with a mobile phone/Pay & Display payment system.*
We support this move.
- *Reduce the annual cost of the permit for residents from £135 to £85 or £23.75 quarterly.*
We object to this move, as we stated in our Stage One submission. Garnethill is an area within the city centre, well served by bus, train and subway and with two nearby multi-storey car parks, on Cambridge Street and Elmbank Crescent. To encourage the use of active travel or public transport, and in-line with other Glasgow City Council and Scottish Government policies on active travel, costs for motor vehicles must increase and not decrease.
- *To implement a Restricted Parking Zone (RPZ) covering the lanes which would make them enforceable without the need for yellow lining.*
We support this move, but with the proviso that the City Council employ sufficient enforcement staff to ensure compliance. Throughout the city motorists leave their vehicles where they wish irrespective of restrictions with impunity, given the scarcity of traffic wardens.
- *To increase the number of parking spaces where appropriate on Buccleuch Street, Dalhousie Street, Garnethill Street and Hill Street.*

While we note that you have reduced the increases originally proposed in the area, we cannot support any increase in parking places given the availability of public transport and the local multi-storey car parks.

- *To increase the number of disabled parking spaces where necessary.*
We have no objection to this increase, but we are concerned that you have given no evidence or reasoning to support an increase. As pointed out above, the parking in this area must be robustly managed; able-bodied motorists are not averse to using any space they can, including disabled parking spaces, to leave their vehicle. Enforcement Officers must be particularly vigilant in respect of these parking spaces.
- *To introduce business parking permits, at an annual cost of £650, for local businesses in the area that require a vehicle for essential business use.*
In our response of 09 January 2020 to the Stage One consultation, we queried the requirements for these parking permits. Sadly, you did not grant us the courtesy of a reply. Thus, given that there is no explanation as to why these permits are necessary, we object to them and suggest that any business use be contained within the off-street multi-storey car parks.
- *To make 'Resident Only' parking bays shared use bays as per all other bays in this area.*
We have no comment on this item.
- *To make the parking tariff the same as the City Centre this would be £1 for 15 minutes with a 2 hour maximum stay.*
We support this increase.

In respect of the items that you state will not change, we object strongly to this inclusion:

- *The one-way system. This will remain in place.*
The existence of a one-way system that does not allow contraflow cycling is in contravention of good practice, common-sense and the design guide, Cycling by Design, which is used by the City Council.
We refer you to this examination of contraflow cycling:
<https://www.gobike.org/contraflow-conundrums-10549>

A Garnethill resident has told us that cycling as per the one-way system makes life tortuous, with long detours and steep hills to get just a short distance as the crow flies or as one could legally cycle, if the City Council were minded to encourage active travel!

In respect of the items in your email that you state have been changed since the Stage One Consultation, we support just this one:

- *No waiting at any time and no loading at any time extended on West Graham Street at its junction with Scott Street to increase visibility at this junction.*
Junctions are potentially hazardous for all road-users and to reduce the incidence of collisions visibility must be a prime concern.

The changes in the number of parking places are referred to above, but to confirm: we object to any overall increase in on-street parking places.

Thus overall GoBike objects to this TRO and to the underlying support of the motor vehicle in this time of COP26, the need to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and the need to get our population more active to both reduce the use of motor vehicles in the city and to improve their health. For completeness I attach a copy of our Stage One response from 09 January 2020.

Yours sincerely



Tricia Fort, for Consultations, GoBike