



The GCP Committee are appreciative of the opportunity to provide comment on Phase 2 of the planned interventions within the city centre.

Before going onto the specific area maps that we were provided with, we would like to make the following observations.

**ROAD CLOSURE SIGNAGE** - All road closure barriers should show specific reference to cyclists being allowed access to the areas now restricted? At present, with the signs merely saying 'ROAD AHEAD CLOSED' surely every cyclist that ignores them and ride through technically commits an offence? As well as making the signing making it expressly clear to cyclists/other motorists who is allowed access, and who is not, to the restricted area, it highlights to pedestrians, in particular, that cyclists are also entitled to be there; (examples below from SFP measures in place in Edinburgh and Dundee)



The point regarding clarity of signage will become increasingly relevant as the weeks and months progress.

**PEDESTRIAN CROSSING TIMINGS** – out with the restricted area, it appears the timed phases at each of the neighbouring crossings have been left as they are. This left pedestrians particularly waiting overly long. GCP Committee believe it would be worthwhile to reconsider the allocated timings at these crossings/junctions. This will be increasingly relevant as more shops, businesses and workplaces begin to open and the linked increased footfall in the area.

A recent meeting of a Glasgow City Council committee discussed a range of possible measures. Please see an extract below;

- Changes to waiting and loading restrictions.
- Selective road closures where feasible.
- Making narrow footways with limited space one-way for pedestrians, with perhaps additional crossing points.
- Identify how to encourage and facilitate responsible queuing at bus stops.
- Identify and target the key walking routes from Glasgow's main public transport interchanges.
- Identify and target potential cycle routes through the city centre linking to strategic routes.
- Increase the green man time at junctions or reduce the traffic light cycle times to aid pedestrians.
- Change pedestrian crossings to be automatically set at the green man and requiring to be activated by vehicles, rather than on pedestrian demand.
- Discuss with Transport Scotland or Department for Transport, the possibility of a dispensation to trial e-scooters in the city centre.
- Investigate the potential to increase the number of bikes and electric bikes available in the Mass Automated Cycle Hire (MACH) bike scheme.
- Installing additional on street cycle parking where space is available.

**PART-TIME PANDEMIC** – as things stand, much of the signs/cones required for the closures, as being stored overnight on the adjacent pavements. While we understand this may make huge sense in terms of time and effort saved at both ends of the day, it is ironic that pavement space is being taken up by these signs.

**PROMOTION/AWARENESS** – GCP Committee note with disappointment the lack of advance information sharing from ACC on the proposed measures being in place on the ground. Many locals may still not know of what is taking place in the city centre. Why was there a media blackout in advance? We realise that you 'can't please all the people all the time', however we see, now much more than ever, more reason to let people know what is being planned. Other cities shared the full details of their bids publicly in advance. On a positive note, it is pleasing to see the online consultation link now live although we do firmly believe that this could and should have been in place beforehand, together with a public release of the entire draft bid to Sustrans.

**COMMUNICATION** – It is appreciated that this is extremely, and increasingly, difficult as you are being asked to adapt and modify things at a much quicker pace than any of us might ever expected would occur in reality. However, the layout/signing was confusing for many (pedestrians, cyclists and drivers). A clearer set of maps detailing who is allowed where would have helped in advance of measures being in place. As we go into phase 2/3 of the Scottish Government's RouteMap, this could be accompanied by adding which businesses are open for people to book and go to (regeneration). Perhaps a series of short films showing a bus users journey (to highlight where some stops have moved to), a pedestrians' point of view (esp. when the 'widened' footpath is implemented) and from a cyclists' perspective (highlighting the need to look out for pedestrians, slow down and take care).

The Committee of Grampian Cycle Partnership applaud the work that has been to date (and that which is still ongoing) to get us to this point and recognise that these plans are still very much in their infancy and will doubtless require substantial tweaking/rehashing as the days, weeks and indeed months, progress. However, much of the points made above will become increasingly relevant as both pedestrian and vehicular traffic levels rise.

Now, referring to each of the area PDFs:

**North** – Why is Broad Street marked as Bus Only? We think this is misleading and would likely cause more confusion if shown in maps for the public. Would it not help to show Broad Street ‘as is’?

In the sections of King Street and Guild Street there are proposals for footway widening. While we are supportive of these measures, we would be extremely keen to know what plans are in place for segregation/protection there for cyclists.

**Central** – as with the other streets mentioned, while we are supportive of the need for footway widening, we are keen that cyclists are not adversely affected by the reallocation of the remaining carriageway space.

**East** – the big black arrow showing one-way on Schoolhill/Upperkirkgate is misleading, especially if this was on a map released to the public. Should there not be two separate arrows? One in black for the eastbound vehicles on Schoolhill and another (in red) for those vehicles allowed into and out of Upperkirkgate/Flourmill Lane?

Regarding the proposed two-way pedestrian/cycle zone at the northmost end of Belmont Street, with cyclists entering from Schoolhill, would this not create further confusion for pedestrians on Belmont Street? Also, in the central section of Belmont Street, it would be highly likely that those cyclists would then continue southward leading to potential conflict with the admittedly limited number of vehicles allowed access to there. We remain to be convinced that there is a need to remove the ‘no entry’ for cyclists from the junction of Schoolhill/Belmont Street.

**West** – as with the other locations already mentioned, while we are pleased to see the understandable footway widening measures, we would be keen that cyclists are not disadvantaged with the reallocated carriageway space. Should this map not also have barriers across the northern end of the closures on Rose Street and Chapel Street?

**Grampian Cycle Partnership Committee**

8<sup>th</sup> June 2020