

**Dennistoun Community Council response to Glasgow City Council
reply regarding queries submitted to the Dennistoun Area Partnership.**

Monday 27th September 2021

Thank you for the detailed reply to the DCC enquiries submitted via the Dennistoun Area Partnership meeting of 1st September 2021. DCC comments in response are as follows.

1. Projects

There is much useful and genuinely enlightening detail on current projects to take away from your reply. DCC welcomes this and looks forward to engaging with each of them constructively as progress continues.

2. Cycle lockers

The information provided is useful, but it is generic rather than specific. There doesn't appear to be any presence of drains or covers that justify the move of the proposed Armadale Street locker onto Garthland Drive (to a location under overhanging trees which are already beginning to have an effect on the locker below). There's a gully/drain where the Whitehill one was proposed, but that doesn't explain why it was moved onto the footway rather than to a nearby alternative carriageway location.

What, specifically, are the reasons for the amended siting of each of the cycle lockers in Dennistoun away from their originally proposed carriageway locations?

3. EV charging points

The response provided does not answer our enquiry about EV charging points. *"To minimise the risk of accidental damage to the EV Chargers"* is a disappointing justification for installing vehicular infrastructure in active travel space when examples of installation in the carriageway exist (e.g. 118 Torrisdale Street and 471 Victoria Road). Further, it does not respect the hierarchy of transport modes.

Putting aside that failure against basic principles, the installations fall short against the claim that *"we ensure there is 2m clearance on the pavement for pedestrians and wheelchair users"*.

At the EV charger outside the library on Craigpark there is only 1.5m pedestrian clearance for pedestrians between plinth upstand and empty cycle stand (which will be reduced to even less whenever the stand is use). But even if the cycle stand were removed entirely and relocated elsewhere, there still wouldn't be the physical space available for a 2m clearance between the new charging point installation and the existing wall at the rear of the pavement).

The two EV chargers on Millerston Street at Craigpark Drive each leave 1.75m clearance between the new charging point installation and the existing wall at the rear of the pavement (reduced to 1.5m if accounting for the detritus and vegetation that narrows the practicably useable space).

The 2030 target is worthy in many respects, but it is not an excuse to further lower or override standards for active travel provision in deference to provision of motor vehicle infrastructure as has happened in these initial instances in the area. It sets a very grim precedent for the subsequent tens/hundreds/thousands of EV charger installations installed in Dennistoun, Glasgow and Scotland.

"Having one in an area is an amenity", yes, but there is no excuse for that amenity being introduced to the clear and unambiguous detriment of pavement users. All on-street EV chargers should be in the carriageway space.

Why are EV chargers being installed within active travel space rather than within the ample carriageway space available, when there are precedents showing that it is entirely possible for this to be achieved?

The stated '2m clearance' was not achievable with an on-pavement installation at either the Craigpark or Millerston Street location, yet EV chargers were still installed on the pavement: why is GCC not meeting its stated standard, and what will be done to correct the problem for this and future instances?

4. Road markings on Duke Street

The Duke Street pelican crossing near Whitehill Street has been back in operation since 16th September after an overdue return visit from the markings team. But it Additionally, there are still various places where the markings on Duke Street still do not match what was there before the resurfacing, including the following:

- At pelican crossing between Sword Street and Thomson Street: No studs along crossing route.
- At top of Thomson Street: hatched corner missing next to loading bay outside Essence of Beauty (No. 350B), and resultant changed junction geometry.
- Outside Florresters (No. 447): Loading bay text missing.
- Outside Techbytes (No. 356): Parking bay separator missing.
- Outside Commonwealth Central Practice (No. 362): Loading bay text missing.
- Outside Coia's (No. 477): Loading bay text missing.

Furthermore, previous resurfacing work on or near Duke Street has taken place in recent weeks/months/years and is still without follow-up road marking reinstatements, including the following:

- McIntosh Street: markings not reinstalled after resurfacing.
- Duke Street at Craigpark: there used to be a hatched yellow box here before the carriageway was patched up.
- Hillfoot Street: yellow lining inconsistencies (double/single/associated parking plate signage).

Can the above road marking issues be reviewed, and corrected where appropriate (along with any other issues not mentioned but which may also be applicable within the scope of this enquiry)?

5. Co-wheels

Thank you for the new information provided which had not previously been made available by Co-wheels in response to previous enquiries. It is good to know that the return of a Co-wheels car to Whitehill Street is being dealt with as a priority.

6. Advertising trailers

We appreciate that the advertising trailers have been raised internally and look forward to their removal in due course.

7. Spaces for People/Contraflow cycling

As the Designer of the scheme, ultimate responsibility for amendments to the scheme are the responsibility of GCC.

DCC accepts that *“the contraflow cycling measures were removed in response to feedback from Police Scotland which highlighted the risk of collision in the narrow residential roads”*, and that GCC has evidently taken this input and acted in agreement. But, thus far, no explanation has been given on the basis for the alleged risk, or how that risk is more significant than already exists on adjacent two-way streets.

Can GCC explain how well-marked and properly-signed one-way streets with contraflow cycling create a risk additional to that which exist on numerous otherwise identical two-way streets?