

Glasgow City Council response to queries submitted by Dennistoun Community Council to the Dennistoun Area Partnership.

Re: <http://dennistouncc.org.uk/2021/09/04/submission-to-dennistoun-area-partnership-september-2021/>

and re: <http://dennistouncc.org.uk/2021/09/29/update-on-submission-to-dennistoun-area-partnership-september-2021/>

Tuesday 5th October 2021

Thank you for your recent enquiries/comments on behalf of Dennistoun Community Council. I have again liaised with colleagues across the service and have detailed below information in relation to each topic.

For ease of reference I have provided responses in the order submitted and highlighted **the topics/enquiries raised by you in blue** with responses in black.

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.

GCC: As do GCC

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).

GCC: After consideration, the position of the shelter at the initial location would have resulted in partial restriction of clear access to the property.

The unit placed at Garthland Drive functions well without any issues and is at full capacity.

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.

GCC: The intention of the units is not to exacerbate any existing parking issues. The shelter location at Whitehill Street is placed on a nib, meaning we were able to place the unit without impacting on available parking in an area of high vehicle parking demand. This unit is at full capacity.

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?

GCC: We have a great number of things to consider when installing chargers and although we have key criteria we try and meet, sometimes we have to make concessions and compromises otherwise we'll never find any locations that are 100% suitable.

As you'll see from the attached image from Victoria Road, the protective bollards have both been impacted by vehicles, which reinforces our aim to minimise the number of these we deploy. The alternative was to have cables trailing across the cycle lane. Hence, we chose the better of two options, neither of which were ideal. Our learning from these installations means we'll be unlikely to use this as an option elsewhere.



Worth also noting that the chargers on both Victoria Road and Torrisdale Street are actually part of the parking bays rather than the carriageway proper. The in-shot nature of these locations affords these chargers some protection, which isn't the case at Craigpark. See below image.



Apologies, my previous response should have read “we try to ensure there is 2m”. Again, if we stick rigidly to this, the vast majority of pavements in Glasgow would be precluded from consideration. 1.5m is the generally accepted guidance, for example from the Energy Saving Trust ‘Positioning charge points and adapting parking policies for electric vehicles’ guidance. It is also what a number of active travel and disability groups, organisations and charities have asked local authorities to commit to, including but not limited to ‘The Equal Pavements Pledge’ started by Transport for all and ‘Cut the Clutter’ being promoted by Living Streets. Hence we aim to exceed these standards under ideal conditions.

The transport hierarchy is an apt reference when considering preferred options from a sustainability perspective but it doesn’t preclude the use of vehicles in their entirety. Any suggestion that motor vehicles are no longer going to be a part of society is unrealistic, hence planning for active travel options and zero emission vehicles has to be undertaken in parallel. The installation of chargers shouldn’t be seen as preferential treatment for cars but rather on of a raft of activities being undertaken by the Council in response to climate change and air quality.

All of that being said, an officer has visited the library again and has acknowledged that the location of the charger isn’t ideal so is going to liaise with active travel colleagues to see if we can move these racks slightly to improve the pavement amenity. GCC will update DCC on this situation.

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.**

GCC can advise that Roads maintenance will inspect the road markings on Duke Street and McIntosh Street and thereafter arrange re-instatement works as required.

- **Duke Street at Craigpark: there used to be a hatched yellow box here before the carriageway was patched up.**

GCC: With regard to the box junction marking, I’d suggest that since there hasn’t been an enforceable marking at this junction for more than 10 years, and that we’re not aware of any issues since then, there is no requirement for this restriction at this junction.

- **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)?

GCC: Could DCC please expand on the inconsistencies?

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.

GCC: You are very welcome

6. Advertising trailers

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

Planning Enforcement Ref no - DRS - 169192105

GCC: Will continue to pursue this matter

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?

GCC: The Spaces for People project in Dennistoun was implemented under emergency temporary schemes, it was trialled and unfortunately Police Scotland were not supportive of all the measures, therefore they were subsequently removed. Due to these associated road safety risks it would require a more robust solution, which is something we will look at, and work with the community on when proposing permanent measures in this area.

Regards

I trust this is of assistance.

Charlie Keane
Neighbourhood Liaison Co-ordinator (Dennistoun)
Glasgow City Council
Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability