

The Herald



Friday October 14, 2016

Action needed for safe cycling

AS something of a "cycling lobbyist" myself, I agree strongly with much of the letter (October 13) from your "pedestrian lobbyist" Andrew McCrae. He is right to call for separate cycle routes on main roads, even if this entails some reduction in parking spaces. How tragic that SNP and Conservative councillors in South Ayrshire are removing such a cycle route even before its effect has been analysed statistically.

His recommendation of 20mph throughout urban areas is being adopted by Edinburgh City Council (except for a limited network of arterial roads). Many other councils are interested, but the legal orders required are complex and the Scottish Government is unwilling to simplify things for councils by changing the rules to a 20mph urban default.

Whilst advance stop boxes at traffic lights have some problems, they give a much clearer view for the adjacent pedestrian crossing, as Mr McCrae requests. I was told informally by a council officer that they had helped reduce casualties to all types of road user, thanks to the better visibility of all and by all. Of course, Mr McCrae is right that more crossings are needed.

The Government also needs to introduce presumed liability (not the same as presumed guilt). This would presume liability on the cyclist in a cycle/pedestrian crash (as well as on the motorist in a car/walker or car/cycle crash) and so would hopefully discourage anti-social cycling (and anti-social motoring). Again the Scottish Government is unwilling to take this simple step to improve courtesy and safety on our roads and on those paths which are designated for shared use.

Dave du Feu,
2 Greenpark Cottages, Linlithgow.

The Herald



H 13.10.16

It is high time our politicians put the rights of pedest

I WRITE, in some exasperation, after reading yet another letter (October 12) promoting cycling.

I am an octogenarian and during my life I have been a public transport user, a cyclist, a motorcyclist, a car driver and a pedestrian. Only the first and the last two modes of getting about still apply – and the last mentioned predominates. It irritates me that I am now expected (without consultation) to share footpaths with cyclists, not to mention parked vehicles. What used to be enjoyable strolling places have been allowed to become dangerous, especially to the disabled and the elderly.

Somewhere along the line, someone has decided that this is not a problem or that pedestrians' rights do not

count. Politicians, local and national, should not allow themselves to be swayed by the noisy and powerful cycling lobbyists. Instead they should concentrate on the provision of dedicated cycle tracks on all main roads. Roads which are currently wide enough could have at least one cycling lane inserted between the motor traffic lane and the pedestrian/perambulator/wheelchair-only pavement. Roadside parking could be eliminated on at least one side of the road, motor traffic speeds reduced to 20mph in towns. Clear-view pedestrian access could be provided at bus stops and at suitable crossing places along the road. Only then should our politicians encourage cycling. Cycling is not a particularly

healthy pastime, anyway; a glimpse at accident statistics would confirm that (though this should improve with adequate provision).

This letter may not make easy reading for cycling enthusiasts but I hope they will note that I have included proposals for better provision for them; members of my own family are keen cyclists. Until something more positive is done to control our chaotic traffic arrangements, please do not forget the safety and enjoyment of the pedestrians among us.

**Andrew McCrae,
3 St Andrews Drive, Gourrock.**

BEING a resident of Ayr, I am irked when ill-informed folk criticise South

rians before those of cyclists

Ayrshire Council for ripping up a cycle path ("Councillors vote to rip up controversial cycleway following public outcry over lack of consultation", The Herald, October 7, and Letters, October 12). While I am not always a fan of the council, this isn't the whole picture.

- The cycle path was installed with no consultation, by Ayrshire Roads Alliance, on a busy arterial route.

- The cycle path is ugly and would affect house prices, access and safety at the adjacent High School.

- Any extension of the cycle path would be along a residential street and across private ground.

- The best option was along the River Ayr, away from traffic and that route is scenic.

- Access to the A77 underpass is best realised from the river bank.

- SNP, Labour and Tory councillors supported the "rip-up" motion.

- More than 150 residents attended the Community Council meeting and the full Council meeting in protest.

- Remedial work starts on October 24.

This community wants the cycle path, so we await the plans to see the best options along the River Ayr. This, I believe, is what local democracy is about.

**John McGuire,
Chairman, Forehill Holmston and
Masonhill Community Council,
54 Roman Road,
Ayr.**

W

cl
th
st

Se
sc
er
C
J

i
c
c
i
s
t