

Draft Nottinghamshire Cycling Strategy 2015: Comments from Pedals

Introduction

Pedals very much welcomes this strategy, its vision and proposed actions, and its clear recognition of the renewed commitment by the County Council to promote cycling, for both daily commuting and other utility trips and for leisure, on grounds of health, air quality and helping to reduce congestion etc. We welcome the spirit of the draft strategy, particular with respect to infrastructure, its proposed reallocation of roadspace, reduced speed limits, and general increase in funding, after many years of declining spending in spending on cycling.

At the same time we would like to take this opportunity to add several detailed comments in the light of our experience. Increased funding should help to ensure that there is adequate attention to detail, so that the proposed actions are not undermined by inadequate attention to detail, as has often been the case in implementing cycle infrastructure. Well-designed, well-built, well-promoted, well-enforced and well-maintained infrastructure we regard as the most important form of cycle promotion.

We are also concerned that there are too many get-out clauses such: 8.2 "where practicable". 6.2 "considered whenever possible". Provision should always be considered. Speed limits should not be advisory.

We should make clear that our main area of interest is Greater Nottingham rather than the whole of Nottinghamshire although we are supportive of developments in the wider area, including for example the emerging plans for the DfT-promoted HS2 cycleway, and any improved routes which encourage safe access by bike to the countryside around Greater Nottingham.

We would like to see the Strategy state somewhere that the basis behind this Strategy was to encourage all bike users of whatever experience etc so that it covers everyone.

1. Do you agree with the cycling vision for Nottinghamshire (detailed in paragraph 2.1 of the Strategy)?
 - a. Would you like anything additional included in the vision? *See comments below*

2. Do you support the actions set out in the Strategy to deliver the cycling vision for Nottinghamshire (detailed in chapters 4 to 14 of the Strategy and summarised in the blue boxes in each chapter)?
 - a. Are there any actions that you would like to see included in the Strategy that are not currently included? *See comments below*
 - b. Of the actions included in the Strategy, are there any that you think the Council and its partners should prioritise? *Specific infrastructure improvements, Well-designed, well-built, well-promoted, well-enforced and well-maintained.*

3. Do you have any further comments on the Strategy?
See comments below

General comments:

The importance of educating / training motorists

There is almost no mention of educating/training motorists. This should explicitly target motorists, for example by adopting the Dutch policy of handing out leaflets to motorists at petrol stations reminding them of the beginning of the school year and offering advice on how they can ensure that their children can cycle/walk safely to school. Professional drivers also need to be targeted: e.g. stop

London-bound coaches from using Melton Road, West Bridgford. There is a need for guidance on what motorists should know about the needs of cyclists via council newsletters.

Evidence of (probably subconscious) ingrained prejudice against cyclists:

Some reporting of accidents (or incidents, a term which some prefer to use) seems clearly biased. In each case but the two most recent deaths, the summary begins with the word "Cyclist". For example, "Cyclist collided with passing lorry" suggests the cyclist was at fault; was "Passing lorry collided with cyclist" a more truthful summary? There is no information given about the behaviour of the driver at the time of the event: for example, speed. In the case of deaths at a pedestrian crossing facility, no information is given.

Biased reporting has an extremely bad influence on public perception and reinforces arguments used by anti-cycling brigade. (The cyclist is always in the wrong. Victim blaming). The bias in the descriptions needs to be removed. The first and 9th events, for example, should both read "Car struck cyclist crossing road on pedestrian crossing".

Concern for older and disabled cyclists.

It is important for the Strategy to address the needs of older and/or disabled cyclists. Such cyclists are more prone to (monomial) accidents when mounting or dismounting because they take longer to reach a stable speed.

Promotion of the use of e-bikes is of particular importance in promoting cycling among older cyclists.

The use of bollards is an example of how older and disabled cyclists can be severely affected. Bollards, though preferable to other forms of access control such as A-frames and staggered barriers should be used sparingly. Where they are used they should be painted in bright colours so that they are clearly visible, and there should be white centre line markings on the approaches, as in common in the Netherlands. There should also be sufficient separation to allow (cycle) trailers to pass comfortably. Consideration should also be given to fitting lights to bollards, as with traffic bollards.

Taking into account the special needs of disabled cyclists must include measures such as lowering the height of signal buttons to be seen by people in recumbents etc. These are typically 75cm wide, and have a much greater turning circle than traditional cycles. For disabled cyclists and others who ride non-traditional bikes it is important that routes are wide enough to accommodate them, have adequate turning at access and egress points and where there are crossings with traffic lights that the buttons are at a suitable height. Many people who use mobility scooters could and probably should also use these tracks and have similar issues.

Uniformity and consistency across council boundaries.

It is very important that there is uniformity of provision and standards across the council boundaries, with close coordination with the City Council as the other Local Highway Authority in Greater Nottingham, and with Highways England in the case of trunk roads.

A significant example is crossing the Suspension Bridge from The Meadows. Once over the bridge and into West Bridgford, cyclists and pedestrians are faced with the daunting task of how to cross to Melton Road from Welbeck Road: the only truly "safe" option on the West Bridgford side is to walk the long way around, negotiating 6 separate traffic lights (designed to maximise the length of the walk), or to cycle via the much more circuitous route via the toucan crossing on Loughborough Road by Millicent Road. Pedals has often raised this issue but been told that any improvements are precluded on "traffic capacity" grounds. This is an example of a major route where active travel is positively discouraged by a failure to achieve consistent good provision across the City / County boundary. One result of this neglect is the relatively high level of pavement cyclists in the vicinity of this junction, a clear indication that many cyclists do not feel safe cycling on the carriageway. Providing safer road layouts is in any case a vital part of addressing the problem of pavement cycling which can often cause irritation to other pavement users.

The need for this consistency will also be very important in other proposals such as the foot-cycle bridge between Trent Lane and The Hook and its approaches from both sides, and in the plans for the Southern Corridor route to and from Clifton, which must also be used to provide much better links for cyclists to and from the proposed new housing areas south of Clifton in Rushcliffe Borough, as well as

other major housing developments due to go ahead soon south and east of West Bridgford. The same principle applies on the west side of Nottingham for routes connecting to and from the new housing areas in Broxtowe Borough.

In our revised wish list for Rushcliffe submitted to Paul Hillier earlier this year we set out in detail our aspirations for upgraded and new routes in that part of the county, with a clear statement of our priorities for this area.

The need for long-term leadership, consistency and commitment

Long-term leadership, consistency and commitment, as well as close coordination and communication between all relevant authorities, are also crucial to help raise general standards of cycling provision and making the network coherent and attractive to users.

We welcome the designation of a Cycling Champion within the County Council whose role we see as vital in helping to raise the profile of cycling with other Councillors and more generally within the authority. They will also need to work very closely with the Cycling Champion at the City Council, and with other agencies, including the local Borough / District Councils, Highways England, the DfT, Health Authorities, Canal and River Trust and Sustrans, as well as with Pedals.

Detailed comments

2. Vision

Section 2: 7:

Printed maps as well as online maps are very important and both must be kept up to date, as well as produced to a consistent format with other local cycle maps, e.g. those produced by Nottingham City Council and Ridewise / Big Wheel.

Section 2:10.

A disappointing target of only 5% total highways capital spent. We would like to see this increased, with definite commitments, in view of the high benefit: cost ratios for cycling investment, acknowledged in the report.

3. Partnership working

Section 3.

No mention of Highways England as a partner to work with. Some vital commuter routes will be discontinuous without integration with sections that will be the responsibility of this agency. This will be particularly important in the case of major new housing developments such as those soon to be built south and east of West Bridgford and south of Clifton, where various trunk road improvements need to be an integral part of improved cycle access, to help prevent these areas becoming car-dependent enclaves.

These included a toucan crossing over the north arm of the Mill Hill roundabout, to provide a safe connection between the shared path by the NET Clifton Terminus park and ride site, and the cycling provision west of the roundabout, and including stretches of the old A453 to and from Barton-in-Fabis and Thrumpton etc, the new A453 cycle path between the West Leake Junction (east of the Ratcliffe Power Station) and the new cycle path junction with Long Lane, west of East Midlands Parkway Station, as well as other quieter routes for cyclists south and north of the Trent (such as Long Lane between Kegworth and Sawley Marina) and including Sustrans NCN route 6 and the Erewash Valley Trail. There was a discussion about the need for this safe connection (toucan crossing) during a site meeting on 9 November between Hugh McClintock and Graeme Broome of Highways England.

The emerging plans for the HS2 cycleway promise a good opportunity for attracting outside special DfT funding for substantial improvements for cyclists in the area alongside the proposed new HS2

railway extension to Leeds and should be fully exploited to help improve both the quality and extent of the local cycle network in the area.

In the current much more constrained financial environment it is very important that the County Council is ready to exploit any such special sources of funding that do become available in relation to particular projects, as has been done by Sustrans in their successful application for Heritage Lottery funding for the Bennerley Viaduct Restoration Project. This will be a very important focal point for routes such as the Erewash Valley on the western boundary of Nottinghamshire and improved links for walkers and cyclists across it.

More generally we think there is plenty of scope for the County Council to work closely with Sustrans, particularly on schemes which relate directly to their National Cycle Network routes such as NCN15 in the case of the proposed foot-cycle bridge between The Hook (Lady Bay) and Trent Lane. This will also help exploit the County Council to exploit the potential for special sources of funding for particular types of project, such as cycle bridges, of which Sustrans have extensive experience. Sustrans also have a key role in advising LEPs such as D2N2 about spending on sustainable travel projects so this is a further reason to work closely with them.

4. Cycling safety

Section 4.1 paragraph 1: Cycle casualty trends

Suggesting that cycling injuries are a drain on health resources - not balanced by the health benefits of cycling. It is good to make cycling safer, but without putting people off by suggesting it is dangerous, and arming anti-cycling people with unbalanced info. Sometimes cyclists are at fault in accidents, but often not but are always particularly vulnerable, so are unlikely in most case to put themselves deliberately at risk.

5. Develop and provide a prioritised high quality, joined up, safe, well-connected route network

Section 5.6. Development control.

Very good, provided that the real potential for making use of developer contributions is indeed well exploited.

Section 5.7: Review of the Nottinghamshire Cycle Design Guide:

It is very important that this is consistent with the new Nottingham City Cycling Design Guide and thereby also in line with the latest Sustrans comprehensive guidance, including for example its advice recommending the use of single or double bollards rather than barriers where there really is a strong case for access controls.

Publication of the earlier Design Guide did not prevent the introduction of some substandard facilities. We therefore think it vital to have a comprehensive design guide like the City's with measures to ensure that future administrations cannot ignore it.

Section 5.8: Maintain, upgrade and repair existing facilities:

This should include bringing sub-standard facilities up to modern standards, e.g. with continuous priority for cyclists at (minor) road junctions with cycle paths or shared paths rather than expecting cyclists to give way, e.g. on the shared path by Ruddington Lane between Ruddington and Compton Acres, or on Regatta Way, east of West Bridgford, a path also made less attractive by requiring users to cross the main road towards the Radcliffe Road end and also by the very convoluted movements required of cyclists at the junction of Regatta Way with both Radcliffe Road and Ambleside etc.

We would like to suggest that the County Council should undertake some detailed audits of the state of key routes within the cycling infrastructure that they have and from this to identify poor links and areas where facilities are no longer up to standard. This should make it easier to pinpoint where relatively small expenditure could be used to complete and / or upgrade useful facilities.

Helpful in making more structured comments about the quality of cycle routes is to make use of the Cycle route audit tool in the very comprehensive Welsh Active Travel Guidance published last year and which has been authorised by the DfT for use by English local authorities. Information on this can be found in Appendix B – Cycling Route Audit Tool, available at <http://gov.wales/docs/det/consultation/140430-active-travel-design-guidance.pdf>

Badly designed layouts, e.g. requiring cyclists to give way far more than if they keep to the carriageway, may well be avoided by many cyclists, especially more confident ones, and less confident ones will be more tempted to take to riding on nearby pavements. This has been the case for example at the junction of Musters Road and Melton Road in West Bridgford, since the major changes to the layout of the Advance Stop Line and Musters Road (south) approaches in April 2011.

In the Beeston area the alignment of Sustrans NCN Route 6 between Beeston Station and Beacon Road / Queen's Road East, though much quieter than Queen's Road, is much more tortuous than the main road so remains very unappealing for many local cyclists. The proposed HS2 Cycleway may offer some potential for improvements in this area but we would like to see these introduced much sooner than that major national scheme is likely to be implemented.

Many cyclists think that current so-called "cycling facilities" are in fact often facilities to support motorists by getting cyclists out of their way and giving them impunity when an accident does occur, e.g. where cyclists have to rejoin carriageway, and giving turning motorists priority over straight-through *cyclists (and pedestrians)*". This needs to be acknowledged and the policy change of prioritising vulnerable road users prominently announced.

6. Ensure the needs of cyclists are considered in all new and improved highway infrastructure schemes

Section 6.2. The first statement, on pre- and post-implementation audits, needs strengthening: "To ensure that provision for cyclists is considered whenever possible" at the very least "considered" should be "provided".

Post implementation (NMU) audits should be carried out some months after completion, to allow schemes to settle down, and not commenced some weeks before completion, as happened in June 2015 with the NMU audit for the A453, carried out on behalf of Highways England by Ed Ducker of WYG Transport Planning.

The conclusions of such audits should be systematically and comprehensively discussed and followed up. The scope of audits should include not just specific cycle infrastructure but 'invisible infrastructure', i.e. wider non-specifically cycle infrastructure which may also help cyclists.

Section 6.4: Cycling Design Guide:

As well as being consistent with the new Nottingham Cycling Design Guide, and Sustrans guidance, this should also draw on other important sources of good practice advice such as the Active Travel for Wales Design Guidance (authorised by the DfT for use in England) and the Transport for London Review of Best International Practice in Cycle Planning, and also the forthcoming Highways England 'Planning for Cyclists' guidance which is due for publication in December, we understand.

In revising the Design Guide we would also like to see the following detailed points taken on board:-

Cycle lanes:

Cycle lanes do not always help cyclists and poorly designed examples are worse for new and less-confident cyclists than the absence of cycle lanes. One example is where cars do park in the absence of double yellow lines and/or proper, visible enforcement of parking restrictions, interspersed with lengths of road where cars are not parked and the cycle lane deviates to and from the kerb. Therefore, cyclists following the cycle lane are forced into and away from the sight of drivers.

We would like to see an objective that Nottinghamshire County Council starts a program to phase-out the combination of cycle lanes and permitted kerbside parking (single-yellow lines/no restrictions). We would also ask that all future kerbside cycle lanes do not have any kerbside parking, and all kerbside parking does not include an adjacent cycle lane which deviates to and from the kerb.

We would prefer mandatory cycle lanes, not advisory ones, to be the default type, in the interests of enforcement and helping such facilities to fulfil their potential, unless there are exceptional reasons why advisory ones have to be used, in specific circumstances, to accommodate large motor vehicles turning.

Traffic signals and cycle crossings:

Avoid multi stage crossings where possible as has been done very successfully at Abbey Street by the Dunkirk flyover junction and NUASt in Nottingham.

Consider a "green wave" for cycles (turning green at approx 12mph), as in Copenhagen, and conversely a "red wave" for speeding vehicles.

Traffic lights default.

Careful consideration should be given to which direction the default green light should favour. It would appear that such consideration is already being given to whether motorists or trams should be favoured by a default green light. For example, on the Victoria Embankment side of Wilford Bridge it would appear that the lights default to green for trams but are set to quickly change to green for motorists and cyclists if there is no approaching tram. The same consideration should be given to junctions between motorists and cyclists; it should not always be the case that motorists are favoured.

Advance Stop Lines:

To help Advance Stop Lines fulfil their potential for assisting cyclists making right turns at major junctions, the inclusion of good standard approach cycle lanes is essential, along with clear markings and measures to ensure that the ASLs and the cycle lanes are respected by drivers. The use of coloured surfaces is on our view essential to help ensure compliance by drivers, but such surfaces must be well-maintained and not allowed to crumble or fade.

Other cycle facility layout issues;

Important to provide a good horizontal separation of cycle tracks, especially at speeds exceeding 30mph. Sometimes what was a good separation area between the cycle path and the carriageway has been made far too narrow by a decision to squeeze in an extra general traffic lane as on the west side of Clifton Bridge in the mid-1990s. We would like to see the County Council give attention to the importance of this on county roads as well as encouraging Highways England to adopt such practice on local trunk roads, including existing trunk road cycle paths such as that by the A52 between Gamston and Radcliffe on Trent.

There needs to be a clear willingness to create space for cyclists by taking it from motor vehicle traffic and this is also the case for ensuring the provision of adequate and convenient cycle parking.

Provide low level push button signals for cyclists, as now installed in London, and consider other new forms of facility now being more widely authorised by the DfT, e.g. cycling zebras.

Speed limits adjacent to cycle paths.

Where cycle paths are adjacent to a road, the speed limit on the road should be dictated by the separation between the cycle path and the road. Where the cycle path is immediately adjacent to the road with no separation, the speed limit should be no more than 30mph. This is particularly important on roads with higher speed limits or which are unrestricted.

We would emphasise that the speed limit should be dictated by the separation and not the other way around. In order to afford motorists the opportunity to drive faster, a greater separation should be an integral part of the design but where the separation is not possible the speed limit should be reduced. Such a reduction should complement other measures such as ensuring that there is a raised surface for the cycle path across the mouth of the junction and clear priority signs and markings.

The County Council should ensure both that this is given attention on its own roads and also work with Highways England to ensure that similar principles are adopted for cycling provision on local trunk roads.

Access controls: barriers and bollards

Bollards are preferable to other forms of access control such as A-frames and staggered barriers, but they can interfere with many types of cycle, so should be used with caution, and after consultation with cyclists and other path users. A single one should be adequate if there are problems with cars. Bollards must be installed with care to provide for disabled cyclists / cargo bikes / trikes and not to pose a danger.

One location where a bollard definitely is needed, as we have already pointed out, is at the Trentside access (by the Rushcliffe Civic Centre) to the riverside path cut-through under Trent Bridge towards County Hall, which is frequently obstructed by parked motor vehicles. This forms part of Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 15.

We would strongly prefer no barriers to be installed, particularly badly installed barriers such as those on the tramside path between the riverside path near Wilford and the Wilford Lane tram stop as part of the NET extension to Clifton. If there really is a strong case for barriers rather than bollards in particular circumstances they should be similar to those installed a few years ago on the riverside path between Beeston Ryland and Attenborough, with adequate spacing for cyclists to ride through while being encouraged to slow down and watch out for other path users.

Cyclists and NET extensions:

Much of the development of the tram has in many places been to the detriment of direct and safe cycle routes, especially where the tram route is on-street and there is inadequate space for any cycle lane or cycle path alongside, as in the High Road / Chilwell Road area.

Cyclists should never be expected to cycle close to tram tracks or cross them at a shallow angle in any facility.

It is very important in planning any further NET extension routes to ensure that the needs of cyclists are comprehensively and systematically considered from the outset and that tram routes should not be chosen if there is not scope for cycle lanes or cycle paths alongside or for cyclists to be offered convenient, direct and nearby continuous parallel alternative routes.

Kerbside tramstops are much harder for cyclists to have to negotiate than island tramstops, especially if they lack adequate space behind for a cycle lane or cycle path, so should be avoided in future routes if at all possible.

Some existing tramside shared paths are below the recommended minimum standard of 3 metres width, e.g. on the Clifton NET route both west and north of the Ruddington Lane tram stop. These sections need to be widened, particularly in view of their status as part of the City Council's proposed Southern Corridor route improvements, and the potential for extending these to serve the major new housing development south of Clifton and other major destinations such as Rushcliffe Country Park, and be part of the Sustrans NCN route 50 to and from Leicester via Rushcliffe Country Park and Watermead Country Park on the north side of Leicester (where cycling provision benefitted greatly a few years ago from being part of the Sustrans Connect 2 Project), with links also to NCN Routes 6 and 48.

The needs of cyclists should be fully borne in mind in the discussions now starting to develop about a possible extension of the NET to Derby, going beyond an extension from Toton Lane to the proposed HS2 East Midlands Hub at Toton, with an extended tramside path. Good cycle access from various directions also needs to be thoroughly and systematically considered in the development of plans for the HS2 Hub, including Sustrans NCN Routes 6 and 67, the Erewash Valley Trail, the HS2 Cycleway Proposals (including improved links to and from Attenborough) and other local cycle routes.

This assessment also needs to have regard to the wider Visitor Economy that could benefit from this improved access, not only the Erewash Valley Trail, but other existing and proposed Greenway developments in Derbyshire, and the Sustrans proposals for the restoration of the Bennerley Viaduct

between Awsworth and Ilkeston, and its use for a walkway / cycleway, providing a further good link between the Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire arms of the EVT, and including the new Ilkeston Station, and other proposed new and upgraded links in the Ilkeston area.

Signage:

Destination signs must be securely fixed or they get easily loose and swivelled round and then become very misleading to people without good local knowledge. They must also be clear, coherent and consistent in the destinations they show, including the distance figures.

Signing must be clear, consistent and coherent, but this is not always the case even with newer signing. For example the new signing on the tramside path between Wilford Lane and Ruddington Lane does not include cycle logos, to make clear that this is a shared path. This must be rectified.

Destinations shown on signs must be consistent with others shown on signs on that route, and more broadly in the network, and this also applies to any distances shown. With several of the new signs erected in connection with the new NET routes there are clear inconsistencies and inaccurate use of distances, as well as orientation of signs. This lack of attention to detail does not give cyclists confidence in using the network, especially if they lack local knowledge, and where the routes for cyclists are very different from the road system and the best routes for drivers.

There must be consistent signing between trunk road cycling provision and that on county roads. This has not been the case with the A453 widening scheme between the M1 and Clifton, where cycle direction signing is still largely lacking, several months after the scheme is supposed to have been completed.

The policy of making turning motorists cede right of way to straight-through cyclists and pedestrians is sufficiently radical in the UK (sadly, even though it is in the Highway Code - see rule 170) that we think it advisable to erect signs along the main carriageways alerting motorists to the change in policy, in the interest of cyclists' safety.

Cycling and new developments:

It is very important to limit car journeys from the start of developments before car-dependent habits get ingrained!

New developments and redevelopments should be permeable to cycles but motor traffic limited to specific routes, i.e. with filtered permeability. Make sure that parking is provided in a way that people use it instead of parking over the foot or cycleway.

Link cycling provision within and to and from new developments to existing major and minor routes, particularly with the proposed Southern Corridor and the major housing areas proposed south of Clifton, as well as with Rushcliffe Country Park. This needs close collaboration with Highways England as well as with Rushcliffe Borough Council.

7. Provide for the integration of cycling with other longer distance passenger transport modes:

7.7 Cycle hubs and 9.3.4 Cycle hire

We very much welcome the further expansion of these outside the Nottingham City area provided that they are extensively promoted and publicised in each local area.

8. Maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing cycle routes and other cycling facilities

Proper maintenance is vital if cycling is to become an everyday activity. The sweeping of cycle paths is important and not just cutting back of vegetation to reduce the risk of punctures or slips of passing cycles. There should be mention of (mechanically) sweeping (wet) fallen leaves and removing

snow/ice (e.g. from on road cycle lanes) as such routes do not benefit from passing motor traffic to push leaves or snow out of the way.

We would like acknowledgement of the reality that water ponding can include but is not limited to, surfaces near to (blocked) channels and gullies. It is important to eliminate ponding as this is risky for cyclists, both in terms of getting wet and how it can hide dangers.

Because maintenance of older facilities has often been inadequate, with rough surfaces and encroaching vegetation, rehabilitation of some path has now become necessary. A good example is the very popular riverside path between Trentside near the Environment Agency) and The Hook, by Lady Bay, West Bridgford.

9. Encourage more people to cycle more often.

Section 9.3.1. Safer environments for cycling.

While 20 mph limits are discussed, and are very important, their effectiveness in reducing speeds needs to be carefully monitored, with further measures than taken if necessary to increase their effectiveness. Such limits should always be mandatory and not advisory. In general we would like to see a more ambitious commitment by the County Council to the adoption of 20mph area limits, especially in residential areas.

It would be good also to have a commitment to identifying residential areas where through-traffic barring, i.e. "filtered permeability" could improve the local environment for walking and cycling.

Important as more extensive area-wide 20mph limits, adequately enforced, are in helping promote the safety of vulnerable road users, we would like to see the County Council support the developing moves in the UK to go beyond these important building blocks in developing a more comprehensive approach to promoting road safety, with the imminent launch (19 January 2016) in London of Vision Zero UK, which seeks to apply lessons from the very successful Swedish Vision Zero Initiative, first agreed in 1997. This has helped to halve road deaths in that country between 2000-2009. Vision Zero says that all road users should be safe from risk of death or serious injury. It recognises that people make mistakes and says that policies should protect them from fatal errors on roads. (more information at <http://www.visionzerouk.moonfruit.com/>)

Section 9 should include a specific reference to the growing use of e-bikes and should make clear how these will be promoted. They can be particularly useful for elderly cyclists, extending their active cycling life, and for cyclists more generally in hillier areas and extending the range and distance of their trips.

HMcC,
for Pedals
19.11.15