



	<p>that I am aware of, in the proposal for the Woking scheme, that will mitigate the risk to the many people that populate the shopping centre. Accordingly, on the grounds of road safety and casualty reduction concerns, I cannot support the proposed permanent TRO. Accordingly, please consider this email to represent an objection to the proposal.</p>	
<p>Woking Cycle Users Group</p>	<p>The Cycle Users' Group is firmly behind the joint use becoming permanent. We are very happy to agree to better signs for areas that are sensibly excluded to cyclists, including the signs on the ground and I favour option A2. The addition of "Please cycle considerately" will not work for a sign on the ground which is seen for a shorter duration than a sign facing the cyclist where such information is more appropriate, not least because the signs on the ground are likely to be often hidden by pedestrians. Option C for the excluded areas seems fine.</p> <p>The traffic advisory leaflet 9-93 may be useful to refer to. This was a study of joint use which concluded that "Observation revealed no real factors to justify excluding cyclists from pedestrianised areas, suggesting that cycling could be more widely permitted without detriment to pedestrians". This study projected only one accident between pedestrians and cyclists in 15 years for each site.</p> <p>I have never seen any incidents between cyclists and pedestrians in the shared use area. In general my feeling is that pedestrians have benefited at least as much as cyclists from the many improvements funded from the Cycle Woking money and I think that there are more similarities than differences between the interests of cyclists, those of pedestrians and those of the physically disabled, particularly wheelchair users. The Canal towpath is also shared use and that is a prime example of improvements benefitting</p>	<p>Ian Wright – Chairman Woking Cycle Users Group.</p>

	<p>all users, not just cyclists. The fact that cyclists may sometimes be perceived as weaving in and out of pedestrians is not a cause for concern but recognises that those cyclists are seeking to give room to pedestrians. In practice in my experience the speeds of cyclists in the shared use areas is much slower than would be the case on roads. This shows that the effect of pedestrians in slowing cyclists which is mentioned in the DfT study is happening in Woking exactly as predicted. The fact that there may be one or two inconsiderate cyclists going too fast is not a reason to deny the order being made permanent. Those irresponsible cyclists would be unlikely to obey a prohibition on cycling in any event. A prohibition newly introduced would additionally be difficult to enforce and such enforcement would add to the costs of rescinding the shared use order.</p>	
Surrey Fire & Rescue	None received	
South Coast Ambulance	None received	
Woking Town Centre Management	None received	
Woking Access Group	See attached letter	Clive Wood
Surrey Disabled People's Partnership	<p>I should reiterate that Surrey Disabled People's Partnership will not comment on this as we have make clear that we will not take part in any consultation process unless the pilot is halted and a full and proper consultation process is carried out. Other organisations, of course, may wish to comment.</p> <p>Please see attached Joint Statement dated 25.08.2010</p>	Clive Wood

<p>Older Peoples Forum</p>	<p>a) Your plans do not appear to separate pedestrians and cyclists in any way. Is this not possible? eg blue cycling route.</p> <p>b) How big will signs on the ground be if no blue marked path?</p> <p>c) Perhaps mobility scooters should be restricted to cycling routes. Could they be included on the signs? (I have had to dodge one or two!)</p> <p>d) I would like to see detailed ground plan of proposed signs or blue marked lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Received 23 August 2010.</li> <li>- Reply 25 August 2010</li> </ul> <p>In response to your questions above I comment as follows:</p> <p>a) I have attached a copy of the report going to the next Local Committee on 2 September 2010 and draw your attention to paragraph 1.23. It is possible to mark these routes blue or green, but due to the volume and movement of pedestrians criss-crossing the cycle routes the cyclists would be straying outside of the cycle lane most of the time.</p> <p>b) The signs will be approximately 600mm diameter for the circular type and 600mm x 600mm for the cycle/pedestrian sign. The wording 'Please Cycle Considerately will add a square to the base of the blue circular sign approximately 600mm x 600mm.</p> <p>C) There are no legal powers to restrict mobility scooters to use the cycle lanes only.</p> <p>d) I will send you a plan tomorrow of the proposed locations for the 'on</p>	<p>Cynthia Green – Chairman of Older People’s Forum</p>
----------------------------	--	---

	<p>ground' signs.</p> <p>Received 30 August 2010</p> <p>Thank you for the proposed plan of signs. I agree that they are sited where permitted cycling areas begin and end.</p> <p>But how would pedestrians know where to expect cyclists?</p> <p>Who would have the priority?</p> <p>I do not agree that these signs are adequate, however large. A metre wide (or more) blue 'road' along permitted routes would be easily identifiable to cyclists and pedestrians alike. Then the pedestrians would treat these routes with the same care as they would roadways. An OPF member has said that this works well in Switzerland.</p> <p>Are the present yellow lines along Commercial Way to be the proposed cycling limits? In this case, how can the fact that someone was almost knocked down by a cyclist as she left the WAVS building?</p>	
Cllr Bryan Cross – Goldsworth East Member	None received	
Cllr Rob Leach – Goldsworth East member	I am certainly in favour of making the arrangements permanent and I welcome the principle of shared use	Cllr Rob Leach
Cllr Rosie Sharpley – Goldsworth East Member	None received	
Cllr Mohamed Amin – Woking Central Division	None received	

Member		
--------	--	--