

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

10 November 2013

Matthew Lowe
Engineer, Streetpride Service
Riverside House
Main Street
ROTHERHAM
S60 1AE

Dear Mr Lowe

Re: West Bawtry Road Service Road – Construction of Road Humps

Ref: 126/18/1441

1. Thank you for the letter dated 7 November. We would confirm that we wish to make an objection to the scale of the proposal to install 4 large humps on West Bawtry Road Service Road. Until such time as the problem of peak hour traffic queues is resolved there will be idiots who try to jump these queues and cause difficulties for residents. However, some of these problems do seem to relate to residents who drive forward onto their properties and then reverse out, often a blind exit because of bushes. We do think that 4 humps would create more problems for residents, and that the above non-resident idiots would probably continue to be irresponsible. The danger spot seems to be where the curve of the service road coincides with the top of the rise, and we can see no advantage to installing humps beyond that. The 30mph restriction sign is obviously placed at the start of the restriction, but may be hidden behind parked vans and is not backed up by reminders. A 20mph with a speed indicating display would perhaps be more effective.
2. The proposed shared use footpath/cycleway worries us enormously. If traffic is acknowledged to be travelling at above safe speeds on the service road, why would cyclists be allowed to travel against the flow of traffic, coming off a shared use cycleway onto an unsegregated section? Any non-resident coming along the service road may not appreciate the logistics and would be taken by surprise by a cyclist coming towards them in the middle of the road. We notice that the 10m long advisory contraflow at the eastern end indicates that cyclists would be coming from the footpath next to the houses, crossing the service road directly outside our property, in order to access the proposed new section of footway/cycleway. That would mean that exiting our property we would run the risk of encountering a cyclist travelling East to West, coming round the bend and crossing the service road directly in front of us. Combined with traffic coming from the right this would be a nightmare, especially in the winter. Also, at the eastern end the shared footpath/cycleway will be shared by wheely bins etc one day a week. Bins on pavements are already a problem for visually impaired people, plus cycles which are not audible would create a hazard.

Apologies if this sounds very negative but there are issues other than cyclists: eg disabled people who have mobility problems – being visually impaired already means that [REDACTED] is now pretty well marooned on our property and needs a carer and transport whenever he needs to travel anywhere. This problem has worsened beyond belief whilst we have lived here.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Lowe, Matthew

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 November 2013 13:19
To: Lowe, Matthew
Subject: Road humps & Cycle path

Hello Matthew,

Thank you for your e-mail response, and the letter and drawings of 25th October, concerning the "Road Humps and Cycle Path Construction". If the road humps are to be placed close to the positions shown on the copy drawings, then we are not too worried about them and so do not object to the Streetpride plans.. The only issues we have are: 1. Regarding the section of West Bawtry Road where you propose to have unsegregated contra-flow cycling, as the width of the road is quite narrow now, so to put a cycle path in the opposite direction to normal traffic flow we think is likely to cause accidents; 2. As cyclists are already using both the road and pavements to ride along in both directions, we wonder how the cycle pathway will be managed for cyclists to only use the correct route and not to continue as at present.

With regard to safety of residents, our neighbour was knocked to the ground last week on leaving her front step, by a middle-aged cyclist who was travelling along the pavement without cycle lights nor a cycle helmet! Fortunately she was not seriously injured, but with the dark nights now upon us, this incident only goes to highlight the dangers of combining people, cycles and traffic, and the law, with the wishes of a minority group.

With regards,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]