

## Bryant, Shellie

---

**From:** Yvonne Choquette [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** May 25, 2020 1:30 AM  
**To:** City Council  
**Subject:** Form submission from: Write a Letter to Council

Submitted on Monday, May 25, 2020 - 01:29

Submitted by anonymous user: [REDACTED]

Submitted values are:

Date Monday, May 25, 2020

To His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

First Name Yvonne

Last Name Choquette

Phone Number

Email [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED] Fourth Ave

City Cudworth

Province Saskatchewan

Postal Code [REDACTED]

Name of the organization or agency you are representing (if applicable)

Subject Bicycle Amendment Bylaw

Meeting (if known)

Comments

Since we have recent knowledge about 2 m social distancing, we all realize sometimes it is not so easy to apply - whether this is 1m. or 2 m. sometimes when people meet on a trail, or trying to pass someone. We have all recent experience of the difficulties in humankind navigating sidewalks or trails, now that we have distancing to deal with.

I continue to think of wording of the bylaw, and defining the "error" of the ways, seems to be problematic or onerous as it rests on the part of the cyclist.

We don't want "accidents" - I am quite sure, both pedestrian and cyclist feel equally so.

But calling for a means to "prohibit passing a pedestrian with less than 1 m distance" is onerous towards the cyclist.

Perhaps now that we have experience with 2 m. distancing, we are all more aware of the actual distance, of what 1 m. or 2 m. when on a sidewalk, or path, or trail looks like. Especially if you look at any pictures of streets(e.g. Toronto has had City planning discussion about increasing sidewalk widths by reducing the road space) because the urban design for cyclist and pedestrians were never designed to accommodate such a distance. Sidewalks were 4 feet? Trails were? How could a sidewalk of 4 feet accommodate a pedestrian, a bicycle with a rider, and a distance of 1 meter? Not.

Many cities are realizing there was a flawed urban design that gave much space to cars, automobiles, vehicles of all types, and not much consideration to people cycling or walking. So now when we put cyclist and pedestrians together on the same trail, or same sidewalk, there is (or can be) a tight fit. It makes it onerous.

The onus is on both cyclists and people walking to make it safe. It cannot be a one sided thing.

Could it be a "recommendation" that 1 m distance be maintained? Is it being punitive -for one side must do XXX and if not, that one party who is the cyclist will be "fined" or 'penalized". This is not a game. It is respect we are asking for, and it would be unfair to put the cyclist completely responsible especially when many urban designs did not accommodate this type of distance.

When urban planning has fixed or corrected distance on all trails to accommodate both cyclist and pedestrian traffic to maintain separate distancing, that would be the only time such an amendment be applied. If urban design is not there yet, I don't think penalizing the cyclist is the answer.

Sincerely,  
Yvonne Choquette  
cyclist, walker, runner  
Attachments

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

