

From: office@greens.org.au on behalf of Benson Bannon via Australian Greens
<office@greens.org.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 16 March 2016 7:06 PM
To: LCLC
Subject: Submission to Inquiry into the Road Safety Road Rules 2009 (Overtaking Bicycles) Bill 2015

This e-mail has been sent on behalf of Mr Benson Bannon, at [REDACTED]. They can be contacted by phone at [REDACTED] or by e-mail at [REDACTED]. The content of their submission is below.

+++++

I don't support safe passing distance laws for cars and trucks overtaking bicycles, as bicycle riders and powered vehicles can't share the road safely, so they need to be travelling on completely different routes. I support extra infrastructure for bicycle-only traffic.

If such a safe passing distance law is passed, I'd expect there would be at least three different aspects to the law (as one-size-fits-all-laws just don't work).

- a) inner-city, where parked cars, and a single lane in each direction, and a tram track might mean endangering traffic coming from the opposite direction.
- b) suburban streets, ditto as above.
- c) rural, where one-lane curvaceous roads with parallel lines down the middle, mean a motorist has to 'break the law' by crossing the parallel lines, risking collision with on-coming traffic (which is why the parallel lines are there in the first place). Only badly considered laws (as already in place in Queensland) encourage citizens to break laws to uphold yet other laws, causing more confusion & danger on our roads.

The main 'problem' with bicyclists is that although they are all eco-warriors saving-the-planet, they are much slower than powered vehicles (often obstructing the flow of traffic), don't give hand signals anymore, speed through red traffic signals, and act badly like a gang or mob when in significant numbers.

When bike riding is safer, more people may leave their cars at home (but not everyone is able to ride a bicycle). This will mean better health, less congestion on our roads and less pollution (but they'll be more bicyclists, so more congestion). Yes, when there are separate bicycle-only routes. The car is not the enemy, as vehicles powered by air & water & electricity have already been invented, and will come into use soon.

I agree with the Committee's decision to look at the examples of Queensland, ACT and Tasmania where safe passing laws have been introduced, or are being trialled, and I certainly agree about the necessity of a public education campaign about any possible nanny-state rule changes.

When the new mobile phone rules came in, most drivers learned the rule quickly because it was in the news (however my observations are that at least 25% of motorists are texting & talking on their hand-held mobile phones whilst driving - yes they are the ones driving at 20kms below the speed limit. An education campaign is more effective when it tells all road users of a new road rule.

Yes, we are all in this together whilst unfortunately & dangerously vehicles and bicyclists share the same roads. There is no 'us' and 'them', however many bicyclists that I have encountered certainly behave in an irresponsible & aggressive manner to responsibly driven powered vehicles (in the inner city & in rural areas). I would hope you are right, but I really can't see that an arbitrary safe passing distance law would make our roads safer for anyone, and are the police really going to enforce them.

I really would like to see bicyclists being safer on our roads, but you'd be better off banning black & dark coloured bicycles, bicycle wear, helmets, back packs, etc, so they are more easily seen visually in the daytime & especially at night. In fact bicycle (& accessories) colour is really an OH&S matter of safety on our roads, & neon colours ought to be compulsory (indeed for all powered vehicles including motor bikes too).

Thank you for listening.