

19/1709/FUL - Land At Pinbrook Court

12th January 2020

Matt Diamond
Planning Officer
Exeter City Council

Dear Matt

Thank you for giving the Exeter Cycling Campaign the opportunity to comment on the application for the [Lidl store at Pinbrook Court](#).

The Campaign is not opposed to new developments. We do however insist that these development must be delivered in line with national, regional and city policies. At present this development falls short of this benchmark and until these shortcomings are rectified we must object to this application. Our objection is based on the following concerns:

1. Cycle Parking
2. Access for people on bikes
3. The provision for and safety of people cycling on the approach roads to this site

Cycle Parking

We are struggling to see on the plans where the cycle parking is. The Transport Statement (para 4.7) that this cycle parking is “visible from the tills” is positive, but this is not clear to us on the plans.

In order to meet the NPPF (para 108) policies of promoting sustainable transport modes and providing safe and suitable access to the site we would expect that:

- Cycle parking places should be safely accessible from the street without having to navigate through the car-park where there are customer cars and delivery vehicles
- Cycle parking is located next to the entrance to the store
- Cycle parking makes provision for non-standard form bikes: e.g. cargo bikes and trikes

The proposal makes provision for 12 cycle parking places and states that this is the “ maximum provision” (para 4.8 of the Transport Assessment). Given the NPPF’s policy that developments should “favour.... sustainable development” and the Exeter Sustainable Transport SPD we would like to see this treated as the minimum provision for cycle parking. Furthermore, the city and county’s response to their declared climate emergency suggests that we need a step change in the number of people travelling by bike and foot.

Access for people on bikes

It is not clear to us how people riding to the store will access the site. Will this be at the same location as the pedestrian access or the vehicle access. If the former (which would be our preference), then the access needs to be designed so that people walking and people cycling can maneuver through this without conflict.

The provision for and safety of people cycling on the approach roads to this site

We have significant concerns about the safety of the road and junction layouts around this proposed site.

We would challenge the statement in the Design and Access Statement that “*The site is accessible via sustainable modes of travel with infrastructure to facilitate pedestrian and cycle movements between the site and local residential areas*”

Whilst the application correctly notes the proximity of the site to the E4 cycle path navigating to the site is not obvious or currently safe. As the Application correctly states “*the greatest accumulation of collisions occur at junctions*”. These junctions therefore need to be made more safe. There are several changes to the junctions / roads that are needed to make this site safe to access. We would like to see as a condition of consent the developer providing:

- Safety improvements to the N or B3181 when approaching from Cumberland Way. Ideally this would be to provide pedestrian / cycle priority across the garage entrances.
- The pathway on the N of B3181 approaching from Aldi is narrow. There is land which is not built on which could be used to create wider foot and cycle paths to the site.



We would challenge the Transport Assessment assertion that Venny Bridge “*is a non-through route*” and that “*the road is lightly trafficked and vehicle speeds are low, allowing pedestrians to treat it as a shared space*”. Venny Bridge is connected to Chancel Lane which is used as a cut through. Furthermore, this development will induce additional traffic through Chancel Lane.

Whilst we claim no expertise in this area we noted with some incredulity the assertion that this development “*substantially reduces the two-way net trip generation*”. To base the trip generation calculations on *net* trips (above the existing consent, which probably bears no relation to the actual existing use) seems to us to be disingenuous.

Kind regards,

Mike

Mike Walton
07305 920 574

for and on behalf of:

EXETER CYCLING CAMPAIGN

exetercyclingcampaign.org.uk

Twitter: [@ExeterCycling](https://twitter.com/ExeterCycling)

Facebook: ExeterCyclingCampaign