

# 21/1564/OUT Police Station Site Heavitree Road

Dear Matthew,

Thank you for again giving the Exeter Cycling Campaign the opportunity to comment on the outline proposal for the [accommodation blocks proposed for the former police station site at Heavitree](#).

We welcome the aspiration to make this a no/low car development on a city centre brownfield site. This is what our city needs.

We do have a few areas of concern about the proposals for cycle access and storage. Furthermore, until the discussions with DCC about connectivity to the E9 cycle route are concluded and available for comment we cannot support this development. We will therefore register an objection until these discussions are concluded and our concerns about cycle parking/access addressed. We look forward to removing this objection at the earliest opportunity.

## 1. Cycle storage and access

We welcome the commitment to build in significant numbers of secure cycle parking into this scheme. However, we have concerns about the detail of this:

### 1.1 Access, manoeuvrability and storage of non-standard bike forms

The Design Statement lays out the cycling strategy for this scheme but appears to assume that all bikes will be standard bicycles.

Increasingly people are using non-standard bike forms (e.g. cargo bikes as a replacement for a car) and the Application's Disability Assessment should surely indicate that provision needs to be made for those who use, for example, a trike as a mobility aid.

**Figure 11.2:** Designated area for cargo bike and tricycle parking at Malmö Central railway station, Sweden



The cycle storage therefore needs to have (i) sufficiently large entrances (ii) space to store non standard bike forms (iii) internal space for these

non-standard bikes to be manoeuvred within the bike stores and (iv) adequate space to actually secure a bike to the bike rack (LTN 1/20 gives the minimum dimensions).

We would refer the Applicant to section 11 of the LTN 1/20 design guidance. Para 11.4.6 states *“Cycle stands require at least 0.6m clearance to walls, and a clear space of 1.0m in front to enable the bicycle to be wheeled into position. A distance of at least 1.0m between stands enables bicycles fitted with panniers or child seats to gain access. Other types of cycle are longer and wider and will require additional space (see Figure 11.3 and Table 11-2)”*.

**We seek confirmation that these minimum space considerations will be honoured in this scheme.**

### **1.2 Cycle Stands**

For the reasons outlined above (accessibility, accommodation of non-standard bikes. minimum space requirements and meeting disability requirements) we have concerns that the proposed Josta 2-tier cycle racks are not appropriate (or, at least not appropriate as a solution for the entirety of the cycle storage).

### **1.3 Security**

Fear of bike theft, particularly with e-bikes and cargo bikes is a significant inhibitor to the use of community bike storage. We would propose that the cycle stores need to be covered with 24 hour CCTV.

### **1.4 Visitor Cycle parking**

It appears that only two Sheffield stands are being provided for visitor cycle parking. Given the county and city's target to achieve 50% of journeys by foot or bike this development needs to plan for a significantly higher proportion of visitors to need to store their bike.

## **2. Access through the site for people cycling**

### **2.1 Permeability of the site**

The Design and Access statement seems to imply that people cycling through and to this site will not be permitted to cycle along the green link space between the two main blocks.

With the cycle parking accessible from the rear of the site there is a strong desire line to move from College Road into and along the green link space. This space should be designed to accommodate people moving by foot and by bike.

There is a good precedent for this mixed-mode space in Bedford Square, Exeter city centre. This is a mostly pedestrian area where people walking and cycling coexist happily.

## 2.2 Shared use path on east of site

We have concerns about the adequacy and viability of the shared use path on the east side of the site. At peak times at the end of lectures this path is very busy with students. To design this as a shared use path is to build in conflict.



## 3. Connectivity to the E9 cycle route

The Application refers to ongoing discussions with DCC Highways to provide a safe cycle connection to the E9 cycle route to the south of this development. If this site is going to work as a no/low car site it is imperative that this is provided.

It seems to us that using cycle-ahead only traffic light phases then the 'challenging' offset access to College Road can be achieved.

Because of the importance of finding a robust, future-proofed and safe solution to engineering this connectivity we will maintain an objection to this application until detailed proposals are forthcoming and available for comment. We are anticipating that this will be made a condition when the planning permission is granted.

The Exeter Cycling Campaign supports dense, brownfield low-car developments like this. We hope that our concerns can be considered and detailed plans for connectivity to the E9 route can be forthcoming for comment so that we can remove our objection.

Yours sincerely,

Mike

Mike Walton

for and on behalf of:

EXETER CYCLING CAMPAIGN

-----  
[exetercyclingcampaign.org.uk](http://exetercyclingcampaign.org.uk) | Twitter: @ExeterCycling | Facebook: ExeterCyclingCampaign