

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Amendments and additions re Active Travel and E-bikes to beef up the "Soundness" of the new Sheffield Draft Local Plan.
Date: 13 February 2023 11:31:34
Attachments: [FW Sheffield CTC comments on Local Plan - plus info on cycle storageparking .msg](#)

Hi Michael
I'm also supportive of Richard's suggestions, and those of Sheffield CTC, (attached).
Ruth

From: Douglas Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 February 2023 19:37
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Amendments and additions re Active Travel and E-bikes to beef up the 'Soundness' of the new Sheffield Draft Local Plan.

Hi Michael,
I am writing to endorse support for the helpful and thoughtful suggestions set out below by Richard Attwood. To the extent these can be incorporated into the addition to the draft local plan, I would strongly support them. I think we do need to be as ambitious as we can about the massive potential for e-bikes of all shapes and sizes to help the city grow.

Regards,
Douglas
Cllr Douglas Johnson, (Green Party)
City Ward, Sheffield
Chair of Housing Policy Committee

[REDACTED]

From: richard attwood [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 February 2023 18:06
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Amendments and additions re Active Travel and E-bikes to beef up the 'Soundness' of the new Sheffield Draft Local Plan.

Hello.
I recently attended a Consultation event regarding the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan 'Our City our Future'.
I was dismayed to see how little there appears to be in the Plan regarding critical aspects of Active Travel, in particular the potential role of non vehicular electrically assisted options (E-bikes and scooting), at least in what I picked out as being the likely places in the document (see headings below).
I have, following the required format, put together the following comments and suggested amendments, and thought I would share them with those of

you who may have an interest in this matter, and who might have opportunities to promote these aspects of Active Travel in the Plan if you so wish.

(Deadline 5pm Feb 20th.)

I will also be sending a copy to the new Active Travel Commissioner, Ed Clancy.

I completed the formal online response, but found it very constrictive. I appreciate it is probably a Govt set format, however it doesn't allow for general comments and squeezes responses in to sections that have to be submitted one at a time for each section of the plan.

I will therefore also be sending a full version (as below) using the email option at sheffieldplan@sheffield.gov.uk,

Thank you.

Richard Attwood. Everyday Sheffield E-biker and CycleSheffield supporter.

Richard Attwood. [REDACTED] - Individual representation regarding the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan 'Our City our Future'

I believe the manner in which some of the aspects of the plan that relate to Active Travel are stated is too weak, even for current times, and certainly insufficient for supporting and promoting the ongoing development of Active Travel over the coming years.

In particular my assertion is that the plan has not given sufficient weight to the contribution that electrically assisted Cycling and Scooting can make, and in particular the potential role of E-bikes (Electrically Assisted Cycles) to replace urban utility vehicle journeys such as the school run, shopping etc.

Their properties of ease of use and convenience are demonstrably already bringing a whole new group of users onto 2 wheels, particularly in the urban environment.

The plan has also not laid sufficient obligation on organisations and developers to provide the relevant infrastructure and facilities to encourage the takeup of these travel modes, particularly Cycle and E-bike usage, for the kind of journeys for which they are ideally suited. (e.g. local 10 minute multi purpose journeys, up to and including longer cycle commutes and journeys of up to 30 mins each way), and needs updating and reinforcing to reflect these most recent trends and opportunities.

For a clear presentation regarding the massive potential of E-bikes in the very scenarios the Plan covers please see:

<https://www.urbantransportgroup.org/resources/types/report/fully-charged-powering-potential-e-bikes-city-regions> p17 Section 4.

Also, the repetitive use of the word 'should' with regard to developers and organisations providing infrastructure and facilities for cycle use/users feels weak - more like a desirable preference than a requirement - and I believe fails to provide clear parameters when applications are being drafted and assessed, and so compromises efforts to encourage or mandate the provision of the conditions needed for a Modal shift to Active Travel, which will include E-bike use.

To comment more specifically:

Re Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy etc:

p.97, sections 5.18 and 5.19: I note that, whilst there is good detail

discussion about the importance of Rail, Tram and Bus service contributions to sustainable travel, Cycling gets just a one word mention, along with one mention of E-cargo bikes, and scooting none at all.

So I think it is essential **to see sections 5.18 and 5.19 expanded and discussed** in a similar manner to the other transport options, including information about the importance and range of initiatives that encourage the use of electrically assisted non vehicular travel, particularly E-bikes, alongside Rail, Tram and Bus options.

For examples please see the article alluded to earlier, p 25, section 6: 'Potential initiatives to increase e-bike take up'

<https://www.urbantransportgroup.org/resources/types/report/fully-charged-powering-potential-e-bikes-city-regions>)

Re Part 2: Development Management policies etc:

Chapter 7, A Connected City. p77:

Again, the repeated use of the word 'should' is not useful.

To improve the chances of facilitating a Modal Shift toward Active Travel terms will have to be more mandatory, e.g.: using words like 'Must', 'It will be expected that' or 'There is a requirement that' as appropriate.

So with respect to this please see where I have highlighted the wording in the original text in red below, and then suggested alternatives and additions underlined in parentheses after each red highlighted word or section:

On **p.77**, section **7.6** - *All developments **should** ('must', 'will be required to') include provisions and incentives to increase sustainable and active travel and reduce reliance on the car.*

On **p.77**, **POLICY CO1: DEVELOPMENT AND TRIP GENERATION**

*New development **should** (will be required to) support the delivery of net zero transport carbon emissions. Proposals **should** (will be expected to) prioritise travel by public transport, cycling, and walking and incorporate inclusive infrastructure which provides connections to and within the development. This should focus on making the most efficient use of existing highway, including where appropriate reallocation of space to more sustainable modes.*

Also add E-bikes to the 2nd paragraph:

"Provision will also be required to support the increased uptake of electric and zero emissions vehicles (and E-bikes).

Annex B: Parking guidelines:

p.8 - *Cycle Parking Developments will need to address the needs of both long stay (staff, residents) and short stay (visitor) cyclists.*

*Allocated spaces for non-standard cycles **should** (must) also be provided. Cycle parking **should** (will) be secure, well overlooked (, lit), and within 20m of main entrances.*

*In order to be considered 'secure', parking related to residential development **should** (must) be in a secure building (with a roof) or a locker with an ability to lock the cycles to a fixture inside.*

Where it is not possible to provide suitable visitor parking within the curtilage of a development or in a suitable location in the vicinity agreed

by the planning authority, the planning authority may at their discretion instead accept, additional long-stay provision or, contributions to provide cycle parking in an appropriate location in the vicinity of the site.

Developers *should* (will be expected to) liaise with neighbouring premises and (must consult) the local planning authority to identify potential for off-site visitor cycle parking.

- Secure cycle lockers *should* (must) be provided for long stay cycle parking. Sheffield Stands (rather 'M' stands - see below*) *should* be provided for short stay and visitor parking.
- Short-stay cycle parking *should* (must) be available for shoppers, customers, messengers and other visitors to a site, and *should* (will) be convenient and readily accessible. Short-stay cycle parking should have step-free access and be located within 15 metres of the main site entrance, where possible.
- For both long-stay and short-stay parking, *consideration should be given to* (provision must be made for) ~~providing spaces~~ accessible to less conventional cycle types, such as tricycles, hand cycles, electric cycles, cargo cycles and cycles with trailers and other adapted cycles. This *should* (will be expected to) include *consideration* (provision) of re-charging facilities for electric cycles.
- *It is recommended that* (Developers and organisations are required to ensure that) supporting facilities are provided at land uses where long stay cyclists require them, (i.e. places of employment). Supporting facilities include secure lockers, showers and changing/drying rooms.
- Where it is not possible to provide adequate cycle parking within residential dwellings, the City Council will engage with developers to propose innovative alternatives that meet the objectives of these standards. This may include options such as providing the required spaces in secure, conveniently located, on-street parking such as cycle hangars. Where there is a lack of space within the curtilage of the proposed development developers will be expected to contribute to the cost of providing cycle parking on the highway.
- Where cyclists share surfaces with pedestrians, the safety and accessibility of the environment for disabled and older people must be assured.

Overall then these sections need to make clear the requirements for:

- Space for non standard bikes (Long John, Cargo, Trikes etc) - **Please note these are the types of E-bike that are increasingly being employed to replace urban utility vehicle journeys.**
- Electric charging facilities at Cycle parking provision at appropriate destinations. **People will need to charge E-bikes at places other than just their home.**
- To facilitate a significant shift away from vehicles, Work and Leisure destinations **must be required to provide appropriate facilities for the type of cycle users who could potentially be using the premises.**

* **M stands** are similar to Sheffield stands in size, cost, installation etc but their 'M' shape makes for much greater versatility when locking on modern E and Cargo type bikes with less conventional frame shapes.

Thank you.
Richard Attwood. Everyday Sheffield E-biker.

From: [REDACTED]
To:
Subject: FW: Sheffield CTC comments on Local Plan - plus info on cycle storage/parking
Date: 13 February 2023 11:27:25

[View this email in your browser](#)

Sheffield Local Plan



Sheffield Council are consulting on their draft local plan

This plan sets priorities for land use for the next 15 years and influences what gets built where. The Club Committee considered the draft plan in January and set up a working group to consider the detail. Generally we are supportive of the aspiration to make Sheffield 'an economically stronger, fairer, more inclusive and sustainable city'. However, we do have significant concerns about the plan. We are aiming to make a joint response to the consultation with Cycle Sheffield and we need to do this by 20 February. We would like members' views. Please take some time to read our draft response below and send any comments to sec@sheffieldctc.org by Thursday 16 February.

[Note: While the club covers a wider area, the plan and the comments relate only to the Sheffield Council area]

Sheffield CTC supports the overall strategy which seeks to protect the green belt

and open spaces. Sheffield CTC supports the focus on the reuse of vacant and underused, previously developed, (brownfield) sites across the city, an increase of high density housing in the city centre and the creation of '20-minute neighbourhoods' where everyday needs can be met within a short walk or cycle ride.

Sheffield CTC fully supports the first two aims of transport strategy:

- Public transport which is integrated, faster and user friendly.
- Better, safer active travel options.

Sheffield CTC believes there is an absence of strategy around connections and cycle routes across the city.

Sheffield CTC fully agrees that there is a need for better public transport and to prioritise cycling and walking. Sheffield CTC strongly supports the objectives for a connected city Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocation pg 17

“To create an integrated and sustainable transport network that promotes and enables walking, cycling and public transport, in order to reduce congestion, support district centres, improve air quality and safety, and enable healthier lifestyles.”

We feel that the commitment to this objective and a network of active travel routes should be clearly shown on the Policies Map.

The proposal for a cycle network seems to show nothing beyond what is already in place, or planned, in the Connecting Sheffield scheme. This creates a network in the city centre but there are some key areas which are not connected by safe cycle routes.

One such example is Stocksbridge. Transport links from Stocksbridge into the city centre are already stretched with no safe active travel option. The population will grow significantly, given the housing sites already approved and further development areas set aside in the Draft Local Plan.

Another example is access for students to the University of Sheffield. There are large student populations in Ranmoor, Broomhill, Crookes and Walkley. There are currently no safe active travel routes / cycle routes connecting these residential areas with the University and there are no ambitions to provide any safe routes indicated on the plan policies map.

A final example is the suburbs to the Southeast of Sheffield, from Intake, through Hackenthorpe, Waterthorpe to Halfway which currently have no cycle infrastructure shown on the policies map.

We seek the inclusion of a cohesive and extensive network of active travel routes throughout the city of Sheffield, not just the city centre, to demonstrate the

commitment of Sheffield City Council to create a city-wide active travel network.

Sheffield CTC is concerned that the wording in the plan relating to active travel and public transport measures is not strong enough to ensure that these elements of the plan will be delivered. Historically for example what has been achieved falls short of the policies and pledges relating to cycle routes in the 2009 Core Strategy. Sheffield CTC is aware that this in part is due to shortfalls in funding. We would like a stronger commitment and ambition from SCC to prioritise active travel and public transport and appeal to councillors to be braver when implementing active travel schemes.

Sheffield CTC calls for statements and policies within the documents to be strengthened in order to demonstrate this commitment and provide a mechanism to ensure this plan is delivered.

Where policies support provision for electric cars, Sheffield CTC calls for the inclusion of provision for electric cycles within the document. Where parking requirements are stated, Sheffield CTC calls for greater, or the same, strength in language to be used for cycles as is used for motorised vehicles.

Part 2 doc, chapter 7, A Connected City. pp 78,79 and 80:

7.6. All developments should include provisions and incentives to increase sustainable and active travel and reduce reliance on the car.

Sheffield CTC calls for 'should' to be replaced by 'must', or at least, 'will be expected to'

POLICY CO1: DEVELOPMENT AND TRIP GENERATION

New development should support the delivery of net zero transport carbon emissions.

Proposals should prioritise travel by public transport, cycling, and walking and incorporate inclusive infrastructure which provides connections to and within the development. This should focus on making the most efficient use of existing highway, including where appropriate reallocation of space to more sustainable modes.

Sheffield CTC calls for 'should' to be replaced by 'must', or at least, 'will be expected to'

Provision will also be required to support the increased uptake of electric and zero emissions vehicles, in accordance with the Parking Guidelines (see Policy CO2).

Sheffield CTC calls for the addition of electric bicycles here.

POLICY CO2: PARKING PROVISION IN NEW DEVELOPMENT

Car and cycle parking must be secure and appropriately designed, suitable for the use and location and be accessible and convenient for all users.

Sheffield CTC supports the use of the word 'must' here but calls for the inclusion of a requirement for charging infrastructure for electric bikes.

Annex B: Parking Guidelines

Sheffield CTC supports the car parking standards for the Central Area.

However, the policies and guidelines relating to cycle parking are weak in comparison. Sheffield CTC notes the repeated use of the word 'should' relating to the provision of cycle parking. We deem this to be unacceptable. Sheffield CTC calls for 'should' to be replaced by 'must' or 'there is a requirement to' in order to support the vision for a connected city and to enable and encourage modal shift.

Sheffield CTC calls for the following text to be replaced, changes highlighted yellow:

Cycle Parking Developments will need to address the needs of both long-stay (staff, residents) and short-stay (visitor) cyclists. Allocated spaces for non-standard cycles should must also be provided. Cycle parking should must be secure, well-lit and overlooked and within 20m of main entrances.

In order to be considered 'secure', parking related to residential development should must be in a secure building (with a roof) or a locker with an ability to lock the cycles to a fixture inside.

Where it is not possible to provide suitable visitor parking within the curtilage of a development or in a suitable location in the vicinity agreed by the planning authority, the planning authority may at their discretion instead accept, additional long-stay provision or, contributions to provide cycle parking in an appropriate location in the vicinity of the site.

Developers should liaise must consult with neighbouring premises and the local planning authority to identify potential for off-site visitor cycle parking.

- Secure cycle lockers should must be provided for long stay cycle parking.
- Sheffield Stands or M Stands should must be provided for short stay and visitor parking.
- Short-stay cycle parking should must be available for shoppers, customers, messengers and other visitors to a site, and should will be convenient and readily accessible. Short-stay cycle parking should will be expected to have step-free access and be located within 15 metres of the main site entrance, where possible.
- For both long-stay and short-stay parking, consideration should be given to providing there must be provision of spaces accessible to less conventional cycle types, such as tricycles, hand cycles, electric cycles, cargo cycles and cycles with trailers and other adapted cycles. This should will be expected to include consideration provision of re-charging facilities for electric cycles.
- It is recommended that It will be expected that supporting facilities are provided at land uses where long stay cyclists require them, (i.e. places of employment). Supporting facilities include secure lockers, showers and changing/drying rooms.

- Where it is not possible to provide adequate cycle parking within residential dwellings, the City Council will engage with developers to propose innovative alternatives that meet the objectives of these standards. This may include options such as providing the required spaces in secure, conveniently located, on-street parking such as cycle hangars. Where there is a lack of space within the curtilage of the proposed development developers will be expected to contribute to the cost of providing cycle parking on the highway.
- Where cyclists share surfaces with pedestrians, the safety and accessibility of the environment for disabled and older people must be assured.

Sheffield CTC calls for the wording within this paragraph to be strengthened in order to reflect that the provision of adequate cycle parking is non-negotiable. This must include:

- Space for non-standard bikes (Long John, Cargo etc) - the types that replace cars.
- Electric charging facilities at parking provision at appropriate destinations. People will need to charge bikes at places other than just their home.
- Work/Leisure places must be required to provide minimum facilities for the type of cycle users who will be using the premises in order to demonstrate the commitment to encouraging modal shift.

Additionally, Sheffield CTC are concerned that open air cycle stands are too widely relied upon for all short stay, We call for major new public facing venues to be required to provide fully secure 'medium' stay cycle parking, either indoors or in cycle lockers.

In conclusion, whilst Sheffield CTC supports the strategy, we believe the aspects relating to active and sustainable travel to be fundamentally flawed. We call for a stronger commitment to active travel through robust policy wording, to enable the delivery of Sheffield City Council transport strategy.

Email preferences

You are receiving this communication as you have subscribed to this email. if you do not wish to receive this email please use the unsubscribe link at the bottom of this email.

Copyright © 2023 Sheffield District CTC, All rights reserved.

You are on this list because you opted in at our website www.sheffieldctc.org, or you were on the original list before we started using MailChimp.

Our mailing address is:

Sheffield District CTC
62-68 Thirwell Rd
Sheffield, South Yorkshire S8 9TF
United Kingdom

[Add us to your address book](#)

[Find Us On Facebook](#)

[unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

