

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SheffieldPlan](#)
Subject: Amendments and additions re Active Travel and E-bikes to beef up the "Soundness" of the new Sheffield Draft Local Plan.
Date: 10 February 2023 18:32:26

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.

I have 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 would therefore appreciate you bringing the following full version to the attention of the relevant officers.

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 includes 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' or at the very least 'will be expected 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.