



*The Lothian Cycle Campaign*

Postal address [we have no staff]: St. Martins Community Resource Centre, 232 Dalry Road, Edinburgh EH11 2JG  
Website: [www.spokes.org.uk](http://www.spokes.org.uk) Email: [spokes@spokes.org.uk](mailto:spokes@spokes.org.uk) Twitter: @SpokesLothian Answerphone: 0131.313.2114

---

**If replying by email, please use...** [davedufeu@gmail.com](mailto:davedufeu@gmail.com)

26.1.17

Richard Slipper, GVA	<a href="mailto:richard.slipper@gvajb.co.uk">richard.slipper@gvajb.co.uk</a>
Michael Nelson, GVA	<a href="mailto:michael.nelson@gva.co.uk">michael.nelson@gva.co.uk</a>
Claire Carr, SWECO	<a href="mailto:claire.carr@sweco.co.uk">claire.carr@sweco.co.uk</a>

cc

[david.givan@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:david.givan@edinburgh.gov.uk)  
[phil.noble@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:phil.noble@edinburgh.gov.uk)  
[donald.anderson@ppsgroup.co.uk](mailto:donald.anderson@ppsgroup.co.uk)

Dear Richard and Michael

## **Edinburgh St James – meeting re cycle provision**

Thank you for the meeting which you arranged on January 24 to discuss cycling issues in relation to the Edinburgh St James development.

We were pleased to meet, and supportive of many of the elements proposed.

However, we were concerned to get the impression that some decisions, even though they have no structural implications, appeared to be almost set in concrete. An informative in the Council's [planning permission of 15.9.16](#) asks that cycle groups should be '*consulted*' - which surely means a meeting at which there is the possibility of change.

We were also disappointed that there seemed to be some nervousness about cycling causing problems, rather than seeing cycle use as a positive contribution to the development, which should be encouraged, and to the Council's future ambitions, as would be the norm in European cycle-friendly countries. Our meeting back in 2014 with Donald Anderson of PPS and Martin Perry of Henderson Investments had felt more positive and open on such issues.

I will not go over the several points of agreement, but the areas where we hope further thought can still be given are...

**1. Cycling parking in the Galleria.** The Council's planning permission informatives ask for this to be provided where possible, but it is not included in the current plans. As stated at the meeting, and for the avoidance of doubt, we were not suggesting cycle parking throughout the galleria, but where the 24-hour route passes through the galleria. Its purpose would be for those people passing through the development and wanting to stop en route at a shop in the galleria. Obviously a shopper coming, say, from Leith, and returning to Leith, would use the bike parking at the entrance rather than bringing their bike up in the lift; but galleria parking would be valuable for someone travelling, say, from Leith to the West End but wanting to shop in St James en route.

**2. Visitor bike parking.** We strongly suggest that some or all the visitor/shopper bike parking at the entrances should be covered from rain. Many people visiting such a major development are likely to stay for some time, and will not want their bike soaking on return.

**3. James Craig Walk.** This is described in the approved planning application [[Transport document](#), section 3.1] as "*a key pedestrian and cycle route*" and we understand it to be of a considerable (12m) width. We understand that no final decision has yet been taken on its detailed design, but we strongly urge that you incorporate clear delineation between pedestrians and cyclists. Whilst we do not anticipate or wish to encourage fast cycling, delineation is more comfortable and reassuring for pedestrians, as well as more convenient for cyclists. Suitable paving and careful design should be able clearly to delineate the areas whilst not encouraging fast cycling, though we emphasise that the delineation, however achieved, needs to be clear to all users. Obviously some pedestrians may walk in the cycle area if it is lightly cycled at any particular time, but the marked pedestrian area provides the near certainty of not encountering a bicycle, which many pedestrians appreciate - particularly those with poor eyesight or some other disabilities. This is the situation, for example, on the Meadows paths, where it works well.

**4. Cycle Hub.** We apologise for not raising this point, but the meeting was already over-running. However, our letters of [8.7.16](#) and [25.1.15](#), and our 2014 meeting, had raised this issue and described our suggestions. More recently, the Scottish Government is expressing much interest in Cycle Hubs, with one or two pilots in place and has secured European (ERDF) funding to deliver more. We hope that a Cycle Hub can still be pursued by the St James developers, as would be common in major developments in European cycle-friendly countries.

**5. Leith Street and the Elder St/York Place junction.** We understand from the meeting that decisions on the overall design and operation of these areas are purely taken by the council, with the St James developers merely having the role of detailed design and implementation. However, for the sake of completeness, we repeat here our disappointment that the upper section of Leith Street is still to have four lanes of motor traffic and no cycle route; whilst at the Elder St/York Place junction the Council's major east-west cyclistroute is to go through a staggered junction with central island. We will write separately to the Council about this junction.

**6. Picardy Place** (and its links to the council East-West route and to Little King Street) We understand that this design is outwith the St James development but we were pleased that Claire offered a meeting about the area in the near future, and we look forward to that.

Thank you again for the meeting, and we hope that 1-4 above can still be considered, particularly given that they are unlikely to affect the development until the later stages of construction.

Yours sincerely

Dave du Feu

Richard Grant  
Martin McDonnell