

## Response ID ANON-PNF2-9EYD-H

Submitted to **The Scottish Government's Programme for Reviewing and Extending Permitted Development Rights (PDR) in Scotland – Consultation on Phase 1 Proposals**

Submitted on **2020-11-01 15:31:22**

### Development Related to Active Travel

**60 Do you agree with the proposal to allow the erection of a cycle store in the front or side garden of a house up to a maximum size of 1.2 m height, 2 m width and 1.5 m depth?**

No

**If you disagree please explain why:**

In principle we agree but we DISAGREE strongly with the detail, because the sizes do not compare favourably with the normal sizes of commercially available bike stores, would be extremely difficult to work with in practice and are too limiting for many families who wish to travel actively.

Your proposed sizes are 1.2m high x 2m wide x 1m deep in Conservation Areas and 1.5m deep in other areas. The suggested height is a major problem - many bikes are around 1.15m and would be almost impossible to insert into a 1.2m finished size (less framing) height. The 1.2m height dimension also makes insufficient allowance for the common sloping roof detail on cycle stores (normally sloping forwards from the rear).

We are aware that cycles stored in front garden cycle stores are more vulnerable to theft by forced entry. Spokes would therefore recommend steel construction in this situation. In support of our preferred height dimensions, we would draw your attention to the dimensions of the two market-leading steel models, specifically 1) the Trimetals "Protect-a-cycle", which is 1.33m high, and 2) the Asgard model for 3 bikes which is 1.478m high, and the 4 bike model which is 1.34m high.

Furthermore, depth and width must be carefully considered – sheds should certainly be able to cater for a family of two adults and two children at a minimum, remembering that the government-promoted trend to e-bikes means that many bikes have become slightly larger or heavier. In order to make the store useable, it must also be possible to manipulate and manoeuvre bikes in and out reasonably easily, which requires some spare space on all sides, as also does the need to store accessories such as oil, panniers, bike locks and helmets. In particular, the proposed 1m depth in Conservation Areas will be unduly limiting for many families, rendering impossible some of the above needs.

Following a series of highly distressing individual cases of planning enforcements, and time-wasting for Edinburgh City Council, in the early 2010s, Spokes worked with the Council to devise shed dimensions which would normally expect to gain planning permission - namely 1.5m high x 2.5m wide x 1.2m deep. These were incorporated into a factsheet (\*1 below) which was approved by the Council's Planning Committee of 3 October 2013(\*2 below), and is now referenced in the Council's official Guidance to Householders. We strongly recommend these dimensions for the above reasons, and as they cover the most popular cycle stores currently on the market, many of which are high-quality secure steel structures in unobtrusive colours.

Perhaps most significantly, since these dimensions were adopted by Edinburgh in 2013, the Council has been able to approve every compliant planning application, thus confirming that the dimensions are fully reasonable and wise in planning terms. Allowing a further depth increase in non-Conservation Areas, as in the consultation, would give added active travel opportunities, particularly for households with children or more than two adults.

We do appreciate that these dimensions are insufficient to fully cater for many larger machines, such as some cargo bikes, adapted bikes, trailers etc, all of which are rapidly increasing in use. Nonetheless for front gardens we accept that there has to be a compromise with conservation requirements. However, the fact that PDR is, hopefully, to be granted for sheds of the size we recommend does not preclude householders seeking planning permission for larger sizes – albeit with the associated uncertainties, financial and administrative costs, and likely subsequent appeals if refused.

In summary, we urge you to adopt for Conservation Areas the Edinburgh dimensions of 1.5m high x 2.5m wide x 1.2m deep and (as suggested in the consultation) a possible greater depth for non-Conservation Areas.

\*1 <http://www.spokes.org.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Cycle-sheds-factsheet-Word97-v12-FINAL.pdf>

\*2 [http://www.spokes.org.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/1309-Cttee-report-item\\_6.2\\_Cycle\\_Storage\\_in\\_Gardens.pdf](http://www.spokes.org.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/1309-Cttee-report-item_6.2_Cycle_Storage_in_Gardens.pdf)

**61 Do you agree with the proposal to permit cycle stores up to 1.2 metres in height, 2 metres in width and 1 metre in depth in the front or side garden of a house in a conservation area?**

No

**If you disagree please explain why:**

In principle we agree but we DISAGREE strongly with the detail, because the sizes are unduly restrictive in terms of encouraging active travel and indeed will not even work in practice - see above answer, Q60.

It is vital that the proposals should extend to Conservation Areas as these cover so much of Scottish cities, and the capital city in particular, and many of whose inhabitants are likely to wish to travel by active means in line with government and public health recommendations.

As explained in Q60, the dimensions 1.5m high x 2.5m wide x 1.2m deep have been used successfully by Edinburgh City since 2013 including in Conservation Areas – and with no planning problems resulting. We urge their adoption for Conservation Area PDR.

**62 Should such an extension to PDR be subject to a restriction on materials?**

No

**Please explain your answer:**

In our view, the use of a discrete colour is more important than the material used in the construction of cycle stores. As mentioned above, strength of construction is increasingly important against theft. Steel cabinets are proving more popular than the more traditional timber designs, depending on the perceived vulnerability to theft of the stored cycles and where the greater cost can be borne. We would support a restriction on colours.

Under Building Standards, non-combustability can be an issue close to houses requiring the adoption of all-metal designs.

**63 Do you agree with the proposal to increase the floorspace of storage sheds allowed in the rear garden of houses in conservation areas to eight square metres?**

Yes

**If you do not agree please explain why:**

We support this. Not only is it important for cargo bikes, adapted bikes, etc, but it will make the process of taking out and replacing bikes much easier where the household has a number of bikes and of bike users, and it may avoid the need to stack bikes one behind the other.

**64 Do you agree with the introduction of PDR for the erection of a cycle store in the private garden area of a flat, including in a conservation area?**

Yes

**Please explain your answer:**

A large proportion of the population live in flats. The Scottish Household Survey 2017 found the following statistics for the occupation of flats: owner occupied 19%, private landlord 62%, local authority 50% and Housing Association 64%. It is therefore vital to extend PDR to flats, including conservation areas, as they cover so much of the population. To exclude flats would make it very much harder to achieve the government's Active Travel targets. Bike stores can invariably be sited and screened discretely.

**65 Do you agree with the proposal to allow cycle stores sufficient to accommodate up to two bikes per flat to the rear of larger blocks of flats, including in conservation areas?**

Yes

**If you disagree, please explain why:**

We support this proposal, including in Conservation Areas as discussed above, but some flexibility should be allowed on the location of such stores as good cycle stores should be overlooked and well lit for security and not hidden, say, at the rear of a block of flats.

**66 Do you agree with the introduction of PDR to allow the erection of cycle stores for buildings of class 4, 5 and 6 uses?**

Yes

**If you disagree, please explain why:**

We support this proposal as it is important for everyday places of work to offer the same standard of security against bike theft as in the home location. This will be an important element in helping to promote increased bike use by commuters.

**67 Do you agree with the introduction of PDR to allow the erection of cycle stores on-streets?**

Yes

**If you disagree, please explain why:**

We support this proposal and we are particularly pleased to see the current role out of such facilities in Edinburgh. Most people in Scottish cities live in flats\* and cycle storage within common stairways, or the lack of it, has been a subject of friction and frustration for many years. On-street storage has the potential to transform cycle ownership and ease of use for such flat owners and again this will be an important element in helping to promote increased bike use by commuters.

\* (Glasgow 72%, Edinburgh 64% - 2011 Census, Aberdeen 55% - 2016 Estimates of Households and Dwellings.)

**68 If such PDR is introduced, do you agree with the proposed maximum size for the stores, and the proposed restriction on the number allowed in a particular street or block?**

No

**If you disagree, please suggest alternatives:**

We note that you propose to adopt the height of the Cyclehoops Bikehanger design as the national standard for on street cycle stores. We do not understand why planning rules are applicable at all in this situation. To the best of our knowledge, Edinburgh City Council's onstreet storage facilities were installed solely through TROs, without any requirement for planning permission. This was the case not just with the new Cyclehoop hangars but also with several other designs which were installed by the Council some years ago in its pilot project.

If however it is felt that planning rules may apply in some circumstances, we strongly disagree with the consultation proposal as it greatly restricts other design solutions, e.g. nests of box designs, possibly storing bikes vertically. Furthermore, we do not believe that a national height limit is appropriate for Council

installations as this should be a local Council decision. If, nonetheless, a national height limit is imposed centrally then it should certainly not be based on one particular design - there are many potential storage solutions, which may be more or less suitable in different settings.

With reference to numbers, the provision in any street should be lead, so far as practicable, by demand but may be restricted by the length and geometry of the street, so prescriptive measures may prove very inflexible and limit expansion of cycle usage.

Furthermore we strongly oppose any restrictions on numbers or size of street cycle stores unless accompanied by equally strong restrictions on street car parking. The sizes, shapes and colours of cars and vans parked on the street are far more intrusive visually (and in terms of pollution and noise) than discreetly coloured cycle stores. To ensure citizen acceptance, it is essential that government rules are consistent and fair and are seen to be so.

**69 If such PDR is introduced, do you think it should it be allowed in conservation areas and, if so, should it be subject to any other limitations on size, materials etc?**

Yes

**Please explain your answer:**

We support PDR in Conservation Areas as such areas represent a significant proportion of our cities. They are areas where we believe that a reduction in car use in favour of active travel would be particularly welcome. In many cases, we find that the pressure to have a convenient cycle store comes from residents in Conservation Areas who wish to adopt a greener life style and, in some cases, give up their car in favour of regular cycle travel. This feeds directly into aspirations for city transformation, reduced congestion and less pollution.

**70 Is there any other amendment to the General Permitted Development Order that you think we should consider in order to encourage active travel further?**

**Please explain your answer:**

Nothing occurs.

## **SEA Post-adoption Statement Summary**

**71 What are your views on the findings of the Update to the 2019 Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanies this consultation document?**

**Please give us your views on the update to the Sustainability Appraisal, but please don't simply repeat what any views you gave us in the November 2019 consultation as these have already been taken into account:**

## **Assessment of Impacts**

**72 Do you have any comments on the partial and draft impact assessments undertaken on these draft Phase 1 proposals?**

**Please give us your views on the partial and draft impact assessments undertaken on these draft proposals:**

**73 Do you have any suggestions for additional sources of information on the potential impacts of the proposals that could help inform our final assessments?**

**Please let us have any suggestions for where we might obtain additional information on the impacts of the proposals:**

## **About you**

**74 What is your name?**

**Name:**

Goff Cantley

**75 What is your email address?**

**Email:**

corrennie@gmail.com

**76 Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?**

Organisation

**77 What is your organisation?**

**Organisation:**

Spokes, The Lothian Cycle Campaign

**78 The Scottish Government would like your permission to publish your consultation response. Please indicate your publishing preference:**

Publish response with name

**79 We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?**

Yes

**80 I confirm that I have read the privacy policy and consent to the data I provide being used as set out in the policy.**

I consent

## **Evaluation**

**81 Please help us improve our consultations by answering the questions below. (Responses to the evaluation will not be published.)**

**Matrix 1 - How satisfied were you with this consultation?:**

Very satisfied

**Please enter comments here.:**

Spokes was pleased to see the subject of Active Travel being raised to Priority 1 consideration. This was a very positive response to the significant increase in all forms of active travel apparently adopted by the public during the current Covid 19 epidemic.

We are very concerned that the possible change to PDR for cycle stores is being framed around minimum size standards which may greatly restrict these otherwise potentially hugely beneficial proposals.

**Matrix 1 - How would you rate your satisfaction with using this platform (Citizen Space) to respond to this consultation?:**

Very satisfied

**Please enter comments here.:**

The consultation was easy to find and complete. The ability to complete part and for that to be saved and returned to, is very helpful.