

## Turnhouse, Barratt development

Spokes response, August 2021

[21/03986/AMC](#) | *Erection of 269x dwellings, associated drainage, infrastructure and landscaping (in respect of conditions 5 (Part 2 i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi), 6(a), 6(b), 6(c), 6(d), 6(e), 6(f), 6(g) of consent 16/04738/PPP, 6(h), 6(i), 6(j), 6(k(i-ix)) & 10 for Plot 3 only).*  
*Land 646 Metres West Of 85 Craigs Road Edinburgh*

Spokes has reservations about the validity of the LDP site HSG19 with respect to quality cycle infrastructure and connections. With this in mind, we object to the current proposals. Our submission includes some general concerns for this development as a whole, as well as issues specific to the above plot proposals.

We highlight the general poor quality of QR9 which skirts the boundary of HSG19 - it is currently a shared footway/cycleway and in places narrow and awkward to cross, especially at the Maybury junction.

So far, the provisional Maybury junction upgrade proposals we have seen have been particularly poor for cycling, and so we have concerns that key connections and infrastructure that dovetail into the HSG19 development site is likely to continue to be poor unless improved markedly. Without a good quality cycling network outside the boundary of HSG19, this development is unlikely to attract cycling as a choice for local trips. Instead we will see car dependency proliferate.

We note that there is no quality north-south cycle route that plugs into this development. HSG19 and HSG20 make much of the north-south proposed active travel corridor along Cammo Walk, but it does not connect to anything of quality north of the Cammo Estate and is therefore not of much use as a through route or connector for everyday trips. Without such connections, we don't believe the planning application complies with Policy Des 7 of the Local Development Plan, which says that developments should have "a comprehensive and integrated approach to the layout of buildings, streets, footpaths, cycle paths...". Such connections are also recommended in the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance (Factsheet P1 - [Street as a Place](#)).

We also note the proposals for a non-signalised crossing for the proposed active travel corridor as it crosses Turnhouse Road, which we understand is to be granted as part of the RCC. This is concerning, as signalised crossings are much safer for people on cycles, including families. This crossing point should be signalised to allow less confident cyclists, families and other more vulnerable active travellers to feel safe when they are crossing this road.

We appreciate the above are wider issues and not directly related to this application, however we feel they are important to mention in this response, as all the planning applications that are currently in the pipeline for HSG19 ignore the wider cycling network implications and purport to be of high quality with respect to active travel provision. This is all very well and good if people want to cycle in circles around their own houses, but doesn't help with any modal shift to cycling if people want to cycle to work, school, university, the shops or to see friends and family.

RE the specifics of this development plot:

- The shared space cycleways are a bit snug, as the plans show them to be 3m wide. This is arguably too narrow and could cause conflict between people walking and cycling. The City of Edinburgh Council Street Design Guidance notes that two way cycle provision should be at least 2.5m, plus a minimum footway of 2m. Ideally we should be seeing wider provision here.
- We can't see any indication of dropped kerbs on the plot's plans - we would expect to see these as part of cycling provision.
- We do not see how cyclists travelling along west-east (and vice versa) desire lines are able to safely access and exit Meadowfield Road, as shared space disappears at this junction. Meadowfield Road is considered a primary road in the HSG19 development as far as we are aware - how will people cycling be able to safely navigate this junction?
- The plans seem to indicate that there is no north-south (and vice versa) provision for cycling. Document 3 on the planning portal shows that shared space stops outside of unit 11. Is the idea that cyclists cross the road and from unit 11 to unit 141, then cross the road again at the seating area near unit 143 to join the 2m wide north-south path? This is circuitous for cycling if so and very inconvenient, and the off-road path is too narrow to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians. Other than this awkward configuration, we do not see any north south protected provision which should be rectified, as a connection to Craigs Road is required for people cycling.
- It would be good to see some bicycle parking in communal areas such as the community orchard. These should be Sheffield stands, as described in [Cycling by Design](#).
- The transport statement is, quite frankly, wildly optimistic on its estimates. There are a lot of figures contained in this report which do not stack up. For example, we see a modal share of 0% for trains (which we would assume also includes light rail?), despite the development situated close to the Edinburgh Gateway train station and tram interchange. This development's associated reports and literature wax lyrical about the high quality cycling provision, yet the transport statement has cycling modal share at 3%. We also see that the transport statement says that it's expected to see a 10% drop in private vehicle use, despite recent City of Edinburgh Council figures showing that miles travelled by car in Edinburgh is the highest it has ever been. With this in hand, we are concerned that the transport statement's figures are not accurate and should be re-assessed.
- The target modal split for cycling should be significantly higher than the 3% quoted in the transport statement. Given the Scottish Government's "10% target" the Transport Assessment should actually be considering whether the development and local network could accommodate a cycling modal split of at least 10%, and the development should be redesigned to enable this.
- Policy 8 of the [Strategic Development Plan](#) includes "Ensure that new development minimises the generation of additional car traffic" and "Ensure that the design and layout of new development demonstrably promotes non-car modes of travel". Designing the development to maintain existing levels of car use in the area clearly accomplishes neither of these criteria.

- We can see no reason for the 4m wide cycleway along the north of the site to not be straight. Making it wiggle, as it does in the proposals, effectively narrows the path and will increase conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.
- We cannot see any details of the design of the proposed secure cycle parking. These should generally be Sheffield stands, with a layout conforming to that shown in [Cycling by Design](#). Provision should also be made for non-standard cycles, such as cargo bikes, adult tricycles and tandems - guidance on providing for such cycles is available from [Wheels for Wellbeing](#).

Spokes (the Lothian Cycle Campaign)  
St Martins Church  
232 Dalry Rd  
Edinburgh EH11 2JG