

## **Cycling UK Stevenage comment on 24/00451/FPM**

### **Abbeyfield 2 Pound Avenue, Stevenage Herts SG1 3JA**

Our objection is related to the provision of cycle parking which is not in line with the SBC Parking and Sustainable Transport SPD para 1.29 “the Council is keen to encourage all residents to cycle or walk as their primary mode of transport.”

The table in SPD para 7.1 indicates that the cycle parking standard for residential accommodation without a garage is 1 space per 1-bed unit and 2 spaces per 2-bed unit – so 19 spaces are required for this development.

The plan for this application shows provision for “20 bikes (stacked)” at the very back of the narrow yard adjacent to the flats which is in accordance with the required number.

However, SPD para 7.7 states: Shared cycle parking facilities should be secure and convenient to use. The requirement for bicycles to be stacked – above head height for many people – means that this provision is not convenient to use. It is also situated at the very rear of the property, beyond the bin store which will have to be negotiated when accessing the bike store.

The nature of the provision is wholly against SPD para 7.8 which states:

“Some forms of cycle parking are inappropriate for all cyclists or all forms of cycles that cyclists use. For example, "double decker" parks are inaccessible for those that ride adapted bikes or less traditional bike such as a recumbent. The type of parking installed should be designed to be used by anybody and should not prohibit certain users or bikes from use.”

The requirement for a cycles to be stacked is entirely inappropriate. It will be very difficult to use for standard weight cycles and those with racks, panniers, and other attachments. It will be impossible to use for a bicycle with a child seat attached, a heavier e-bike or large cargo bicycle. Adapted cycles, tricycles and other non-standard cycles will not fit and in any case could not be manoeuvred through the narrow access gate and passageway. The process of lifting a cycle will be impossible for many people and so will prohibit certain users from use.

This development is in Residential Accessibility Zone 2 as shown SPD para 2.1 which states that lower car ownership is likely. The Design and Access statement states, “Due to the central location we believe that there is no reason why this could not be a parking free development if we wanted ...” This current provision of cycle parking is wholly inadequate - it is inconveniently sited and of a type that is inconvenient or impossible to use - and thus will not encourage residents to cycle.