

Supermarket, Former BigW site, Brunstane, Edinburgh  
Response to Planning Application  
[Ref \(CEC\)10/01663/FUL](#)

Dear Karen,  
Ref 10/01663/FUL, supermarket on site of former Big W, Brunstane

We object to this application, on grounds of inadequate provision for cycling.

1) National Cycle Route 1 (NCN 1) crosses the car park at the southern end of the site but there are a number of un-dropped kerbs, the route is not clearly delineated nor marked for traffic to be aware of it, and the bridge over the railway at the east side has a flight of steps both up and down - the latter clearly also failing DDA requirements, and either preventing access to the supermarket from the east altogether, or making it very awkward with buggies etc, thus discouraging access via walking and cycling, and encouraging car use;

2) The cycle parking as proposed in the plans is poorly located and virtually invisible, tucked away in the NE corner of the site. It is also not covered. This parking should be close to the main entrance, covered, marked by a sign or signs, and with signage at the perimeters to indicate where it is;

3) Another major path runs along the west side of the site. It's not clear from the plans or the photo whether there is a connection into the site at the north end, opposite the main entrance, but it appears not. Clearly such a connection is highly desirable since it avoids walking south to the far end of the car park, then back through the car park (with potential conflict with vehicles).

In fact there IS a gap in the hedge at the right place at present, but this needs to be formalised, and properly signed as a pedestrian/cycle entrance. Indeed this would be the preferred entrance for peds/cyclists from all directions except the east.

4) Finally, I had some email correspondence at an earlier stage with the agent, Alistair Wood, which I will forward to you. All the above points were raised there. Mr Wood, as you will see, offered to forward my comments to the engineers, but he never got back to me. Furthermore, in the Pre-Application Consultation Statement which is part of the current documentation, these comments are not even mentioned.

Thus, it may be that some of our points have been taken on board, and are just not shown on the plans. I doubt it - but if so, we have not been told anything.

I hope these points will be taken into account when the application is considered by the Committee. If granted, it should be with conditions to satisfy (2) and (3) above. (1) is probably out of the owners' jurisdiction as they do not own the bridge, but they could be asked for a substantial developer's contribution towards replacing the steps.

Yours etc,  
Peter Hawkins  
CTC Lothians

**From:** stuart@snowcycle.co.uk  
**Subject:** RE: [ 10/01663/FUL supermarket, former Big W Brunstane  
**Date:** 7 July 2010 23:15:32 BST

Dear Karen,

After examining the plans for the new supermarket, it also strikes me that there is no reasonable access for wheelchair users, not only from the path from the Jewel running along the west side. I therefore object to the plans under Disability Discrimination Acts and Regulations.

You are aware that from 1st October 2004, Disability Discrimination Acts service providers will have additional duties in relation to physical features that make it impossible or unreasonably difficult for disabled people to use their service. These plans make it impossible for people with disabilities, not only to access the new supermarket, but also to access the established right of way across the car park.

I should also like to point out that there are people with disabilities living in and around Edinburgh who use a bicycle as their only form of independent transport. For example, people with epilepsy may not be able to drive a car, but a bicycle is a perfectly legitimate form of transport. Using the A1 is not a safe place for a bicycle.

Furthermore, "It is unlawful to discriminate against a disabled person by

- deliberately not providing a service which is provided to other members of the public
- deliberately offering a standard of service to the disabled inferior to that offered to other members of the public
- discrimination in terms of provision of a service or goods.
- failure in the duty to make reasonable adjustments where such failure results in making it impossible or unreasonably difficult for a disabled person to use a service
- treating a disabled person less favourably for a reason relating to the disability"

Also, replacing the steps on the railway bridge would also improve access to not only the supermarket, but to tourists who use the the National Cycle Route 1, and the International North Sea Cycle route.

Regards,

Stuart Threlfall

**From:** davedufeu@googlemail.com

**Subject: Re: 10/01663/FUL supermarket, former Big W Brunstane**

**Date:** 9 July 2010 17:34:42 BST

Hi Peter - Your point towards the end is rather worrying.

I've not looked at the documents, but it seems from what you say that the developers are trying to get brownie points with the council by saying they have held a public consultation, but they are failing to mention points raised during the consultation which they don't like - even though you had made them in written form in emails. That seems a flaw of the PAN system - the developer can make it sound like they have satisfied the public, but their consultation report can be biased to not mention those things they don't like of what the public raised.

Since your comments were direct to the agent, there is no excuse for them not to be fully considered.

I wonder if the Planning Officials think about this? Ideally they should be asking them if the consultation report is a complete one, or if it is only reporting on the comments which they adopted!

Dave