

From: jnprice [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 January 2019 10:33
To: Planning Policy
Subject: Comments on Proposed Developments on Land East of Kenilworth

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Comments on Proposed Developments on Land East of Kenilworth

I wish to make the following comments after being informed by the Kenilworth Town Plan, the Catesby Information Event and the recently published WDC Development Brief.

My principal concerns about the plans described in the latter document revolve around the proposed Spine Road and its various junctions. The original concept as proposed by Catesby and in the Kenilworth Town Plan proposed a new "Spine Road" running the full length of the development, with various access points to the existing road network to the northwest of the site, whereas the present Brief visualises the integration of a considerable length of Glasshouse Lane, passing a number of side junctions serving around 600 existing properties in total, many of which have no other vehicular egress to the wider road network (for example Mountbatten Avenue/Heyville Croft/Knightlow Croft – around 70 properties).

The Brief assumes that traffic joining the northern sectors of the spine road will exit the Glasshouse Lane sector on to the southern sector at the proposed Heyville Croft roundabout. It seems more likely that much of this traffic will be destined for Kenilworth town centre or the various side roads from the western part of Glasshouse Land and therefore not exit to the proposed western sector of the spine road, thereby exacerbating the existing traffic problems in Glasshouse Lane and Birches Lane, including the difficult exits from Moseley Avenue and Windy Arbour. The Heyville Croft exit, as depicted in Figure 31 appears to include an additional hazardous right turn for traffic heading west; a four arm roundabout should perhaps be located at that junction.

I would therefore propose that the spine road would be better located to the east of Woodside (which could then have a new and safer entrance, there having been a number of road traffic collisions in recent years at the current entrance off Glasshouse Lane). The road could then roughly bisect the development site, parallel to Glasshouse Land and the A46 as far as the planned Local Centre, thus serving the proposed Primary School before re-joining the planned route.

The proposed Public Park could be re-orientated alongside the A46 and join up with the area of ancient woodland and thus further increasing its amenity. This change might increase potential development area available around the local centre.

The spine road should also be constructed very early in the development (no indication of the programme is included in the Brief), thus avoiding construction traffic on the surrounding

roads which cannot easily accommodate heavy vehicles. This is partly due to on-street parking (e.g. Dencer Drive). Informal research indicates an average population of more than two cars per house in the immediate area, a fact which should be borne in mind when providing space in the new proposed development.

I note with interest the proposals for improved public transport facilities contained in the brief. By definition, these extend outside the development area which may mean that a wider view needs to be taken. In particular some services are circular, served only in one direction. This can result in excessively long journey times, a clear deterrent to users. The existing SL service is a case in point, though given the relative difficulty of road access to the Railway Station it is difficult to see an easy solution. Perhaps it is the cynic in me, but I would remind you that "Developers' Contributions" are ultimately part of the individual property costs!

I have no objection to any part of my comments being used or published in the public domain and I would be happy to discuss them with WDC officials. However, I ask that my contact details are not made public without my specific permission.

Mr James N. Price, C.Eng, FSCTE, MIET,

