

**From:** Martin Harper [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 January 2019 21:29  
**To:** Planning Policy  
**Subject:** Land East of Kenilworth Development Brief - Public Consultation

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

I would like to make the following observations: -

**1 Table 2: Kenilworth Transport development Plan Key [pages 94-97]**

Schemes 11 and 22 seem to be at odds. How can the school entrance be created and traffic lights installed without Leyes Lane being realigned at the same time? Currently they are programmed 2 years apart and by different parties. This is nonsense and merely drags out the construction inconvenience. It also means that the second scheme will be undertaken after the school has become operational. Scheme 22 should be delivered by Kenilworth School at the same time as Scheme 11. Both schemes are necessitated by the new school development.

**2 Vision and green space within the site. [page 107]**

Soft green edges etc should also apply to the new school site. [page 107]

**3 Development Principle 5C & 5D – Noise and Air quality [pages 114 & 115]**

Why do these two principles not apply to the impact on existing development due to the new development? They should. Wisley Grove will be severely impacted by the school development and needs special protection. Two sets of traffic lights, slow moving and standing traffic, vast people and vehicle movements 24/7 is not something to be dismissed.

4 The Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP4 point j. provides for protection of residential amenity of existing development. This point needs incorporating in the development brief if only for emphasis.

5 There should be a requirement to retain or enhance all existing hedge boundaries and trees wherever possible in order to maintain wildlife. This total development will destroy large amounts of natural habitat for animals and plants so it needs to be made very clear that as much of the existing habitat as possible is retained or enhanced.

6 The draft is very specific on how the residential parts of the site should be developed. There is very little about how the educational buildings, sports pitches and other buildings on site ED2 should be sited or be constructed. Why not? This issue is of just as much importance to other parts of the new development as well as the existing built environment. Issues such as drop off points and noise limitation need addressing.

**7 Employment land [page63]**

This provides for a buffer zone between the ind dev and residential, but no such provision is made in respect of the new school. Why? If site ED2 is to be used much more intensely

then noise and pollution from traffic during those longer hours is bound to have a detrimental effect on surrounding residential areas, be they new or existing.

I would be pleased if you would acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.

Regards

Martin Harper

