

Response/comments relating to Kenilworth Development Brief

Access to Education facilities

Consideration will need to be given as to whether additional bus services to serve the proposed secondary school, sixth form and potentially primary school over and above those identified for serving the housing allocations as shown in the KDB

Consideration will need to be given as to how access to the identified cycle network can be provided from/to each education site.

Traffic speed reduction measures on Glasshouse Lane and close to educational establishments will be a requirement through planning process e.g. TRO/controlled crossings will have cost associated. Therefore consideration should be given to sharing the burden of this across developments. This is likely to be fairly in comparison to wider scheme costs but may not be considered fair to burden the schools with.

Highways England Response to Kenilworth Development Brief

WCC Transport Planning/Development Management teams have reviewed the comments and recommendations provided by Highways England Asset Manager and agree with those points raised within their response to the Kenilworth Development Brief consultation dated 3rd January 2019. The Kenilworth Development Brief should be amended to reflect the recommendations made.

Delivery of Crewe Lane improvements

Another point, on which I was contacted by the developer for the land south of Crewe Lane, is the requirement for completing the Crewe Lane improvements prior to the build out of this site - this would make it completely dependent upon the Catesby site being built out in full prior to these Crewe Lane improvements - which may take several years. Without which we would effectively be reducing capacity on routes entering/exiting Kenilworth (which may be especially important during Stoneleigh A46 Ph1 and Hs2 construction periods where Dalehouse Lane will be subject to restrictions).

Development Principal 3G: Other Accesses point b which states (page 85):

“Should any part of ED2 be developed for residential purposes, a suitably designed access into the site shall be provided. The access shall not be utilised to serve any residential development unless and until Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane junction improvements have been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Highways Authority. Access to the site must also be located and designed giving due regard to the proposed Secondary School site access;”

Cycling

As stated on p68, 4 metre wide cycle footways / cycleways should ideally be the aspiration on the spine road, as this is the minimum width you could segregate pedestrians / cyclists if this is decided as preferred and even if unsegregated, 4m would allow more space for all users at busy times, such as school trips. Therefore, it is suggested that the final paragraph on p 78 should be amended to be consistent with p 68 ie *'ideally 4 m shared footways / cycleways'* rather than *'3 – 4m'*. The wording in the text still gives scope to accept reduced widths where 4m not achievable or for 4m provision on one side only if acceptable.

However, it may be best to remove the next sentence on p78 *'As an absolute minimum, a 4m shared provision should be provided on one side and a 2m footway on the other side'* as this may not be achievable on Glasshouse Lane section of spine road.

On p66, it is not considered necessary to change the wording in the fifth paragraph as Catesby have requested (comment AC 9), as this paragraph refers to any short connecting routes onto the spine road from different areas of the development where 3 metre shared use will be adequate as usage will be lower, rather than cycling provision on the spine road where a wider path may be of benefit.

Comparison of Atkins Transport Study to Kenilworth Development Brief

WCC have reviewed the Kenilworth Development Brief in comparison to the Atkins study and note the following sections from the transport study are either omitted or do not fully reflect the information contained with the report.

- Development Principle 3D discusses connection to existing cycle/ped infrastructure but omits access to proposed infrastructure (e.g. K2L and the Kenilworth circular routes etc identified in the cycle network plan)
- Castle Farm – it is noted this section covered by the transport study is omitted from the development brief, whilst it is recognised that the highway access solutions to Castle Farm will have to be delivered by the applicant for the site, it is less clear where funding will be sought for improved pedestrian/cycle access.
- Dev Principle 3E (b) should we be saying footway/cycleway at this stage rather than just footway?
- Off site Highway Improvements – St Johns Gyratory, there is no mention of providing pedestrian and cycling facilities at this junction – this will be a requirement where it is feasible to deliver. The cycle network plan shows a route traversing this junction
- It is noted that information relating to the A46 Link Rd is limited, this is not a particular concern but does help demonstrate to the public that there is a wider transport strategy to alleviate pressures of through traffic on Kenilworth.
- The Transport Study (chapter 7) identifies a number of specific off site cycle improvements, these are not specifically referenced within the development

brief, however WCC would expect developer contributions towards these schemes as they will provide connections between the development site, the town's amenities, employment and will be used for leisure purposes. Some of these schemes (e.g. route 52/K2L) have proved difficult to deliver and including them within this document would provide them with further status and may help bring forward delivery

General

It should be noted all identified "preferred schemes" are still current concepts and substantial work is still required to determine their feasibility – e.g. no topographical or utilities information has informed these designs. Further optioneering of all identified schemes will be undertaken, as expected, both through the planning application process and through further refinement through the scheme development process

Additional Comments

Pg 77 typo – modol rather than modal

Pg 95 typo - unction