

Submission to Warwick District Council's Draft Development Brief for Land East of Kenilworth by the Kenilworth Green Party group.

The Kenilworth Green Party is a local political group of the Warwick District Green Party and the national Green Party of England and Wales. As both Green campaigners and Kenilworth residents, we have taken great interest in the proposed developments in East Kenilworth. This submission comes from our Kenilworth Development Working Group.

When the consultation was announced we decided to seek residents' views on the proposals. We have now delivered 5000 leaflets across the town summarising the plan in neutral terms and explaining how people can make comments. We have also visited ~200 houses and discussed the plan with residents on doorsteps. A significant number of residents have said that they found difficulty adding their comments online. For part of this submission, we draw upon conversations and comments made by residents to us, and emails received by us from residents.

We conclude that, in many ways, the Draft Development Brief offers an acceptable guideline to developers. But residents are critical of specific issues relating mainly to traffic flows, road layouts and connectivity, and our own concerns focus on sustainability and standards, placemaking principles and air quality. At the heart of these criticisms is a widely held view that the necessary evidence for proposing specific elements within the Brief have not been sought nor been presented in detail for proper scrutiny. Much greater stakeholder participation and engagement is required before the Brief will be acceptable to us and the majority of residents we have engaged with.

This report summarises 1) the essence of conversations we have had with residents including examples of email comments we have received (some of which summarise comments submitted online separately), 2) our Local Green Party views on the Brief.

1) Residents' Views

In our conversations, some residents, especially those living along Glasshouse Lane and other perimeter roads, had taken a close interest in the proposed developments since the public meeting held 25/7/2017 that outlined the Local Plan. But many other residents were confused between the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan and Development Brief. There has been insufficient communication between WDC and the residents of Kenilworth who constitute key stakeholders.

This is contrary to the statement on page 6 of the Brief that the District Council has undertaken extensive consultation with key stakeholders. In our view there has not been extensive consultation and, unless there is further direct engagement with residents (more public meetings, focus groups, leafleting etc), this paragraph should be amended for accuracy.

Residents are most concerned about transport which takes several forms.

a) Central Spine road

Many residents remember an earlier version of the Local Plan which showed a continuous spine road connecting the northern part of the development site at Crewe Lane directly to the A46 roundabout/A452. There is now alarm at the suggestion that the proposed 'spine road' will join the existing Glasshouse Lane for part of its section and many residents want to hear the arguments for the change. Emailed comments (see Appendix for full emails) summarise these views well:

"At the public meeting on the 25th of July 2017 I attended at St Francis Hall the hundreds of other concerned residents and people said the creation of a spine road being was the key issue to acceptance (having a primary school to further impact on this was hidden then), the Council noted this and took it away to action this has been ignored, why?"

"My view on the central park is that it is far more important to have a spine road all the way through the new development to keep traffic off Glasshouse Lane than to preserve Rocky Lane, which is essentially just a straight line metalled pathway of little merit of itself."

"I am ready to sacrifice even Rocky Lane.....for the spine road to continue through the new estate. How can it be considered sensible to keep it when all the traffic problems will be considerable and Glasshouse Lane, a quiet road will become the North Circular of the Town."

"The revised plan does not eliminate concerns over traffic flows, it simply transfers them to Birches Lane/Glasshouse Lane. Clearly no consideration has been given to existing residents that are dependent on these Lanes and the extent to which they will be able to continue to access them at peak times."

"The original 'spine road' looks to have been scrapped for tapping into the existing road network with some roundabouts – With 6,000 additional journeys a day this will cause gridlock at peak times – This is totally unacceptable and increases dramatically the risk to life via accidents to road users, pedestrians and the young school children. Why has this changed?"

"I believe the original concept proposed a "spine road" roughly parallel with the A46, linking Crew Lane with the Leamington Road, allowing traffic to remain within the development. This is surely the logical solution, to have a new infrastructure to support a new development, and not to impact on existing properties and present traffic arrangements."

b) Specific traffic and road layout issues

There are concerns about the proposed re-configuration of the dog-leg junction where Leyes Lane meets Rawnsley Drive/Dencer Drive related to congestion/traffic flow and also the possible loss of biodiversity and amenity - especially when the whole development is supposed to result in 'added biodiversity value':

"As a resident of the little bit of Leyes Lane (the dog-Leg) I am hugely concerned about the new plans and possible ideas that will impact on our road

and nearby....Having sought consultation I have been made aware that you wish to realign the road to improve congestion around our road- what evidence do you have that widening our road or removing some of the green will decrease congestion? Are you indeed planning to alter the green area at all? The small amenity belt of trees and shrubs is attractive and has biodiversity value to us in Leyes Lane and surrounding houses. If you alter this how are you going to add biodiversity by removing key green area and re aligning Leyes Lane? Certainly this is a much loved area by my children who play in the trees and have made dens with other children in our road and we would prefer no alteration to it at all... There are at least 11 children in the houses along the small bit of Leyes Lane and we are all keen to ensure safety as well as benefits to residents are considered as a priority.”

“We think [the new junction] would actually be more dangerous than it is now, as many drivers come down Rawnsley Drive over the speed limit. By having a crossroads we think drivers having to go straight across the junction while on Leyes Lane will be more at risk and cannot see any advantage at all of a new junction, unless a roundabout is installed (a mini-roundabout would confer no extra benefit either).”

There are associated concerns about the car parks or drop-off points needed for the new school:

“How will the parking of cars associated with the school pick up and drop off times be controlled. Access to residential properties in Denewood Way, Hidcote road, Leyes lane etc will be severely affected unless control measures are in place, or facilities are provided by the School

Have adequate parking facilities been provided at the new School for both Staff and visiting public, if not this will inevitably force some parking out into the surrounding streets etc.”

There are concerns about the Hidcote Avenue, Crewe Lane, Glasshouse junction(s): the heightened risk of accidents particularly as this will be the focus of traffic movements in and out of the new secondary school:

“My major concerns are with the much increased traffic associated with the development and the lack of information regardingThe dangerous Hidcote road/Crewe lane/Glasshouse lane junction, there have been quite a few accidents here.”

“The issue is the need to either control access to Crew Lane or improve the junction of Crew Lane, Knowle Hill and Hidcote Road which is currently a very dangerous interchange and which is likely to be used much more once the development is occupied. People will use Crew Lane to access Dalehouse Lane for a speedier route towards Coventry, the M6, M69, M45 etc. Also it may become a preferred drop off point for the senior school. The increased use of the road, which is not constructed for such a volume of traffic, is not the primary concern but it is the risk of death or injury arising from the poor visibility at this 4 way junction of Crew Lane, Knowle Hill, Glasshouse Lane and Hidcote Road.”

There are concerns about current traffic speeds on Glasshouse Lane and Windy Arbour and how these may become greater with more traffic flows. This is of particular concern because the proposed 30 mph speed limit for the Spine Road would be contrary to the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan (KP4g) which states "residential roads within developments are designed to a 20mph standard..."

"Given that the existing road between Crewe Lane and Rocky lane will provide access to two schools it would be beneficial if the stretch from Rocky Lane to the roundabout serving the Woodside hotel were regulated to 20mph and the existing carriageway narrowed to further inhibit any temptation to speed over the present 30mph limit between the two roundabouts. A similar restriction should apply between the Woodside roundabout and Crewe Lane Junction but maybe narrowing the carriageway would not be appropriate in this instance."

"I am hoping that the consultation will afford a chance to fast-track an existing problem – i.e. traffic speeds on Glasshouse Lane and Knowle Hill..... traffic tends not to decelerate adequately as glasshouse Lane turns into Knowle Hill, causing traffic hazards with restricted visibility up and down the bends on Knowle Hill and exiting Crew Lane."

There are concerns about the proposed roundabout at the end of Rocky lane and the need for allocate car parking space to access the proposed Central Park:

"This roundabout would result in a significant increase in traffic noise, congestion, pollution, safety issues and lights shining directly into the front of my property and also neighbouring properties."

"The need for a car park is perhaps sad but it's a practical necessity (overspill from the current 3 car one is onto Heyville Croft which will not take the vastly increased load a good park will generate as it's not and still will not be easy to get to by cycle under the new plan)."

"It would seem more logical from this point of view to site the new roundabout further into the Rocky Lane area thus moving traffic further away from the frontages of properties immediately adjacent to the slip roads."

"...serious consideration should be given to relocating the roundabout into the ...Park area, proposed on the other side of the existing Glasshouse Lane, in order to reduce the impact on existing properties."

c) Non-vehicle routes

Very many residents we spoke to were concerned that the new houses and new schools will create more vehicle movements - and that safe routes for pedestrians, mobility scooters and cyclists within the development site and between the rest of the town and the site should therefore be viewed as absolute priorities:

“As for pedestrian & cycle routes, these do not seem to provide direct links into the town, the station and the library or anywhere else for that matter.”

“...my more general point is regarding cycle and pedestrian routes, given Kenilworth's size and focal point of Abbey Fields, I'm unclear on why the council haven't established safe cycle routes from the East side of Kenilworth to Abbey Fields and other leisure facilities like the Kenilworth Greenway.”

“I'm a supporter of and volunteer for The Campaign to Protect Rural England, electric cars and of pushing for more walking/cycling routes, and I'm disturbed about the loss of so much greenbelt land”

2) Local Green Party Views

Our view is that high quality sustainable development should reflect the best practises and standards that exist across the UK and Europe: a step-change in quality rather than incremental improvements on what currently passes as sustainable. For an attractive edge-of-town location in a popular town like Kenilworth, there are no reasons not to expect the highest 'ecological' standards for architecture, materials, energy use, transport and biodiversity. We urge WDC to ensure that the standards set down for developers rise above those for 'anywhere development'. Here we highlight three sets of issues with suggestions for progressing the Brief.

a) Sustainability and Standards

The Introduction (page 6) states the development will be a '*sustainable urban extension*'. Although there are many policy statements, the actual details of the Brief fall short of what is needed to ensure that the proposed development will be meaningfully sustainable. The phrase 'high quality' is used throughout the document but, again, not in any meaningful way. There is reference to a 'high quality' new community (Chapter 1 page 6), 'high quality' housing, 'high quality' design etc. Clear definitions must be included for 'high quality' including specified measurable standards.

The vision refers to "high quality sustainably designed buildings" however, once again there is no definition of what this means. KP15 seeks to encourage applicants to adopt higher environmental standards of building design and energy performance such as Passivhaus or equivalent. It goes on to say that the public sector has an important role to play in demonstrating the practicalities and the long-term benefits of adopting high environmental building standards. To comply with this policy it will be necessary for developers to go beyond the current 2013 building regulations, yet such a suggestion is absent from the 'vision and objectives' for the development area.

We are very disappointed that there is no mention for the provision of social housing.

Under 'Design Principle 4: Education', we are disappointed that little ambition is being shown by WDC in relation to the provision of the two new schools. There is no indication as to the quality of the design of the buildings. With the schools being at the heart of the new sustainable urban extension surely it is up to the public sector to set the Brief for exemplar buildings? We would advocate that the buildings be designed to certified Passivhaus standards as this will set the agenda for future generations of children and also provide a message for the various developers looking to provide 'high quality' housing.

We would advocate a specific section on energy. For example, there is no mention of a distributed energy system on a neighbourhood scale. Neither is there mention of the possible need to move to electric heating rather than gas as the nation moves to a decarbonised future. Given the recent evidence from DEFRA that wood-burning stoves are a major (if not the largest) source of PMs in residential areas we would argue that all central and space heating sources must be 2022 compliant (see also section c Air Quality below).

b) Development Principle 7A: Placemaking Principles.

The Placemaking Principles are laudable in their range and general aspiration. However, we question how they will be applied by developers from the details provided in the rest of the Brief, particularly with regards Healthy Community, Connectivity and Movement, and Car and Cycle Parking. Whilst the Brief considers these three themes in detail there is little evidence of integrated thinking about how they affect each other, especially around the issue of traffic flows and non-vehicle journeys.

As we have described above, residents are very concerned about the higher levels of traffic flows. We agree. These are expected to result not just from hundreds of new homes but also from the two new schools. We would argue that the Brief does not give confidence that the traffic flows are currently understood to a sufficient level to enable planners and residents to properly foresee the problems - and the solutions.

The 'Kenilworth Transport Study' document is referred to in several locations but we have not been able to access it: this needs to be publicly accessible. Yet modelling of traffic flows described in this document is used as evidence for arguing that the proposed road layouts or modifications are the correct ones. For example:

"The junction has been modelled and the junction capacity results highlight that the junction operates well within capacity on all arms during both peaks" (p.81),

"A junction capacity analysis has been undertaken which demonstrates that this arrangement would work well within acceptable thresholds of capacity on all arms across both peaks." and (p. 82).

The Brief may be right and principled in justifying the 'central park' in favour of the longer 'spine road', but such statements as those quoted above do not provide compelling evidence and certainly do not convince residents.

Similarly, there is frequent mention in the Brief of safe cycling and walking routes but there is no concrete proposal for funding the Cycle Network (which we welcome). In Chapter 7, Table 2 lists 24 new proposed transport schemes. 'Cycle Network Improvements' are listed but not even enumerated as the 25th which suggests a very low priority.

We would argue that there is need for an Integrated Transport Plan for the whole town: a comprehensive strategy that captures local private car journeys, through-traffic journeys, bus travel, rail travel, walking, mobility scooters, and cycling - not just for now but for 10 years hence (at least) when the development is due for completion.

The Plan needs full stakeholder participation from the start with residents, user groups, private transport providers, local businesses etc working together with the District and Council planners. Residents, in particular, have to be included in the decision-making process – and at present they do not feel that they are.

The Plan needs to combine the best transport modelling with sensitivity experiments to model alternative assumptions (e.g. what happens if people have more than x cars per household), projected changes in demography (e.g. routes for mobility scooters), and new information about personal preferences for travel (e.g. how many children would cycle to school from West Kenilworth if there were safe routes, or what if electric bikes become popular) with the findings made accessible for perusal and comment.

c) Air Quality

The A46 will remain a major air polluter for at least a decade. The worst-case modelled plumes of nitrous oxides presented in the Catesby Homes planning outline document¹ show that the annual average for the whole road would exceed legal levels ($\text{NO}_2 > 40$ micrograms/ m^3). Although concentrations subside away from road, the poisonous plume extends into the development site by 300-400 m. The Brief recognises the need for buffer zones, vegetation and fences but there is no explicit description of what developers must do to ensure that they are not building houses within the polluted zone.

The new development will also cause higher levels of pollution. The same modelling exercise for air quality resulting from the operation of the development appears to show similarly high levels of nitrous oxides in the residential Glasshouse Lane. These data (or WDC's own data) are not presented in the Brief as evidence for the need of stringent mitigation measures. Yet if these high levels of nitrous oxides are realistic they represent severe health risks to Glasshouse Lane residents (potentially life-limiting) who should be made aware.

¹ Catesby Estates Plc, Land east of Kenilworth (Crewe Lane and Woodside Training Centre) Air Quality Assessment Report No. 442738.AQ.01 (06)

Worryingly, the proposed site for the new primary school sits in the narrowest part of the site between the A46 and Glasshouse Lane. Young children are at greatest risk from poor air quality in terms of stunted lung development, and also life-threatening asthma attacks linked to short term spikes of high pollution concentrations that are often masked by annual average values. Before indicating the site for a primary school to developers, the evidence should be presented that modelled annual average and peak air pollution levels are not, and will not be, an issue at this site.

We would argue that the Brief should lay down a clear set of protocols for developers to evaluate the levels of nitrous oxides and the even more damaging particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) particles. Independent expert advice should be sought but it would seem sensible to install monitoring stations for these pollutants along transects at right angles to the A46 for at least 12 months prior to the start of building.

Permanent monitoring stations should be a mandatory requirement inside and outside of both proposed schools. Additionally, modelled air quality for the whole site using inputs from the vehicle flow modelling should be made publicly available and published within the final version of the Brief.

January 2019

Appendix (emails – home addresses, phone numbers and email addresses have been redacted and names anonymised where requested)

From 'AP' of Kenilworth

I'm pleased to see, from your flyer, that The Green Party is taking an active interest in the above plan. My view on the central park is that it is far more important to have a spine road all the way through the new development to keep traffic off Glasshouse Lane than to preserve Rocky Lane, which is essentially just a straight line metalled pathway of little merit of itself.

I'm a supporter of and volunteer for The Campaign to Protect Rural England, electric cars and of pushing for more walking/cycling routes, and I'm disturbed about the loss of so much greenbelt land especially as the case for the number of new houses is not proven.

I'm not against parks. I just want to see the new one re-aligned (with its own car park) and a pedestrian underpass (or traffic light controlled crossing) to allow walkers to reach the A46 footbridge bridge. The need for a car park is perhaps sad but it's a practical necessity (overspill from the current 3 car one is onto Heyville Croft which will not take the vastly increased load a good park will generate as it's not and still will not be easy to get to by cycle under the new plan).

Living where I do, in Mountbatten Avenue, I have problems over the road and parking plans for East Kenilworth. They are detailed in the attachment (which I have submitted to the review process, which I'd like to hope you and the councillors on copy will read and come to a decision about and act accordingly.

From: **RNSpare** <XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX>

Date: Fri, 4 Jan 2019 at 11:45

Subject: Extended Leyes Lane

To: <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

Hello

We have received your leaflet dated January. We wish to comment on the "new extended Leyes Lane to avoid dog-leg". This is the first time we have come across this proposal and have concerns.

We are assuming this means that at the Junction with Dencer Drive/Rawnsley Drive, the junction will be a crossroads rather than a dog-leg, which means the road will shift to cut through the green area between Wisley Grove and Leyes Lane as it is at the moment.

We think this would actually be more dangerous than it is now, as many drivers come down Rawnsley Drive over the speed limit. By having a crossroads we think drivers having to go straight across the junction while on Leyes Lane will be more at risk and can not see any advantage at all of a new junction, unless a roundabout is installed (a mini-roundabout would confer no extra benefit either).

Can you pass this on to the people who wants any comments please.

Please note: we DO NOT wish to be put on any mailing lists.

Thank you,

Nicola

From: **Brian Moreton** <XXXXXXXXXXXXX>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2018 at 13:06
Subject: East Kenilworth Development
To: kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

The revised plan does not eliminate concerns over traffic flows, it simply transfers them to Birches Lane/Glasshouse Lane. Clearly no consideration has been given to existing residents that are dependent on these Lanes and the extent to which they will be able to continue to access them at peak times. The fleet of double-decker buses and parents on the school run going to the new schools together with the new traffic from the development are going to cause major congestion and will be a potential pollution health risk. The Lanes are a popular route for joggers and cyclists and they and the Lanes residents deserve special consideration with regard to their health. Locally we are all too aware of the accidents that have happened at the junctions with Farmers Ward Road, Windy Arbour and other side roads, these and other existing routes need major reconstruction if existing local residents are not to be grossly inconvenienced and put at risk. The Development is going to create more traffic and new traffic flows and this needed to be recognised and properly planned for – it is an essential priority which must be correctly resolved before the Development is started.

While we all wish to see fewer vehicles on our roads, all indications are that by 2030 we will be mostly 2 car families, so it is surprising to see that in the Development Plan there is a lack of provision for car parking spaces (let alone garages) for residents, visitors & delivery vans. Since by 2030 the expectation is we will have switched to electric cars so parking spaces with electric charging facilities need to be a priority. There is no mention of public transport or pull-in areas for bus stops. The Development's roads seem too narrow for buses and waste collection trucks. The deliberate use of the civic centre as a "pinch-point" to discourage non-residential traffic is counter-productive since it will be a greater impediment to residents & bus services etc. There is no indication either of where residents are to store their waste bins, bicycles etc – it doesn't look as if the Development will be any improvement over the old Victorian side streets of Kenilworth. As for pedestrian & cycle routes, these do not seem to provide direct links into the town, the station and the library or anywhere else for that matter. Where too is the sustainable woodland for wood-burning stoves? The new Development ticks the box for the number of homes but in all other respects it fails!

Brian Moreton

From: **Darin Tudor** <XXXXXXXXXXXXX>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2018 at 12:40
Subject: URGENT - Darin Tudor Re: Consultation - Kenilworth Pre submission Neighbourhood Plan
To: <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

Dear Alix

I received your 'Flyer' in my post yesterday on the 'Land east of Kenilworth development' I am very concerned so I have some questions please that I would appreciate your view on;

1. The original 'spine road' looks to have been scrapped for tapping into the existing road network with some roundabouts – With 6,000 additional journeys a day this will cause gridlock at peak times – This is totally unacceptable and increases dramatically the risk to life via accidents to road users, pedestrians and the young school children. Why has this changed?
2. Since the original Secondary school which was a good idea, a new 'primary school' site has appeared – As usual parents on the school run will cause obstructions on this new route and with 6,000 additional journeys a day this will cause gridlock at peak times – This is totally unacceptable and increases dramatically the risk to life via accidents to road users, pedestrians and the young school children, Why has this changed?

3. At the public meeting on the 25th of July 2017 I attended at St Francis Hall the hundreds of other concerned residents and people said the creation of a spine road being was the key issue to acceptance (having a primary school to further impact on this was hidden then), the Council noted this and took it away to action this has been ignored, why?

Also a general question, who do I complain to and what should I say please? and what can you do to help us please?

Regards

Mr Darin Tudor

From: **gurvinder bisla** <XXXXXXXXXX_>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2018 at 13:01
Subject: Land East of Kenilworth Development
To: kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>, planningpolicy@warwickdc.gov.uk <planningpolicy@warwickdc.gov.uk>

Dear Sir / Madam,

Regarding land east of Kenilworth which is due for development. I had a very good discussion with Alix Dearing yesterday from the Green party.

I live at 38 Glasshouse lane, our house sits between the Wardens Sports Ground and Kenilworth Rugby club, we back on to the upcoming development.

I am not opposed to the development but I do have one very specific concern and a more general request.

My specific concern is that our property is adjacent to a farmers track providing access to the fields and a rented cottage (Jersey Cottage), having experienced a burglary last year, I'm very keen to understand - what is the intended use of this track once the development is completed? Plans on the consultation website are not clear. You can understand that I am very keen for a secure boundary to be established. The general plans show eight black access arrows spread around Glasshouse Lane and Thickthorne Close, yet the text clearly states 7 road access points Can you please clarify what the final intended use of the farm track is please?

Secondly, my more general point is regarding cycle and pedestrian routes, given Kenilworth's size and focal point of Abbey Fields, I'm unclear on why the council haven't established safe cycle routes from the East side of Kenilworth to Abbey Fields and other leisure facilities like the Kenilworth Greenway. I urge you to use this and other upcoming developments to vastly improve the cycle routes and pedestrian paths in Kenilworth.

From: **Jenny Sherwood** <XXXXXXXXXXXX_>
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2019 at 16:12
Subject: Fwd: East of Kenilworth Development Brief
To: <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

Below is a copy of the email I have sent to Warwick District Council regarding the East Kenilworth Development Brief. I thought I would forward it to you, for your information.

Regards

Jennifer Sherwood

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jenny Sherwood <XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX>
Date: 10 January 2019 at 15:59:44 GMT
To: planningpolicy@warwickdc.gov.uk
Subject: East of Kenilworth Development Brief

With regard to the above, i wish to comment as follows.

As the owner and resident of 61 Glasshouse Lane, I am probably the most affected by this development, particularly the location of the proposed new roundabout, which is directly in front of the access to my property.

The plan indicates that the roundabout would encroach onto the existing grass verge, bringing the road even closer to my home. This would mean that on driving from my property, any vehicle would be all, or in part, blocking the footpath, until it is able to proceed onto the road.

This roundabout would result in a significant increase in traffic noise, congestion, pollution, safety issues and lights shining directly into the front of my property and also neighbouring properties. The issue of an extra 3000 vehicles accessing the development, has been highlighted by many local residents, and I support their views. Quality of life would be severely affected, surely there has to be a better solution!!

I believe the original concept proposed a "spine road" roughly parallel with the A46, linking Crew Lane with the Leamington Road, allowing traffic to remain within the development. This is surely the logical solution, to have a new infrastructure to support a new development, and not to impact on existing properties and present traffic arrangements. Should the proposed plan be implemented, there would be severe inconvenience as a result of road works and traffic controls, necessary to carry out the work.

Alternatively, serious consideration should be given to relocating the roundabout into the Green Park area, proposed on the other side of the existing Glasshouse Lane, in order to reduce the impact on existing properties.

I hope there will be a positive response to the concerns raised, by myself and other residents, affected by this development.

Mrs Jennifer Sherwood
Sent from my iPad

From: Michael Bullock <XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX >
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2019 at 10:54
Subject: East Kenilworth Housing Development
To: <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

Many thanks for your note on the development and on offering to collate concerns.

I am hoping that the consultation will afford a chance to fast-track an existing problem – i.e. traffic speeds on Glasshouse Lane and Knowle Hill. The current 50 mph section will clearly be reduced as a residential area, not to mention the increased crossing of schoolchildren. It is already too fast though and in appropriate for a short stretch of what is essentially an urban environment. The acceleration up to 50 mph for a short stretch which saves minimal time causes increased emissions and fuel usage, and should be curtailed. As it is so short, traffic tends not to decelerate adequately as glasshouse Lane turns into Knowle Hill, causing traffic hazards with restricted visibility up and down

the bends on Knowle Hill and exiting Crew Lane. The only place for pedestrian crossing is just over the crest of the hill which causes a severe risk to pedestrians if traffic fails to slow down as it should do.

The proximity of the new school will obviously force the council to finally address these issues, but in view of the environmental and safety concerns already existing, can we push for earlier attention please? When HS2 comes along, any construction traffic, or diverted commuter traffic, will exacerbate all these terribly.

Kind regards,

Michael Bullock

From: **Innocent, Martin** <XXXXXXXXXXXXX_>
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2019 at 10:17
Subject: East Kenilworth housing development
To: kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

Whilst at my Mother's house over the holiday period I read your leaflet on the above.

I thought this area was all Green Belt, or has the council removed that protection for its own purpose of building more houses?

If that is the case has the same occurred for the Kings Hill site?

What is the point of Green Belt if the Council can remove the protection at the drop of a hat?

Regards,

Martin

Mr and Mrs G.N. Way

Having studied all the available documents in connection with the proposed East Kenilworth Development, we would like to make the following comments:

1. The siting of the new proposed roundabout in the vicinity of Heyville Croft has raised anxieties for residents in the immediate location.
2. The proposed slip roads connecting the new roundabout with Glasshouse Lane, Heyville Croft and the new road linking with Leamington Road will impact severely on properties in this part of Glasshouse Lane.
3. It would seem more logical from this point of view to site the new roundabout further into the Rocky Lane area thus moving traffic further away from the frontages of properties immediately adjacent to the slip roads.
4. The considerable increase in the expected number of cars will put an intolerable pressure on the roundabout particularly on to Glasshouse Lane. What guarantee can there be that traffic en route for Kenilworth or the A46 coming from Knowledge Hill will not use Glasshouse Lane in preference to the proposed new road through the new estate.

As the development now stands, there will also be considerable impact on a number of adjacent properties in Heyville Croft, and Dencer Drive. How can this be avoided?

We feel that it is important to bring these concerns to the attention of planners. We fully accept the need to build new houses and all the associated services, but surely a minor adjustment to the plan could ease the anxieties of people living in the area?

G.N. and Mrs. G.M.Way.

8th January, 2019.

On Saturday, January 12, 2019, 4:51 pm, Elizabeth Keell <XXXXXXXXXXXX > wrote:

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of the little bit of Leyes Lane (the dog-Leg) I am hugely concerned about the new plans and possible ideas that will impact on our road and nearby.

Having consulted your plans I can see that there are plans to realign the road (Leyes Lane) and I am uncertain about what is involved. I am concerned that you will destroy some or all of the green that lies between us and Wisley Grove and fear the negative impact this may have- as well as the increased level of traffic.

Having sought consultation I have been made aware that you wish to realign the road to improve congestion around our road- what evidence do you have that widening our road or removing some of the green will decrease congestion? Are you indeed planning to alter the green area at all ?

Certainly this is a much loved area by my children who play in the trees and have made dens with other children in our road and we would prefer no alteration to it at all.

You mention in the plans that grass verges and green areas will remain and that this is a concern of yours. We are already concerned about the impact of a school and a housing estate being built to the right of us- what can the realignment add to us?

Are there plans to make our road a cul de sac for example to help reduce the traffic on the dog leg- your plans are indeed very vague.

The small amenity belt of trees and shrubs is attractive and has bio diversity value to us in Leyes Lane and surrounding houses. If you alter this How are you going to add bio diversity by removing key green area and re aligning Leyes Lane?

In addition, the trees opposite us and by us act as a barrier to noise and as we are already concerned about the impact of noise and increasing traffic, removing or altering these will most definitely affect us also. There are at least 11 children in the houses along the small bit of Leyes Lane and we are all keen to ensure safety as well as benefits to residents are considered as a priority.

Please do contact me to keep me updated regarding plans
Elizabeth Keell

From: Gerald Andrews <XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX >
Date: Sat, 12 Jan 2019 at 17:35
Subject: East Kenilworth Housing Development
To: <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

My major concerns are with the much increased traffic associated with the development and the lack of information regarding the following;

1 The dangerous Hidcote road/Crewe lane/Glasshouse lane junction, there have been quite a few accidents here.

2 How will the parking of cars associated with the school pick up and drop off times be controlled. Access to residential properties in Denewood Way, Hidcote road , Leyes lane etc will be severely affected unless control measures are in place, or facilities are provided by the School

3 Have adequate parking facilities been provided at the new School for both Staff and visiting public, if not this will inevitably force some parking out into the surrounding streets etc.

4 With the disruption of road access Into Kenilworth due to HS2 , what provisions have been put in place to ensure that further traffic load is not funnelled down Glasshouse Lane etc.

5 Have the affects of the increased traffic on air pollution been assessed as this is a residential area.

G Andrews

From: Mike Lewis <XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX >
Date: Sat, 12 Jan 2019 at 12:23
Subject: East Kenilworth Housing Development
To: <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

Hi,

I raised an issue with WCC regarding highways issues of the new development (off Crew Lane) and as they had not concluded their review of the transport consequences of the development I was promised a response once they had. I have not received that response.

The issue is the need to either control access to Crew Lane or improve the junction of Crew Lane, Knowle Hill and Hidcote Road which is currently a very dangerous interchange and which is likely to be used much more once the development is occupied.

People will use Crew Lane to access Dalehouse Lane for a speedier route towards Coventry, the M6, M69, M45 etc. Also it may become a preferred drop off point for the senior school.

The increased use of the road , which is not constructed for such a volume of traffic, is not the primary concern but it is the risk of death or injury arising from the poor visibility at this 4 way junction of Crew Lane, Knowle Hill, Gkasshouse Lane and Hidcote Road.

There is nothing on your newsletter plan of the development relating to shops and when meeting the developers they seem to think that the distance to Leyes Lane shops was not a problem. I think the developers should be required to provide a similar sized shopping facility as the Leyes Lane site provides.

i would be pleased if you would represent these views to the planning authority.

Regards

Mike

Mike Lewis

From: AJ <XXXXXXXXXXXX >
Date: Sat, 12 Jan 2019 at 18:37
Subject: East Kenilworth
To: <kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

Hi Alix.

Further to our chat this morning, I did promise to send you some observations on the Development Brief.

The aim of the brief is to establish a framework to inform the various subsequent planning applications that will be submitted by developers/housebuilders once the brief is "approved" by the Council. I use the term approved in its loosest sense, since the brief is not subject to the same rigours as the Local Plan.

So, my observations on the brief and its plan, are directed towards suggesting possible modifications to this framework.

a. Glasshouse Lane. Given that the existing road between Crewe Lane and Rocky lane will provide access to two schools it would be beneficial if the stretch from Rocky Lane to the roundabout serving the Woodside hotel were regulated to 20mph and the existing carriageway narrowed to further inhibit any temptation to speed over the present 30mph limit between the two roundabouts. A similar restriction should apply between the Woodside roundabout and Crewe Lane Junction but maybe narrowing the carriageway would not be appropriate in this instance. Both stretches of the road should have segregated cycleways and appropriate crossings into the school sites.

b. I assume the land use designation, ref 15, will be the location for the shops? Not clear to me but I haven't scrutinised the whole document.

c. If the main spine road has no properties directly fronting on to it then 30mph would be appropriate between Rocky Lane and Leamington Rd.

You mentioned the need for a traffic study of Kenilworth. I understood a strategic level assessment had been undertaken by the County and that in turn informed the various schemes for the key junctions. Not sure if that however has considered co-ordination of signals along the Warwick/Leamington Rd junctions which will be within close proximity in relative terms. Without it there could be junction blocking in the peak hours. As someone who is retired it may not trouble me but if not sorted out there will inevitably be later junction tinkering schemes.

As I mentioned if you think I can assist, by way of offering my considered views on matters don't hesitate to contact me. I think the real opportunity to comment on and influence the details of the housing layouts will come when the applications and the pre-application publication efforts of the developers/housebuilders follow in due course.

Best Regards

A

From: Teresa Douthwaite <XXXXXXXXXXXX>
Date: Sun, 13 Jan 2019 at 09:23
Subject: Kenilworth Town Plan
To: <Kenilworthgreenparty@gmail.com>

As one of the many residents resigned to the fact that no consideration what so ever will be given to our views and needs, I am left with only one comment to make.
Taking into account the sheer devastation that will be made to the surrounding area, especially the local wildlife, will I ever hear our owl again? I am ready to sacrifice even Rocky Lane, the main haunt of dog walkers!! For the spine road to continue through the new estate.
How can it be considered sensible to keep it when all the traffic problems will be considerable and Glasshouse Lane, a quiet road will become the North Circular of the Town.

Listen to sense for just once.
Teresa and James Douthwaite