

**To the Planning Officer concerned with the
'Land East of Kenilworth Development Brief'**

Geoff and Jacqui Mexson



13 January 2019

Dear Sir / Madam

We would like to make the following observations about the proposed development as outlined in the Development Brief.

Although we live in Thickthorn Close and our property backs onto the land concerned with the proposed development we support this development as it will be good for Kenilworth. However, we have been concerned for some time as to how this development might affect us and the value of our property. Having studied the Brief we are pleased to see that two of our concerns have been addressed.

- (a) We note that the spinney that backs onto our property and runs along Jordan Close from Thickthorn Close to the A452 is to be retained and, in any case it contains some very large protected trees.
- (b) The planted verges on Thickthorn Close are to be retained. These are a unique feature in Kenilworth and are very much part of the ambience of the Close. In addition, this is sensible from a cost point of view as almost all of the services either run along these verges or across them (including electricity, communications, rainwater and sewage drainage and gas).

These conditions must be rigorously protected and developers prevented from infringing them, not least in accordance with the comment on page 44 to 'minimise the impact on existing residential properties'.

However, we have one serious concern about the proposed development and that concerns access into and out of the new development from Thickthorn Close. In this respect the Brief is unclear – in fact confusing, as it includes several contradictory statements about this! Some of the comments in the Brief are as follows:

- (a) It shows a secondary road within the residential development at the end of Thickthorn Close with a sole access point into Thickthorn Close which is specified as a 'secondary access'. (See Figure 57 on page 145). Surely this should be classed as a primary access if it is the only one?
- (b) Elsewhere the Brief states that access into Thickthorn Close is for pedestrians and cyclists only and is not intended for vehicular access. How are the residents in the new development to get their vehicles in and out as elsewhere it states that access into this residential development should not be from the spine road and at least one plan shows this completely sealed off from the rest of the development by a green barrier?

- (c) The brief also suggests that access via Thickthorn Close could be used by emergency vehicles. How is this to be designed such that it is suitable for such use but other vehicular traffic is prevented from doing so?
- (d) The Brief also acknowledges on page 86 that Thickthorn Close is not appropriate as a main access way and defines how access via this route should be restricted (to pedestrians and cyclists).
- (e) Figure 22 on page 49 purports to show 'Access and Connectivity at Site Level' and does not show any access from Thickthorn Close!

One of the problems in using Thickthorn Close as an access way into the development is its width (at 4.75 M it does not even conform to the specification for a secondary route which is set at a minimum of 6M – see page 154). This is evident even without the development as we have seen on several occasions that heavy vehicles have had to use the planted verges to get past parked visiting cars or delivery vans!

However, of even more concern is the junction at the top of Thickthorn Close onto Birches Lane which is definitely not for use by heavy vehicles. This is not suitable for the safe exit of such vehicles and will almost certainly cause traffic congestion on Birches Lane and accidents. My car is slightly larger than standard and I find that I have to be very careful when exiting Thickthorn Close in order to not cross into oncoming traffic on the other side of the road. Plus, on many occasions vehicles turning into Thickthorn Close cut the corner and put cars coming out at risk.

Whilst access through Thickthorn Close for pedestrians and cyclists would not be a problem, vehicular access certainly would be if there were to be a significant number of cars. Even worse, in fact dangerous, if heavy goods vehicles (delivering to the residential properties) were allowed to access via Thickthorn Close. Quite how the access could be designed to allow cars and emergency vehicles but not other traffic is difficult to envisage. That is why it does not make sense, as suggested in the Brief, to not allow vehicular access into and out of the residential area from the new spine road but direct all traffic along the A452, round the St John's giratory, along Birches Lane, down Thickthorn Close and into the adjacent residential development!

I would also emphasise that construction traffic should not be allowed to use Thickthorn Close for any reason.

Please take account of this concern which, if not clarified and corrected, would certainly adversely affect existing local residents - the prevention of which is one of the significant protections in the Brief.

We would be grateful for confirmation that these observations have been received and will be considered, either by email or letter.

Yours sincerely,

Geoff and Jacqui Mexson