

Report of Public Consultation

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
71298	Mrs G Hopkins		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concern about volume of traffic, particularly with other new developments taking place (e.g. Kings Hill)</li> <li>b) People will always use their cars as the first choice of transport</li> <li>c) There is not an efficient public transport system so most people will not use the bus</li> <li>d) Proper cycle paths should be in place for public safety prior to any new build</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) All committed and Local Plan allocated developments have been considered in the development of the transport strategy in the Kenilworth Development Brief. A significant amount of mitigation is focused in sustainable travel initiatives to encourage alternative modes of transport</li> <li>b) It is understood that many people prefer to use their cars. However, it is important to promote and encourage alternative modes of transport. If routes are safe and legible for pedestrians and cyclists, then this will encourage a modal shift</li> <li>c) Contributions will be sought from developments towards public transport and the Brief includes information on the proposed provision of two bus services to support the development. Furthermore, it promotes connectivity between the development and the railway station</li> <li>d) Cycle paths will be provided along the</li> </ul>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				spine road at the time of its construction and other routes will be provided at an appropriate time in the construction of each phase of development	
71236	Mr P Rolfe		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Generally supportive</li> <li>b) Recommend putting the community centre and shops next to the schools so that people can use the facilities and parking whilst dropping off children</li> <li>c) Concerned that too many houses are proposed alongside the A46 with the associated noise and exhaust pollution</li> <li>d) Recommend the employment land is located alongside the A46</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted, thank you</li> <li>b) We do not want to encourage parents/guardians to drive their children to school or encourage congestion in the vicinity of the schools. The location of the community centre and shops near to the central park and employment site will allow people to walk to/from those destinations. Furthermore, the broad location for these facilities has been chosen when considering the location of other local centres, e.g. Leyes Lane, to ensure a reasonable spatial distribution in the wider area</li> <li>c) Noise and air pollution will be key considerations in the assessment of planning applications in the area and applications will need to demonstrate that dwellings provide an acceptable living environment for future residents</li> <li>d) The employment land is located on land allocated for this use in the Local Plan and is already to be located</li> </ul>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				alongside the A46	
71320	Prof. O Pikhurko		<p>a) General objection to adding new dwellings to Kenilworth is that the town does not provide many employment opportunities and development will put a strain on already busy rush-hour traffic</p> <p>b) There are currently unused post-industrial sites around and in Coventry. Coventry has better connections, many large employers and developing new dwellings there would be a much better use of resources</p> <p>c) It seems that existing sports pitches and clubs would be demolished without building new facilities. There should be a study exploring whether the available public sports facilities in Kenilworth would be sufficient and adequate after the proposed development</p>	<p>a) The examination of the Local Plan considered the location of new housing sites in the District. This site was deemed to be appropriate for development. The Local Plan also allocates 8 hectares of employment land on the site, thus offering more employment opportunities</p> <p>b) Coventry's Local Plan proposes development on many such sites and does not have the availability of sites to fully meet their own housing needs, thus Warwick District is required to meet some of the shortfall</p> <p>c) Kenilworth Rugby Club and Kenilworth Wardens will only move from the site if they are able to relocate to new sites elsewhere in the town and are actively working on relocation plans</p>	No amendments proposed
71462	Mr A Entwistle		<p>a) Difficult to understand the documents. The maps are at a scale too small to see the detail and the language should be different for the public to understand. Is there an alternative method to seeing exactly what is planned?</p>	<p>a) The maps are considered to be at an appropriate scale for the information each depicts. For a number of the plans, it should be noted that this is a reasonably high level masterplan and is not intended to drill down into fine grain detail that would be expected for a planning application. It is considered that the language used is appropriate</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				and balances the need for wider understanding and the necessary use of technical terms	
71305	Mr J Baly	J B Landscap e Architects	<p>a) The strip of woodland between Rocky Lane and the hotel is a fabulous mature woodland which is enjoyable for walking. The proposals show this woodland retained as a narrow strip with no buffer between it and the 'Preferred Primary School Site' and adjacent housing. Recommend ensuring there is a wide buffer between the retained woodland strip and the housing and school site. The best option might be to have the playing fields of the school stretched out along the length of the woodland belt rather than have housing right up to the edge of the woodland. The playing fields could then act as a suitable buffer</p> <p>b) Ensure there are walking routes/links formed, i) down Rocky Lane to cross the A46 bridge and on into Ashow; and ii) to pass through the woodland south of the retained hotel to cross the A46 on the footbridge and on to Stoneleigh Manor, passing through the woodland between the A46 and the B4115 Stoneleigh Rd</p>	<p>a) It is considered that the woodland already offers amenity value. Developments will be expected to have an appropriate relationship with the woodland and utilise it as an asset and may have the potential to incorporate landscaping to complement the woodland. Detailed planning applications will determine appropriate relationships between development and existing features including woodland and the scheduled monument. Further significant landscape buffers will however result in a large land take thus potentially affecting the viability of housing delivery</p> <p>b) Both existing footpaths are to be retained and the Brief seeks improvements to them to encourage their use to improve safety and further encourage their use. Further text to be added in Public Rights of Way section to support improvements to the A46 footbridges, where necessary. This will also be identified in Table 6,</p>	To improve safety and further encourage their use, propose to add further text in Public Rights of Way section to require improvements to the A46 footbridges, where necessary to meet modern safety standards, e.g. raising height of railings. This will also be identified in Table 6, Infrastructure Requirements

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				Infrastructure Requirements	
71237	Mr C Nichols		a) Good mix, right location	a) Noted, thank you	No amendments proposed
71238	Mrs J Nichols		a) Well thought through. Good mix of dwellings. Good location	a) Noted, thank you	No amendments proposed
71239	Mr R Dolan		a) This land was green belt, and while it has been re-designated, wouldn't it be far less contentious to develop the land west of Kenilworth above Rouncil Lane or even further south west which seems a far wider space	a) The examination of the Local Plan considered the location of new housing sites in the District. This site was deemed to be appropriate for development. Land to the west of Kenilworth is constrained for development purposes largely owing to the impact development would have on heritage assets	No amendments proposed
71301	Mr J Miller		a) Knoll House, Glasshouse Lane in ED2 is an early 18 <sup>th</sup> Century farmhouse which is a distinctive feature of the area and should be retained as it doesn't take up much land. This would help retain the character of the area. Retaining the house and its trees would garner some goodwill in the community and perhaps soften the aggressiveness of the plan as a whole	a) The farmhouse is not a statutory listed building, nor a locally listed building and it is not located in a conservation area. Furthermore, it is not in the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan as a 'Local Non-designated Heritage asset'. Therefore, whilst it's loss is unfortunate, the building has not been identified as being a building of significant merit worthy of retention. It sits on land recently allocated for education use and specifically where Kenilworth School are to relocate and it is unlikely that this will be able to be retained as part of their proposals	No amendments proposed

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
71314; 71315	Ms M Wahlberg		<p>a) HS2 is not mentioned in Chapters 4 or 5 and should be. HS2 will have a significant impact on land east of Kenilworth and so should be evaluated. HS2 and the development will be taking considerable amounts of agricultural land and there will be further impacts on the viability of agricultural holdings in this area</p> <p>b) There needs to be analysis of noise in the area – both existing and from HS2</p>	<p>a) HS2 is mentioned in Ch1, Ch7 (transport and noise sections) and Development Principle 5C d) specifically aims to ensure noise from HS2 is appropriately considered. Other than potential noise, it is considered that HS2 will not have a major impact upon this development, except the need to ensure the construction of highway schemes are programmed appropriately with HS2 construction to minimise disruption. The loss of agricultural land on the site was deemed to be acceptable through the Local Plan examination</p> <p>b) Planning applications will be required to include noise assessments relating to existing noise/potential noise generation. Mitigation measures will be required where necessary</p>	No amendments proposed
71333	Mr S Robertson		<p>a) Concerned the A452/A46 roundabout already gets very busy at rush hour with long queues and another 1000 homes are likely to make this junction even busier. Please carefully consider this to minimise the impact</p>	<p>a) WCC acknowledge that there are existing issues on the network at this location. A series of transport schemes to address the whole network in this area have been identified. These have been tested with the full allocation of housing and background growth. The schemes will be subject to further rigorous testing and will have to be</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				agreed by Highways England	
71308	Mr K Harvey		<p>a) The land is part of the increasingly important buffer that separates Kenilworth from Coventry and this plan contributes to the steady chipping-away of the two conurbations morphing into one large metropolitan sprawl</p> <p>b) The levels of road traffic in the area has steadily risen over the last ten years and the point has passed at which residents' quality of life is being degraded. Short journeys now take much longer and most of the time is spent sitting in stationary traffic</p> <p>c) Further development should be resisted as the area is full</p>	<p>a) The examination of the Local Plan considered the location of new housing sites in the District. This site was deemed to appropriate for development. Coventry is situated to the north of Kenilworth and this development is to east Kenilworth</p> <p>b) If any air quality issues arise from the development appropriate mitigation will be required as part of planning applications. Substantial traffic analysis has been undertaken as part of the preparation of this Brief and the Local Plan examination. The Brief promotes walking and cycling to encourage travel behavioural change</p> <p>c) See point a) above</p>	No amendments proposed
71457	Prof D Clark		<p>a) Concern there is insufficient recognition of the implications of building in east Kenilworth for flooding in Ashow. Equally a failure to recognise the opportunity to substantially reduce flood risk by separating that part of the catchment of the Ashow stream that falls west of the A46, from the rest of the catchment. The aim must be to ensure that any precipitation that falls west of the centre line of the A46 stays west of the centre line of the A46</p> <p>b) Would like to see WDC prepare a comprehensive drainage plan to achieve this. No building must be allowed in the Ashow stream catchment in east Kenilworth until the</p>	<p>a) Flooding has been considered in the Development Brief and includes Development Principles relating to flood risk and drainage. Both the Lead Local Flood Authority (WCC) and Severn Trent Water being involved in the production of the Brief. Sections on flooding and drainage will however be updated and added to in light of the consultation response received by the Lead Local Flood Authority (see rep ref:</p>	Amendments to be made as per response to rep: 71354 by WCC Flood Risk Management; and also reference to the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP4

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>drainage plan is implemented in full and signed off by the Council</p> <p>c) Properties in north Ashow are at risk of flooding from the Ashow stream. This rises in east Kenilworth, flows in a pipe under the A46, through Thickthorn Wood, alongside Rocky Lane, and through a narrow culvert in the village. The stream did not evolve to drain the built-up area of east Kenilworth and the A46. The culvert is unable to cope in periods of heavy rainfall. The risk of flooding was increased substantially when Knight's Meadow in east Kenilworth was built c.30 years ago and when the Highways Agency 'improved' the drainage of the A46 in 1997. Ashow stream was a convenient drainage channel. In neither case did the responsible authorities consider the implications for those who live downstream</p> <p>d) Properties in Ashow were flooded in 1993, 1996, 1998 and 1999 and close to being flooded in 2007</p> <p>e) Following 1999 WDC co-ordinated mitigation measures including installation of a by-pass culvert in the village. The Highways Agency promised to create holding ponds in Thickthorn Wood but this never happened. The by-pass culvert has helped, but it was only ever seen by WDC as part of the solution</p> <p>f) East Kenilworth must be made drainage-neutral by the creation of holding ponds and the blocking of the pipe under the A46. This would enable the catchment of the Ashow stream to be halved in size. Convinced from my study of local hydrology and rainfall that this will end the risk of flooding once and for all</p>	<p>71354) and to ensure reference is made to Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP4 part I). Best practice for the design of surface water drainage systems is to mimic natural catchments and to ensure that watercourses are not severed from their natural catchments. This also ensures that flood risk is not increased elsewhere with new flows. Current planning legislation and WDC's Local plan policies state that there must be no increase in surface water runoff from developments in comparison to existing greenfield run off rates</p> <p>b) See a)</p> <p>c) See a)</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) Noted</p> <p>f) See a)</p>	<p>part I to be added</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
71240	Mr R Newham		<p>a) Crewe Lane – The proposals are in part not feasible and they represent a missed opportunity to create a high quality pedestrian and cycle environment. The proposal means that Crewe Lane will need to remain open to two-way traffic for its entire length since there is a residential access adjacent to the Knowle Hill junction. The retention of two-way traffic will mean that the carriageway width cannot be narrowed and the speed of the significant remaining eastbound traffic is on average likely to increase due to the very low opposing westbound traffic flow. If the existing carriageway width is retained there is insufficient land along a significant length of Crewe Lane to enable provision of a continuous footway on the south side. Even if the land can be acquired to enable provision of a continuous footway the pleasant rural character of the road will be substantially harmed since substantial hedgerow and trees would have to be removed. This proposal will leave Crewe Lane as a poor environment for pedestrians and cyclists and it will be damaged environmentally.</p> <p>It is not necessary to retain eastbound traffic on Crewe Lane and a better pedestrian and cycle environment could be achieved if it were closed to vehicular traffic at its junction with Knowle Hill. Crewe Lane west of the spine road would still need to remain open to two-way traffic for access to frontages but all through traffic would use the spine road of the developments, which can be designed to cope with it. Traffic volumes on Crewe Lane west of the spine road would then be very low making it</p>	<p>a) This is a design principle/concept which will have to be worked into more detail. The intention is that traffic will be “access only” and not be able to make through movements. This may be achieved through further restrictions. All schemes will be subject to thorough reviews, modelling and road safety audits. The document does not and should not go into the level of detail that would be expected within a planning application. The flows are expected to be low because of the planned restrictions and therefore options such as on-carriageway cycling or vehicle passing place(s) may be considered</p> <p>b) As above, further analysis will be undertaken prior to determining the optimum scheme for this junction. The scheme will be subject to Road Safety Audit, at which point issues such as these will be addressed. WCC will consider full closure except for access when negotiating appropriate mitigation with developers</p> <p>c) Modelling evidence does not suggest this junction will be a congestion issue. Furthermore, in the medium term the</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>cycle and pedestrian friendly. The need for provision of a footway would be removed thus retaining the existing pleasant character of the road.</p> <p>Crewe Lane would become a very pleasant environment that would encourage walking and cycling and be a great asset to the area for recreational walking. This proposal would also remove vehicular movements into and out of Crewe Lane at the Knowle Hill junction thus simplifying that junction. This proposal would also be cheaper as it would not be necessary to construct a footway on the south side of Crewe Lane</p> <p>b) Crewe Lane/Hidcote Rd/Knowle Hill junction – The proposal for this junction is welcomed but the opportunity can be taken to further improve safety at the junction at a lower cost. It does not deal with the blind right turn from Knowle Hill into Hidcote Road. The higher volume of traffic that will use this route following development will increase the risks associated with the blind right turn. It will be a missed opportunity if the right turns are not removed as part of this junction improvement.</p> <p>A much simpler and cheaper scheme for this junction would be to close vehicular access to and from Hidcote Road and Crewe Lane. With the spine road in place and the improved junction at Leyes Lane there is little reason to retain these movements. This proposal would remove the disruption and cost of constructing the carriageway realignment and junction table. In this way a safer, cheaper and less disruptive solution is available</p> <p>c) Common Lane/Coventry Road junction – Whilst this</p>	<p>proposed A46 Link Road (Phase 2) will further reduce impacts here as it will offer an alternative route due to delays caused by the signals on Common Lane</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			junction is somewhat remote from the main development it is likely that traffic volume will increase here as a result of development. Egress from Common Lane to Coventry Road is already difficult at busy periods and this leads to risk taking at the junction and to traffic inappropriately using Woodland Rd as an alternative. Larger vehicles such as buses find the junction difficult if traffic is queued on Common Lane. It is justifiable to fund signalling this junction as an off-site highway improvement. The savings from the two proposals above would fund this improvement		
71463	Mr G Bisla		<p>a) Not opposed to the development but have one specific concern and a general request</p> <p>b) What is the intended use of the farmer's track providing access to the fields and a rented cottage (Jersey Cottage)? Concerned about ensuring a secure boundary to properties in Glasshouse Lane. The general plan shows 8 black access arrows on Glasshouse Lane and Thickthorn Close yet the text states 7 road access points</p> <p>c) Unclear 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. This and other upcoming developments should be used to vastly improve the cycle routes and pedestrian paths in Kenilworth</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) This is answered on p84 of the draft. It is unlikely that the access will be considered appropriate as a main access point into the wider site and any development off the access would need to demonstrate its connectivity with the remainder of the site in terms of design and sustainable travel routes. Detail relating to securing boundaries will be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage. There should be 7 not 8 black arrows on Figure 22 and this will be amended</p> <p>c) The Development Brief strongly promotes and encourages cycling. Fig.24 shows proposed cycle routes and the Brief identifies that developers</p>	<p>Amend Fig.22 to ensure arrows denoting access to Woodside Hotel and Woodside Lodge are accurate</p> <p>Additional plan to be provided showing how the development will be connected to destinations in the town</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				will be required to contribute towards the delivery of this cycle network which will connect the site to other destinations. An additional trip generators plan will be added and show key destinations which the development will be expected to connect with to fully integrate with the existing town	
71328	Mr R Seaber		a) Currently no safe cycling route from Kenilworth to Abbey Park in Stoneleigh. There will be more vehicles on the road following development making it worse. Stoneleigh Park and the NAC is just across the A46 from Kenilworth with many businesses based there, now is the perfect time build a cycle way from Kenilworth to both business parks. With hundreds of workers and even more visitors to the NAC wouldn't it make a great showcase for Warwickshire to show how it's connecting people to their workplaces. It will have health benefits for employees too	a) The importance of providing cycle access to Stoneleigh Park is recognised and the options for providing links will be investigated further as part of WCC cycle network planning work	No amendments proposed
71453	Mr R Evans		a) There are TPOs on the trees that border the new development with the bottom of the gardens on Birches and Glasshouse Lane. Please ensure that the TPOs on the land to be developed and land adjacent to the development are fully respected b) Underground waste water drains – There is at least one waste water pipe which takes considerable water from Birches Lane and Glasshouse Lane where it is suspected it is ultimately allowed to soak away on land towards the A46. This pipe runs through rear gardens of the last	a) The trees in question are protected by a group Tree Preservation Order. All trees within that area are protected and consent would be required for works to trees. This does not mean that there could be no works to those trees, just that consent would be required. The Brief supports the retention of mature trees unless there is strong justification for their removal	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			houses in Birches Lane and the first house of Glasshouse Lane facing the development. It briefly enters a corner of the Rugby Club (where there is an inspection cover) and then heads towards the A46. Please ensure that the water that this pipe carries is adequately dealt with and not just ignored as it will cause future problems	and also encourages landscaping between new development and existing dwellings in that area b) Public sewers, including, waste water (Foul) sewers are the responsibility of Severn Trent Water (STW). However, site specific flood risk assessments submitted with planning applications will consider existing sewers and the LPA will consult STW on these applications	
71460	Mr T & Mrs B Steele		<p>a) Figure 28 Indicative proposed Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane/Hidcote Lane junction – proposed one-way system at north west corner of Crewe Lane will limit access to our property and be detrimental to our occupancy and also reduce the value of the property (object)</p> <p>b) Concept Plan Figure 56 Pedestrian and Cycle Connectivity – Proposed cycleway/footpath opposite Golf Club entrance on the boundary between Southcrest and Crew Gardens. For 40 years we have had permitted informal access from the garden of Southcrest to our Arboretum adjoining Crewe Lane. We note the Development Brief wishes for the Arboretum to be retained. If we do not have direct access – garden to ‘tree garden’, we will be prevented from working on the upkeep of the Arboretum. We keep the Arboretum paths mown and from late July we keep the grass round the trees rough mown to prevent a thicket of brambles obscuring and damaging the trees. There is also often arboriculture to attend to, to keep the</p>	<p>a) The schemes identified in the Kenilworth Development Brief are design concepts and will be subject to further design and assessment. Any change to the highway network which will alter access to your property will be appropriately consulted upon and access arrangements to existing properties will be an important consideration. The intention of the scheme is to reduce the through traffic and to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>b) We wish to see the arboretum retained. However, do not believe that the provision of a cycle/footpath between Southcrest and Crew Gardens would prevent the ongoing</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>trees in good health. Without this access there is a risk of the Arboretum becoming neglected and we would probably then apply for planning for maybe 4 self-build housing plots as the best way to preserve as many trees as possible (object)</p> <p>c) We object to the homes of Knoll House and Southcrest Farm being demolished</p>	<p>maintenance of the arboretum</p> <p>c) The properties are located within an allocated site for education use on a site identified by Kenilworth School and supported by the Local Plan Inspector for the construction of a new school and it is unlikely that they could be retained through this process</p>	
71241	Mr P Slater		<p>a) Please make sure there is a decent noise barrier alongside the A46 otherwise the new development will be marred by excess traffic noise. This will also improve the environment for current residents</p>	<p>a) Development Principle 5C covers this issue. Development proposals will be required to provide appropriate noise mitigation the extent and nature of which will be determined through planning applications. Given that the relationship between different parts of the site and the A46 varies, a one size all approach to mitigation is not appropriate</p>	No amendments proposed
71395	Ms J Stratton		<p>a) Speed of traffic on Glasshouse Lane – many cars travel along this road above 30 mph. What will be done to improve the compliance of traffic with the speed limits?</p> <p>b) The part of Glasshouse Lane that I live in will form part of the proposed spine road. Concerned that there will be a huge increase in traffic, bringing noise and air pollution. We would prefer there is a completely new road built that keeps the additional traffic away from existing properties</p> <p>c) Concerned that there is no new doctor's surgery on the development. What is being done to make sufficient additional provision for the new residents as the houses</p>	<p>a) Speed limits on Glasshouse Lane will be reduced near to the proposed Secondary School to 20 mph and the creation of two roundabouts along Glasshouse Lane will assist in naturally slowing traffic along stretches of the road</p> <p>b) There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development site, as set out in the Development Brief. There</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>are built?</p> <p>d) There are some dangerous spots on Glasshouse Lane e.g. turning for Windy Arbour, the corner by the Woodside Conference Centre, the blind hill on the Crewe Lane junction. What is being done to address these areas?</p> <p>e) If Glasshouse Lane is going to be the site for new schools what is being done to provide pavements, cycle routes etc without damaging trees and hedges?</p> <p>f) How will the community centre be run? The current centre in Kenilworth has struggled to gain funding, how will the new centre be funded to ensure it remains viable?</p> <p>g) How will the development be built to ensure that amenities, shops, doctors, school etc are built at the right time to avoid overload on the existing amenities?</p>	<p>will be an inevitable increase in volume of traffic due to an increase in development in the area, however the impact of these changes will be mitigated as much as possible, with significant improvements for sustainable modes of transport. Noise and air pollution mitigation will be an important consideration at the detailed design stage and in the assessment of planning applications</p> <p>c) The South Warwickshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has confirmed that the quantum of development does not justify a new GP practice on the site. They will however require contributions from developments to support improving the facilities and enable the expansion of existing GP practices in the town</p> <p>d) The Transport Assessments required to support each development site will be subject to detailed Road Safety Audits. The speed limits will be subject to reviews and where necessary appropriate speed limiting measures will be identified</p> <p>e) To promote sustainable travel, it is essential that pedestrians and cyclists</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>have the ability to travel safely to schools and this will require appropriate facilities for these users. Where possible trees and hedges should be retained and protected</p> <p>f) It is expected that the construction costs and initial running costs of the community centre will be provided by housing developers and that a community development worker and centre manager will also be funded through developer contributions. It will be down to the community centre to become self-financing and sustainable once the developer funding ends</p> <p>g) Where considered necessary and appropriate trigger points are included in the Development Brief to ensure infrastructure is delivered at the required time</p>	
71242	Mr P Gebbels		<p>a) Can I assume that an effective acoustic barrier of some form will be introduced between the A46 and the new development?</p> <p>b) Will the existing tree preservation order which covers the boundaries of the Thickthorn development area effectively preserve this natural habitat?</p>	<p>a) Development Principle 5C covers this issue. Development proposals will be required to provide appropriate noise mitigation. Given that the relationship between different parts of the site and the A46 varies a one size all approach to mitigation is not appropriate</p> <p>b) The trees in question are protected by a group Tree Preservation Order. All</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				trees within that area are protected and consent would be required for works to trees. This does not mean that there could be no works to those trees, just that consent would be required. The Brief supports the retention of mature trees unless there is strong justification for their removal and also encourages landscaping between new development and existing dwellings in that area	
71296	Mr F Hurst		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Consultative documents understate the ability of both Glasshouse Lane and Birches Lane to cope with the large volumes of cars/traffic that will be generated by the development</li> <li>b) Kenilworth already struggles to cope with current levels of traffic through the town, traffic jams along St. John's island/Warwick Rd/Leamington Rd are the rule, not the exception. It is quite common for traffic to back up all the way along Birches Lane towards Glasshouse Lane because of congestion at the St.John's island/Warwick/Leamington Rd area</li> <li>c) Adding more feeder roads from the new estate into Birches Lane &amp; Glasshouse Lane will make Warwick Rd/St John's island traffic stationary with consequential actions of motorists looking for 'rat runs' around side streets (as can be witnessed now due to the temporary closure of Common Lane)</li> <li>d) The traffic survey was flawed in measuring current</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The initial assessments of the sites in Kenilworth were undertaken as part of the Strategic Transport Assessment to support WDC Local Plan. The impacts of traffic generated from new developments was assessed and appropriate mitigation identified for the areas discussed</li> <li>b) WCC acknowledge existing issues and have identified mitigation measures to address the impact of development traffic. WCC are bound by policy in the National Planning Policy Framework where impacts on the road network should not be "severe" when compared to forecast reference case conditions</li> <li>c) It is for these reasons that the</li> </ul>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>volumes of traffic, the assessment of the existing roads to manage with increased levels of traffic is wrong</p> <p>e) More work should be done with Highways England to find a way of traffic accessing the A46 directly from the development. The current road proposal is not an acceptable solution for either the motorist, the resident, the town, the air quality and ultimately will have a negative impact on Kenilworth's ability in attracting new inhabitants and businesses</p> <p>f) The second thing that needs to be looked at closely is the viability of creating a one-way road system around Warwick Rd and Waverley Rd to try and keep traffic moving more freely</p> <p>g) Something needs to be done about delivery vehicles blocking Warwick Road. This is a major cause of off-peak traffic jams and damage to pavements. Should be more 'delivery only' spaces in car parks at the rear of the shops on both sides of Warwick Rd, combined with more rigorous traffic warden patrols to stop kerb parking will help alleviate congestion and improve air quality</p>	<p>Development Brief recommends a high quality link road principally through the development sites, improvement and signalisation of St Johns gyratory and have recommended significant sustainable travel improvements</p> <p>d) All analysis is based upon future forecast conditions and meets all government</p> <p>e) It is not possible to create a new junction on the A46 due to a number of constraints including Ancient Woodland, gradients and proximity to existing A46 junctions. Major improvements to the 2 existing Kenilworth access junctions are planned, as set out in the Kenilworth Development Brief and the Strategic Transport Assessment</p> <p>f) This was not identified as being necessary linked to the proposed development sites. When requesting mitigation from developers there must be a clear link between development impact and the mitigation required</p> <p>g) This is an operational issue and not directly related to the proposed development site</p>	
71289	Ms C	Duckfield	Can see a number of issues:	a) The location of the Local Centre	Add a sentence in

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Duckfield	Property Development	<p>a) There is a spine road, which by its nature should be to ensure the smooth flow through the development which is great but then there is a main street right in the centre which by its nature will cause congestion</p> <p>b) There is a projected budget for bus route support but no indication of how many years these funds will cover and how it will be funded when these funds have been used</p> <p>c) There is no proposal on how the existing infrastructure will cope with 1400-2800 extra vehicles. The A46 and A452 into Leamington are already heavily congested and the Stoneleigh Junction is equally busy at peak times. Can see nothing in this proposal to address the infrastructure of Warwickshire as a whole to keep things moving. A cornerstone of all major building schemes going forward should be to improve the road infrastructure as these activities are implemented so that the roads stand a chance of keeping up with future demands</p>	<p>adjacent to the spine road is considered appropriate. The final layout and relationship between the spine road and local centre will be a matter for the detailed planning application. Traffic, pedestrian and cycle movements will be a key consideration in determining the most appropriate final layout</p> <p>b) P91 of the Draft Development Brief states that this will cover the services for 6 years. The expectation is that the routes will be (largely) self-financing at the end of this period</p> <p>c) The details relating to the ability of the transport network (existing and proposed mitigation) to cope with the demands linked to the housing are contained within the Strategic Transport Assessment for the Local Plan available on WDC website</p>	the Development Brief regarding financing of the bus services after the 6 year period
71243	Mr D Crawley		<p>a) Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane/Hidcote Rd junction shown in Figure 28 – having made several representations on behalf of residents of Hidcote Rd since March 2015 about the dangerous nature of this junction, we are pleased to see this proposal</p> <p>b) However, with the plan showing that houses/primary school are to be built on the triangle of land adjacent to Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane, the complete closing of</p>	<p>a) Noted, thank you</p> <p>b) Further analysis will be undertaken prior to determining the optimum scheme for this junction. The scheme will be subject to Road Safety Audit, at which point issues such as these will be addressed</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Hidcote Rd would help to remove the traffic risks of the existing and new access road junctions		
71458	Ms L O'Connor		<p>a) It is essential that the existing green belt in this town is protected</p> <p>b) Concerned there won't be an efficient and effective transport system if careful attention is not paid to several roads. The junction where Crewe Lane meets Glasshouse Lane is presently a danger to pedestrians and vehicles. It will be very close to the new school and needs altering. The length of Glasshouse Lane, from its junction with Rawnsley Drive needs footpaths on both sides and the road needs upgrading. Safety must be a top priority</p> <p>c) Other roads will also need upgrading and co-ordination is required between all parties to relieve traffic congestion. The A46 is to be upgraded, HS2 works will begin soon and for the benefit of all road users, there needs to be a holistic approach to all of these traffic problems</p> <p>d) The St John's Gyratory and the Rouncil Lane/Warwick Road junction and traffic hold ups in Kenilworth town centre need sorting before any more housing developments take place</p> <p>e) A new 420 pupil primary school will generate extra traffic. Access points to this must be carefully considered, together with traffic management at peak times</p> <p>f) Concerns over meaningful consultation between residents and applicants during the planning application stage</p> <p>g) Public transport is necessary to relieve the road congestion, with the thread of a reduction in the number of buses</p>	<p>a) This development does not result in the loss of any existing green belt. The land was removed from green belt when the Warwick District Local Plan was adopted in September 2017</p> <p>b) The Development Brief proposes changes to the Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane junction. A new footpath is likely to be required outside the front of the new secondary school</p> <p>c) WCC as Local Highway Authority, in association with other organisations, will co-ordinate with one another and seek to minimise disruption. Individual developments will be required to submit a construction management plan which will also seek to minimise disruption. However, it should be noted that any impacts of construction will be short term issues not permanent</p> <p>d) The Development Brief proposes improvements to St.Johns Gyratory and requires these at an early stage in development</p> <p>e) Noted. However, the Brief is to be amended to indicate two smaller</p>	Clarity to be added to Brief that footways will be required to serve the new school

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>h) The lack of policy funding will mean that new developments will be difficult to police, emergency services are already working to capacity and more doctors, dentists and retail outlets will be required</p> <p>i) Landscaping will be needed to make a pleasant environment</p> <p>j) Drainage could be a big issue when houses are built</p> <p>k) The infrastructure for the development must be put in place</p>	<p>primary schools thus dispersing traffic movements</p> <p>f) The Local Planning Authority has no powers to insist upon public consultation prior to the submission of planning applications. As indicated in the Development Brief applicants are however strongly encouraged to undertake meaningful consultation</p> <p>g) New and altered bus services are proposed to serve this development</p> <p>h) Warwickshire Police and South Warwickshire CCG have been consulted on this document and have provided a response. Retail outlets are proposed and there is potential for a dental surgery to be provided in the Local Centre if there is demand and a proposal for this</p> <p>i) Agreed. The Brief requires appropriate landscaping as part of developments and seeks to retain existing landscape features</p> <p>j) Drainage matters are covered within the Brief</p> <p>k) Agreed. This Brief is a tool to identify infrastructure needs required to serve the development</p>	
71327	Mr R		a) Will have a significant and detrimental impact upon	a) WCC acknowledge existing issues and	No amendments

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Clarke		<p>existing residents along Birches Lane, Glasshouse Lane and certainly the spur roads of Farmer Ward, Windy Arbour, Moseley Rd, Dencer Drive and Leyes Lane. The impact of so many vehicles suddenly utilising this piece of road, both in rush hour and school runs will lead to deterioration of quality of life, ability to freely access and traverse roads adjacent to the immediate and surrounding properties</p> <p>b) The spine road must continue through the entire new development from the A452 and into lower Crewe Lane</p>	<p>have identified mitigation measures to address the impact of development traffic. The Development Brief proposes a high quality link road principally through the development sites, improvement and signalisation of St Johns gyratory and recommends significant sustainable travel improvements</p> <p>b) There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief. The spine road proposed is continuous, it utilises existing infrastructure in places</p>	proposed
71332	Mr S French		<p>a) Please ensure that parking is fully taken into account with any planning permission for the E1 employment land. The area on the plan does not look large enough to handle enough parking spaces especially considering the lack of overflow or alternatives nearby. While green policies such as buses and cycleways will obviously be promoted it is certain that most employees, customers and visitors to the E1 area will still take cars. There is no other parking outside of E1 close by other than the residential estate and the A452 Leamington Rd (and specifically the access roads opposite the site where limited residential parking is available)</p> <p>b) Concerns over the access to the A452 Leamington Rd from</p>	<p>a) It is envisaged that parking will be provided within the employment site in accordance with WDC's recently adopted Parking Standards SPD (2018) and employers will be required to provide travel plans to promote sustainable modes of travel</p> <p>b) As part of the detailed planning application process, the development site access will be subject to further detailed modelling, design, safety audits and will also have to be assessed by Highways England prior to accepting</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>this development. It is proposed that there is an entrance/exit road on the A452 as well as one off the A452/A46 roundabout for the business element. The A452 is a key road into and out of Kenilworth as well as the main route to Leamington/Warwick and the access to the main A46 arterial route for the south of Kenilworth. It is important that this is kept moving and even now the road is at a standstill at busy times. Adding a main junction where the current exit for that site is would cause terrible traffic flow issues (even at today's traffic levels prior to any development). Surely it is better to have all traffic (except for cycles) use the new exit on the A452/A46 roundabout to keep traffic on the A452 moving better</p>	<p>an access solution</p>	
71288	Mr B Moreton		<p>a) No consideration given to adverse difficulties for existing ratepayers living in the area along Birches Lane and Glasshouse Lane. There are existing serious hazards of traffic joining from Windy Arbour and Farmers Ward Rd junctions and this is before the queueing and challenge of St Johns roundabout. The plan needs a new road running through the development that would relieve traffic along Glasshouse &amp; Birches Lane as well as serve traffic from the new development, not create traffic problems for the area</p> <p>b) Question the need for 2,800 extra houses to be built. The Town's existing ratepayers should not be inconvenienced by having overspill from other towns dumped upon them. The plan should give explicit details of the towns existing population's housing needs and meet that requirement and no more, otherwise we are in danger of becoming a sprawling metropolis of Kenilworth, Leamington and</p>	<p>a) WCC acknowledge existing issues and have identified mitigation measures to address the impact of development traffic. WCC are bound by policy in the National Planning Policy Framework where impacts on the road network should not be "severe" when compared to forecast reference case conditions. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development, as set out in the Development Brief. The spine road proposed is continuous, it utilises existing infrastructure in places. However, it has been designed to</p>	<p>No amendments proposed</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Warwick with a complete loss of identity. The focus should not be on building the maximum number of houses but rather provide an area that is pleasant to live in – we don't need more Victorian slums</p> <p>c) The Plan fails to recognise that its roads need to be wide enough for buses and Council waste collection vehicles not to impede other traffic. It needs to be realistic and provide at least parking space for 2 vehicles per dwelling as well as designated pedestrian &amp; cycling routes from all parts of the development to other areas of the town, new schools, shops &amp; surgery</p>	<p>mitigate impacts of the development and in addition to improvements at St Johns, will minimise delays in the area.</p> <p>b) 1,400 dwellings are estimated in this area and 2,000 across the whole of Kenilworth. The examination of the Local Plan considered the location of new housing sites in the District. This site was deemed to be appropriate for development. This Development Brief promotes good design that respects and utilises existing features, in order to ensure a pleasant place to live and work</p> <p>c) The Brief supports the provision of pedestrian and cycle routes to other destinations and it is envisaged that parking standards will be in accordance with the District's Parking Standards SPD (2018). The width of roads are expected to conform with the standards set out in the Development Brief</p>	
71293; 71294	Mr E King		<p>a) The road system cannot take all this traffic. Roads with any slowing of traffic will be a complete failure. The development is too much for this side of Kenilworth and will cause rat runs</p> <p>b) Drainage issues</p> <p>c) Air pollution will be a major problem from</p>	<p>a) The details relating to the ability of the transport network (existing and proposed mitigation) to cope with the demands linked to the housing are contained within the Strategic Transport Assessment for the Local</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>A46/development traffic</p> <p>d) HS2 and this development will be a nightmare during construction and then once built with new school traffic to the relocated school</p>	<p>Plan available on WDC website</p> <p>b) No further detail is made on this point. However, the Brief includes sections (Objectives 5 and 8 in Chapter 6) on drainage matters</p> <p>c) Planning applications will be required, through air quality assessments to demonstrate that air pollution will be acceptable to the end users of development</p> <p>d) WCC as Local Highway Authority, in association with other organisations, will co-ordinate with one another and seek to minimise disruption. Individual developments will be required to submit a construction management plan which will also seek to minimise disruption. However, it should be noted that any impacts of construction will be short term issues not permanent</p>	
71299	Ms G Walsh		<p>a) Very disappointed that the proposed spine road is now not included in the plans. Why has this been removed? It is going to have a tremendous impact on existing roads where junctions need to be created</p> <p>b) Glasshouse Lane and Birches Lane are entirely unsuitable for such a high volume of traffic. None of the existing roads, in particular Leyes Lane, are capable of carrying greater volumes of traffic &amp; are totally unsuitable for</p>	<p>a) A continuous spine road is included in the plans and utilises existing infrastructure in places. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief. WCC are satisfied that the spine road</p>	No amendments proposed

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
			roundabouts/traffic lights	<p>as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic</p> <p>b) The details relating to the ability of the transport network (existing and proposed mitigation) to cope with the demands linked to the housing are contained within the Strategic Transport Assessment for the Local Plan available on WDC website</p>	
71245	Mrs J Jones		a) Concerned that the plan sees existing GP surgeries able to cope with what will be a very large increase in population. Both surgeries have extended their provision as much as what seems practical on their current sites. Hard to see how they provide adequate healthcare to the proposed increase in population	a) The South Warwickshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has confirmed that the quantum of development does not warrant a new GP practice on the site. They will however require contributions from developments to support improving the facilities and enabling the expansion of existing GP practices in the town and have liaised with the practices on this matter	No amendments proposed
71244; 71247; 71248	Mr A Palmer		<p>Using Glasshouse Lane as part of the spine road would mean two things:</p> <p>a) 1. Given there will be possibly 3000 more cars using the route, the peak hour traffic would be much higher than now. All current road users, particularly those living on or just off the part of Glasshouse Lane that will become a spine, will be impacted</p> <p>b) 2. The southwestern end of Glasshouse Lane/Birches Lane</p>	<p>a) The details relating to the ability of the transport network (existing and proposed mitigation) to cope with the demands linked to the housing are contained within the Strategic Transport Assessment for the Local Plan available on WDC website</p> <p>b) The proposed spine road is the</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>will be used instead of the new spine road by many wanting to go into or north/northwest of Kenilworth. Current dwellings will be impacted. A proper spine road through the entire new housing area from Leamington Rd to Crewe Lane would reduce the impact. The current plan adds impact</p> <p>c) Cars will not be able to safely exit Heyville Croft when turning right</p> <p>d) The planned linear public park should be reoriented to be roughly parallel to Glasshouse Lane and the spine road could go all the way through the new development without having to make use of Glasshouse Lane. No significant amenity would be lost but traffic flow would be better and existing dwellers would not be seriously impacted</p> <p>e) Can't see any new parking for the central park. Currently there are about 3 spaces at the Glasshouse Lane end of Rocky Lane. Overspill parkers already use Heyville Croft (often parking dangerously on the corner). It is good to promote arrival on foot or by cycle but in practice car parking is required. Reliance of Heyville Croft and possibly Mountbatten Avenue cannot be the plan. There has to be ample public parking within the new development area for visitors to the central park and other 'green' areas</p> <p>f) Spine Road junction with Glasshouse Lane near Heyville Croft - extending the end of Mountbatten Avenue to meet Mayfield Drive by Warton Close would provide an alternative route to Kenilworth and other places to the north (like Balsall Common/ Knowle/ Solihull) for existing</p>	<p>optimum solution given the known constraints</p> <p>c) Network changes will be subject to Road Safety Audits</p> <p>d) The Development Brief identifies a number of constraints that would mean routing the spine road directly through the centre of the site would be undesirable</p> <p>e) The central park is not proposed to be a destination park, such as Abbey Fields. It is likely to be primarily used by residents living in the local vicinity and sustainable modes of travel will be encouraged. A small level of car parking may be considered appropriate and this will be explored at the detailed planning application stage</p> <p>f) This would introduce rat running on residential roads not designed to cope with increased levels of demand</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			residents at relatively low cost. This would avoid residents having to try to join a busy road (Glasshouse Lane) if they are travelling to local shops (via Dencer Drive and Leyes Lane) or the above, more distant areas. It would take some pressure off Glasshouse Lane and might eliminate the need for the traffic island near Heyville Croft. Closing the Glasshouse Lane end of Heyville Croft could then be considered. The above should be seen as a fall back option if the correct solution (having a true spine road all the way through the new development) is not adopted		
71295	Ms E Deeley		<p>a) We want to buy a 4-bedroom family house on the new development. However, we do not want to pay over half a million for the house so are concerned about the costs. Also we do not want to buy a house next to 'affordable housing' of which are social houses because we feel it is not quite fair. 40% affordable housing is far too much</p> <p>b) It's great new houses are finally coming to Kenilworth. I hope it brings professionals into the area from all over England. Two new schools is excellent, will one be a catholic school as there is only one in Kenilworth which is overprescribed?</p>	<p>a) Affordable housing can provide opportunities for those who cannot afford to pay full market value. WDC remains committed to the delivery of 40% affordable housing</p> <p>b) Noted. Under current Government policy, all new schools will be Free Schools. At this stage it is not known which Academy Sponsors will apply to run the primary schools</p>	No amendments proposed
71250	Mr A Milton		<p>a) Good principles in regards to cycling but fails to give priority to cycling and pedestrians over cars – it still accommodates cycling and pedestrians rather than designing on their behalf</p> <p>b) It is essential that the approach to the spine road is not watered down. The road could be potentially dangerous for non-car users so must be made safe including appropriate crossing points</p>	<p>a) The Brief proposes high quality provision for cyclists both within the site and to key destinations in and around Kenilworth. Design work will be undertaken on these schemes at an appropriate stage and will be based on recognised design principles and guidance</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			c) The mention of connections to wider cycle routes are not sufficiently explained or detailed and are essentially meaningless. If this is not to become a well-intentioned white elephant these plans need to be detailed now	b) The Brief seeks a high quality cycle route on the spine road and to ensure this is accessible from all areas of the development through provision of suitable crossing points. c) The cycle network plan identifies a number of future routes to connect the site to key destinations within the town and further afield. It will be ensured that these connect conveniently to the on-site cycling provision. Design work on these routes will be undertaken at the appropriate stage	
71339 and 71340	Mr E Kirwan		a) Chapter 8 p145 shows vehicular access into the site from Thickthorn Close leading to a secondary route around the site. P144-145 indicate this will be the only access point into the site (there is no connection shown to the new spine road). If it is the 'only access it can't be considered as secondary b) Objection on the following: i. The above would require traffic from the A46 and Leamington Rd to access the site via the St John's Gyratory system, then Birches Lane and Thickthorn Close ii. Ch 7 p84 makes reference to the potential of using Thickthorn Close as an Access but states 'they will be unlikely to be considered appropriate means of main access points...' It also states	a) The term primary route is used to determine the principal transport corridor through the development site. Thickthorn Close does not fulfil this function and therefore is referred to as a secondary route. b) WCC Highways do not foresee an issue with a small number of dwellings being accessed via Thickthorn Close and not connecting to the spine road. Detailed access arrangements will be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage. The Brief is seeking to identify Thickthorn Close as providing pedestrian and cycle links to	Wording on p84 to be reviewed and amended if necessary for clarity  A 'Proposed Access' drawing similar to the 'Existing Access' drawing, Figure 22, might be added  Amend Figure 61

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>‘Impact upon residential amenity will be a consideration when assessing the suitability of these access points. While not proposed for vehicular access the accesses do offer good potential for use as emergency access points and enable opportunities for good connectivity to the existing town for walking and cycling’</p> <p>iii. P49 Ch 5 Figure 22 indicates the existing access points to the whole development site and sensibly does not refer to an access off Thickthorn Close</p> <p>iv. By making the access via Thickthorn Close there will be a loss of amenity to existing residents, an increase in traffic onto existing streets and a subsequent increase in risk to pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>v. It seems appropriate to positively plan for and integrate the new development with pedestrian and cycle connectivity only at the ends of Thickthorn Close but with all vehicular access being provided off the proposed Primary Routes</p> <p>c) Property Types and Scale – Ch 8 p150 indicates a mix of bungalows as well as 2 and 3 storey properties being located in the section of the site between Thickthorn Close and Leamington Rd. P150 also states ‘it is recommended that the scale of properties is similar to the scale of neighbouring properties’. Object based on the fact that Thickthorn Close is primarily made up of bungalows whereas the plan indicates the majority of new dwellings being 2 and potentially 3 storeys</p>	<p>the existing town and also potentially serving a small number of dwellings, which may help with development phasing, but it would not be desirable for there to be a vehicular link with the spine road</p> <p>iii. This is an ‘Existing’ access drawing that only shows current access points into the site</p> <p>iv. Whilst a matter for detailed consideration through a planning application, it is unlikely that the provision of a small number of additional dwellings accessed off Thickthorn Close will result in any significant harm to the amenities of existing residents</p> <p>c) Fig 61 identifies new development closest to this road as being ‘2 storey properties with some bungalows’ which is considered appropriate and flexible. To the north-east of the road it does indicate ‘Predominately 2 storey buildings with some 3 storey buildings at key locations’ and it is agreed that 3 storey properties immediately adjacent to Thickthorn Close may be unsuitable. However, beyond any new dwellings immediately adjacent to Thickthorn</p>	<p>to change the block to the north east of Thickthorn Close to ‘2 storey properties with some bungalows’ and add a ‘Predominately 2 storey buildings with some 2 storey buildings at key locations’ further into the development site (mirroring the block to the south west of Thickthorn Close)</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				Close, 3 storeys may be considered appropriate	
71459	C O'Connor		<p>a) This vast scheme must take into account all of the other proposed housing schemes in Kenilworth and their likely impact on the town. In particular, there needs to be a co-ordinated and holistic approach to alleviating the current traffic congestion in the town. Without the necessary measures being in place matters will only become worse. There needs to be a comprehensive strategic plan to enable Kenilworth to function normally whilst achieving the satisfactory completion of all of these works</p> <p>b) I note that the St.John's gyratory and various road junctions in the town are to be improved at some point. Perhaps these could be incorporated into the overall plan, thus saving much inconvenience?</p> <p>c) Query the location of the new secondary school. It could not be any further from the eastern side of Kenilworth. This will cause more vehicle movements and is extremely bad for the environment in terms of air pollution</p> <p>d) At present it is a very slow tortuous journey to Leamington in the morning. To now propose to add further access points to the A46 Thickthorn island would be folly and only compound delays. This junction requires a total reconfiguration possibly with an over bridge for the Kenilworth/Leamington traffic. No doubt developers would suggest a sophisticated traffic light system which would be cheaper, but lead to longer queues</p> <p>e) Kenilworth needs a north/south bypass possibly from improving the road from Stanks interchange northwards</p>	<p>a) The examination of the Local Plan considered the location and amount of new housing sites in the District. This site was deemed to appropriate for development as were other sites in Kenilworth. The Local Plan evidence base included a series of Strategic Transport Assessments which considered the impact on the highway network, please refer to WDC website for details. It is acknowledged that various development is proposed in and near to Kenilworth and therefore WCC as Local Highway Authority, in association with other organisations, will co-ordinate with one another and seek to minimise disruption. Individual developments will be required to submit a construction management plan which will also seek to minimise disruption. However, it should be noted that any impacts of construction will be short term issues not permanent</p> <p>b) This Development Brief identifies junctions that require improvements and does include them in the overall</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			to the Wroxall island to help diverting any Birmingham traffic	<p>plan</p> <p>c) The location of the land allocated for education, and to include the secondary school, was considered in detail through the Local Plan examination and this was deemed the only appropriate site within the town. Despite its position to the east of the town, the school remains accessible on foot for the majority of residents</p> <p>d) Any changes to the highway network will be subject to detailed modelling analysis and road safety assessments. The additional arm is one option to be considered, however through the development and analysis of the scheme alternative arrangements may be identified. The final option must be demonstrated to be a workable solution for both Warwickshire County Council and Highways England</p> <p>e) This would not be a proportionate response to the scale of development proposed irrespective of other significant constraints</p>	
71249	Mr D Tudor		a) The original 'spine road' looks to have been scrapped for tapping into the existing road network with some roundabouts – this will cause gridlock at peak times. This is totally unacceptable and increases dramatically the	a) This is the only spine road that has been tabled by WDC and therefore is the original spine road. There are various constraints in providing a spine	No amendments proposed (except for primary school locations)

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>serious potential risk of injury and to life via accidents to road users, pedestrians and the young school children</p> <p>b) Re: the 'primary school' site – parents on the school run will cause obstructions. This is totally unacceptable and increases dramatically the serious potential risk of injury and to life via accidents to road users, pedestrians and the young school children</p>	<p>road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief</p> <p>b) Parking for schools will be considered carefully and sustainable travel will be encouraged to minimise such impacts. Note, the primary school locations are proposed to change (see Executive Report)</p>	
71336	Ms J Mullaney & Mr J Saxelby		<p>a) The original spine road roughly parallel to the A46 linking Crewe Lane with the Leamington Road should be re-introduced. The present plan is not satisfactory as Glasshouse Lane is not suitable to carry the increased volume of traffic. It is already used as a 'rat run' and is very busy at rush hour times. There is a dangerous sharp bend by the hotel and conference centre, and many other junctions which need consideration. The junction of Windy Arbour and Birches Lane is already dangerous, and more traffic might be tempted to go that way instead of taking the spine road at the roundabout at Heyville Croft, as shown on the present plan. A spine road parallel to the A46 linking Crewe Lane with Leamington Road is a much better and safer option and should be re-introduced</p>	<p>a) This is the only spine road that has been formally tabled by WDC. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief</p>	No amendments proposed
71452	Mr P and Mrs S Chatland		<p>a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p>	<p>a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p>	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71355;	Mr M	Kenilwort	<p>a) KRFC acknowledge the need for an overall comprehensive</p>	<p>a) Noted, agreed</p>	Requirements of

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
71356; 71357	Blakeman	h Rugby Football Club (KRFC)	<p>Development Brief for the East of Kenilworth development and have been supportive throughout the process and have provided positive and constructive input during the development of the brief</p> <p>b) Vision for greenspace within the site – Whilst it is accepted that there is a need and a statutory obligation to provide public open space within the entire East of Kenilworth Development commensurate with the increase in dwellings, the provision of one central multi-functional open space (Diagram 43, Page 106) in which the location of the central park and its size would account for circa 50% of the developable area of the land controlled by KRFC on the land known as ‘The Cowpatch’. On this basis the value that is likely to be achieved based on the valuations provided by Bruton Knowles to WDC would render KRFC’s relocation unviable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unlike the other landowners (apart from the Wardens), KRFC need to fund their entire relocation from the proceeds of the sale of their grounds. As WDC are aware, The Cowpatch is on a long leasehold from the Trustees of Stoneleigh Estates and therefore KRFC will only receive a portion of the proceeds from the sale from which they will have to fund the entire relocation. This will entail significant upfront funding which will have to be obtained from the appointed developer – at a significant cost.</li> <li>- For KRFC to be able to relocate the following conditions will have to be met in connection with The Cowpatch in order to ensure the viability of the</li> </ul>	<p>b) Whilst there remains a strong desire to deliver a central park, the size of this park will need to be scaled back to ensure it can be delivered in the context of the requirements of the Public Open Space SPD. This revision will feature in the revised Development Brief. The updated Brief will include a principle that site owners will not be disproportionately adversely impacted by non-value generating land uses. It is acknowledged that KRFC and the Wardens require the development value from their existing sites to be sufficient to enable their proposed relocation to alternative sites. If there remain significant concerns regarding development viability, following the above changes, these will be matters for consideration at the detailed planning application stage</p> <p>c) Following detailed dialogue with promoters Catesby and Barwood as well as with the Department for Education and WCC, the Brief is to be amended to indicate two smaller primary schools on land under the control of Catesby and Barwood. With</p>	<p>central park to be revised in appropriate sections of the Brief.</p> <p>References to the primary school requirements and location(s) will be amended in the Brief. The Masterplan will be updated</p> <p>An updated version of the Cycle Network Plan will be included</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) A minimum developable area of 12.5 acres</li> <li>ii) No requirement for further public open space within the site</li> <li>iii) A reduction in the level of affordable housing required within the overall development</li> <li>iv) No requirement for any Section 106 payments</li> </ul> <p>- Our advisors consider that on the basis that the development complies with our strategic requirements, then a relocation on the site allocated within the Local Plan is indeed financially viable.</p> <p>c) Masterplan – The various plans published in connection with the Masterplan Design Principles show an incorrect boundary between the Wardens land and the KRFC controlled land. This boundary does not tie in with the proposed additional access from Glasshouse Lane. The net effect of the revised boundary (if correctly interpreted) means that, once again, the area of the KRFC retained land would be further reduced in order to accommodate the proposed primary school. This substantially affects the viability of the entire relocation</p> <p>d) Furthermore, Figure 57 shows the secondary access route being routed around the site allocated for the primary school. This further encroaches into the KRFC controlled land. This is at variance with the access concept prepared as part of the Transport Study. It is unlikely that the diagrammatic routing of the proposed access into the balance of the residential land will provide an acceptable highways solution.</p>	<p>the removal of the proposed primary school on the central parcel of the site this section of the masterplan will be redrawn and due regard will be given to land ownership boundaries</p> <p>d) As per c) the masterplan will be redrawn. However, we highlight that the Masterplan is indicative and therefore the precise layout of infrastructure will be come forward as part of the detailed planning process</p> <p>e) The cycle network plan highlights an indicative route for this connection and will be updated to reflect these comments. Identification of the preferred alignment will take place at the appropriate stage in the future development of this route</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			e) Proposed cycle routes – Although outside of the East of Kenilworth Development Brief area, the proposed expanded cycle network as indicated in Figure 24 shows a proposed link between Leamington Road and Warwick Road. The cycle route crosses through private woodland over which Warwick DC have no control and then crosses the land allocated for KRFC with the route going right though the proposed location of the Clubhouse		
71251	Mr B Birkett		<p>a) Section 2 - The employment land should be laid out so the orientation of the building roofs maximises the generation of electricity by solar panels. The angle of slope of the building roofs should also maximise the generation of electricity by solar panels. The buildings should harvest and store rainwater for flushing toilets</p> <p>b) Sections 1 and 4 – delivery of a mix of housing and social and community infrastructure (same points as above)</p>	<p>a) The orientation and specific detail individual buildings will be a matter for detailed planning applications. However, we encourage developments to be designed sustainably and in an environmentally conscious way and developments will be required to accord with Policy CC1 ‘Planning for Climate Change Adaption’ of the Local Plan which refers to building orientation</p> <p>b) See a)</p>	No amendments proposed
71312; 71313	Mrs C Wilkes		<p>a) Unhappy with the spine road being on Glasshouse Lane between Crewe Lane and Rocky Lane. This is already a busier road than it was and the additional traffic the development and school will bring will be too much for the existing residential area. Request consideration of a spine road linking Crewe Lane and Leamington Rd closer to the A46 as this would alleviate some of the additional traffic east Kenilworth will have</p> <p>b) P44 (Chapter 5) – If the intent of the development</p>	<p>a) The proposals put forward are considered acceptable in highway terms. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief</p> <p>b) Effort has been made to minimise the impact of the entire development on</p>	No amendments proposed

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
			<p>proposals is to 'minimise the impact on existing residential properties' the proposed location of the spine road is inconsistent with this aim</p> <p>c) Request that any lighting along Glasshouse Lane is sympathetic for the residential housing in the vicinity, i.e. not high lampposts and not high glare</p>	<p>existing residential properties. The proposed spine road is considered the most appropriate in order to deliver the development as a whole with as little negative impact as possible taking into account other material considerations</p> <p>c) This will be addressed at detailed design stage. Lighting will be designed to an appropriate level and will be subject to the same polices as other lighting in the surrounding area and should have due regard to other considerations such as ecology</p>	
71381; 71382	Mr D Van Gils		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	b) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71440	Mr T Spencer		<p>a) Support objections submitted by Mr E Kirwan</p> <p>b) Concerns over traffic on Thickthorn Close. Since Thickthorn Manor became a nursing home there has been an increase in traffic created from staff at changeover periods and from visitors at weekends. The side road is often lined with cars parked as an overspill from the Manor. During morning rush hour, the traffic jam on Birches Lane often reaches the entrance to the Close and it is difficult to exit and add to this blockage. With 10-15 houses adding possibly another 20-30 cars exiting onto</p>	<p>a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p> <p>b) WCC Highways do not foresee an issue with a small number of dwellings being accessed via Thickthorn Close and not connecting to the spine road</p>	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Birches Lane the problems will be increased at this pinch point. Traffic emanating from the development should be directed to the new spine road		
71464	Ms M MacDonal d		<p>a) The building of the new primary school, retail outlets, commercial and community buildings is not scheduled until the development is two thirds completed, i.e. before the 1000<sup>th</sup> house. Could this be done earlier in the development?? Are there safeguards to stop developers walking away leaving the last few houses unbuilt and no primary school, retail outlets, commercial and community buildings?</p> <p>b) There is no mention of improvements to the road into Leamington Rd beyond the A46 roundabout. Heading into Leamington is already very busy and there is no safe cycle route. Is one planned?</p>	<p>a) Trigger points for the delivery of infrastructure will be agreed in legally binding documents between developers and the District and County Council</p> <p>b) Items 1, 14 and 23 of Table 2 in the Brief do identify improvements including the K2L (Kenilworth to Leamington) cycle route, improvements to the A452 Bericote Roundabout and the dualling of the A452. Provision of a continuous cycle route along the A452 between Kenilworth to Leamington is a high priority future cycle scheme. Contributions towards this route will be sought from the East Kenilworth development</p>	No amendments proposed
71300	Mr G N and Mrs G M Way		<p>a) The siting of the new proposed roundabout in the vicinity of Heyville Croft has raised anxieties for residents in the immediate location. The proposed slip roads connecting the new roundabout with Glasshouse Lane, Heyville Croft and the new road linking with Leamington Rd will impact severely on properties in this part of Glasshouse Lane</p> <p>b) Would seem more logical to site the new roundabout further into Rocky Lane thus moving traffic further away</p>	<p>a) Designs will be subject to Road Safety Audits and consultation. The impact of all highway schemes upon existing properties will be an important consideration at the detailed planning stage</p> <p>b) Where feasible it would be preferable to locate the roundabout further from</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>from the frontages of properties immediately adjacent to the slip roads</p> <p>c) The considerable increase in the expected number of cars will put an intolerable pressure on the roundabout particularly onto Glasshouse Lane. What guarantee can there be that traffic en-route for Kenilworth or the A46 coming from Knowle Hill will not use Glasshouse Lane in preference to the proposed new road through the new estate</p> <p>d) 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?</p> <p>e) Fully accept the need to build new houses and the associated services, however a minor adjustment to the plan could ease the anxieties of people living in the area</p>	<p>residential properties. However, it is also important to protect the woodland at Rocky Lane and moving the roundabout would potentially impact upon this. This will be considered at detailed design stage</p> <p>c) The spine road would be the quicker and shorter route. Whilst we cannot guarantee that all traffic will take this route it will be the most desirable route</p> <p>d) Refer to responses a) and b)</p> <p>e) Noted</p>	
71321; 71322; 71323; 71324	Mr M Harper		<p>a) Table: Kenilworth Transport Development Plan Key (p94-97) – 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 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</p> <p>b) Vision and green space within the site (p107) – Soft green edges etc should also apply to the new school site</p>	<p>a) Agree – scheme 22 should have an estimated delivery date of 2021</p> <p>b) Agree. However, the wording already identifies the requirement for soft, green edges to the ‘development site’ which includes the school site</p> <p>c) i. Development Principles 5C c) and 5D b) address this point ii. The Development Brief already does seek to protect residential amenity of existing residents. No further changes are considered necessary iii. Development Principle 5A j) already</p>	<p>Amend Table 2, scheme 22 to change estimated delivery date to 2021</p> <p>Some additional detail to be provided regarding site ED2</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>c) Development Principles 5C &amp; 5D – Noise and air quality (p114-115):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) 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 protection. Two sets of traffic lights, slow moving and standing traffic, vast people and vehicle movements 24/7 is not something to be dismissed</li> <li>ii) 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</li> <li>iii) There should be a requirement to retain or enhance all existing hedge boundaries and trees wherever possible in order to maintain wildlife. This 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</li> <li>iv) 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? The issue is of just as much importance to other parts of the development as well as the existing built environment. Issues such as drop off points and</li> </ul>	<p>addresses this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. The Brief will be updated to provide assurance that the future design and layout of the educational allocation will positively respond to existing site features, existing neighbouring properties and proposed neighbouring development. However, the Brief will not go into detailed design principles as per the residential properties owing to the unique nature of bringing forward education facilities. We will continue to work closely with the school and WCC to ensure the new school meets the educational requirements as well as respecting neighbouring properties.</li> <li>d) It is considered that an education and residential use are likely to be compatible alongside each other and therefore no significant buffer is required. However, all developments will be expected to include appropriate landscaping</li> </ul>	

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
			noise limitation need addressing d) Employment land (p63) – This provides for a buffer zone between the employment/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		
71292	Ms D Kings		a) Agree entirely with Mr Kirwan’s comments but would like to add that the loss of amenities to existing residents who are predominantly elderly in Thickthorn Close, would cause a great deal of stress. The increase in heavy traffic would obviously incur greater air pollution affecting residents with health problems	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan’s representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71331	Mr N and Mrs R Clark		a) Object to the access on Thickthorn Close. The close is unsuitable to take the type of traffic, well intentioned how it seems will only act in future as a main entrance. The primary route is very close to the island junction that carries fast moving traffic	a) WCC Highways do not foresee an issue with a small number of dwellings being accessed via Thickthorn Close and not connecting to the spine road. Changes to the highway will be subject to Road Safety Audit	No amendments proposed
71454	Mrs G Taylor		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan’s representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71455	Ms S Lee-Wright		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan’s representations (rep refs: 71339

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
					and 71340)
71436	Mr R Bruce		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71254	Mr G Stewart		<p>a) Ch 5 highlights requirement for consideration of the relationship with neighbouring buildings. However, the proposed Glasshouse Lane/Spine Rd/Heyville Croft 3-arm roundabout (Fig.31) does not consider the detrimental impact the roundabout will have on adjoining properties (in particular nos.59, 61 and 63 Glasshouse Lane) and the impact which using the road for the middle section of the spine road would have on properties in that location due to the resulting increased traffic, including the 51 properties which exit onto Glasshouse Lane from Heyville Croft</p> <p>b) Access to/from no.61 would be a particular problem and all 3 properties would incur considerably increased traffic noise and have vehicle headlights pointing directly at them</p> <p>c) Although there is mention of priority access it is unclear how this would operate for cars joining Glasshouse Lane from Heyville Croft</p> <p>d) Concerns could be overcome by routing the spine road through the new development. Cycle and pedestrian access across Rocky Lane could be maintained by a bridge over the road</p> <p>e) Alternatively, the concerns could be alleviated by siting</p>	<p>a) The design will be subject to further assessment and consultation. There are physical constraints, road safety and ecological constraints to consider if moving the location of the junction. The protection of residential amenity and access arrangements for existing residents are important considerations and will be fully considered in the detailed design of this junction. The feasibility of siting the roundabout slightly further into the site should be considered at the detailed design stage</p> <p>b) As per a)</p> <p>c) As per a)</p> <p>d) As set out in the Brief, there are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. A bridge would be excessively costly and likely impact upon the viability of development</p> <p>e) As per a)</p>	Additional text to be added to the Development Brief regarding the need to consider residential amenity and access to existing residential properties in the final design of the two proposed roundabouts and highway schemes relating to the development in general

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			the new roundabout further into the development site, reducing the impact on adjoining properties. A further possibility would be to utilise the land of the non-residential property at 56 Glasshouse Lane		
71286	Mr A Fox		a) Ch 9, p151 – Traffic problems likely by having two access points. At peak times the flow of traffic past the indicated Leamington Rd junction is extremely heavy and the consequence of constructing a further traffic inflow at this point would add to the burden that drivers have to face during the weekday commute. Far better would be to use solely, the junction directly from the A46 roundabout, through the industrial sector and onto the spine road. Two junctions are unnecessary when one will suffice, remove the spine road junction onto the main Leamington bound main road	a) Whilst the Brief identifies two accesses as the preferred option this may not ultimately be the final scheme as there are other potential options. The final design will be subject to further detailed analysis and will also have to be agreed with Highways England	No amendments proposed
71432	Mr R and Mrs D Collins		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71309	Mr K L Gray		a) Endorse the points made by Mr E Kirwan b) Since their construction the rose bed borders to properties on Thickthorn Close have been tended by the householders, new roses bought as necessary, with all such labour and expense carried by themselves. These borders greatly improve safety and convenience for children and older pedestrians. Further, as your proposals implicitly accept you cannot possibly consider widening the road	a) Noted. See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340) b) No widening of the road is proposed in the Development Brief, nor is it inferred	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
71443	Ms T Wheat		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Realise what a great deal of work has gone into the document</li> <li>b) Very concerned about the lack of real commitment by WDC to keep this area developed by the Arden Regional Landscape Character Area designation especially concerns over the ancient woodlands and hedgerow. Who decides whether the removal of the mature landscape 'enhances the development?' 'Feasible' and appropriate' are not words developers understand</li> <li>c) Drainage – what damage could be done to the ancient landscape by developers mitigating pluvial flooding?</li> <li>d) Car ownership and infrastructure: car ownership is above average, public transport in Kenilworth is poor. Need to ensure that each development provides ample off road parking. Roads must be wide enough for buses and not have cars parked on the streets or grassed kerbs</li> <li>e) By having the secondary school on this new site the traffic along Glasshouse and Birches Lanes will be horrendous at certain times. Care must be taken not to allow nearby roads to become rat runs</li> <li>f) Traffic flows in Crewe Lane do not mention changes due to HS2</li> <li>g) Birches Lane maybe needs to have part time traffic signals on the new proposed St John's roundabout</li> <li>h) All accommodation should have their own outside space</li> <li>i) No student accommodation should be allowed, the town centre is already oversubscribed</li> <li>j) Affordable rental accommodation for young people should be provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted, thank you</li> <li>b) We will be encouraging developers to retain mature trees and hedgerows. The specific details will come forward as part of planning applications relating to the site which will be determined through the planning process</li> <li>c) Any potential damage caused by flood mitigation measures would be considered through the planning process</li> <li>d) All developments will be expected to meet the standards laid out in the Parking Standards SPD. Road widths are to be designed in conformity to the Highways Authority requirements</li> <li>e) This development Brief has included substantial highway analysis and planning to help mitigate this. The examination into the Local Plan identified the proposed school site as appropriate for that use</li> <li>f) HS2 is not expected to significantly impact traffic flows on Crewe Lane. Any impacts during construction will be temporary although all efforts will be made to manage the impact upon the local highway network</li> <li>g) The gyratory at St Johns will become a</li> </ul>	<p>Wording to be added to the Brief highlighting the requirement for Electric Vehicle charging points to be provided (as required by the Local Plan and Parking Standards SPD)</p> <p>Text on p86 to be amended regarding signalisation of the end of Birches Lane</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>k) A smaller local centre should be provided but much further out as this site is near to the town centre</p> <p>l) An urban street design has problems, not having any front garden causes problems and a lack of privacy</p> <p>m) Community centre – after 5 years funding, WDC will not pay out for youth workers and Kenilworth people will have the problem of funding this new centre as well as the one in town</p> <p>n) Why can't the new schools become community schools and locals use these facilities? Health centres could use them as the current health centres are not enough to serve the development</p> <p>o) Greenspaces, parks etc are a great idea but only if designed not to cause a social nuisance</p> <p>p) Will the increased number of new residents lead to better policing in Kenilworth?</p> <p>q) Open spaces must allow for use by older people. This seems omitted in the Brief</p> <p>r) Lack of electric vehicle charging points – this should be included in the Brief</p> <p>s) All developments shall have high speed broadband installed on the site not added later when roads etc have to be dug up to lay cables</p>	<p>signalised junction. Further modelling, design and road safety audits will need to be undertaken prior to identifying the final solution. Often leaving a single arm of a signalised roundabout improves capacity, the drawings in the Kenilworth Development Brief are a proof of concept and do not present the final optimised layout. Figure 36 does however show traffic signals at the end of Birches Lane but there is an error in the text on p86 which states that they will be unsignalised. Text to be amended to reflect detail on the drawing that Birches Lane might be signalised</p> <p>h) Amenity space requirements are detailed in the district-wide Residential Design Guide and Public Open Space (POS) SPDs. All development will be expected to meet these requirements</p> <p>i) There is no evidence to suggest that the town centre is oversubscribed with students. Furthermore, this document would not be able to and would not wish to refuse a certain type of occupier of accommodation</p> <p>j) The Council's policy for 40% affordable housing in a mix of tenures. These</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>cannot be restricted to specific age groups</p> <p>k) The broad location for the Local Centre as indicated in the Indicative Masterplan is appropriate when considering its relationship with other centre, e.g. Kenilworth town centre and Leyes Lane local centre</p> <p>l) A range of street typologies have been proposed with the urban street only being shown in the vicinity of the local centre. Varying street typologies will have different characteristics, reflecting the diverse range within existing Kenilworth</p> <p>m) Upon construction developers will fund operational costs and staffing costs of the community centre for a period of time which shall be agreed through legal agreements between developers and WDC. Following this period, there is an expectation that the community centre will become self-sufficient</p> <p>n) The new schools will be important community facilities. WDC will look to enter into community access agreements with the schools to promote wider community use. The South Warwickshire Clinical</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>Commissioning Group (CCG) has confirmed that the quantum of development does not justify a new GP practice on the site. They will however require contributions from developments to support improving the facilities and enabling the expansion of existing GP practices in the town</p> <p>o) Agreed, the design of accessible and inclusive open space for all is important. Detailed designs of open spaces and their relationship to other development will be a matter for consideration through the planning application process</p> <p>p) All new development will be required to pay appropriate contributions to services such as the police, at the request of that service, during the planning application process. Warwickshire Police have indicated that they will seek contributions from developers on this site to support their service</p> <p>q) See point o)</p> <p>r) The requirement for electric vehicle charging points is set out in the Local Plan and Parking Standards SPD and</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>therefore does not require repetition in the Brief. However, for the avoidance of doubt a paragraph will be included within the Brief to highlight the need for such provision</p> <p>s) Policy BE5 'Broadband Infrastructure' of the Local Plan encourages residential and employment developments to provide on-site infrastructure, including open access to industry standards, to enable all premises and homes to be directly served by fibre optic broadband technology. WDC would expect developers to engage with utilities companies at an early stage in the development of their sites</p>	
71343	Mr I A Moss		<p>a) National, Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies give priority to the provision of cycling and walking routes. Whilst the Brief does make reference to this the Brief fails to provide a successful basis to ensure that cycling and walking become the transport mode of choice. It is a traditionally based car dominated analysis</p> <p>b) It is essential that the needs of walking and cycling are given priority with relevant infrastructure provided at an early stage of the development so that new residents get into the habit of not using the car because there are attractive alternatives</p> <p>c) There is a failure to analyse in detail what routes exist and</p>	<p>a) The Brief is considered strong in its promotion of cycling and walking both within the development and to nearby destinations. The section on walking and cycling is at the front of the section on movement/transport emphasising its importance. There is of course also a need to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure for vehicles (as is apparent in many consultation responses)</p> <p>b) The need for early delivery of the</p>	<p>Update the policy section on the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan now that it has been 'made'. Add KNP policies in the blue boxes setting out each objective</p> <p>Amend wording</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>what can be done to make them safe and attractive. This means that the Brief cannot be used as a basis for a successful, sustainable development</p> <p>d) Prioritising walking and cycling provide a range of benefits including visual impact, less pollution improving air quality and health</p> <p>e) The Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan is now part of the Development Plan. The statement in the last paragraph on page 25 is incorrect where it states the KNP, “will be afforded significant weight in the determination of planning applications.” As part of the development plan “determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.” In this context in Chapter 7 of the Brief where “Relevant WDC Policies” are listed needs to be amended to read Development Plan Policies with relevant policies from both the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan included</p> <p>f) The details of the Brief fall short of what is needed to ensure that the proposed development will be genuinely sustainable (p6 states the development will be a ‘sustainable urban extension’)</p> <p>g) The introduction to Chapter 1 (page 6) states “...Land East of Kenilworth presents a significant opportunity to deliver a high quality new community...” The only definition of high quality I have found is on page 7 which states, “The overarching aim of a Development Brief is to secure a higher standard of development than would have been achieved without it. This is a very nebulous definition against which it will be impossible to measure success.</p>	<p>cycling infrastructure is recognised and highlighted in Table 2 of the Brief</p> <p>c) The cycle network plan highlights a number of key future routes to serve the development site. These have been subject to an initial assessment to establish the feasibility of appropriate cycle infrastructure improvements. Further feasibility and design work will be carried out at the appropriate stage. It is not necessary to include a high level of detail for off-site cycle routes in the Development Brief and resources do not permit detailed design work to be carried at this early stage. At this stage, the key requirement is to identify the extent of the future routes required to serve all key destinations, establish that they are broadly feasible and ensure developers are aware of the level of funding required to deliver the routes</p> <p>d) Noted. These benefits are already identified in the Brief</p> <p>e) Agreed. The Brief will be updated now that the KNP forms part of the Development Plan</p> <p>f) Disagree. The Development Brief offers a range of methods and interventions</p>	<p>in relation to the proposed part of the southern spine road access/employment access to refer to the need to connect cycle routes with the proposed K2L cycle route</p> <p>Add reference where appropriate in the Brief to the forthcoming WDC Developer Design Framework SPD which will provide further detailed guidance on achieving high quality design</p> <p>Objective 3 to be re-written to state: “To deliver</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Unless a clear definition of high quality the phrase should be deleted from the document as misleading and meaningless</p> <p>h) It is noted at page 6, paragraph 2 that the District Council "...has undertaken extensive consultation with key stakeholders including ...landowners and land promoters." It is should be noted that the interests of these two groups are almost certainly at variance with the interests of the people of Kenilworth who will have to live with the consequences of the development. Encourage more active engagement with the people of Kenilworth</p> <p>i) Given the need to minimize the use of the car and promote cycling and walking it is essential that the development brief provides a clear analysis of the problems with solutions to be achieved as part of the development process. There is no comprehensive analysis of such routes and therefore no solutions are provided</p> <p>j) It is essential that walking/cycling routes into the centre should be by the shortest routes to promote pedestrian and cycle movement and fully integrate the development into the town</p> <p>k) Objective 3 on page 65 does not give the right priority. The Local plan and KNP give a clear lead that walking and cycling should be given priority. The objective should be rewritten as 'To deliver a sustainable transport system that gives priority to walking and cycling links with good public transport connectivity'</p> <p>l) Relevant Policies from the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan which should be referenced include KP2, KP4, KP8</p>	<p>that will help ensure that the East of Kenilworth development sites will be a sustainable urban extension</p> <p>g) The forthcoming Developer Design Framework SPD, based upon the national best-practice guidance Building for Life 12, will provide further detailed guidance on achieving high quality design</p> <p>h) The Plan has been developed with input from various organisations. Presentations have been delivered to and discussions been had with Kenilworth Town Council (elected by residents) and the Kenilworth Development Forum, the latter including a workshop specifically focusing on the Brief. The public consultation for this document, over and above the typical level of consultation for such events, involved public drop-in sessions where members of the public could come and talk to officers to discuss their thoughts</p> <p>i) A comprehensive future cycle route has been identified, based on an initial feasibility assessment of each route. It also identifies the requirement for improved wayfinding to existing</p>	<p>an effective and efficient transport system that gives appropriate priority to pedestrians and cyclists, as well as delivering public transport connectivity and the safe movement of traffic"</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>and KP9</p> <p>m) It should be noted that there is a clear link between Objective 3 and Objective 6 “Promoting a healthy and safe community”. By promoting walking and cycling this has clear health benefits as well as reducing pollution from vehicles. All these benefits are contained in Warwickshire County Council’s document ‘Healthy Travel Choices in Warwickshire’</p> <p>n) Given the need to ensure that this is a genuinely sustainable development it is surprising that emphasis and a lot of work appears to have been devoted to ensuring the free flow of traffic and little practical work on improving pedestrian/cycle routes</p> <p>o) How is the penultimate paragraph on p66 to be effectively implemented?</p> <p>p) P67 states “Enhancements to the crossing points over the railway line, which currently create a barrier to east-west cycling movement” but nowhere does it state what those enhancements will be or a time scale. This is absolutely critical for the whole cycling/walking strategy</p> <p>q) When considering the access arrangements to the employment site there is no mention how this will link to the proposed K2L cycle route</p> <p>r) Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane/Hidcote Rd (p76) – it is not clear how the layout improves pedestrian and cycle provision as the no entry sign means that cyclists will have to find a long way round to reach their destinations. How the proposal improves visibility at the junction is not explained as it is the vertical alignment of Glasshouse</p>	<p>destinations. It is not feasible or considered necessary for the Brief to provide detailed analysis and solutions for the off-site infrastructure at this stage, when at present the main focus is on securing funding towards delivering the identified network. Cost estimates have been based on previous schemes and government guidance and therefore are considered robust at this stage. The County Council, as highway authority, will have responsibility for delivering the cycle routes connecting the site to destinations in and around Kenilworth, with funding secured from the developers via S106 agreements / CIL. Design work on the routes identified on the cycle network plan will be carried out at the appropriate stage and will be based on national / regional design guidance and will be developed once funding becomes available</p> <p>j) The identification of the key cycle routes to connect the site to the town centre and railway station has been based on the core principles for cycle route design, one of which is directness. The layout of the existing</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Lane that is the critical issue. This problem could be resolved by making Hidcote Rd to Crewe Lane the priority route</p> <p>s) Two roundabouts are proposed without any provision for cyclists</p> <p>t) St.John's Gyratory (p86) – The focus here seems to be getting as much traffic through this junction as possible. There is a statement that this “would allow for increased opportunities to provide controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing points.” What does this mean in practice? Given that this junction provides access to Leek Wootton and Rouncil Lane it is essential that cyclists are given a safe route through. How is this to be achieved?</p> <p>u) Dalehouse Lane/Knowle Hill - What is meant by the statement at the bottom of page 87 that it will improve ‘pedestrian and cycle connectivity’. This junction is a link between the development site and cycle route 52. There are no proposals to improve this link for cyclists which is a wasted opportunity</p> <p>v) Leyes Lane realignment - Given that this is a key link to the new school site where getting school children into the cycling habit is vital this has to be the most preposterous scheme in the document. The objective of this scheme seems to be to maximize traffic flow through the junction. The objective must be how do we maximize the arrangement of this junction to make it attractive and safe for cyclists as part of a comprehensive approach to walking and cycling</p> <p>w) Page 140 has a list of principles including, “Ensuring the</p>	<p>residential area adjoining the site and physical barriers such as the railway line impact on the potential for providing direct routes as does the availability of highway land. However, it is considered that the routes identified on the network plan are the most direct routes possible within the above physical constraints</p> <p>k) Agreed, in order to fully comply with Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan policy KP8 the objective will be re-written to: “To deliver an effective and efficient system that gives appropriate priority to pedestrians and cyclists, as well as delivering public transport connectivity and the safe movement of traffic”</p> <p>l) See response to e)</p> <p>m) Agreed. This link is already identified in Objective 6</p> <p>n) Significant work was required to be undertaken on the highway network impacts, and the concerns of representations clearly reflect this, and confirm the appropriateness of this work. However, the Development Brief does also place great emphasis on walking and cycling and brings forward a number of requirements with regards</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>necessary infrastructure to encourage walking and cycling as part of people’s daily routine” and “Connecting the site with the existing town and surrounding countryside”. Page 144 Fig 56 purports to show Pedestrian and Cycle Connectivity. However, this just shows the existing situation</p> <p>x) The document fails to ask the question of how do we get residents out of cars</p>	<p>to cycling and pedestrian connectivity and movement. £3.7m of cycleway improvements, along with un-costed improvements at junctions and through the proposed development sites have been identified. This is a very significant and ambitious proposal for encouraging more use of cycle and facilitating the modal shift required</p> <p>o) The cycle routes will be delivered with developer funding as and when each part of the development site comes forward. The key route(s) to provide sustainable transport links from each particular application will be identified and funding secured from the developer concerned. The need to deliver routes at an early stage to enable sustainable travel habits to be established is recognised and reflected in Table 2 of the Brief. The routes highlighted on the network plan have been identified to provide direct and convenient routes to key destinations, within the constraints of the existing highway layout and residential pattern in Kenilworth. Each route will be subject to further feasibility work and design work, based on recognised</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>design guidance</p> <p>p) The options for cycle crossings of the railway line have been identified and the feasibility / design work on these routes will be carried out as and when funding comes forward from the site</p> <p>q) It will be vital that the spine road cycle route connects directly and conveniently with the K2L route and this should be achievable. Wording in this section will be amended to reflect this and refer to K2L</p> <p>r) Cyclists will be permitted to use the route. Cycling infrastructure will be included in the design for the junction scheme, to contribute towards the delivery of the identified cycle links from the site</p> <p>s) See response to r). If a cycle route has been identified to pass through these junctions, there will be provision for cyclists</p> <p>t) Further consideration will be given to the safe operation of this junction for all users when working with developers on their planning applications, including provision for cycle movements</p> <p>u) Where cycle routes pass through</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>junctions WCC will consider the need for improvements for cyclists with the junction design. Crossing facilities will be incorporated into new junction designs. Cycle network planning work has identified an alternative route to connect the site to NCN52 due to constraints on highway space on Knowle Hill which will make dedicated cycling infrastructure difficult. However, it is acknowledged that Knowle Hill will offer the most direct on-carriageway route for cyclists travelling in the direction of Coventry / the Greenway, and opportunities to improve cycling conditions will be sought, including as part of the signals scheme at the Knowle Hill / Dalehouse Lane junction</p> <p>v) This scheme will both be beneficial to cyclists and pedestrians by providing suitable crossing points when travelling west-east and improve legibility and also be beneficial in terms of highway safety</p> <p>w) Figure 56 includes proposed routes. Figure 24 of the Brief also shows proposed routes</p> <p>x) The document identifies the cycle</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				routes needed to connect the site to all key destinations and the level of funding required to deliver these routes, in order to seek funding from developers. Provision of comprehensive and high quality cycling and pedestrian infrastructure will help to make cycling and walking a viable choice for short local journeys. This will be complemented by extensive signage and promotional measures to raise awareness of the benefits and opportunities for sustainable travel	
71383; 71384	Mr D Hunt		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	b) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71325	Mr R A Sambrook		a) The traffic in Birches Lane has got worse year on year for 40 years especially early mornings on St Johns junction. It is therefore very important that the Council do not lose the chance to build a relief or spine road from Thickthorn roundabout to Dalehouse Lane this will help take some of the traffic from St John island which will only increase more with the planned 1400 new homes. If the housing and employment units are built without a link road then there will be no way of building one in the future	a) It would be unfeasible to build a spine road to Dalehouse Lane. A continuous spine road is proposed, as set out in the Development Brief. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief	No amendments proposed
71406; 71407;	Mr J Whitehou	The Trustees	a) The development of this area is of vital interest to the whole of the town, not just its future residents	a) Noted, agreed b) The vision and objectives do relate to	Amendments are proposed to the

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
71408; 71409; 71410	se	of The Kenilworth Centre	<p>b) Agree with the statement in the Vision &amp; Objectives section that “The new community will be fully integrated into the existing town...” but want to see this vision extended to all aspects of the Brief and not just its highways infrastructure and transport aspects</p> <p>c) The key focus for the Trustees is the proposed community centre facility (p97-101). We have already made a formal expression of interest to WDC to be involved in the design and development work for this facility at an early stage, and look forward to this happening soon</p> <p>d) It is unclear why the proposed Whitnash Community Hub has been used as the template for the centre configuration, as the scope of this hub is considered wider than needed for this site. For example, it includes relocation of Whitnash library and town council offices. Also, the quoted cost for the Whitnash hub of £1.6m has already been superseded, with the latest estimate nearer to £2m</p> <p>e) In relation to the sports facilities proposed for the community centre, namely sports hall and sports area with a separate entrance and changing facilities leading out into an open space, these need to be considered in the context of the sports facilities to be made available to the local community at the new Kenilworth School site to be built only a short distance away. We understand that the footprint of these facilities will be similar to what is at the current school site, with a similar operating model. There appears to be some danger of duplication of sports facilities between the new school site and the community</p>	<p>all aspects of the Brief</p> <p>c) Noted. A procurement process will be undertaken in due course allowing all interested parties to bid to be involved in the community centre</p> <p>d) The proposed Whitnash Centre was used as it is the most recent community centre proposal in the District. However, some amendments will need to be made following further guidance from WDC Community Partnership team</p> <p>e) The Brief was drafted before the leisure development plan for Kenilworth was known. There is a need for the Brief to be amended to co-ordinate with WDC’s leisure plans, which will remove the requirement for some of these facilities in the new community centre as they will be provided elsewhere in the town</p> <p>f) Noted. There will be some tweaks to the main hall requirements to allow for a multi-use hall</p> <p>g) The aim of having community offices based in the community centre is for centre management and community outreach purposes</p> <p>h) Noted, agreed</p>	<p>section setting out community centre requirements (and Table 6) following further liaison with WDC Community Partnership Team and WCC in light of this response and those from promoters. Notable changes include: the sports hall is no longer required in addition to a multi-purpose hall; contributions will be sought towards a centre manager</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>centre</p> <p>f) A main hall seating more than 150 people would be a major new asset for the town as a whole. Currently no such community hall of this capacity exists within the town, other than by using one of the churches</p> <p>g) It is unclear for what purposes the provision of community offices is proposed</p> <p>h) The provision of suitable external space associated with the community centre would be excellent. The footprint of the town centre-based Kenilworth Centre includes a small external hard surface sports court, but no grassed area</p> <p>i) It is unclear whether the quoted cost of £28k per annum for a 20 hours per week community champion/developer worker is the actual cost or a full-time equivalent rate. If the former it seems high, but if the latter then low</p> <p>j) One member of staff working 20 hours per week seems inadequate for the scale and scope of the facilities proposed. Roles to be covered include facilities management, reception and customer bookings and finance and administration. This is one of the areas where there could be considerable synergies with the current Kenilworth Centre structure, where all of these roles are in place and well developed, and could be expanded to cover another facility at relatively low incremental cost</p> <p>k) We have not interrogated the estimated centre running costs of £33,820 per annum in detail, but on the face of it these seem reasonable</p> <p>l) It is unclear why the developer contribution towards</p>	<p>i) The Brief is to be amended to include costs associated with a centre manager and community development worker based on experience WDC has identified with other centres around capacity and sustainability</p> <p>j) See i)</p> <p>k) Noted</p> <p>l) Noted. It important that we consider how we create self-sustaining socially active communities, where residents participate in a range of social recreational activities at a neighbourhood level and where people can have a positive sense of belonging to the wider community. The rationale behind the Community Development Worker role is to have someone in situ who can work with new residents as the development progresses. When a specified number of dwellings are occupied should act as a trigger to appoint a Community Development Worker so the work of engaging with the new and emerging community can begin. The focus of the work is around setting up community structures such as a resident association as part of supporting community interaction and</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>running costs is proposed for 10 years for the community champion/development worker, but 5 years for centre running costs. The experience of the Kenilworth Centre shows the dangers of a cliff-edge drop in funding. The new facility would need to be managed from Day 1 with a very clear strategic plan as to how long-term financial sustainability will be achieved</p>	<p>engagement. In addition, engaging and involving communities at an early stage makes it more likely that the physical design and layout of any centre facilities will create a sense of ownership and that any service offer is tailored to the needs of the community. Therefore, in order to deliver on this work, it important that at least 10 years funding is available to support a Community Development Worker to help support the development of the new community. The 5 years funding for running costs is to help with the sustainability of the centre and support the development of a business plan that will look at how the centre can be sustained beyond the initial 5 years funding</p>	
71303	Mrs J Sherwood		<p>a) 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</p> <p>b) The roundabout would result in a significant increase in traffic noise, congestion, pollution, safety issues and lights</p>	<p>a) Designs will be subject to further assessment, Road Safety Audits and consultation. There are physical constraints, road safety and ecological constraints to consider if moving the location of the junction. The protection of residential amenity and access arrangements for existing residents are important considerations and will be fully considered in the detailed design</p>	<p>Additional text to be added to the Development Brief emphasising the need to consider residential amenity and access to existing residential</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>shining directly into the front of my property and also neighbouring properties. Quality of life would be severely affected</p> <p>c) The original concept of a 'spine road' roughly parallel with the A46, linking Crewe Lane with Leamington Rd, allowing traffic to remain within the development is surely the logical solution. This would support the new development and not impact on existing properties.</p> <p>d) Should the plan be implemented, there would be severed inconvenience as a result of road works and traffic controls, necessary to carry out the work</p> <p>e) 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</p>	<p>of this junction. The feasibility of siting the roundabout slightly further into the site should be considered at the detailed design stage</p> <p>b) See response to a)</p> <p>c) As set out in the Brief, there are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. This is the only spine road route that has been put forward by WDC</p> <p>d) There will be appropriate Construction Traffic Management Plans required as part of any detailed planning application</p> <p>e) See response to point a)</p>	properties in the final design of the two proposed roundabouts
71256	Dr D Darby		<p>a) I envisage that exiting from Heyville Croft onto Glasshouse Lane will become more hazardous as will need to cross the flow of traffic to go right. When a school is built I foresee that a lot of the side roads off Glasshouse Lane will become parking lots, which already happens when the rugby club is in use. Parked cars decrease visibility and the pavements become blocked. I would hope that double yellow lines are instated on these side roads to reduce the hazards</p> <p>b) Using a single spine road with increased housing and population, increased schooling and business facilities will cause an inevitable bottleneck. Examples of the inevitable chaos is already present in Myton Road, Warwick and</p>	<p>a) Designs will be subject to further detailed design, Road Safety Audits and consultation. In the detailed planning application for the new school consideration will be given to matters such as this and any mitigation deemed necessary will be delivered</p> <p>b) The modelling to date has not identified these issues. Further assessments will be required to support planning applications</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Heathcote and Warwick Gates developments in Warwick/Leamington		
71379; 71380	Mr D and Mrs C Owen		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71285	Mr A Rogers		<p>a) Understand more homes are required in the UK. However, don't think the major developments and number of houses planned for Kenilworth are appropriate given the facilities, schools and already busy roads. There are numerous developments planned for Kenilworth over the next few years, and they are being looked at in isolation, rather than holistically. Consequently, the full effects of the developments are not being considered together. All of the schools and medical centres in the town are full. During rush hour, all routes in and out of the town are heavily congested. Adding hundreds of new homes will result in many hundreds more cars, journeys, children (requiring schools) and people (requiring medical facilities)</p> <p>b) Object to the roundabout and entrance to the new estate at the junction of Stansfield Grove and Glasshouse Lane. This will adversely affect the lives of everyone in the small cul-de-sac of Stansfield Grove with air and noise pollution, as well as parking issues, cars turning in people's drives when they make a wrong turn, noise from lorry and bus brakes, as they slow for the roundabout etc. Why does the roundabout/entrance have to be right outside</p>	<p>a) The examination of the Local Plan considered the location and amount of new housing sites in the District. This site was deemed to appropriate for development. The Local Plan evidence base included a series of Strategic Transport Assessments which considered the impact on the highway network, please refer to WDC website for details</p> <p>b) The route of the spine road will involve utilising part of Glasshouse Lane as the central part of the road. This route is a result of weighing up various constraints. The roundabouts must provide access into the residential elements of the proposed development. A junction at the end of Leyes Lane would not provide access into the residential development as Glasshouse Lane at this point abuts the land allocated in the Local Plan for</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			people's homes? Why not place this junction further up Glasshouse Lane towards the Leyes Lane T junction where the houses are set back from the main road? There could be a simple T junction (rather than a roundabout) which would be screened by the large, mature trees which are already present and will therefore not spoil anyone's view, or cause as much noise/air pollution	education use	
71311	Ms L Wood		<p>a) Whilst I accept that the additional housing and schools are inevitable I am distressed that the main spine road is not a spine road at all, but joins onto Glasshouse Lane as the primary route, before meandering back into the new development again. Feel let down by your Council as at meetings I have attended in the past the traffic issues were addressed by this new road and Glasshouse Lane/Birches Lane would be relatively unaffected. As the spine road was not as was first discussed and with the obvious huge increase in road congestion, air and noise pollution, quality of life is diminished</p> <p>b) Intrigued as to the mix of housing. By your own admission the highest rate of projected population growth in the future is aged 65+ and yet there is only a vague suggestion of bungalows to be constructed</p>	<p>a) As set out in the Brief, there are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. This is the only spine road route that has been put forward by WDC. Air quality and noise assessments will be required at the detailed planning application stage and will need to demonstrate acceptable impacts. WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic</p> <p>b) There is no such 'admission' in the Development Brief. An appropriate mix of dwellings has been proposed</p>	No amendments proposed
71387; 71388	Mr R Williams		<p>a) There is currently congestion around St John's Gyratory and roads leading to it every morning. The tail back regularly reaches Mosely Road junction making it extremely difficult to join Birches Lane from any of the side roads such as Thickthorn Close and Jordan Close. In view of the current congestion, would like to know if any</p>	<p>a) Modelling has been undertaken using Paramics Microsimulation tools, WCC has significant experience in this field and have been assisted by Vectos Microsim who are leading specialist in microsimulation modelling. Details of</p>	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>computer simulation has been undertaken of the traffic flows and the impact of the extra traffic. Would like to see this and even with the main spine road the whole area will become gridlocked during peak times</p> <p>b) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p>	<p>the series of modelling assessments which were undertaken can be found on WDC website under Local Plans, Strategic Transport Assessment. <a href="https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/info/2/0410/new_local_plan/1197/local_plan_evidence_base">https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/info/2/0410/new_local_plan/1197/local_plan_evidence_base</a> . WCC have adopted the same approach across all districts and boroughs in Warwickshire and have assisted a number of Local Authorities in achieving a sound Local Plan</p> <p>b) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p>	
71345; 71346; 71347; 71348; 71349	Ms J Burnell	Kenilworth h All Together Greener (KATG)	<p>a) This is an opportunity for ensuring that Kenilworth becomes a genuinely sustainable town. This requires integration of the new with the old in a manner that will be fit for the 21st century. The document highlights the need for integration but then fails to demonstrate how this will be delivered in a sustainable manner</p> <p>b) The phrase 'high quality' is used through the document but not defined. If the development is genuinely to be sustainable then clear criteria such as build quality must be set down</p> <p>c) We note there appears to have been detailed consultation with some stakeholders but this is the first time residents of Kenilworth have been involved. We look forward to working with WDC to develop a document that will meet the aspirations of new residents and the needs of the</p>	<p>a) The Brief sets out a number of ways that the new development will integrate with the existing town, and includes a variety of sustainability measures, including providing good cycling and walking routes within the site and linkages to nearby destinations</p> <p>b) The authority is producing a Development Design Framework SPD that will articulate the thresholds and assessment criteria, based on the Building for Life 12 principles. This will be referred to in the appropriate sections of the Development Brief</p>	<p>Add reference(s) to the proposed Development Design Framework SPD, which will provide further to ensure high quality development</p> <p>Update the policy section on the Kenilworth Neighbourhood</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>existing town</p> <p>d) Almost identical issue to point e) of Mr I Moss's representation (ref: 71343)</p> <p>e) Almost identical issue to point f) of Mr I Moss's representation (ref: 71343)</p> <p>f) Almost identical issue to point g) of Mr I Moss's representation (ref: 71343)</p> <p>g) Almost identical issue to point h) of Mr I Moss's representation (ref: 71343)</p> <p>h) P13 - Question the extent of stakeholder engagement. More organisations could have been involved, nor is there any mention of other communities where successful sustainable urban communities have been developed, e.g North Bicester</p> <p>i) Delighted to read that the 2018 version of the NPPF is referenced. Following the consultation on updating the NPPF, the government's summary response has clarified that councils can once again set energy efficiency standards for new homes which go above and beyond the building regulations (Part L). This enables the effective implementation of Policy KP15 which seeks to encourage applicants to adopt higher environmental standards of building design and energy performance such as Passivhaus or equivalent. This ambition and reference to KP15 should be evident within Chapter 3</p> <p>j) Pleased to see the bullets on p44 relating to the site analysis, constraints and opportunities</p> <p>k) Question how minimising the impact on green/blue infrastructure and on wildlife sites, and retaining habitats</p>	<p>c) In order to produce a detailed Development Brief there is necessarily a large amount of work that needs to be done prior to consultation. However, there has been significant work done to ensure that as many residents as possible have been made aware of the Development Brief and its consultation</p> <p>d) See response to Mr I Moss (rep ref: 71343)</p> <p>e) See response to Mr I Moss (rep ref:71343)</p> <p>f) See response to Mr I Moss (rep ref: 71343)</p> <p>g) See response to Mr I Moss (rep ref: 71343)</p> <p>h) WDC undertook comprehensive engagement, significantly in excess of that required by statute. Presentations were made to the Town Council and Kenilworth Development Forum (and a workshop was held with the latter), neighbour notices were hand delivered to all adjoining properties, site notices were put up near to the site and in the town centre, email and paper notifications were sent to all statutory consultees and all those with a</p>	<p>Plan now that it has been 'made'. Add KNP policies in the blue boxes setting out each objective</p> <p>High quality designed and energy efficient schools will be encouraged and the section on 'Education Facilities' and Development Principle 4B will be updated to emphasise this</p> <p>References in the Brief to the draft Air Quality SPD will be updated to reflect its recent adoption. All references to draft SPDs will be checked to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>where possible, complies with KNP policy KP4(l) which calls for an environmental strategy to establish how the development will deliver a net biodiversity gain. A requirement for the development of such a strategy is missing</p> <p>l) Note there are no recommendations as to how close to the A46 houses and gardens should be. With respect to noise and its attenuation the Passivhaus approach to construction ensures a better quality of life for house occupants thanks to its high levels of insulation and low air/noise permeability</p> <p>m) Ch 6 – We do not feel that this vision fits with the vision for Kenilworth as set out in the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>n) Mention is made for affordable housing but there is no reference to social housing or custom and self-build housing in the vision</p> <p>o) KNP Policy KP4(e) states that there should be provision of open market homes as self-serviced plots for self-build and custom build not exceeding 5% of the total number of dwellings. There is the proviso in this policy that this build is commensurate with the demand evidenced on the local authority self-build register of interest. However, if this is not advertised as part of the vision and objectives how are people to know of this opportunity?</p> <p>p) The Vision refers to “high quality sustainably designed buildings” however, there is no definition of what this means. KNP policy KP15 seeks to encourage applicants to adopt higher environmental standards of building design</p>	<p>registered interest on our system (numbering over 4000 individuals), public exhibition and drop-in sessions were run in Kenilworth library and the consultation was promoted on the Council’s website (and Kenilworth Town Council’s), via social media pages and via traditional press</p> <p>i) Whilst energy efficient would be welcome, in order to set standards beyond those contained within Building Regulations, evidence must be presented and policies set as part of a Local Plan (as per the Planning and Energy Act 2008) and It is not therefore possible to set them as part of a SPD. Policy KP15 encourages these higher targets but cannot set them as requirements</p> <p>j) Noted, thank you</p> <p>k) The wording in the Development Brief will be amended to provide specific reference to Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP4 part l) and set out a clear requirement for each application (at which point the impact of schemes will be known) to be accompanied with an environmental strategy to establish</p>	<p>ensure they accurately reflect the latest position</p> <p>Masterplan to be amended to show a greater landscape buffer to the eastern side of the central parcel of land</p> <p>Amend wording in Objective 5 and Development Principle 5A (or create a new Development Principle) to require each application to include an environmental strategy to establish how the development will deliver a net</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>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 applicants to go beyond the current 2013 building regulations. Such a requirement is absent from the vision and objectives</p> <p>q) Question how the vision statement relating to the removal of existing mature landscaping and woodland can enhance the development? KNP policy KP4(l) calls for an environmental strategy to establish how the development will deliver a net biodiversity gain. Any requirement for the development of such a strategy is absent from the document</p> <p>r) There is nothing in the vision and objectives about how to counteract the noise and air pollution from the A46</p> <p>s) Ch 7 Development Principles – The opening statement that the development principles are based on the vision and objectives of Chapter 6 does not inspire confidence</p> <p>t) Have examples of other such developments been studied – both ones that have worked and ones that have not? Have any discussions taken place with leading communities both in the UK and Europe as to how they have managed to develop more sustainable communities? E.g. Malmo, Freiberg and North Bicester?</p> <p>u) Pleased to see that self-build and custom-build housing feature. The principles laid down in Objective 1B are broadly appropriate, however there is no specific mention</p>	<p>how the development will deliver a net biodiversity gain and manage the sustainable drainage of the land. Each strategy will be required to complement any other approved environmental strategies submitted as part of applications within land East of Kenilworth</p> <p>l) The Brief identifies noise and air quality associated with the A46 as being issues which require consideration and mitigation. The mitigation will almost certainly involve, inter alia, setting development back from the A46. Also see response to i)</p> <p>m) The Development Brief and the Neighbourhood Plan were drafted cognisant of one another and WDC liaised with the Town Council (as qualifying body for the Neighbourhood Plan) prior to publication of the Brief, and we do not believe there is conflict between the two</p> <p>n) The definition of affordable housing is held within the NPPF and includes social housing. Custom and self-build is not a type of affordable housing</p> <p>o) The method of promotion of self-build plots is contained within the Custom &amp;</p>	<p>biodiversity gain and manage the sustainable drainage of the land</p> <p>Wording will be added in the Brief to refer to the incorporation of green roofs as potential measures to assist with the attenuation of rain water and encourage biodiversity</p> <p>A note will be added at the start of the on and off-site highway infrastructure section to highlight that notwithstanding details on</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>of the potential for small bespoke developers who in general build higher quality housing with performance in use standards. Therefore, advocate that WDC advertise the fact that sites for this type of development will be available for both individuals and for small bespoke developers/builders</p> <p>v) Employment Land – Can a definition of high quality design be provided/ We advocate that building to the out-dated 2013 building regulations is most certainly not high quality, consequently WDC needs to make its ambition clear to developers</p> <p>w) Objective 3 – This highlights a major shortcoming of the document. Although it seeks to promote walking and cycling the actual policies and implementation is focused on detailed improvements to the road network with very little on the practical requirements to make a success of encouraging people to walk and cycle</p> <p>x) Almost identical points to points b), i), j), k), l), m), n), p), r), s) of Mr I Moss’s (ref: 71343) representation</p> <p>y) The section on junction improvements proposed illustrates that this is a traditional and out-dated approach to traffic management which completely fails to respond to policy requirements and the need for sustainable development. Over and over again cycling provision has been forgotten</p> <p>z) Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane/Hidcote Rd (p76) – it is not clear how the layout improves pedestrian and cycle provision as the no entry sign means that cyclists will have to find a long way round to reach their destinations. This</p>	<p>Self-Build SPD currently under public consultation</p> <p>p) See answer to i)</p> <p>q) The Brief must include some flexibility and the vision only supports the removal of existing landscaping and woodland “where their removal demonstrably enhances the development” – i.e. there are greater benefits that can be achieved in the aim of delivering high quality development if they are removed. See response to k)</p> <p>r) There are many specific constraints that require consideration and mitigation. The vision should be succinct and cannot refer to all matters considered in the Brief. The second paragraph of the vision is considered to appropriately cover matters relating to noise and air quality</p> <p>s) Noted, although we would dispute this</p> <p>t) The Brief is the result of extensive research. However, this has rightly been focussed on ensuring that what is proposed is the best and most appropriate for the needs of the District and town</p> <p>u) It would not be appropriate for the</p>	<p>indicative drawings, cycling and pedestrian provision will be given full consideration in the design of each highway scheme</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>indicative layout conflicts with Fig 56 on p143 which shows Crewe Lane as a cycle route. How the proposal improves visibility at the junction is not explained as it is the vertical alignment of Glasshouse Lane that is the critical issue. This problem could be resolved by making Hidcote Rd to Crewe Lane the priority route</p> <p>aa) Dalehouse Lane/Knowle Hill - What is meant by the statement at the bottom of page 87 that it will improve 'pedestrian and cycle connectivity'. This junction is identified as a link between the development site and cycle route 52 yet proposals to improve the link for cyclists are missing</p> <p>bb) Leyes Lane realignment – Schools across the country are looking for ways to keep traffic away from their sites because of concerns about air pollution and road safety as well as the need to promote exercise for general health. Yet it appears this scheme is designed to do the exact opposite and maximise the traffic flow to the new school, Given the proximity of the new school where getting school children into the cycling habit is vital, this layout needs to be reconsidered with the aim of optimising the arrangement to make it attractive and safe for cyclists. The importance of taking a comprehensive approach to walking and cycling to school cannot be overstated</p> <p>cc) Welcome the 20mph speed limit which is in accordance with policy KP4(g) of the KNP. However, there is no justification to have a 30mph speed limit on the spine road as all of it goes through the residential area. Merely placing a 20mph speed limit through the local centre will</p>	<p>Brief to favour one size of housing developer over another – the key is that they conform with guidance within the Brief and the emerging Custom and Self-Build SPD</p> <p>v) As per previous comments regarding the national Building Regulations, it is not possible for this document to require standards beyond those that are nationally set via Building Regulations</p> <p>w) There are significant and substantive improvements and suggestions to the cycle network suggested as well as significant on-site provision. These of course need to be balanced with the need to ensure that the road network is best placed to take the additional vehicular movements that will accompany the new development</p> <p>x) See response to relevant points in Mr I Moss's representation (rep ref: 71343)</p> <p>y) Disagree. The improvements identified for cycling represent a very significant investment in cycling infrastructure, £3.7m, improvements at junctions and a network of planned routes through the proposed development sites will achieve a step change in cycle</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>encourage braking followed by acceleration over short distances. As Glasshouse Lane will become a road within a residential area it should also have a 20mph speed limit</p> <p>dd) Fig 56 on p144 purports to show pedestrian and cycle connectivity. However, this just shows the existing situation: no improvements or enhancements are indicated</p> <p>ee) Objectives 4 and 5– We note that the appropriate KNP policies are missing from the blue highlighted box</p> <p>ff) Principle 4A – Pleased to note the significant detail provided for the configuration of the community centre (p99). Can similar detail be provided for what a sustainable urban extension might look like...and what high quality design might look like in relation to the new houses?</p> <p>gg) Design Principle 4: Education - There is a lack of ambition for the design quality of the new schools. With the schools being at the heart of the new sustainable urban extension 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 build 'high quality' housing</p> <p>hh) With the location of the proposed new primary school being set for the central parcel of land, we are concerned that due consideration has not been given to the potential problems of air quality issues from the A46</p> <p>ii) Pleased to read that a standard of green space has been</p>	<p>provision for Kenilworth</p> <p>z) Whilst the drawing may not clearly identify cycle provision at the junction, cycling infrastructure will be included in the design for the junction scheme, to contribute towards the delivery of the identified cycle links from the site. A note will be added at the start of the on and off-site highway infrastructure section to highlight that notwithstanding details on indicative drawings, cycling and pedestrian provision will be given due consideration in the design of each highway scheme</p> <p>aa) See response to z)</p> <p>bb) The network has been planned in a way which can accommodate cyclists and pedestrians safely. Simplifying the network (removing staggered junctions), providing signalised junctions with cross facilities and slowing the speed of traffic down in this vicinity are all features designed to help facilitate more use of cycles. The signalisation at this location is not required for capacity reasons, it has been identified to manage the traffic flows and primarily to ensure safe</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>identified as a primary concern by the Parks and Open Spaces Audit, but would welcome guidance on what a 'high quality' environment looks like, with examples on what has been achieved elsewhere, including mainland Europe. Would question whether the WDC 'Open Space SPD' is fit for purpose 10 years on?</p> <p>jj) Due consideration must be given to the potential public health issues arising from air pollution and noise from the A46 when planning the development of public open spaces and allotments</p> <p>kk) Ecology and Biodiversity – We note that there are three designated Local Wildlife Sites within the site. To ensure that these are considered properly a full biodiversity assessment should have been conducted to inform the Development Brief</p> <p>ll) Principle 5A – What will 'high quality' look like? We note that applications shall be accompanied with a Biodiversity Impact Plan and this shall set out measures to ensure that there is no overall loss of biodiversity. This negatively expressed statement is at odds with KP4(l) which calls for an environmental strategy to establish how the development of land will deliver a net biodiversity gain</p> <p>mm) Principle 5A – There is no mention of mitigation measures required to protect the health of people while within the green infrastructure areas subject to noise and air pollution from the A46</p> <p>nn) Principle 5C – We welcome this principle although are concerned about the comment that consideration will be given to the financial viability of a solution. We advocate</p>	<p>movements for pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>cc) The justification is that the route would not be attractive at 20mph and would not work as a Spine Road, this would place undue pressure on other areas of the network</p> <p>dd) See response to point w) of Mr I Moss's representation (rep ref:71343)</p> <p>ee) See response to point e) of Mr I Moss's representation (rep ref: 71343)</p> <p>ff) The purpose of the Development Brief is to provide the detail of what the development sites will comprise of, including such things as indicative densities, street hierarchy and placemaking principles. The forthcoming Developer Design Framework SPD – based upon the national best-practice guidance Building for Life 12 – will provide further detailed guidance on achieving high quality design</p> <p>gg) As with the residential development, it is not possible for the Brief to require a standard in excess of those set out in the national Building Regulations. High quality designed and energy efficient schools will be encouraged and the section on 'Education Facilities' and</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>that people's health and wellbeing should come before financial considerations</p> <p>oo) Principle 5D – Welcome this principle although are concerned that all detailed air quality assessments should be up to the best international standards. Most AQ assessments fail to measure particulate matter (PMs) and this should be deemed unacceptable as there is no lower 'healthy' threshold for finest particles (PM2.5s) that enter the bloodstream</p> <p>pp) It is also a concern that existing AQ assessments on the site (Catesby) rely on modelled data and not monitored data, especially when the sole attempt to validate the modelled AQ shows a significant underestimation of pollution levels. I would argue that the text is amended to include the need for specific monitoring programmes for nitrous oxides, PM10s and PM2.5s at key locations (e.g. roadside, roundabouts) but especially along transects at right angles to the A46 to assess the distance that the pollution plume extends over the site. The monitoring programmes should run for at least 12 months prior to planning permission consent to enable an assessment of annual cumulative pollution loadings within households</p> <p>qq) Given medical evidence that poor air quality in the UK contributes to the early deaths of up to 40,000 people each year and particularly in view of the emerging risks to children, it is important to pay particular attention to pollution levels around the proposed schools. We argue that continuous AQ monitoring should be installed inside all new schools for their lifetime</p>	<p>Development Principle 4B will be updated to emphasise this</p> <p>hh) The site of the primary school is to be moved. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed site was unsuitable on air quality grounds and officers discussed the matter of air quality in relation to the new school with the Council's Environmental Protection team prior to publishing the draft SPD</p> <p>ii) There is a new Public Open Space SPD currently out for public consultation which details the requirements for various typologies of Public Open Space</p> <p>jj) Noted, these will be considerations for detailed planning applications</p> <p>kk) The Development Brief has been sensitive to these sites in its production. Full assessments will be expected as part of detailed planning applications</p> <p>ll) See response to k)</p> <p>mm) Whilst there is no specific mention of greenspaces, Development Principle 5C does require development to provide acceptable standards of amenity for future users and this</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>rr) Request that estimates for pollution produced by new residents through house heating and vehicle movements should be fully quantified and explained. Current AQ assessments of the projected pollution generation (Catsey) are insufficiently transparent to afford proper interrogation of the assumptions, methods and data used (e.g. how vehicle movements, including start up each morning and pollution levels are calculated).</p> <p>ss) Development Principle 5F – There is no mention of the use of green roofs. Yet these can assist with the attenuation of rain water and encourage biodiversity</p> <p>tt) Objective 7 – We question whether the guidance contained within the WDC Garden Towns Villages and Suburbs document (May 2012) is fit for purpose. We query this having viewed the extensive new housing developments to the south of Warwick &amp; Leamington all of which we consider to be of ‘poor design’</p> <p>uu) We question why it is thought that the local vernacular is appropriate for a 21<sup>st</sup> century sustainable community. Especially since bricks are not a sustainable building material. One of the drivers of the Government’s Clean Growth Strategy is the promotion of off-site construction which uses sustainable materials, e.g. timber. This alternative approach is quite capable of delivering a consistent high quality, sustainability and good design as well as the distinctive character cited in Table 4 item 5 (p121)</p> <p>vv) Welcome the requirement that the design should include ‘Use of sustainable construction materials and</p>	<p>would include areas of public open space. Noise and air quality impacts will be assessed as part of planning applications where the relevant objective levels are likely to be exceeded. In this case we will would expect the air quality assessment to include designated public open spaces near to the A46 in order to demonstrate that the hourly air quality objectives would not be exceeded</p> <p>nn) Noted. People’s health and well-being is a key consideration and development is unlikely to be unacceptable if it is likely to result in significant harm to health. However, financial viability is also an important consideration that must be considered through the planning process</p> <p>oo) The minimum requirements will be in line with the Council’s recently adopted Air Quality SPD. Impacts of new development on particulate matter levels are routinely assessed by WDC Environmental Health through requests for air quality assessments</p> <p>pp) The recently adopted Air Quality SPD, developed in conjunction with the Council’s Environmental Health team,</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>construction of energy efficient buildings, utilising zero-carbo or renewable energy technology where applicable'. However, since a study into new domestic and non-domestic buildings built to 2013 Part L Building Regulations carried out under the Technology Strategy Board/Innovate UK's Building Performance programme (Jan 2016) revealed a typical energy use performance gap of between 2.5 and 4 times, we would recommend that WDC clearly quantifies its ambition for energy efficiency and includes this in the Brief</p> <p>ww) Principle 7D – We question why consideration has not been given to replicating existing developments where the car is secondary to the street scale allowing residents and children to have access to safe public space, e.g. exemplar developments in Malmo, Freiberg, the Netherlands and Kevin McCloud's first development in Swindon</p> <p>xx) Principle 8 – When upgrading of the WPD primary substation is planned, we consider it essential that consideration is given to the need for additional electricity capacity for the increased take up of Electric Vehicle charging points, air source and ground source heating and the move in general from gas to electricity as a source of power. What consideration is being given to incorporating infrastructure supporting local distributed generation and storage to mitigate centralised supply inadequacies?</p> <p>yy) Ch 8 – Whilst we welcome the Masterplan Design Principles, we would recommend that specific examples of exemplar developments are included as being</p>	<p>sets out the requirements, mitigations and damage costs for air quality impacts. The SPD encourages monitoring to be undertaken at locations with complex road layouts and/or topography but this is not always feasible and therefore modelling can be used. This Development Brief cannot set requirements such as those suggested as they are beyond the requirements of the Local Plan</p> <p>qq) The installation of monitoring stations inside all schools, for the lifetime of the school, is not something that is feasible or viable at the current time. However, we would expect nearby schools to be included as a receptor in the air quality assessments submitted as part of planning applications</p> <p>rr) As per the recently adopted Air Quality SPD, dependant on the nature of the development, reports will need to accompany the planning application that will be reviewed by our Environmental Health team. Where impacts are identified they will need to be mitigated, preferably on site. These mitigations will vary dependent on the</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>‘indicative’. We note for example in the Land Use and Housing Density concept plans that residential areas are shown right up to the edge of the A46. We hope this is not indicative</p> <p>zz) Ch9 – Indicative Masterplan and Scale Parameters Plan – The developments seem to revolve round the car. This is not appropriate for the 21<sup>st</sup> century when the street should revolve around walkers and cyclists. The housing in the streetscapes look mid war – 1920s and 30s some Victorian. Is this the streetscape that WDC should be putting forward to potential developers? We ask if consideration can be given to modern exemplar developments such as Malmo, Freiberg, the Netherlands and North Bicester</p> <p>aaa) We understand that this is a high level indicative masterplan, however we are of the opinion that it totally lacks ambition and as such gives potential developers the impression that this is anything but a genuinely sustainable urban extension. We believe this will attract poor design rather than high quality design</p> <p>bbb) Welcome the statement that WDC will take a proactive role in monitoring the delivery of dwellings and recommend that this be extended to cover the energy efficiency of new buildings</p>	<p>site and issue and therefore the Brief does not specify the precise nature of the mitigation that is required</p> <p>ss) There can be no requirement in the Development Brief for green roofs as this is not a requirement in Local Plan/Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan policy. However, Policy CC1 ‘Planning for Climate Change Adaptation’ of the Local Plan does refer to the potential use of green roofs. Wording will be added in the Brief to refer to the incorporation of green roofs as a potential measure to assist with the attenuation of rain water and encourage biodiversity</p> <p>tt) As part of the development of the forthcoming Developer Design Framework SPD significant assessments will be made of existing developments. As far as we are aware this will be the first time that a robust, consistent methodology will have been used to appraise new development design in the South of Leamington and Warwick. It would, therefore, be premature to claim that the previous SPD did not deliver good quality design. However, if improvements</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>could be made then this process will identify and redress this through the new, district-wide SPD</p> <p>uu) We feel that it is important that the new development is integrated into and feels a part of the town, and an element of that is understanding and utilising local vernacular where appropriate</p> <p>vv) The energy efficiency standards are those contained within the Building Regulations and so do not require repeating within the Development Brief</p> <p>ww) In producing the Development Brief, a wide range of potential scenarios and urban design principles were assessed. The indicative masterplan is the culmination of this work and represented the most appropriate development that will provide the housing, employment and education that is needed and that will integrate with the rest of the town. The residents of the proposed developments will have safe access to shared space, notably the central park</p> <p>xx) Noted. This will be shared with Western Power though is beyond the</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>scope of the Development Brief</p> <p>yy) Diagrams such as those mentioned are used to understand the Development Brief area in spatial relationship terms. Any applications that come forward will need to respond to this as well as meet the various technical requirements such as noise and air quality issues. However, it is acknowledged that development is unlikely to be located as close to the A46 as currently shown on the central parcel of land (the Wardens and KRC sites) and therefore the masterplan will be amended accordingly</p> <p>zz) See response to vw). Also, Kenilworth is a commuter town, even with the planned improvements in rail services and cycle networks there will still be a strong reliance on the car for accessing employment and other services</p> <p>aaa) We respectfully disagree, and are confident that the masterplan will deliver a development that integrates well with the town, and provides housing, education and employment opportunities for its residents</p> <p>bbb) Warwick District Council's Building Control will take appropriate</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				measurements where they are responsible for signing off developments. However, developers may use private, Approved Inspectors should they wish over which the Council has no control. It is therefore not possible to impose the additional monitoring suggested	
71441	Ms T J Langmead		<p>a) Filled with despair regarding the proposed vehicle access point off Thickthorn Close when the new properties are built. It will spoil the very nature of the neighbourhood, which is mainly made up of elderly residents.</p> <p>b) The nursing home at the end of the road requires constant access for ambulances, fire engines and staff. If the road is clogged up with extra vehicles from residents or construction vehicles this could lead to a serious incident where ambulances or fire engines are delayed</p> <p>c) The road is already narrow and in poor repair and extra vehicles will only exacerbate the condition of the road. If vehicles are parked on the road, then construction vehicles will not get past. Under no circumstances should the flower borders be removed in order to widen the road as they have been present since the houses were built and are an integral part of the neighbourhood</p> <p>d) The extra traffic caused by the possibility of at least a hundred extra vehicles down a normally quiet road would not only be detrimental to the quality of life of the current residents, but would also have a massive knock on effect to the traffic which already clogs up Birches Lane and</p>	<p>a) WCC Highways do not foresee an issue with a small number of dwellings being accessed via Thickthorn Close and not connecting to the spine road. Changes to the highway will be subject to Road Safety Audit</p> <p>b) Noted. However, it is considered that a small number of additional dwellings potentially being served off Thickthorn Close is unlikely to cause any significant congestion. Developments will be required to have construction management plans to identify and mitigate construction impacts</p> <p>c) There is no suggestion of widening the road in the Development Brief. WCC are responsible for road conditions across the County and will intervene where necessary</p> <p>d) See response to a). It is highly unlikely that all vehicles associated with new</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Glasshouse Lane and also have a negative impact on the volume of traffic at St Johns gyratory which cannot cope with current volumes of traffic.</p> <p>e) Although I appreciate the need for extra housing in Kenilworth and the Council's obligations to provide this, it must be done in a manner that does not impact negatively both on current Kenilworth residents and road users</p> <p>f) It would be prudent that the new housing is accessed by a spine road off the A46 thereby alleviating any potential distress to residents, the nursing home and road users in this area</p>	<p>development would travel along the road at the same time and a small number of additional dwellings is unlikely to significantly adversely impact upon the living conditions of existing residents</p> <p>e) Noted, we agree development should proceed in a manner that does not result in significant harm to existing residents or result in adverse highway impacts</p> <p>f) The majority of new housing will be accessed off a new spine road</p>	
71423	Mr C Leggitt	Kenilworth Golf Club	<p>a) Whilst we take some comfort from the statement in Chapter 5, page 54, that "the impact on KGC must be considered with regard to the development of Crewe Lane" this is not followed through in Chapter 7 which contains proposals which would have significant adverse effects on KGC</p> <p>b) Object to the proposed changes to the access to Crewe Lane from Glasshouse Lane as described in Development Principles 3E b) and c) and shown on figure 28. The proposals would severely affect golf club staff, members and visitors who work or play at the club or attend social functions who wish to leave the club and head towards Kenilworth. Their choices would be to drive through the proposed development or to take a very long detour which would exacerbate traffic problems elsewhere. Either route would be completely unacceptable. The</p>	<p>a) Noted. However, we disagree there would be significant adverse impact on KGC</p> <p>b) C and d) This is a design principle/concept which will have to be worked into more detail. The intention being that traffic will be "access only" and not be able to make through movements. This may be achieved through further restrictions. All schemes will be subject to through reviews, modelling and road safety audits. The document is a Development Brief and does not go into full details of the arrangements as they will have to be worked up fully</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>proposals would also affect Reservoir House, the golf club greenkeepers sheds and the adjoining residential property 'Dingle', all of which are accessed from Crewe Lane between the golf club entrance and Glasshouse Lane. Furthermore, figure 28 shows a junction layout that prevents, or at least makes it very difficult to turn right from Glasshouse Lane in to Crewe Lane. The proposals would effectively isolate the KGC from Kenilworth and have a disastrous impact on the club which is one of the major outdoor sports amenities in the area. Journeys would increase in terms of time and distance travelled with a major impact on traffic congestion and the environment. We urge the Council to delete this proposal</p> <p>c) The draft Plan recommends that Crewe Lane between the spine road and the golf club is retained as an informal access road. We have concerns as to what this will mean for the club and how it will be achieved. However, in the light of our very strong objections to Development Principle 3E, we would expect this policy to change</p> <p>d) Strongly object to the proposals to change the priority route on Crewe Lane at the development access as shown on figure 27. We consider this layout to be fatally flawed as it is inherently dangerous to access the development via a sharp bend. We urge WDC and the Highway Authority to revert to a priority junction off Crewe Lane with the major route being Crewe Lane</p> <p>e) Figure 30 appears to show the proposed spine road joining Crewe Lane at the point of the existing access land to Crewe Gardens. This would be undesirable from our</p>	<p>through planning applications. The flows are expected to be low because of the planned restrictions and therefore options such as on carriageway cycling or vehicle passing place may be considered</p> <p>e.) Priority will reflect the heavier flow of traffic which will be on the Spine Road. Congestion and safety would result otherwise</p> <p>f.) There is no forward funding for the infrastructure and the developers are currently assessing at what level of housing that there is a requirement for the St.Johns improvements to come forward. This will have to be agreed with WCC as highway authority and will be in adherence with the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>perspective and we would wish to discuss with the highway authority a more suitable access point</p> <p>f) We note the WCC signalisation scheme for the St. John's Gyratory which is proposed to mitigate the impact of development traffic but there must be a s106 obligation requiring the improvement scheme to be in place prior to first occupation of any development. The Highway Authority has a track record of delivering improvement schemes well behind programme and they must commence design, procurement and construction well in advance to avoid this busy junction becoming a major problem</p>		
71266	Mr D Lloyd		<p>a) Figures 55 &amp; 57 show a secondary access for vehicles to part of the development from Thickthorn Close. This is their only access as there is no connection shown to the new spine road. I object to having vehicular access via Thickthorn Close and would instead fully support restricted access for sustainable active forms of travel such as walking and cycling into the town facilities and rail station. I recommend the development site in question should have access via the new spine road which will be designed for this purpose and weight/volume of traffic</p> <p>b) Agree with chapter 7 which refers to additional possible accesses including via Thickthorn Close and states "these potential accesses will be unlikely to be considered as main access points into the wider site and any development off these accesses would need to demonstrate its connectivity with the remainder of the site. It is likely that the number of dwellings accessed off</p>	<p>a) and b) We wish to avoid Thickthorn Close becoming a through route to the spine road and encouraging 'rat running' and this is why there is no connection. WCC Highways do not foresee an issue with a small number of dwellings being accessed via Thickthorn Close and not connecting to the spine road. Detailed access arrangements will be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage. The Brief is seeking to identify Thickthorn Close as providing pedestrian and cycle links to the existing town and also potentially serving a small number of dwellings, which may help with development</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Thickthorn Close will be limited and through routes to the Spine Road are unlikely to be supported for vehicles (but will be required for walking and cycling)".	phasing, but it would not be desirable for there to be a vehicular link with the spine road	
71306	Mr J Hodge		<p>a) It is a pity that the spine road does not run through the complete site but I accept that the retention of the Woodside complex makes this impossible</p> <p>b) It does mean that the northern spine road will almost certainly disgorge the majority of its traffic into Glasshouse Lane at the proposed roundabout adjacent to Stansfield Grove. This will mean that an already busy Glasshouse Lane will become extremely busy in the direction of Birches Lane</p> <p>c) I am not clear where the entrance to the primary school adjacent to Woodside will be – assume it will be onto the spine road to the east of the site. An entrance to Glasshouse Lane would be calamitous. This will be an extremely busy road and the thought of parents waiting in their cars and primary age pupils being released onto this road is very worrying. I suspect there will be a 20mph speed limit and possibly double yellow lines on Glasshouse Lane. Even so the severe bend in the road about 50 yards from a possible entrance would render such an entrance very dangerous. I also suspect that if double yellow lines are put on the main part of Glasshouse Lane to prevent parental parking they will also be keen to do the same in the small cul-de-sac opposite which would create great problems for residents when it comes to parking for visitors etc</p>	<p>a) Noted. There are a number of constraints that would make the spine road running centrally through the site difficult, including the Woodside Hotel</p> <p>b) The proposals put forward are considered acceptable in highway terms and WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic. However, designs will be subject to further assessment, Road Safety Audits and consultation.</p> <p>c) The access to the school would have been on a road off Glasshouse Lane and not off the spine road itself. The location of the proposed primary school however is to be changed. See response c) to Kenilworth Rugby Club rep ref: 71357</p>	Changes to be made regarding primary education provision (see Kenilworth Rugby Club rep ref: 71357)
71329;	Mr R &		a) Concerned about Thickthorn Close being used as an	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs:	See amendments

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
71330	Mrs A Meeks		<p>access to this new development. The road is narrow and often has parked vehicles on it so it is totally unsuitable for construction traffic or a big increase in traffic due to being a rat run through to the A46. Concerned about safety of children. I do not mind pedestrian or bicycle access up the road but object to the character of the area being changed significantly</p> <p>b) With regard to the house types on the development I do not mind there being more 2 and 3 bedroom properties than bungalows, which I know is a complaint of others locally and would prefer high specification housing to small units</p>	<p>71339 and 71340)</p> <p>b) The housing mix will need to conform to the mix given in Development Brief, which gives sufficient scope to meet the needs of individual sites as well as providing the homes that the District needs</p>	to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71304	Mr J Atkinson		<p>a) Our family believe that the new spine road joining Glasshouse Lane near the Heyville Croft turning on Glasshouse Lane will cause a bottleneck for traffic particularly at school start and finish times and other peak period. Currently there are approximately 50 properties on Heyville Croft and Mountbatten Ave. The only route onto main roads for residents of this road is the Heyville Croft exit. If a traffic roundabout is built close to this junction it will present a very tricky and potentially hazardous right turn onto Glasshouse Lane and the associated delays for residents trying to leave these two roads. This will only be exacerbated by a significant increase in the volume of traffic from residents of new homes. The alternative left turn out of Heyville Croft will take residents towards the proposed location for the new primary school opposite Dencer Drive potentially contributing to additional bottlenecks in this area</p>	<p>a) The proposals put forward are considered acceptable in highway terms and WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic. However, designs will be subject to further assessment, Road Safety Audits and consultation</p> <p>b) The proposals put forward are considered acceptable in highway terms. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. A continuous spine road is included in the plans and the route of the road is considered to be the most appropriate in order to deliver the development as</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>b) The spine road needs to be located through the new development. This needs to run in parallel to the A46 so that this route is in addition to the existing Glasshouse Lane. Failure to build a completely new and separate spine road for the development will have an adverse impact on all residents</p> <p>c) The changing demographics of Kenilworth will also contribute to an increase of road users in the area.</p> <p>d) The disruption caused by the recent temporary closure of Common Lane and the impact this has had on alternative local routes, particularly at peak time, should also be noted</p>	<p>a whole with as little negative impact as possible taking into account other material considerations. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief. Effort has been made to minimise the impact of the entire development on existing residential properties and this will be an important consideration when looking at detailed designs for junctions at the planning application stage</p> <p>c) Noted, however no evidence is provided to justify this statement</p> <p>d) Noted. The assessment of network disruption and mitigations, and further details of modelling is in the Strategic Transport Assessment on WDC website</p>	
71389; 71340	Ms E Keell		<p>a) Hugely concerned about the new plans and alterations to the dog-leg of Leyes Lane. Concerned some or all of the green that lies between Leyes Lane and Wisley Grove will be destroyed and fear the negative impact this may have as well as increased traffic. What evidence do you have that widening our road or removing some of the green will decrease congestion? Are you planning to alter the green area at all?</p> <p>b) The green is used by children to play and is attractive with biodiversity value. How are you going to add biodiversity by removing this green area and re-aligning Leyes Lane</p>	<p>a) Justification will be based upon traffic modelling and road safety audits. The proposal will inevitably involve the removal of a part of the green area</p> <p>b) The loss of any trees/greenery and any biodiversity impact will be assessed as part of any planning application relating to this scheme and where mitigation is necessary this will be required to be provided</p> <p>c) It is considered that the trees in this</p>	No amendments proposed

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
			c) The trees act as a noise barrier. Concerned about impact of noise and increasing traffic and removing or altering these will affect residents	area will have limited impact in terms of noise reduction. Furthermore, it is unlikely that there will be any significant noise generated over and above levels that would exist without any alterations to the junctions in this area. However, it is expected that these matters will be considered further at the detailed design stage	
71338	Ms W Parkes		a) Object to the proposed vehicular access into the site from Thickthorn Close. Changing the quiet close into a thoroughfare would be very detrimental and will spoil my home, which I have lived for so many years. Any increase in traffic would be extremely dangerous (there are many elderly residents at Kenilworth Manor) and noisy	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	No amendments proposed
71334	Ms T and Mr J Douthwaite		a) 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? b) 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	a) The Brief seeks to protect existing mature woodland and thus avoids any such impact b) There are a number of constraints that would make the spine road running centrally through the site difficult	No amendments proposed
71349	Mr G Lawrence		a) AM peak traffic regularly queues back from past Jordan Close to just before Windy Arbour and it is difficult to get out of side roads. All of this traffic is going to join the St John's gyratory where there is a further wait to be able to find a gap in the traffic heading South from the Kenilworth	a) Detailed modelling has been undertaken to determine the impacts and mitigation requirements linked to the development proposals. The details are available Strategic Transport	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Town Centre. There is another queue to get onto the A46 roundabout because of the traffic approaching it from the right heading either from the A46 to Leamington, or from Leamington to the A46 Northbound. I have been told that the average car owning ratio in this area is 2.4 cars per household. So an additional 3,360 cars have to be taken into account. If only half of them wish to leave the new site during the morning rush hour, that is an additional 1,680 cars must be given access to the surrounding roads</p> <p>b) It appears from the plans that a major exit will be onto or very near the bend in Glasshouse Lane where a new roundabout is being proposed, and further exits are planned through the current Rugby Club and adjacent to Wardens Cricket ground access. It is clear from the current situation that bringing more traffic onto Birches Lane will not be successful. It will add to the congestion at St John's gyratory, where it is planned to fit traffic lights. This will simply back up the Southbound traffic from town along the Warwick Road, and will also release cars from Birches Lane in large groups as opposed to in small numbers Southbound towards the A46. Getting across all this traffic to simply get to St John's school will be a nightmare. The traffic lights will also add to the congestion of the vehicles trying to access the gyratory from Leek Wootton</p> <p>c) A second major exit from the new development is planned to be approximately where the current Horse Fair enters and exits the field. You only have to see the congestion caused by this event to realise that putting a</p>	<p>Assessments at:  <a href="https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/info/2/0410/new_local_plan/1197/local_plan_evidence_base">https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/info/2/0410/new_local_plan/1197/local_plan_evidence_base</a> . It should be noted that car ownership does not translate directly into trip generation figures. Whilst car ownership may be high the trip generation linked to a development site will be much lower. The figures adopted in the Strategic Transport Assessment are robust and a peak hour figure of 0.6 trips generated per household in the AM peak was adopted (0.48 leaving 0.12 arriving AM peak). This is higher than the majority of sites on the national Trics website and higher than locally observed trip rates</p> <p>b) The long term solution is to provide a high quality route through the development site in the south linking Glasshouse Lane to Leamington Road thus reducing the need to use Birches Lane. There are also significant plans for improving the operation of St Johns Gyratory which will help manage the throughput. The network improvements have been determined through a detailed modelling</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>new road there with traffic lights will not work. For the Thursday and Friday before a horse fair the traffic backs up to St John's gyratory and beyond in all directions in spite of the good services provided at peak times by the local police</p> <p>d) There is also a plan to put traffic lights on the roundabout above the A46. The distance between the new spine road exit and the first lights will not permit many cars to be able to wait there, which will also add to the congestion North of this new junction. The traffic lights on the roundabout will cause congestion to occur for the first time for cars approaching the roundabout from the Northbound slip road off the A46, and from Leamington trying to get onto the Northbound slip onto the A46</p> <p>e) A further plan is to add another junction to the A46 roundabout from the business part of the new development. I cannot see how you could restrict cars which leave the new houses from using this access if they wish to go to Coventry or Leamington for business. With the increased traffic on the existing access to the roundabout, this will simply cause further problems. This appears to me to be a congestion disaster waiting to happen</p> <p>f) A further general concern is that the average speed of traffic outside peak rush hours on Birches Lane is already far higher than the legal 30 mph. The current "advisory" signs are not adequate to control the majority of drivers using the lane. Any additional cars using Birches Lane as an access road, both from the new development and for</p>	<p>assessment (see link in response to a)). Further scheme optimisation of scheme proposals will be undertaken through the development of the proposed schemes</p> <p>c) Scheme proposals have been subject to modelling assessments. Under signalisation, the Thickthorn roundabout and the development site access have been demonstrated to operate well. Any changes to the highway network will be subject to further detailed modelling analysis and road safety assessments. The final option must be demonstrated to be a workable solution for both Warwickshire County Council and Highways England</p> <p>d) See response to c)</p> <p>e) Any changes to the highway network will be subject to detailed modelling analysis and road safety assessments. The additional arm is one option to be considered, however through the development and analysis of the scheme alternative arrangements may be identified. The final option must be demonstrated to be a workable solution for both Warwickshire County</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>those using it as an access to the new Kenilworth School location, will only add to the difficulty of trying to cross the road as a pedestrian. I cannot speak on behalf of cyclists, but I would imagine their problems are similar. Birches Lane will become such an important urban highway that speed bumps would not be the answer either. Proper speed cameras in several places are the only real answer</p> <p>g) In my opinion, an additional access to the A46 is going to be the only real solution to solve the highway problems. The one proposed already for the business area is a small step but I cannot see how it will solve the problem on the roundabout. I think a major highway junction is needed to be able to get the traffic in and out of the new development</p>	<p>Council and Highways England</p> <p>f) Speed cameras will only be installed where there has been a history of injury related collisions and where there are no options for addressing such issues with engineering solutions</p> <p>g) An additional access on to the A46 is not feasible as there would be insufficient distances between the junctions to meet the required highway standards for a dual carriageway trunk road</p>	
71287	Mr B Nutter		<p>a) Mostly concerned about the considerable increase in traffic in the area, its effect on the quality of life of Kenilworth's existing residents and the future impact of the present pressure points in the Glasshouse Lane and Birches Lane roads</p> <p>b) I note that a partial spine road has been envisaged from the southern end of Birches Lane to Heyville Croft but that it has not continued to run parallel to the A46 and behind the Woodside Conference Centre to the new housing estate as was originally proposed. It seems this original proposal would perform the function of diluting the traffic and easing the pressure points at peak times. This would also make the journeys safer and dilute the adverse effects of noise and pollution. Safety must be paramount</p>	<p>a) The initial assessments of the sites in Kenilworth were undertaken as part of the Strategic Transport Assessment to support WDC Local Plan. The impacts of traffic generated from new developments was assessed and appropriate mitigation identified for the areas discussed. Impacts upon the amenities of residents will be considered as part of planning applications</p> <p>b) The proposals put forward are considered acceptable in highway terms. There are various constraints in</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>since there will be considerable numbers of secondary and primary school pupils on foot mingling with the additional residents going to work along with school staff and pupils travelling by car</p> <p>c) Aside from traffic problems envisaged in the new plan consideration should be given to the beautiful aspect of Glasshouse Lane and hope that its avenue of trees can be retained. Is it not possible to construct a bridge over Rocky Lane to continue the spine road behind Woodside?</p> <p>d) Since the population of Kenilworth contains a large percentage of people over 65 it would be helpful to include a number of bungalows and provision for the elderly in the new development</p>	<p>providing a spine road running entirely through the development. A continuous spine road is included in the plans and the route of the road is considered to be the most appropriate in order to deliver the development as a whole with as little negative impact as possible taking into account other material considerations. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief. Effort has been made to minimise the impact of the entire development on existing residential properties and this will be an important consideration when looking at detailed designs for junctions at the planning application stage. Road safety audits will be required as part of the detailed design of schemes</p> <p>c) The retention of veteran and mature trees throughout the development area is encouraged wherever practicable</p> <p>d) The housing mix will reflect the needs of the town and also the wider District. The opportunity to develop significant amount of affordable and start homes is one that is welcomed</p>	

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
71297	Mr F Farrell		<p>a) Concern relates to vehicular access between the site of the proposed development and Thickthorn Close. Chapter 8 pages 144-145 indicate that the only access point to the site will be from Thickthorn Close. This would require traffic from the A46 and from Leamington Rd, as well as local traffic from the town centre, to access the site via the St John's Gyratory, Birches Lane &amp; Thickthorn Close. However, in Chapter 7 page 84 access from Thickthorn Close is referred to but 'will be unlikely to be considered appropriate means of main access points into the wider site' and 'while not proposed for vehicle access, the accesses do offer good potential for use as emergency access points and enable opportunities for good connectivity to the existing town for walking and cycling'</p> <p>b) Vehicle access from Thickthorn Close will entail a loss of amenity to existing residents (concern for which is expressed in Chapter 3 page 26) and a significant increase in traffic onto existing streets. It therefore seems appropriate to plan for pedestrian and cycle access only from Thickthorn Close, but with all vehicle access from the proposed primary routes</p>	<p>a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p> <p>b) See a)</p>	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71316; 71317; 71318	Ms M Moorhouse		<p>a) As a resident of the area, I accept that new housing, and the infrastructure to support it, are inevitable, but I have concerns about the plan as it stands. In any discussions over many years with residential and council groups, the one point on which there was adamant agreement was that a spine road would take new traffic away from Birches Lane and Glasshouse Lane, as these are already very busy roads, especially at peak times. However, the</p>	<p>a) A continuous spine road is provided that utilises existing infrastructure in places. As set out in the Brief, there are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. This is the only spine road route that has been put forward by WDC</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>latest plan indicates no such road to divide the traffic between the existing roads and a spine road, all traffic converging between Heyville Croft and Stansfield Grove. There is no spine road, the one thing we believe is fundamental to any new development</p> <p>b) The proposed roundabouts will halt and slow down traffic, increasing air and noise pollution and disruption, and diminishing quality of life for those already living on busy streets</p> <p>c) The development will cause so much disruption to flora and fauna anyway that a proper spine road continuing from the proposed southern new road, across Rocky Lane, behind Woodside Hotel and the new houses, would be less intrusive and would be parallel to the A46</p> <p>d) Hundreds of daily school runs to new school sites will increase traffic enormously and needs to be shared by more than the existing roads, which will become Kenilworth Eastern Ring Road, especially as there is not to be any new access to and from the A46</p> <p>e) There is little mention of provision of housing for the older population of Kenilworth, despite your admission that the highest rate of projected population growth will be in the 65+ age group</p>	<p>b) The roundabouts are necessary to minimise the delays not increase them. If the junctions were standard priority junctions the delays would increase. Noise and air pollution will be important considerations in the detailed design of junctions and in the assessment of planning applications</p> <p>c) Disagree. The protection of the designated wildlife corridors is an essential feature of the development, coupled with the mitigation and improvement provided elsewhere in the development brief area</p> <p>d) Appropriate mitigation has been identified through the STA and further assessment will be undertaken for the planning application for the school. The junctions on the A46 will not be affected by school related traffic, but there are plans for major improvements referred to in the Brief</p> <p>e) An appropriate mix of dwellings is considered to be proposed that not only meets the needs of the existing home-owning population of the town but offers much-needed opportunity for first time buyers and younger home owners.</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
71396; 71397; 71398; 71399; 71400; 71401; 71402; 71403; 71404	Mr J Brightley		<p>a) Generally supportive of the Brief but with a few comments</p> <p>b) Ch 7, p61 – Development Principle 1A – Does this mean every development should accommodate housing suitable for older people, or should there be a separate site for specialist housing somewhere on the development? More clarification is required</p> <p>c) P62 – Support Development Principle 1B but unsure how ‘major’ is defined? Should the word ‘major’ be omitted?</p> <p>d) P67 – Proposed cycling routes should include ones across the railway at Clarendon Rd and from Glasshouse Lane to Stoneleigh Park (an upgrading of public footpath W202), as this is a major employment site which is very close to the development site, but has very poor links at present</p> <p>e) P64 and 72-73 – Although para 3, p72 suggests there could be two options to access the residential site, the preferred option highlighted by para 3 on p64 says that “there should be no through route between the employment land and residential areas”. Two separate links to the A452 Leamington Rd would appear to be unnecessary duplication and adds complications. P73 notes that with the current proposals, there is a danger of traffic queueing back to the A46 roundabout. This is highly likely as currently in evening peak periods traffic frequently backs up from the St John’s gyratory across the roundabout and down to Chesford Bridge. When this development was originally proposed, the expectation was that all the new development would be served directly from the Thickthorn roundabout and suggest that</p>	<p>a) Noted, thank you</p> <p>b) This policy specifies that development for older people within the Development Brief area will be supported. It does not make it a requirement of all, or indeed any, individual parcels of land. It is not felt that any further clarification is needed, detail will come forward as part of the planning application process</p> <p>c) Major housing applications are defined in planning terms as applications for 10 dwellings or more</p> <p>d) A route over the railway line via Clarendon Rd was not included on the network plan due to the width of the bridge, which is below the recommended width for shared use. However, further consideration will be given to options for this route. The crossing point between Farmers Ward Road and Clarke’s Avenue offers more scope for upgrading and this forms part of the updated cycle network plan</p> <p>e) The draft Brief puts forward a preferred option but alternatives will be considered. Planning applications for the employment and housing sites will be subject to further detailed</p>	<p>Amend text relating to St. John’s Gyratory on p86 relating to the potential signalisation of Birches Lane</p> <p>Whilst the K2L cycle route is identified as no.23 in Table 2 a reference to it will also be included in no.1 of the table</p> <p># to be removed next to Scheme no.23 of Table 2. This is because contributions towards K2L will be sought from developers</p> <p>P108 – additional wording to be added relating to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>arrangement be provided</p> <p>f) P76 – If the Hidcote Rd junction is changed as Fig.28, how is the current X17 bus service supposed to negotiate the junction, or is it to be diverted?</p> <p>g) P86 – i. Para 1 says that Birches Lane will remain un-signalised yet Fig.36 below it shows ‘new traffic signals’ at the junction. It is imperative that there are new signals at this junction as at present there are frequently long queues of traffic waiting to exit Birches Lane in rush hour periods; ii. There also needs to be provision through the gyratory system for cyclists as it is an important link between the north of the town and the Warwick/Leamington Rds and will also be one end of the K2L cycle route; iii. The footway adjacent to the petrol station needs to be retained to allow pedestrian access to the petrol station and Camden House – a lot of people use the petrol station as their local convenience store and access it by foot; iv. Visibility from the vehicle exit from the petrol station is currently difficult and should not be made worse</p> <p>h) P88 Fig.38 – carriageway widening will be required to allow buses to negotiate the corner safely. At the moment, buses frequently mount the pavement on the turn from Dalehouse Lane into Knowle Hill</p> <p>i) P89 Fig.39 – It would appear that a number of mature trees would have to be removed to achieve the proposed alignment of Leyes Lane. Have they been taken into account?</p> <p>j) P90 – i. It may be more practical for the town service bus</p>	<p>analysis and will have to seek agreement from Highways England</p> <p>f) This will be considered through the detailed design of this junction. It is possible to design junctions, if desirable and necessary, so that bus movements are possible but no other vehicle movements. The drawings in the Development Brief are a proof of concept and do not present the final optimised layout. Through the development of the scheme further consideration will be given to the impact on all modes of travel including the routing of bus services</p> <p>g) This is a drafting error. St.Johns Gyratory on Birches Lane may be signalised. The text in the Brief will be amended. However, final details of the design of this junction may result in the junction being either signalised or un-signalised</p> <p>h) This will be considered at the detailed design stage</p> <p>i) The drawings in the Development Brief are a proof of concept and do not present the final optimised layout. Through the development of the scheme further consideration will be</p>	<p>the requirement for a RoSPA report to include the words “to confirm that the proposed designs are safe”</p> <p>Amend wording on p120 relating to renewable energy technology to state “where appropriate”</p> <p>Development Principle 7C b) wording to be amended along the lines suggested in point x)</p> <p>Last sentence of first bullet in Car Parking section relating to Development</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>route to return to the town via Leyes Lane rather than as an 'out and back' route</p> <p>k) Fig.40 does not show the current 'SL' (station link) bus service</p> <p>l) Table 2-map ref 1. Should include reference to incorporating K2L cycle route</p> <p>m) Table 2-map ref 23- K2L should be part funded by East of Kenilworth sites. This is very important and justified so # symbol should be removed. Many of the new residents will be able to use the new route to access Leamington and is more important/just as important as 'Cycle Network Improvements' (unnumbered)</p> <p>n) P102 – The location of the primary school should be determined at this stage, rather than having the vagueness of 3 potential sites</p> <p>o) P103 – It is good that the current under-provision of open space in this area of town is highlighted. However, object to the statement that “applicants are not expected to address an existing deficiency”. It is very reasonable that applicants contribute to resolving this deficiency</p> <p>p) P107 – The statement of 'soft green edges to the edge of the development will be desirable' should be changed to 'essential'</p> <p>q) P107 - Support the statement that developers should offer open spaces to be adopted by the Council</p> <p>r) Support the statement “the Council will require a ROSPA report to be provided” but the wording “to confirm that the proposed designs are safe” should be added</p> <p>s) P117 – Objective 7 – the words “where possible and</p>	<p>given to the impact on trees</p> <p>j) At this preliminary stage, the bus route indicated in the Brief is not finalised, and simply acts as an indication of the bus service to be provided. The optimum route is still under consideration</p> <p>k) The Station Link was not included because it is currently only being operated on an experimental basis to measure passenger demand. A decision on the long term future of the bus service has yet to be determined</p> <p>l) Whilst the K2L cycle route is identified as no.23 in Table 2 a reference to it will also be included in no.1 as suggested</p> <p>m) The importance of the Kenilworth to Leamington cycle route to provide a sustainable travel connection for residents of the site is recognised. The section between Kenilworth and Bericote Road will be delivered by the A452 highway scheme, which will be partly funded by the East Kenilworth site, and an appropriate contribution towards the remainder of scheme will be included in the package of schemes to encourage cycling from the site. The # relating to scheme 23 in Table 2 will</p>	<p>Principle 7D, to be removed</p> <p>First bullet point on p159 to be amended to also include reference to the Local Plan and Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>appropriate” should be omitted</p> <p>t) In the phrase “...recommended that properties be built to the optional requirements”, suggest the word ‘recommended be omitted to avoid confusion</p> <p>u) P119 – Suggest the words “strive to achieve Building for Life accreditation” should be replaced by “properties will be required to achieve Building for Life accreditation” to avoid confusion</p> <p>v) P120 – In the phrase “renewable energy technology where applicable” the words “where applicable” should be removed to avoid confusion</p> <p>w) P129 – Support the fact that red sandstone detailing has been recognised as a particularly distinctive Kenilworth feature</p> <p>x) P132 – Development Principle 7C b) needs to be amended. The statement “Timber fencing, without hedging, will not be supported as a boundary treatment to the edge of any plots..” is impractical and unnecessary. It should be amended to read “Timber fencing to the boundaries of rear gardens adjoining highways will not be supported”</p> <p>y) P132 – Car parking – the first paragraph says ‘on plot parking...should be integrated into the street’. This is not clear – what does it mean?</p> <p>z) P132 Paragraph 5 – “...constructed from permeable paving unless it is deemed unsuitable”. Omit ‘unless it is deemed unsuitable’ to avoid confusion</p> <p>aa) P135 – Development Principle 7E Public Art – the words “...will be supported and strongly encouraged” should be</p>	<p>therefore be removed as contributions will be sought for this from developers</p> <p>n) The Brief needs to provide some flexibility as it is unknown when different sites will come forward</p> <p>o) It is not appropriate to require developers to overprovide greenspace to meet any existing deficiency</p> <p>p) Whilst the provision of soft green edges is desirable there may be occasions, such as ensuring seamless, targeted integration with the existing town, where a comprehensive and consistent green edge may be counter-productive, and therefore the original wording is appropriate</p> <p>q) Noted</p> <p>r) Agreed, the additional wording would add clarity. Brief to be amended</p> <p>s) Disagree. The wording is appropriate</p> <p>t) We cannot insist upon requirements over and above the statutory requirements of the Building Regulations and therefore this will be unchanged</p> <p>u) It would be inappropriate for the Development Brief to set a requirement in excess of the Local Plan</p> <p>v) Wording to be amended to “where</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>replaced by "...will be required". If these words are not included it is likely that no public art will be provided by applicants. Also change words "All major applications" with "All planning applications"</p> <p>bb) P143 – The inclusion of indicative densities is supported. Within the 'high density area' higher densities than 50 units/hectare could be possible if apartments are included without detracting from the overall concept</p> <p>cc) P144 – A cycle route to Stoneleigh Park via the existing footpath route to the Grecian Lodges should be included. A cycle link to Thickthorn Close is shown but a cycle route along Thickthorn Close and Moseley Rd should be shown as this could be the most suitable quiet cycle route from the southern end of the site to the town centre</p> <p>dd) P159 – Planning applications should also include supporting documentation showing how the application accords with the aims and objectives of the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>ee) P163 – Support the infrastructure delivery triggers and proposals for the spine roads to be completed before housing is occupied. This is realistic and necessary to avoid extra traffic on existing surrounding roads</p>	<p>appropriate"</p> <p>w) Noted</p> <p>x) Agreed, wording will be amended. This was the intention of the wording</p> <p>y) The final sentence of the first bullet will be removed for clarity</p> <p>z) Without the detailed information that will come forward through the planning application process it would be inappropriate to remove this caveat as there may be specific, exceptional circumstances where permeable paving is not suitable</p> <p>aa) It would be inappropriate for the Development Brief to impose a requirement that is not already contained within the Local Plan. However, we do strongly encourage the incorporation of public art and will be working with developers towards this</p> <p>bb) The densities suggested are indicative and are aimed to act as a guide. Should an application come forward with higher density in a particular area, the merits of this will be fully considered through the assessment of the application</p> <p>cc) The importance of providing cycle</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>access to Stoneleigh Park is recognised and the options for providing links will be investigated further as part of WCC cycle network planning work. Improvements to footpath W202 will be considered – however, the A46 bridge is currently unsuitable for use by cyclists due to width / parapet height. The potential for a cycle link via Thickthorn Close / Moseley Road will be considered and if appropriate added to the cycle network plan.</p> <p>dd) The wording of the first bullet point will be amended to also include reference to the Local Plan and Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>ee) Noted</p>	
71267; 71269; 71270; 71271; 71272	Ms M Ashton		<p>a) Chapter 1 - I note that H09 Kenilworth School Site is not included in this Development Brief. Given the increased number of residential properties when this site is developed, it will impact considerably on traffic in the area, particularly in Leyes Lane, Dencer Drive and Windy Arbour. Therefore, it would seem appropriate to include H09 in this Development Brief with regard to transportation in particular</p> <p>b) Principle 3C – Traffic speeds referred to in the Brief should include Leyes Lane as this is proposed to be a key access road to the new secondary school. Recommend speed and traffic calming measures on Leyes Lane remain as pupils</p>	<p>a) This Development Brief solely covers the East of Kenilworth development. A separate Development Brief will be required to be prepared for site H09 as required by Policy BE2 of the Local Plan. Transport considerations/assessment informing this Brief is based on Local Plan modelling, which includes the proposed development on site H09</p> <p>b) As part of the assessment of the planning application for the secondary</p>	<p>Additional text to be added to p76 to highlight the impact of the indicative scheme upon Hidcote Road</p> <p>Table 2, scheme no.22 'Leyes Lane Realignment' estimated</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>will be walking this way. The safety of pupils should be considered at lunch time and after school as they visit shops in Leyes Lane</p> <p>c) Principle 3E – Crewe Lane and Hidcote Rd junctions. It is unclear how traffic restrictions apply to Hidcote Rd. Fig 28 shows no entry signs but there is no comment in the document about one-way traffic in Hidcote Rd</p> <p>d) Principle 3J – i. Leyes Lane should not be considered as a primary means of access or ‘cut through’ to the new school and the new housing development from central Kenilworth. Glasshouse Lane, the new Spine Road and Knowle Hill are the main access roads. Wording should be amended; ii. Other roads to the west of Leyes Lane are already congested at peak times of the day, made worse with unrestricted parking in narrow roads. These roads are not suitable to take even more traffic from and to the new school and new housing; iii. The junction at western end of Leyes Lane is staggered with limited visibility when exiting Leyes Lane and also Whitemoor Rd. A review of this junction and options to improve it should be included in the Brief; iv. Parking on the road at the east end of Leyes Lane before the proposed signalisation should be reviewed. At peak times of day, parking along this section of Leyes Lane already causes traffic to be held up</p> <p>e) The junction at Windy Arbour and Glasshouse Lane/Birches Rd should be considered as part of the Transport study in this area. When approach the east of Kenilworth from the St Johns roundabout, there is a bend in the road which obscures the junction at Windy Arbour.</p>	<p>school, consideration will be given to what changes may be required to speed limits and traffic calming measures both on Glasshouse Lane and immediate surrounding roads</p> <p>c) Additional text will be added to acknowledge this alteration. Further consideration of layouts will be assessed through scheme development</p> <p>d) The impact linked to increased traffic volumes is considered through the Strategic Transport Assessment and will be considered further at planning application stage</p> <p>e) The assessments to date have not identified a need to improve the junction based upon junction capacity. There may be opportunity to consider implications of increased traffic through this junction in safety terms through the planning application process</p> <p>f) Dates are indicative and will depend on funding being available. However, it is proposed to amend the Leyes Lane realignment to 2021 to reflect the date of the school access as it would be preferable to see this work carried out at the same time</p>	<p>delivery date to be changed to 2021</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Traffic exiting Windy Arbour is not visible and there is potential for a serious accident. Signalisation or a mini roundabout would help to improve this junction. With the new traffic arrangements at the east of Leyes Lane, Windy Arbour may be used more frequently by residents in the area</p> <p>f) Summary of highway infrastructure requirements – The timings in the Development Plan key reference Leyes Lane are confusing: 11) refers to a date in 2021 for access from Leyes Lane to the School site, whereas 22) refers to Leyes Lane realignment in 2023. Surely the realignment of Leyes Lane needs to be completed first to enable access to the School site as shown in the maps included in the Brief</p> <p>g) Chapter 10 – Indicative trigger points mentioned in this section do not refer to the secondary school in the education paragraph. There is no mention of the date of completion for the secondary school within the Brief. Please include this for clarity</p>	<p>g) P101 of the Brief does already highlight that the school hope to move to the new site and be operational from September 2021</p>	
71344	Mr G Martin		<p>a) Welcome the idea of a Development Brief for all of the land east of Kenilworth and recognise the difficulties of dealing with a number of landowners</p> <p>b) Can consideration be given to the creation of a Locally Accountable New Town Development Corporation. This would enable WDC to have full control of the development</p> <p>c) Believe the Brief falls short of what is needed to ensure the proposed development will be genuinely sustainable. This is a missed opportunity to develop a more challenging Brief that looks to the future with climate</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) This is not a mechanism that WDC wishes to pursue, and is instead using this Development Brief and the traditional planning process to bring forward development</p> <p>c) The Brief will be an essential tool in bringing forward a SUE that meets all of the requirements of the Local Plan and Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan, delivering housing, employment and</p>	<p>Amend wording in Objective 5 and Development Principle 5A/or an additional Development Principle to require each application to include an environmental</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>change as a major concern. My view is that the brief will allow developers to build 'anywhere housing'. Is there any reason why this should not be an exemplar sustainable urban extension?</p> <p>d) Question the extent of stakeholder engagement. More organisations could have been involved and there are also a number of tools available to assist with stakeholder engagement which could have been used</p> <p>e) The document needs to be updated with the specific Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan (KNP) policies so that developers are fully aware that they are required to take these policies into account. I am of the opinion that the vision included within the document does not match the vision for Kenilworth as set out in the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>f) Delighted to read that the 2018 version of the NPPF is referenced. This needs to be highlighted to developers so they understand the enhancements over the 2012 vision</p> <p>g) High Quality – Delighted to see so many references to 'high quality' in the document although cannot find definitions of how this will be measured nor is it explained how this will differ from what developers would normally deliver. Ask that clear definitions be included for 'high quality' including details as to how this will be measured</p> <p>Housing:</p> <p>h) The Vision refers to "high quality sustainably designed buildings" however, there is no definition of what this means. KNP policy KP15 seeks to encourage applicants to adopt higher environmental standards of building design</p>	<p>education land to the benefit of the town</p> <p>d) The Council undertook comprehensive engagement, significantly in excess of that required by statute. Presentations were made to the Town Council and Kenilworth Development Forum (which also included a workshop specifically relating to Land East of Kenilworth), neighbour notices were hand delivered to all adjoining properties, site notices were put up, email and paper notifications were sent to all statutory consultees and all those with a registered interest on our system (numbering over 4000 individuals), public exhibition and drop-in sessions were run in Kenilworth library and the consultation was promoted on social media and via traditional press</p> <p>e) The Brief was written prior to the Neighbourhood Plan referendum, and minor changes will be made to update the Brief to reflect the new status. The Brief and the NP were drafted cognisant of one another and there is no conflict in their respective visions or subsequent policies</p> <p>f) This is not necessary and to list the</p>	<p>strategy to establish how the development will deliver a net biodiversity gain and manage the sustainable drainage of the land</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>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 / house builders to go beyond the current 2013 building regulations. Such a requirement is absent from the document</p> <p>i) An ‘otherwise distinctive character’ would be one that incorporates modern technologies and building methods and importantly sustainable materials in order to create something attractive, distinctive and sustainable</p> <p>j) There is a need to make use of modular construction and off-site construction to reduce emissions</p> <p>k) Mention is made for affordable housing but there is no reference to social housing. Surely there will be provision for social housing?</p> <p>l) The requirement for custom and self-build housing is not mentioned within the vision thereby potentially downplaying this in the eyes of developers. How are people to know about this opportunity if it is not advertised as part of the vision and objectives?</p> <p>m) The principles laid down in Objective 1B are broadly appropriate, however there is no specific mention of the potential for small bespoke developers who in general build higher quality housing with performance in use standards. I advocate that WDC advertise the fact that sites for this type of development will be available for both individuals and for small bespoke</p>	<p>changes between the 2012 and 2018 NPPF’s would be superfluous</p> <p>g) The placemaking principles provide a strong idea of what is required to achieve high quality development. The District will be bringing forward a Developer Design Framework SPD that takes Building for Life 12 as it’s starting point. This SPD will set out the framework for assessing the quality of the design of proposals</p> <p>h) A SPD, or Neighbourhood Plan cannot require standards in excess of Building Regulations, this can only come forward within a Local Plan. The NP “encourages” these higher standards but does not, and cannot, make them a requirement</p> <p>i) Noted</p> <p>j) These kind of mitigations, and others, that are aimed at reducing emissions will be considered at the planning application stage</p> <p>k) The definition of affordable housing is set by the National Planning Policy Framework and thus includes social housing</p> <p>l) The provision of custom &amp; self-build plots is a requirement within the</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>developers/builders</p> <p>n) Note there are no recommendations as to how close to the A46 houses and gardens should be. With respect to noise and its attenuation the Passivhaus approach to construction ensures a better quality of life for house occupants thanks to its high levels of insulation and low air/noise permeability</p> <p>Environment – biodiversity</p> <p>o) Question how the vision statement relating to the removal of existing mature landscaping and woodland can enhance the development? KNP policy KP4(l) calls for an environmental strategy to establish how the development will deliver a net biodiversity gain. Any requirement for the development of such a strategy is absent from the document</p> <p>p) There is also a later statement on page 55: “Detailed development proposals will need to retain habitats where possible and mitigate any impact upon ecology.” However, minimising the impact on green / blue infrastructure and on wildlife sites, and retaining habitats where possible, also does not equate to policy KP4(l) within the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan. A requirement for the development of such a biodiversity strategy is missing from the document including specifically for the 3 designated wildlife sites</p> <p>q) Pleased to read that a standard of green space has been identified as a primary concern by the Parks and Open Spaces Audit, but would welcome guidance on what a ‘high quality’ environment looks like, with examples on</p>	<p>Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan, and the marketing and promotion of these will need to take place appropriately. The guidance for this is laid out in the Custom &amp; Self-built SPD currently under consultation</p> <p>m) It would not be appropriate for the Brief to favour one size of housing developer over another – the key is that they conform with guidance within the Brief and the emerging Custom and Self-Build SPD</p> <p>n) Noise attenuation and air quality mitigation will be requirements of the individual planning applications, where issues are identified</p> <p>o) The wording in the Development Brief will be amended to provide specific reference to Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP4 part l) and set out a clear requirement for each application (at which point the impact of schemes will be known) to be accompanied with an environmental strategy to establish how the development will deliver a net biodiversity gain and manage the sustainable drainage of the land. Each strategy will be required to</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>what has been achieved elsewhere, including mainland Europe. Would question whether the WDC 'Open Space SPD' is fit for purpose 10 years on?</p> <p>r) Due consideration must be given to the potential public health issues arising from air pollution and noise from the A46 when planning the development of public open spaces and allotments</p> <p>s) Traffic and Transport – Fig 56 on p144 purports to show pedestrian and cycle connectivity. However, it just shows the existing situation with no improvements or enhancements. Thee chapter fails to provide a successful basis to ensure that cycling and walking become the transport mode of choice</p> <p>t) Traffic Speed – Welcome the 20mph speed limit which is in accordance with KNP policy KP4(g). However, there is no justification for the spine road to have a 30mph speed limit as all of it goes through the residential area. Merely placing a 20mph speed limit through the local centre will encourage braking followed by acceleration over short distances. Also as Glasshouse Lane will become a road within a residential area it should also have a 20mph speed limit</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p>u) Air Quality – This is the major concern with medical evidence demonstrating that poor air quality in the UK contributes to the early deaths of up to 40,000 people each year. Is WDC satisfied that the land east of Kenilworth is safe for people's health and that by living there it will not contribute to their early death?</p>	<p>complement any other approved environmental strategies submitted as part of applications within land East of Kenilworth</p> <p>p) See response to o)</p> <p>q) There is a new Public Open Space SPD currently out for public consultation which details the requirements for various typologies of Public Open Space</p> <p>r) These will be matters that will be considered through the planning application process</p> <p>s) Figure 56 shows proposed routes and identifies existing roads where improvements will be sought to improve routes</p> <p>t) Noted. The spine road needs to remain an attractive route and the favoured alternative to using Birches lane to access the A46/Leamington Road. At lower speeds the route would become less attractive. Design features such as appropriate crossing points, wide footways and cycleways, limited on-street parking etc will ensure that the operation of the network is safe. Whilst the spine road will go through residential areas restricting this road to</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>v) The paragraphs related to Development Principle 5D: Air Quality, describe minimum requirements for air quality (AQ) assessment. Most AQ assessments fail to measure particulate matter (PMs) and this should be deemed unacceptable as there is no lower 'healthy' threshold for finest particles (PM2.5s) that enter the bloodstream</p> <p>w) It is also a concern that existing AQ assessments on the site (Catesby) rely on modelled data and not monitored data, especially when the sole attempt to validate the modelled AQ shows a significant underestimation of pollution levels. I would argue that the text is amended to include the need for specific monitoring programmes for nitrous oxides, PM10s and PM2.5s at key locations (e.g. roadside, roundabouts) but especially along transects at right angles to the A46 to assess the distance that the pollution plume extends over the site. The monitoring programmes should run for at least 12 months prior to planning permission consent to enable an assessment of annual cumulative pollution loadings within households</p> <p>x) It has become clear recently that inner city London schools have the highest concentrations of pollutants inside classrooms. Coupled with other studies that show the most adverse health effect of air pollution is stunted lung growth in children, it is important to pay particular attention to the pollution levels in and around the two proposed schools. Continuous AQ monitoring should be installed inside all new schools for their lifetime</p> <p>y) I also request that estimates for pollution produced by new residents through house heating and vehicle</p>	<p>20mph will reduce its effectiveness as a spine road and therefore in this instance there is a strong argument that material considerations would suggest a deviation from the precise wording of KNP policy KP4(g)</p> <p>u) The allocation of the development site was considered in detail through the Local Plan process and the subsequent, independent Examination in Public. The site was found to be suitable for residential, educational and employment development</p> <p>v) The minimum requirements are in line with recently adopted Air Quality SPD</p> <p>w) The recently adopted Air Quality SPD, developed in conjunction with the Council's Environmental Health team, sets out the requirements, mitigations and damage costs for air quality impacts. This Development Brief cannot set requirements such as those suggested as they are beyond the requirements of the Local Plan</p> <p>x) The comments regarding inner city London schools are noted. The installation of monitoring stations inside all schools, for the lifetime of the school is not something that is feasible</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>movements should be fully quantified and explained. Current AQ assessments of the projected pollution generation (Catseby) are insufficiently transparent to afford proper interrogation of the assumptions, methods and data used (e.g. how vehicle movements, including start up each morning and pollution levels are calculated). Beyond direct AQ assessment is the need for Transport Plans offering a comprehensive and integrated strategy for all types of journeys, funded through Section 106, that can actually reduce vehicle use</p> <p>z) I would strongly advocate that WDC directly commission the air quality monitoring to ensure that they are entirely in control of the quality and transparency of the work and that there is no risk of 'manipulation' by the developers</p> <p>Noise</p> <p>aa) The location of the site next to the A46 means that noise in addition to air quality needs to be addressed. If this sustainable urban extension is to be a 'high quality' development, then these issues must be resolved. I am not confident that enough resource is being devoted to this, particularly in light of the comment in the Planning Statement forming part of the Catesby Planning Application (W18/1635), "The predicted noise levels throughout the majority of the site's proposed garden areas would likely meet the WHO noise criteria for outdoor living areas, assuming the garden areas would have intervening buildings and garage blocks in front. In this case, it is likely the outdoor garden areas would not exceed the upper BS 8233 criteria of 55 dB(A)." (para</p>	<p>or viable at the current time</p> <p>y) As per the recently adopted Air Quality SPD, dependant on the nature of the development, reports will need to accompany the planning application that will be reviewed by our Environmental Health team. Where impacts are identified they will need to be mitigated, preferably on site. These mitigations will vary dependent on the site and issue and therefore the Brief does not specify the precise nature of the mitigation that is required</p> <p>z) Noted</p> <p>aa) Noise impact and attenuation is a matter for the planning application process rather than the Development Brief. Environmental Health officers will carefully examine noise issues as part of the determination of each application</p> <p>bb) Noted. Financial viability of a development is important as we need to meet the growth requirements of the district. It is therefore important that we find appropriate mitigation for any site issues that deliver an appropriate living environment whilst also delivering the needed housing</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>5.4.12). This raises the question development is this progressing when it is only 'likely' that WHO standards will be met? I would strongly advocate that this issue needs to be resolved now before development commences?</p> <p>bb) Whilst I welcome the Principle 5C I am very much concerned about the comment that consideration will be given to the financial viability of a solution. I would advocate that people's health and wellbeing should come before any financial considerations.</p> <p>cc) As with the air quality, I would also advocate that WDC directly commission the noise surveys so as to ensure control and quality of the work</p> <p>Education</p> <p>dd) There is a lack of ambition for the design quality of the new schools. With the schools being at the heart of the new sustainable urban extension 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 build 'high quality' housing</p> <p>ee) 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 asthma and stunted lung development. Before indicating the site for a primary school to developers, the evidence should be presented that air quality is not an issue at this site</p>	<p>cc) Noted. However, this is not generally how the planning process works. It is for applicants to provide detailed reports relating to their proposals and the LPA has the opportunity to challenge these reports if it considers it necessary to do so</p> <p>dd) As with the residential designs, it is not possible for the Development Brief to require a standard in excess of those set out in the national Building Regulations</p> <p>ee) The site of the primary school is to be moved. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed site was unsuitable on air quality grounds</p> <p>ff) Noted</p> <p>gg) There is sufficient energy provision either currently available or within current expansion capabilities. However, the local authority would welcome applications that feature alternative sources of power generations</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>ff) Utilities – When upgrading is planned to the existing primary substation it is essential that consideration is given to the need for additional electricity capacity for the increased take up of electric vehicle charging points, air source and ground source heating and the move in general from gas to electricity as a source of power</p> <p>gg) Utilities – why has consideration not been given to incorporating infrastructure supporting local distributed generation and storage to mitigate centralised supply inadequacies?</p>		
71391	Mr G and Mrs J Mexson		<p>a) Support the development as it will be good for Kenilworth. However, have been concerned as to how this development may affect us and our property</p> <p>b) We are pleased to see that two of our concerns have been addressed: i. Note that the spinney that 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; ii. The planted verges on Thickthorn Close are to be retained. These are a unique feature in Kenilworth and are part of the ambience of the Close. This is also sensible 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</p> <p>c) However, one serious concern about access into and out of the new development from Thickthorn Close. The Brief appears contradictory:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A secondary road within the residential development at the end of Thickthorn Close is shown with a sole</li> </ol>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) The term primary route is used to determine the principal transport corridor through the development site. Thickthorn Close does not fulfil this function and therefore is referred to as a secondary route. WCC Highways do not foresee an issue with a small number of dwellings being accessed via Thickthorn Close and not connecting to the spine road. Detailed access arrangements will be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage. The Brief is seeking to identify Thickthorn Close as providing pedestrian and cycle links to the existing town and also potentially serving a small number of dwellings,</p>	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>access point into Thickthorn Close, which is specified as a 'secondary access' (See Fig.57 on p145). Surely this should be classed as a primary access if it is the only one?</p> <p>2. 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 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?</p> <p>3. The Brief 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?</p> <p>4. The Brief also acknowledges on p86 that Thickthorn Close is not appropriate as a main access and defines how access via this route should be restricted (to pedestrians and cyclists)</p> <p>5. Figure 22 on p49 purports to show 'Access and Connectivity at Site Level' and does not show any access from Thickthorn Close</p> <p>d) One of the problems in using Thickthorn Close as an access way into the development is its width (at 4.75m it does not even conform to the specification for a secondary route which is set at a minimum of 6m – see p154). This is evident even without the new development</p> <p>e) Of even more concern is the junction at the top of</p>	<p>which may help with development phasing, but it would not be desirable for there to be a vehicular link with the spine road. The content of the Brief will be checked to ensure it is written to this effect.</p> <p>No.5 – This is an 'Existing' access drawing that only shows current access points into the site</p> <p>d) Noted. The route hierarchy is a guide and in some instances it may be acceptable to allow deviations from this guide. In this case there is an existing road which functions acceptably for the existing dwellings on Thickthorn Close and therefore there is no reason to suggest that it wouldn't for a small number of additional dwellings. WCC/WDC would want to take a pragmatic view in light of residents having a strong desire to not see the road widened as this would result in the loss of the rose beds which are an attractive feature of the road</p> <p>e) WCC Highways do not foresee an issue with a small number of dwellings being accessed via Thickthorn Close and not connecting to the spine road. Detailed</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>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</p> <p>f) 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</p>	<p>access arrangements will be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage</p> <p>f) Noted</p>	
71405	Mr J Lyons		<p>a) Understand that WDC has to implement Government housing targets but have a number of concerns how it might affect us and our neighbours (off Glasshouse Lane)</p> <p>b) The new school(s) will be in area ED2 opposite where we live. We have not seen any formal plan of the exact position or the design or layout of the school. We hope that the location and design will be as sympathetic as possible with the existing housing, including the retention and possible extension of green screening along Glasshouse Lane and the siting of the main school building well back on the site</p> <p>c) We are aware of current traffic problems in and around Leyes Lane due to on-street parking and the use of nearby shops and cul-de-sacs as dropping-off and collection points, four times a day. We trust that the school will be built with sufficient parking on site and easy arrangements for dropping-off and collecting children, so that drivers are not attracted to look for alternatives. We are not happy at the prospect of the current parking problems being shifted in our direction and having daily conflict with school users cluttering our cul-de-sac and</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) These details will come forward as part of the planning application process. Kenilworth School will be undertaking public consultation and also pre-application discussions with WDC/WCC prior to the submission of a planning application. The Development Brief lacks detail relating to what is expected from the school site (and the primary school sites) and so will be updated to emphasise the need for perimeter landscaping and the development to respect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties.</p> <p>c) These matters will be considered through the detailed planning application process. In initial discussions with Kenilworth School WDC/WCC have advised to ensure that there are appropriate levels of on-site</p>	<p>Development Principle 4B (Education) to be amended to add some additional detail around the need for perimeter landscaping and for the proposed schools to be designed to respect the amenities of neighbouring properties</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>inhibiting our movements</p> <p>d) Although the ED2 zone has been shown as the site for the new school, we have read comments that there might be more land than needed and therefore part of this zone (the top part bordering Glasshouse lane and Crewe Lane) was not allocated for any specific use. We now read that it could be used for additional housing. Given that the Council's additional building quota is covered in the other zones, we object to this and question whether it is desirable or legal to increase the land allocation for housing when this is not necessary and would be an intrusion into what will remain of the Green Belt</p> <p>e) We assume that other measures such as traffic calming and reduced speed limits might be proposed for Glasshouse Lane, including 20 mph limits. We are concerned that any such measures should be sensible and commensurate with need rather than blunt measures that have little relevance to any speeding problems or attendance patterns - such as restrictions for 24 hours a day and 7 days a week</p> <p>f) We note that the plan for new roads has been changed and that rather than build a spinal road through the new development it is now proposed to direct much of the new traffic along Glasshouse Lane between Crewe Lane and Rocky Lane – we have seen a figure of 6000 extra journeys a day. This seems entirely inappropriate and will surely create conflict between domestic and school traffic</p> <p>g) Potential chaos and disruption whilst the building work is being carried out. This will be compounded by potential</p>	<p>car and cycle parking and the provision of an on-site drop off facility will be required</p> <p>d) The educational land has an underlying allocation for housing, and land not needed for educational purposes will be given over to housing. This was clearly articulated in the Local Plan Policy DS12. As part of the Local Plan process the entire Development Brief area was removed from the green belt and so this does not require a green belt release</p> <p>e) Detailed traffic calming measures will come forward as part of the detailed planning application process</p> <p>f) This is the only spine road that has been put forward by WDC. A continuous spine road is included in the plans and utilises existing infrastructure in places. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief. WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			disruption caused by the construction of HS2. The housing, school and HS2 developments need to be coordinated to minimise disruption and inconvenience.	g) Noted. All efforts will be made to coordinate the various developments and mitigate the disruption	
71268	Mr G Hyde		a) The proposed location for the community centre is on the southern edge of Kenilworth and the south-western end of the development. It is hard to understand how this can be described as a hub for eastern side of town as a whole. Please consider siting this on the north-eastern corner of the Leyes Lane School site (H09), which is opposite the existing shopping area and pub. The existing library building is little more than 20 years old so could be adapted for use as a community centre. Traffic calming on Leyes Lane is already in place	a) The proposed community centre is located in a fairly central location on the site and adjacent to the proposed Local Centre. One of the reasons for siting these facilities here is to ensure an appropriate spatial distribution of centres and therefore is deliberately away from Leyes Lane. As developers of the new development will be funding the community centre it is entirely appropriate that it is delivered on their site. As with the primary school, to locate these facilities on the central parcel of land is likely to have resulted in more challenges to the delivery of the community centre	No amendments proposed
71370	Mr B Heath		a) At present, there is a reasonable traffic flow along Glasshouse Lane/Birches Lane towards the St. Johns Gyratory (SJG) at most times, with the following exceptions: 1) The junction of Birches Lane, Windy Arbour and Glasshouse Lane is particularly dangerous. There is a kink in the road and the junction layout makes it almost impossible for traffic exiting Windy Arbour to see traffic approaching on Birches Lane and vice versa. 2) During the morning rush hour there is often a queue to	a) 1. Further consideration will be given to the safe operation of this junction when working with developers on their planning applications 2. Noted, WCC will be adopting the use of a network of signals which can communicate to optimise the throughput of traffic and minimise queues. The spine road through the development site will also mitigate	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>enter the SJG. This becomes a major problem in the event of any traffic hold-ups on roads such as the A46 resulting in local diversions.</p> <p>Having read the Draft Development Brief, these issues will be greatly magnified by the resulting increased traffic flows; and the signalisation of SJG will further hinder the flow unless careful, intelligent, traffic phasing is incorporated into the scheme. The diversion of the planned spine road to use Glasshouse Lane as part of its route will also contribute to the potential for congestion on Glasshouse Lane</p> <p>b) The Development will incorporate new schools on the Southcrest Farm site and, most likely, on the development opposite the southern junction of Dencer Drive with Glasshouse Lane. The plans for various roundabouts and traffic lights on Glasshouse Lane are obviously designed to slow traffic flow and increase safety around the vicinities of these schools, but great care needs to be taken to ensure that the changes do not encourage congestion; with resulting increases in accident risks. Recent developments in Leyes Lane have been made with the aim of increasing safety for pupils attending Kenilworth School, but in my view they have not addressed the issues effectively and have proved a significant hindrance to traffic using Leyes Lane at times when school children are not present. A particular issue at night is that the headlights of traffic negotiating the speed ramps momentarily blind on-coming cars, cyclists and pedestrians, increasing the risk of accidents. Also, as a</p>	<p>these impacts</p> <p>3. The details regarding the treatment of the highway in the vicinity of the school will be determined through the planning application process for the school. The statistical evidence from following the implementation of the traffic calming measures on Leyes Lane differs from your anecdotal observations. There has been a reduction in injury accidents from 6 during the period 2012–07/2015 to 1 accident (at the school entrance when a child stepped in front of a turning coach) during the period 09/2017 – 01/2019. We are also planning to implement a comprehensive network of cycle paths and improvements for pedestrians and aim to achieve a good shift to alternative</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>regular user of Leyes Lane at school times, I have observed that parents taking their children to school by car take advantage of temporary halts in the traffic flow to allow children to alight directly onto the road. This causes further delays to the traffic flow, but more importantly it increases the risk of accidents to school children; and potentially to passing cyclists. It is imperative that this traffic congestion and these risks to school children are not transferred to the new school sites on Glasshouse Lane. Traffic pull-ins should be provided at each new school site; and they should be of sufficient length and appropriate design to ensure that parents are able to drop off their children in a safe and effective manner. Further, this would also minimise the need for parents to park in nearby roads to deliver their children to school, causing further traffic congestion and inconvenience to local residents. I have regularly encountered unnecessary traffic congestion, with associated risk to the safety of school children, at many school sites in Kenilworth.</p>		
71361; 71362	A Dearing	Kenilworth Green Party	<p>a) Following much consultation seeking residents' views on the proposals, we conclude that, in many ways, the Draft Development Brief offers an acceptable guideline to developers</p> <p>b) 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 criticism is the view that the necessary evidence for</p>	<p>a) Noted, thank you</p> <p>b) Noted. The Plan has been developed with input from a significant number of organisations. Presentations have been delivered to and discussions been had with Kenilworth Town Council (elected by residents) and the Kenilworth Development Forum, the latter including a workshop specifically</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>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</p> <p>Residents' Views</p> <p>c) 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 Council has undertaken extensive consultation with key stakeholders. Unless there is further direct engagement with residents this paragraph should be amended for accuracy</p> <p>d) Central Spine road – concerns about the route of the spine road. Believe this should run straight through the site and not onto Glasshouse Lane</p> <p>e) 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'</p> <p>f) Concerns about the car parks or drop-off points needed for the new secondary school</p> <p>g) Concerns about the Hidcote Ave, Crewe Lane, Glasshouse Lane junctions and a heightened risk of accidents particularly as this will be the focus of traffic movements in and out of the new secondary school</p> <p>h) Concerns about traffic speeds on Glasshouse Lane and</p>	<p>focusing on the Brief. The public consultation for this document, over and above the typical level of consultation for such events, involved public drop-in sessions where members of the public could come and talk to officers to discuss their thoughts</p> <p>c) See b)</p> <p>d) There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief. WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic</p> <p>e) Noted. The network has been planned in a way which can accommodate cyclists and pedestrians safely. Simplifying the network (removing staggered junctions), providing signalised junctions with crossing facilities and slowing the speed of traffic down in this vicinity are all features designed to help facilitate more use of cycles. The signalisation at this location is not required for capacity reasons, it has been identified to manage the traffic flows and</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Windy Arbour and how these may become greater with more traffic flows. This is of particular concern because the proposed 30mph speed limit for the Spine Road would be contrary to the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan policy KP4(g) which states “residential roads within developments are designed to a 20mph standard”</p> <p>i) Concerns about the proposed roundabout at the end of Rocky Lane and the need for allocated car parking spaces to access the Central Park</p> <p>j) Non-vehicle routes – the new houses and schools will create more vehicle movements. Safe routes for pedestrians, mobility scooters and cyclists within the development site and the between the rest of the tow and the site should therefore be viewed as absolute priorities</p> <p>Local Green Party Views</p> <p>k) High quality sustainable development should reflect the best practices and standards that exist across the UK and Europe: a step-change in quality rather than incremental improvements on what currently passes as sustainable</p> <p>l) Sustainability and Standards – Clear definitions must be included for ‘high quality’ including specified measurable standards</p> <p>m) Almost identical comments to Mr G Martin’s (ref: 71344) points g), h), k) and dd)</p> <p>n) 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</p>	<p>primarily to ensure safe movements for pedestrians and cyclists. It is acknowledged that there would be some loss of trees/greenspace and the design of any final scheme for this proposal will be required to pay due consideration to any such impacts upon biodiversity. These matters will be considered through the detailed planning application process</p> <p>f) In initial discussions with Kenilworth School WDC/WCC have advised to ensure that there are appropriate levels of on-site car and cycle parking and the provision of an on-site drop off facility will be required</p> <p>g) This Development Brief acknowledges that this junction requires detailed consideration and p76 of the draft Brief and Figure 28 show an indicative proposal for these junctions. As part of any detailed proposals for changes to these junctions, safety will be a key consideration and road safety audits will be required. Planning applications in the area will be required to consider the impacts of their developments upon any relevant off-site junctions</p> <p>h) Noted. However, the spine road needs</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>as the nation moved to a decarbonised future</p> <p>o) 7A Placemaking Principles – These are laudable in their range and general aspiration. However, we question how they will be applied by developers. Whilst the Brief considers theses of ‘Healthy Community’, ‘Connectivity and Movement’ and ‘Car and Cycle Parking’, there is little evidence of integrated thinking about how they affect each other, especially around the issue of traffic flows and non-vehicle journeys</p> <p>p) 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</p> <p>q) The Kenilworth Transport Study is referred to in several locations but we have not been able to access it: this needs to be publicly available</p> <p>r) 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). Chapter 7, Table 2 lists 24 new proposed transport schemes. ‘Cycle Network Improvements’ are listed but not even numbered which suggests a very low priority</p> <p>s) There is a 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</p> <p>t) The Plan needs full stakeholder participation from the</p>	<p>to remain an attractive route and the favoured alternative to using Birches lane to access the A46/Leamington Road. At lower speeds the route would become less attractive. Design features such as appropriate crossing points, wide footways and cycleways, limited on-street parking etc will ensure that the operation of the network is safe. Whilst the spine road will go through residential areas restricting this road to 20mph will reduce its effectiveness as a spine road and therefore in this instance there is a strong argument that material considerations would suggest a deviation from the precise wording of KNP policy KP4(g)</p> <p>i) There may be some allocated parking provided on street or adjacent to the Central Park – this detail would need to come through the detailed planning application. However, there will be parking associated with the community and commercial centre and there will be sustainable travel routes through the Development Brief area to encourage walking and cycling to the central park area</p> <p>j) Noted. The Brief strongly supports safe</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>start with residents, user groups, private transport providers, local businesses etc working together with the District and Council planners. Residents have to be included in the decision-making process</p> <p>u) The Plan needs to combine the best transport modelling with sensitivity experiments to model alternative assumptions, projected changes in demography and new information about personal preferences for travel with the findings made accessible for perusal and comment</p> <p>v) The A46 will remain a major air polluter for at least a decade. 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</p> <p>w) The new development will cause higher levels of pollution. If high levels of nitrous oxides are realistic they represent severe health risks to Glasshouse Lane residents who should be made aware</p> <p>x) 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. Before indicating the site for a primary school, 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</p> <p>y) The Brief should lay down a clear set of protocols for developers to evaluate the levels of nitrous oxides and the even more damaging particular matter (PM2.5 and PM10) particulars. Independent expert advice should be sought</p>	<p>pedestrian and cycle routes</p> <p>k) Noted</p> <p>l) These will be further articulated in the forthcoming Developer Design Framework SPD which will be based on the national best-practice Building for Life 12</p> <p>m) Please see answers to representation from Mr G Martin rep ref: 71344</p> <p>n) Noted, however these do not constitute planning requirements appropriate for a SPD to bring forward</p> <p>o) Disagree. The Development Brief has been brought forward as a coherent and integrated document. Once adopted it will carry material weight in the planning process</p> <p>p) Noted, however a significant, detailed and extensive Transport Study has been undertaken and the mitigations and amendments to the network stem from this</p> <p>q) The Transport Study is available on the WDC website</p> <p>r) Funding for the interventions proposed will come forward through the Section 106 process, as part of planning applications</p> <p>s) Noted, however, this is beyond the</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>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</p> <p>z) Permanent monitoring stations should be a mandatory requirement inside and outside of 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</p>	<p>scope of a site-specific Development Brief</p> <p>t) The Development Brief process has included a wide range of engagement with stakeholder groups. This Brief, and the Local Plan have undergone significant consultation periods, open to all members of the public to make representations. Finally, applications that come forward for the site will be available for members to make comment on, and to support or to object</p> <p>u) Noted. The Kenilworth Transport Study is available to review on the Council's website</p> <p>v) As the site is not uniform in topography and its relationship with the A46 it will be for the individual application to come forward with appropriate mitigation, in line with the recently adopted Air Quality SPD</p> <p>w) Noted</p> <p>x) The amendments proposed to the Development Brief will relocate the primary school. However, there is no evidence to suggest that there was a significant air quality issue</p> <p>y) Developers will be expected to adhere</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>to the standards laid down in the recently-adopted Air Quality SPD</p> <p>z) The installation of monitoring stations inside all schools, for the lifetime of the school is not something that is considered feasible or viable at the current time</p>	
71273; 71274; 71275; 71276; 71277; 71278	Ms S Fitton	Finham Brook Flood Action Group	<p>a) Have concerns about how the proposed traffic lights at the bottom of Knowle Hill will interact with the traffic lights on Common Lane. There are currently temporary traffic lights on Common Lane (which I assume will be similar in their effect on traffic flows to the permanent solution), and already at peak times traffic is queuing back to the bottom of Knowle Hill. Will these lights have a linked control system?</p> <p>b) The running costs for the Community Centre should be supported by the developers for a longer period than 5 years. During this period, the estate would still be developing, a longer time period (for instance 10 years) would allow for the development to become more mature, at which point the facility could look to become self-funding. This is especially pertinent if the community worker is expected to be funded for 10 years</p> <p>c) To ensure that the highest standards of noise mitigation are applied to all residential dwellings in the development, it would be helpful if policy could ensure that areas of social housing are not concentrated in the areas of development that are worst affected by traffic noise from the A46</p>	<p>a) Appropriate assessment will be undertaken through the scheme development, consideration will be given to linking of local signalised crossings and junctions at this stage. Permanent traffic lights will be more efficient at managing traffic than standard temporary signals</p> <p>b) Noted. It important that we consider how we create self-sustaining socially active communities, where residents participate in a range of social recreational activities at a neighbourhood level and where people can have a positive sense of belonging to the wider community. The rationale behind the Community Development Worker role is to have someone in situ who can work with new residents as the development progresses. When a specified number of dwellings are occupied should act as a trigger to</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>d) Flooding is a cumulative issue and I would like to see this policy strengthened to ensure that developers across the whole site are obliged to work together to mitigate the impacts of flooding from the whole site as a single objective, rather than for each individual plot. In addition, has an adequate assessment been undertaken of the impact of developing this site on the current mitigation of surface run-off from the A46?</p> <p>e) I would like to see Concept Plan no.7 better aligned with the WCC advice on Surface Water Management Plans</p> <p>f) Section 8 (utilities) – point d needs to be replaced with a clause that an SWMP for the entire site should be approved by WCC as the LLFA</p>	<p>appoint a Community Development Worker so the work of engaging with the new and emerging community can begin. The focus of the work is around setting up community structures such as a resident association as part of supporting community interaction and engagement. In addition, engaging and involving communities at an early stage makes it more likely that the physical design and layout of any centre facilities will create a sense of ownership and that any service offer is tailored to the needs of the community. Therefore, in order to deliver on this work, it important that at least 10 years funding is available to support a Community Development Worker to help support the development of the new community. The 5 years funding for running costs is to help with the sustainability of the centre and support the development of a business plan that will look at how the centre can be sustained beyond the initial 5 years funding</p> <p>c) Through planning applications, the LPA will ensure that affordable housing is pepper-potted across developments</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>d) Each site must demonstrate that they are not increasing flood risk through a site specific Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy and they will have to pay due regard to the known development coming forward elsewhere on the wider site</p> <p>e) Agreed, please see rep ref: 71354 from WCC Flood Risk Management. Beyond that there is not enough detail to understand the question.</p> <p>f) The point highlights the acceptable outfall hierarchy for surface water outfalls as detailed in planning practice guidance, WCC Flood Risk Management support that connection to a sewer is not listed</p>	
71433	R A Busby		<p>a) I have read the document on line in its entirety and I believe it to be a generally positive approach</p> <p>b) Fully accept and endorse the need for the country to build more houses and as such do not seek to resist this development, however I am surprised at the ease with which the noise and air pollution consequences of siting so many people by the A46, a six lane highway which forms a significant link in major national routes are accepted, (page 113) particularly in the light of recent research evidence of the effect of 2.5pm on the development of children? Mitigation can only be limited, please walk down Rocky Lane at evening rush hour</p>	<p>a) Noted, thank you</p> <p>b) The site was established as an appropriate location for development through the Local Plan process, culminating in an independent Examination in Public</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) The trigger point for when land is required will be negotiated with the developers at the time of their applications. We need to take account of site accessibility and the subsequent</p>	Reference on p86 to Birches Lane being unsignalised to be amended

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>c) Given the above concern the proposals regarding the site seem generally very positive, however I have several significant concerns regarding the traffic management. Regarding the site:</p> <p>d) It is essential that the infrastructure changes and provisions are made early, the 1000th dwelling being occupied is too late, especially for the school</p> <p>e) Very active steps need to be taken to protect the ancient woodland, both during construction and afterwards, particularly the young newly planted trees, with so many additional people on site, parts of it need to be restricted from people and dogs or it will become a sterile area with no wildlife</p> <p>f) Whilst I support the desire not to put a spine road through the woods along Rocky Lane, I would encourage you to go and view the effects of the recent felling which has removed 75% of the mature trees, I believe this renders invalid the wish to avoid putting a second access point into the middle section of housing on the sports pitches. There remains very good reason to avoid a road through Glasshouse Spinney</p> <p>g) I note the suggestion that noise and air pollution is abated by putting play areas and green space next to the A46 boundary – are we to encourage children to play in the area of greatest noise and pollution? Regarding traffic flows</p> <p>h) Your recently delivered A5 document speaks of the new school generating 6000 journeys per day. The original spine road was envisaged as keeping this off Glasshouse</p>	<p>safety of pupils attending provision on a live building site. At this stage it is intended that initial growth across Kenilworth will be met through the expansion of existing provision. This will also cater for the early development at East Kenilworth. Projections show that the absolute deadline for a new school to open is by the 1000th occupation. However, if land is transferred prior to the 500th occupation we would envisage the first primary school opening well in advance of the 1000th occupation. Pupil forecast data and resulting timetable for required new places will be made available to support the delivery of a shared infrastructure solution</p> <p>e) Agree that there needs to be appropriate protection of ancient and mature woodland during construction and this will be something that will be considered carefully at planning application stage and likely to be covered through Tree Protection Plans/Construction Management Plans</p> <p>f) We are not aware of an approved scheme to remove 75% of the mature trees along Rocky Lane. However,</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Lane and limiting the probability of rat runs?</p> <p>i) This volume of additional traffic on Glasshouse Lane is certain to cause fatalities with school children being at highest risk, already cars are driven at excessive speeds past the proposed school site and on down round the bend at Woodside, the provision of the roundabouts will just add to the drivers' frustration, traffic calming measures including a 20mph limit are going to be essential.</p> <p>j) The entire spine road not just the section outside the school (page 71) should be 20mph</p> <p>k) What is the pollution impact on Glasshouse Lane residents from this number of journeys – has this been assessed?</p> <p>l) I have yet to see any attempt to address how the number of vehicles that will wish to either enter the new school site or to drop off children will do so, Leyes Lane is chaotic in the mornings and has just made into a 20mph zone, now a bigger school and including the 6th form is intended on a road that is in effect an eastern ring road. Whilst I commend the desire to promote walking and cycling these require the pupils to cross Glasshouse Lane to enter the school, what effect will this have on traffic flows? Also I cycle in Kenilworth and it is often not a pleasant experience, will there be cycleway provision along Glasshouse Lane to provide a safe route to school?</p> <p>m) The closing of access from Hidcote Road onto Knowle Hill/Glasshouse Lane blocks access from the Knights Meadow estate for those who wish to travel north to Coventry or the motorways, this will encourage the use of</p>	<p>active woodland management does sometimes require the pruning and felling of trees</p> <p>g) The uses proposed close to the A46 will require assessment and suitable mitigation. It should be noted that the nationally-set level of acceptable noise and environmental intrusions varies dependent on use, with residential dwellings one of the most sensitive due to the prolonged nature of the exposure</p> <p>h) WDC are unsure what document is referred to here and do not believe it is a WDC produced document. Our understanding is the school have always proposed their main point of access to be off Glasshouse Lane</p> <p>i) A lower speed limit is proposed near to the school and the proposed roundabout on Glasshouse Lane nearest to the school and the Leyes Lane realignment and Dencer Drive junction should assist in slowing vehicle speeds to appropriate levels</p> <p>j) Noted. However, the spine road needs to remain an attractive route and the favoured alternative to using Birches lane to access the A46/Leamington</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>the rat run through Finham Road and a right turn onto Dalehouse Lane towards the A46. Better to close Crew Lane or enlarge it and provide a roundabout.</p> <p>n) The proposal to put traffic controls on the gyratory (page 86) at the bottom of Birches Lane by the studies own admission will provide minor improvements at peak times, already it is difficult to exit Birches Lane in the morning yet it is not to be provided with signal controlled access to the gyratory?</p> <p>o) Finally the proposals still only provide two options for cyclists to cross the railway line to access the town centre both of which are dangerous, the aim of improving cycling rates is unlikely to be achieved</p>	<p>Road. At lower speeds the route would become less attractive. Design features such as appropriate crossing points, wide footways and cycleways, limited on-street parking etc will ensure that the operation of the network is safe. Whilst the spine road will go through residential areas restricting this road to 20mph will reduce its effectiveness as a spine road and therefore in this instance there is a strong argument that material considerations would suggest a deviation from the precise wording of KNP policy KP4(g)</p> <p>k) The detailed impact studies for the proposed spine road, and suitable mitigation, will come forward as part of the planning application process</p> <p>l) Cycle routes to the school will be provided in the new development and developers will also be expected to contribute towards off-site cycle routes. WCC Highways will require drop-off facilities for pupils within the school site and therefore off the main carriageway of Glasshouse Lane</p> <p>m) The new spine road and improvements to the B4115 will provide a better and safer alternative route. It is unlikely</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>that there will be any significant increase in journey time for residents</p> <p>n) The gyratory at St Johns will become a signalised junction. Further modelling, design and road safety audits will need to be undertaken prior to identifying the final solution. Often leaving a single arm of a signalised roundabout improves capacity, the drawings in the Kenilworth Development Brief are a proof of concept and do not present the final optimised layout. The reference to Birches Lane remaining un-signalised will be amended to reflect the drawing but highlight that that this will be fully considered as part of the detailed design of the scheme</p> <p>o) The options for cycle crossings of the railway line have been identified and the feasibility / design work on these routes will be carried out as and when funding comes forward from the site. The cost of any additional crossing locations being installed would be prohibitive and so the Brief concentrates on improving the existing two crossings</p>	
71438	Mr S Keell		a) Issue not with the development itself, but the piecemeal and non-transparent presentation of it	a) This Brief ensures provides a transparent presentation and helps	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			b) A consultation plan has been presented without giving specific information about traffic management and access from the surrounding area. More detailed information sought	avoid piecemeal development b) The Kenilworth Development Brief focuses on a specific area within Warwick District, to understand the interaction with the wider highway network and other planned developments and schemes. Please see the WDC Strategic Transport Assessment available on WDC website	
71375	Mr C Dickson and Ms C Laver		<p>a) Concerned that our rights in relation to the affect on our use, enjoyment and amenity of our property have not been fully considered in the Brief</p> <p>b) We are supportive, in principle, to the overall objectives of the Brief and that our concerns specifically relate to the affect on our property</p> <p>c) In broad terms, we agree with the objectives set out in Chapter 1 of the development brief, in that we welcome the ongoing investment in Kenilworth and we can see that there will be some connected benefits in improving safety (particularly for road users on Glasshouse Lane) by consequence of the changes to infrastructure that will be required to deliver the Brief and the subsequent detailed implementation plans</p> <p>d) For the avoidance of doubt, we believe that the enjoyment of our property is detrimentally affected by areas that you have designated “H40” (which is also the subject of the Planning Application) and “H06”. You will be aware that our property is situated at the point at which these two areas intersect</p>	<p>a) Noted. However, we disagree. The Brief does highlight the importance of the amenities of existing residents but the nature of the document is that it does not go into the level of detail that would be considered through a planning application</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) The sites were allocated through the Local Plan process and the owners of your property were consulted as part of this process. It is understood that you purchased the property in the knowledge of the Local Plan allocations</p> <p>e) It is considered that the impact of the development upon your property has been appropriately considered. However, further more detailed considerations are a matter for</p>	<p>Incorporate reference to retained dwellings, rather than just buildings in text on p54 of the draft Development Brief</p> <p>Amend Fig.32 to include an access to Woodside Lodge (opposite the access shown to Woodside Conference Centre)</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>e) We are pleased to note that the underlying tone of the Brief is to provide a “sustainable” urban extension. We are similarly pleased to note that is accepted that: “The site is owned by multiple landowners (see Figure 7) and therefore it is considered important to provide overarching guidance to ensure that the multiple applications which are anticipated are prepared in the context of an overall vision for the area. This Brief helps to identify and set out the infrastructure requirements to support the successful delivery of the development as well as identifying any phasing required”. Clearly, we are one of the affected “multiple landowners” yet appear to be the only landowners whose rights and amenity have not been considered in pursuance of delivering the overall commercial and revenue-generating Brief for other parties with a financial gain and/or interest in mind</p> <p>f) We are pleased to note, at Chapter 2, that the presence of ancient woodland “Glasshouse Spinney” and the “Designated Ancient Monument” (which abut our property) are acknowledged in the site description. In particular, we are concerned that appropriate consideration is given to the protection of Glasshouse Spinney and the “Roman Settlement at Glasshouse Wood” as one of only four scheduled monuments (the others being Kenilworth Abbey, Kenilworth Castle and Fishpond Complex at Castle Farm), page 38. We would like to know whether Natural Woodland (sic) have been consulted in line with statutory requirements</p> <p>g) Objection – We consider that the Brief does not satisfy</p>	<p>assessment through the planning application process. It should also be noted that your property lies within a strategic housing allocation that is required to meet the housing needs of the District</p> <p>f) Noted. The Development Brief places great emphasis on the protection of these important assets. Natural England have been consulted and their response has been included as part of this document. As part of planning applications relating to the area, all required statutory consultees will be sent consultations</p> <p>g) Noted. However, we disagree. The Indicative Masterplan has avoided the spine road being routed through these areas partly to minimise tree removal. Whilst there may be a requirement for some very limited removal of woodland, this would be kept to a minimum and only acceptable if there is a wider benefit to the overall scheme. The provision of footpaths/cyclepaths is an essential element of the scheme to encourage these uses and it is considered that such routes located near to your</p>	<p>Remove reference to mountain bike/BMX facility from the Development Brief</p> <p>Masterplan to be updated to show and/or reference Woodside Lodge and Southcrest (dwellings envisaged as being retained)</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>the objectives set out on Page 44 to: “Retain and minimise the impact on existing historic assets whilst providing opportunities to enhance their setting and afford them greater protection • Retain and minimise the impact on wildlife sites and provide new additional habitats and associated connectivity • Minimise the impact on existing residential properties”. Specifically, we believe, the creation of new thoroughfares and boulevards that dissect Glasshouse Spinney will disproportionately and negatively impact upon our existing property and significantly erode the historical and present value of Glasshouse Wood and Spinney. This view is based on the inherent need to remove ancient trees and the unavoidable impact of driving more foot traffic, litter and anti-social behaviour into the area. Whilst Glasshouse Spinney is clearly a Warwickshire Wildlife Trust reserve and co-maintained area, it appears to be at risk in the event that there are not more prominent protective measures in the final plan</p> <p>h) Objection – Chapter 5 sets out a detailed analysis of the existing access and connectivity to the site/proposed site yet does not reflect either the need to access Woodside Lodge or, specifically, the legal right of way enjoyed by us as owners to park vehicles on the adjacent land which does not fall within our ownership</p> <p>i) Objection - In Chapter 7 of the Brief, the proposals set out, in detail, the aims in relation to the proposed developments. Whilst many of the proposals are clearly positive, and which we support in principle (such as</p>	<p>property are unlikely to cause significant harm to the amenity of residents of the property. All public open space within the development will require a management plan. These matters will be considered fully through the planning application process</p> <p>h) Figure 22 shows an existing access to your property. The text under ‘Other’ on p54 also acknowledges that there are some existing on-site buildings that will be retained. It is not considered necessary for the Development Brief, a document aimed at bridging the gap between the higher level Local Plan and the detailed requirements of planning applications to consider matters relating to private rights of way</p> <p>i) The property is located within a strategic allocated housing site and it is therefore inevitable that there will be an increase in activity over and above the existing situation. However, the envisaged relationship between new housing, new roads and paths and this property are considered to be acceptable in principle subject to</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>promoting walking, cycling etc), the proposals do not appear to take into account the deteriorating effect on our enjoyment of Woodside Lodge. Specifically, the proposed development principles (whether intentionally or otherwise) all appear to conspire to drive significant foot and vehicular traffic to the entire perimeter of our property. We believe that it is possible to build in some prohibitive principles to future plans to mitigate this risk, whilst still achieving the stated aims and principles of the brief. For example, compelling screening, minimum distances or similar measures could easily be prescribed for adoption by future developing parties</p> <p>j) Objection - We have been provided multiple versions of events/proposals in relation to access to our property by Catesby plc. Initially, we were advised that the delivery of their plans for area "H40" would require the introduction of a new roundabout further along Glasshouse Lane which would then necessitate and new link road (discreetly) to our property and, separately, the Woodside Hotel and Conference Centre. In subsequent discussions we were advised that this was no longer proposed and that the existing access would remain as it is presently. We understood this to be at the behest of highways planners due to "safety reasons" but there would be no feeder road to the lower part of the H40 development driving increased traffic past our front door. We see from the proposals at page 81 (fig 32) of the Brief that none of the above is true. In fact, it appears that a new feeder road to the bottom of the development is planned and that new</p>	<p>further detailed consideration at planning application stage. The Brief identifies the need to protect residential amenity and it is a matter for detailed consideration through the planning application process as to how this can be achieved – e.g. through planting to provide appropriate screening to the rear garden of the dwelling. WDC have proposed a Brief that is able to accommodate development around this retained dwelling</p> <p>j) WDC was not involved in any discussions between the property owner and Catesby that took place prior to the submission of the Catesby application. The Development Brief identifies an indicative proposed arrangement that would see access to Woodside Hotel improved whilst also providing a separate spine road into the development. It is unlikely that there would be any such rat run as it would be easier to access Glasshouse Lane via the proposed roundabout than the other junction shown. Fig.32 clearly should have included an access into Woodside Lodge opposite the</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>access to the hotel will be provided. We are concerned that this will produce a natural “rat run” which presents a safety and loss of enjoyment risk and will unintendedly drive parents towards parking on or adjacent to our property when dropping off for the school run (assuming the new primary and secondary school locations proposed remain as presented). Notwithstanding the major issue of additional vehicular traffic passing our boundary, the plans as produced entirely cut off Woodside Lodge from any access at all and do not consider our rights of way or rights to park adjacent to our property. Clearly this is entirely unacceptable and, we consider, illegal. We believe that there are a number of proportionate and cost effective potential solutions to this issue which we would be happy to discuss</p> <p>k) We note the proposed requirement for an alternative Mountain Bike/BMX facility in H40 (due to the presence of the existing unauthorised track in Glasshouse Spinney) at page 107. We would propose to comment further on any detailed plans when produced.</p> <p>l) We note the proposals at page 105, table 3, for the requirement of allotments. Subject to no further detriment being caused by any of the preceding points we are content with the proposed placement of the allotment area in H40</p> <p>m) Objection – We object to the proposal for a major boulevard or connecting avenue through Glasshouse Spinney. We do not believe that the current proposals (when taking the Planning Application and the intentions</p>	<p>proposed access to Woodside Conference Centre and this amendment will be made. However, it should be acknowledged that the arrangements shown in Fig.32 is an arrangement that has emerged from the Kenilworth Transport Study and that the Brief is sufficiently flexible to allow alternative proposals to come forward. It is noted that Catesby have submitted alternative access arrangements and these will be considered through the assessment of their planning application for the site</p> <p>k) The mountain bike/BMX facility is being removed from the proposals as it is not deemed to be necessary</p> <p>l) Noted</p> <p>m) A shared use footpath/cycle route is considered to be appropriate and necessary to connect the land currently in use by Kenilworth Wardens and land in the control of Catesby and this is an important factor in achieving the comprehensive development of the area. Sufficient care will need to be given to minimising the impact upon the Scheduled Monument when implementing this proposal and this</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>of the Brief together) to connect the upper and lower ends of the H40 and H06 achieve the position set out at page 111 (3<sup>rd</sup> full paragraph). However, we may (subject to final proposals) arrive at the view that the present usage of the spinney (mountain bike or otherwise) is an acceptable trade off to the preclusion of a full thoroughfare</p> <p>n) Objection - We agree with the assessment and recommendations in relation to boundary treatments at page 132. However, we cannot see from the proposals that there is any compulsion on future developers to adopt the same. In relation to our property, this would mean that – with the commensurate increase in foot traffic along the proposed adjacent footpaths - that there would be no obvious segregation of our property mandated to fall in accordance with this principle. We find it entirely objectionable that we, as existing homeowners, should be put to considerable expenditure (estimated at in excess of £150k) to, effectively, delineate our property to meet the likely requirements</p> <p>o) Objection – We do not have any objection in principle to the car parking principles set out at fig 51 and on page 134. However, we anticipate that the presence of the “rat run”, cut through and school runs will invite residents and others to park on or adjacent to (where we have a legal right of way) our property. We would expect a positive prohibition to be present in any material plans either at the level of the Brief or to be forced upon the Planning Application for this area</p>	<p>will be a matter for detailed consideration through a planning application. As identified in the Brief, the use of Glasshouse Wood for mountain biking/BMX jumps is not appropriate and has resulted in the Scheduled Monument being listed on the Historic England’s ‘At Risk’ Register</p> <p>n) Development Principle 7C sets out to developers what will be expected with regards to boundary treatment. The matter raised is not insurmountable and is a detailed issue for consideration at planning application stage</p> <p>o) Noted. However, this issue is not insurmountable and is a detailed matter for consideration at planning application stage</p> <p>p) Noted. The Masterplan is to be updated to show and/or reference this retained dwelling. One other dwelling, Southcrest, is likely to be retained on site and therefore the amendment is likely to reference this also</p> <p>q) The property is located within a strategic housing site. Excellent pedestrian/cycle connectivity is a key aspect of the Brief and it is likely that</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>p) Objection - We object to the indicative master plan set out at figure 60 (page 149) on the basis that, whilst it references the retained Woodside Hotel, it completely ignores our presence. We do not object, and positively endorse, the proposed placement of the allotments (note 6) and primary school (note 2), subject to the footfall, vehicular and other infrastructure issues relating to our property being fully resolved</p> <p>q) Objection - The combined developments will, without doubt, drive considerably more foot traffic around Woodside Lodge. No mitigating steps appear to have been built into either plan. Indeed, the delivery of both the Brief and the Planning Application appear to require Woodside Lodge to become an, effective, "goldfish bowl" to foot traffic that could easily be diverted elsewhere without breaching the stated principles of the Brief</p> <p>r) Objection - The Planning Application (with allotments at the lower end of the development) and the Brief (with Primary school at upper end of H06) will drive people to misuse our property and breach our legal rights of enjoyment and adjacent parking</p> <p>s) It is imperative that Woodside Lodge has reasonable vehicular access. The current plans do not afford this</p> <p>t) The creation of essentially a parallel footpath network around our property appears to be unduly onerous and detrimental to our enjoyment of our property when there are clearly easy mitigating steps</p>	<p>such routes will have to be directed around the property in order to deliver the housing allocated to the site through the Local Plan. The detail of any proposed footpaths and their relationship to the dwelling will be a matter for detailed consideration through a planning application</p> <p>r) This is a detailed issue that is a matter for the planning application stage. However, this issue is not insurmountable and if there was to be a problem there are potentially measures that can be undertaken, e.g. signage/rising bollards, by the property owner to prevent such usage</p> <p>s) See response to j)</p> <p>t) Full details of any pedestrian/cycle paths will be assessed through detailed planning applications and the impact of these upon neighbouring properties will be fully assessed at that stage. However, the provision of a network of pedestrian and cycle routes within the site is considered to be an essential element of the proposed development of the area</p>	
71290; 71291	Mr R Dickson		a) Concern about access from Thickthorn Close to the site at Thickthorn. The close must remain a close because it's not	a) There are no plans to allow a through route between Thickthorn Close and	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>designed for through traffic</p> <p>b) Concern about any vehicular access off Thickthorn Close. The properties have a distinct character brought about by their seclusion and single access off Birches Lane solely to the properties</p> <p>c) The housing that is close to the bungalows of Thickthorn Close should be in keeping, i.e. be bungalows not 3-4 bed houses</p>	<p>the proposed spine road</p> <p>b) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p> <p>c) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p>	<p>representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)</p>
71345; 71346; 71347; 71348; 71349	Ms J Burnell		<p>a) Inconsistency p162-163 - Suitable phasing of the implementation of public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes to encourage residents and employees to adopt sustainable modes of travel soon after occupation is essential. The phrase 'soon after' is open to wide interpretation. I've heard of this delay being more than a decade elsewhere in the District. New residents need to find sustainable modes of travel available and attractive from the time they move in. A couple of paragraphs lower down the same page it says: "ensure that residents experience a satisfactory living environment with necessary services from the outset" which is how it should be</p> <p>b) Page 162 lists a number of road improvements which are required before certain parcels of land are developed. Yet no mention is made of the cycle infrastructure which is to be prioritised and hence at least as important.</p> <p>c) Page 163 lists trigger points and once again these are only car-related, even though the cycle infrastructure is just as vital and needs to be there from the outset. Cycling infrastructure should be included in the trigger conditions</p>	<p>a) The specific details of the trigger points within a Section 106 agreement will be part of the planning application process. This will agree appropriate and legally binding trigger points.</p> <p>b) Cycle infrastructure is included in chapter 7 of the Development Brief</p> <p>c) Noted. However, the stress that any development makes is inevitable on the surrounding road network – one of the great advantages of the cycle network is the all but absent congestion issues</p> <p>d) We feel that the indicative figures follow a clear logical path from the preceding paragraphs. Both these descriptions and their following indicative illustrations follow best practice urban design principles whilst also respecting the urban vernacular and the site constraints</p>	<p>Objective 5 to be amended with updated text/additional Development Principle relating to ecology/the requirement for an environmental strategy for each site</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>d) Indicative but of what? – There are numerous maps, plans and other illustrations which are described as ‘Indicative’. However, rarely does the text or caption give any guidance as to what they are indicative of, and, just as important, what they are not indicative of. For example, the new housing areas are shown with straight criss-crossed streets with long sight lines which are known to encourage speeding. Yet piecing together information from elsewhere in the text and other relevant planning documents, the new residential areas are to be designed for 20mph with permeability across areas for cycles and pedestrians so that the roads can be social spaces. This would surely be best achieved with curves and cul-de-sacs so why employ illustrations which give a conflicting impression? How can conflicting imagery possibly result in good communication with developers? The Department for Transport said its own guidance “is crystal clear that street design should explicitly consider pedestrians and cyclists first”. This is the approach which needs to be evident throughout the Brief and one which is vital to achieving the intended modal shift in transportation</p> <p>e) Boundary treatments p131 – Impenetrable garden boundaries are believed to be a major factor in the decimation of the UK hedgehog population and would not be compatible with the protection or improvement of current biodiversity. The Brief should include the stipulation that “all garden boundary treatments should be hedgehog-friendly”</p>	<p>e) Noted, however we feel inappropriate for the Development Brief to specifically favour one species over another. Additional text/ad additional Development Principle may be added to Objective 5 relating to ecology/the need for an environmental strategy in accordance with the KNP but this will require ecology and biodiversity matters to be fully considered and not lay out specific requirements such as this</p>	

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
71392; 71393	Dr G Williams		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	a) See response to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71435	Mr R Hall		a) Aware there are some considerations to either extend Leyes Lane or to significantly change the current road layout at the Leyes Lane/Dencer Drive/Glasshouse Lane junctions and also you may look to remove the current 'dog leg' that exists on Leyes Lane. Concerned of the impact such plans could have on Wisley Grove and the current tree lined common area that sits opposite. We cannot find any definite comments/inclusions in the proposed plans but would welcome comments and of course encourage consultation regarding such changes	a) Any proposals to change the current road layout would need to be subject to detailed design and impact work, and be subject to a public consultation through the planning process	No amendments proposed
71302	Mr J N Price		a) Principal concerns 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. The current plan involves 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. b) The Brief assumes that traffic joining the northern sectors of the spine road will exit the Glasshouse Lane at the proposed Heyville Croft roundabout. It seems more likely	a) WCC/WDC were not involved with the alignment shown in Kenilworth Town Plan. There are immovable constraints which prevent this more direct alignment being achieved. WCC are satisfied the proposed alignment will be fit for purpose b) Assessment of junction impact has been undertaken through the Strategic Transport Assessment (see WDC website) and will be further assessed throughout the planning application process	Amend the indicative masterplan to reduce the size of the central park and potentially provide a slightly more linear park arrangement

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>that much of this traffic will be destined for Kenilworth town centre or the various side roads from the western part of Glasshouse Lane 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 Ave 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</p> <p>c) 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 Lane and the A46 as far as the planned Local Centre, thus serving the proposed primary school before re-joining the planned route</p> <p>d) 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</p> <p>e) The spine road should be constructed very early in the development (no indication of the programme is included in the Brief), thus avoiding construction traffic in the surrounding roads which cannot easily accommodate heavy vehicles. This is partly due to on street parking.</p>	<p>c) There are a number of constraints, identified in the Development Brief affecting a potential spine road route along the route suggested</p> <p>d) The shape of the central park may differ from the indicative masterplan. A totally linear park would not be desirable, and make accessing, maintenance and legibility problematic. However, it is proposed to amend the indicative masterplan as the size of the park is unlikely to be achievable and also a slightly more linear park arrangement may be proposed which will also assist in providing a buffer between the A46 and the built development and assist in the viability of development as land furthest from the A46 is likely to be higher in terms of value</p> <p>e) Whilst there may be some benefit to this, the significant forward funding required is not available to achieve this</p> <p>f) The provision of parking spaces is comprehensively dealt with in our Parking Standards SPD</p> <p>g) Clearly, the use of circular services is not always suitable and the use of such services is only considered if</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>f) 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 development</p> <p>g) Need to consider carefully the proposals for public transport facilities. Circular services served only in one direction can result in excessively long journey times, a clear deterrent to users</p>	appropriate. The final routing of the bus services have yet to be fully determined	
71279; 71280; 71281; 71282	Mr P Kershaw		<p>a) Indicative Site Masterplan – the plan is sufficiently fuzzy to prevent easy reading of the key and shows an area at the north of the site which was previously referred to as reserved for education now being residential. This indicates that either the plan has changed or we are being misled about the extent of the education or residential development</p> <p>b) Concept plans – the plans are insufficiently clear to show the junction locations for proposed vehicular access</p> <p>c) On &amp; off site highway infrastructure – there is no indication of proposed junctions to Glasshouse Lane other than the major junctions. The effect of the changes along Glasshouse Lane and Leyes Lane means that residents in the area will be hemmed in by comparison to the free flowing traffic movements that are currently in place. An increase in noise and pollution would be expected due to vehicle braking and accelerating from the multitude of lights and junctions created</p> <p>d) On &amp; off site highway infrastructure - Crewe Lane would be better as no entry westward at the start of the new spine road</p>	<p>a) Policy DS12 in the Local Plan is clear that any land within the education land allocation not required education uses will have a housing allocation. This is reiterated in the Development Brief. There is, therefore, no change to the plan or any misleading</p> <p>b) They are concept plans, detailed plans will be developed through the planning application process and through scheme development</p> <p>c) This has not been highlighted as an issue in the assessment undertaken. We are bound by National Planning Policy Framework when requesting mitigation from developers. Under the NPPF, impacts are acceptable until they are considered “severe”. Noise and air quality impacts will be assessed fully through the planning application process</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>e) On &amp; off site highway infrastructure – There is no identification of any junction improvements to the Crewe Lane/B4115 junction, nor the B4115/A452 junction to alleviate flows out of the development northern spine road exit. These are particularly relevant in the event of duelling the A452 between the Thickthorn and Bericote which is identified as a proposed scheme</p>	<p>d) Noted. The principle/concept is to restrict vehicle movements, options to achieve this are still being considered  e) Consideration will be given to the B4115/Crewe Lane junction through the planning application process. The A452/B4115 junction will be considered through the scheme development work to informing the Thickthorn to Bericote duelling</p>	
	Mr J Whitehouse	Liberal Democrats in Kenilworth	<p>a) The development will be of huge significance to the town and will affect all current residents as well as the new ones. If done well, it could contribute to a major transformation of some of the current inadequacies of Kenilworth’s local infrastructure and facilities. If done badly, it risks the creation of a largely separate new population living close to the existing town but not forming an integral part of it  b) The statement that the new community will be fully integrated into the existing town is important. The question should not be ‘what does the new community need’ but ‘what does the whole town need’ to ensure that the ambitious vision is achieved  c) In terms of linking the site with the rest of the town, heavy reliance is placed in the document on linking with the WCC “Kenilworth Cycle Network” shown in Figure 24 (page 67). However, much of this “network” only exists on paper and is purely aspirational at this stage, with little to</p>	<p>a) Noted  b) Noted  c) This Brief identifies that developers will be required to contribute towards improvements to the cycle network with Table 2 providing an indicative figure of £3.7m towards cycle network improvements. The precise levels of funding from each application is a matter for consideration through planning applications and any contributions sought must be in accordance with relevant tests for obligations. The distribution of CIL receipts is governed by projects being accepted on the Regulation 123 List, an annual process that is the decision of the District Council’s Executive, and therefore not something that the</p>	Amend specification of spine road (as per Local Highway Authority comments)

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>no public funds currently dedicated to its delivery. Reference is made to seeking S106 contribution from developers to assist, but we believe that the cycle network for the whole town should be one of the top priorities for CIL and public infrastructure funding as well</p> <p>d) There are significant barriers to safe cycling in Kenilworth at the moment, in particular the shortage of safe routes across the railway line splitting the town, and the dangerous St John's Gyratory road system. The National Cycle Network route 52 through the town has a gap in the middle, with the ongoing failure to resolve the question of a cycle route through Abbey Fields. The Greenway cycle route to the University of Warwick lacks sufficient connectivity with key areas of the town. The K2L route to Leamington remains unfunded</p> <p>e) It is vital that residents of the new development are as closely linked with the existing town as possible, and bus services have a vital role to play in this. What is proposed at the moment is completely inadequate. Diverting the Stagecoach X18 service through the site will link new residents with Coventry and Leamington for employment or shopping/leisure purposes, but do nothing to help them get in and out of Kenilworth. The only town bus link proposed appears to be to extend the route and frequency of the current hourly station link service, which is poorly used and dependent on time-limited public subsidy. We recommend that urgent consideration is</p>	<p>Development Brief can set. There would also be a greater risk to securing such funding if we relied on such a scheme to be on the Regulation 123 List. It should also be noted that the Town Council will ultimately be in receipt of some CIL income and they would have the ability to spend this on infrastructure to benefit the town</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) The proposed bus routes identified in the Brief would provide services that both connect the development to the existing town and to neighbouring settlements. The proposals put forward in the Brief have been developed through input from Stagecoach and WCC</p> <p>f) The preferred layout option of a separate entrance to the employment land is the result of the detailed transport study jointly commissioned by WDC, WCC and Kenilworth Town Council. The purpose of splitting the two is to minimise conflict between the different uses, however the Highways Authority remain open to alternatives should this preferred option prove to be undeliverable. Highways England</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>given to diverting the strategic Stagecoach X17 service, by turning off the Leamington Road, going along the southern section of the new slip road as far as Glasshouse Lane, then turning left down Birches Lane and re-joining the existing X17 route at the St. John's Gyratory. This would be a relatively minor diversion, which would link the majority of new residents directly with the town centre via a frequent service, as well as further afield to Coventry and Leamington – therefore making the proposed X18 route diversion probably unnecessary</p> <p>f) Question the rationale for separating access for the employment area and for the spine road at the southern end of the development, either both off the Leamington Road, or one off the Leamington Road and one directly on to the Thickthorn roundabout. This is especially important if the option of access direct on to the Thickthorn roundabout turns out not to be feasible. To have two access points off the Leamington Road within a short distance of each other would be highly undesirable. A single entrance to the development, ideally coming directly off the Thickthorn roundabout, would be safer and would help maintain traffic flow on one of the main entrances into the town</p> <p>g) Housing mix (p60-63) –The shortage of affordable housing within the existing housing stock in Kenilworth is one of the major current problems facing the town. Children of current residents find it difficult to stay locally when they</p>	<p>will also be involved in any final decisions regarding access into the southern end of the site given its relationship with A46/Thickthorn Roundabout</p> <p>g) The development sites will be expected to meet the required 40% affordable housing threshold. The table on p61 shows the housing mix requirements of market and affordable housing types. The preceding paragraph on p60 makes it clear that the policy requirements will be expected to be complied with</p> <p>h) Agree. The sections in Objective 1 about both types of uses already makes this clear</p> <p>i) The provision of a through-route from the residential to the employment land would inevitably lead to 'rat-running' which we are keen to avoid</p> <p>j) Rat-running will occur where alternative routes through are provided. The spine road will be of different width and typology better suited to through traffic and so it is appropriate to ensure that traffic principally travels along it. By not providing potential rat-runs we are</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>want to get on to the housing ladder, while many people employed within the town, especially in the retail and hospitality sectors, cannot afford to live here. It is unclear how the housing mix percentages set out in Table 1 (page 61) meet WDC's overall 40% affordable requirement, which must be the minimum objective for this development</p> <p>h) We agree with the comments about older people's housing and student accommodation, but note that both will require good public transport links</p> <p>i) Employment land (p63-65) – Welcome the inclusion of employment land within the development. However, we disagree with the deliberate separation of the employment land from the residential areas, with no through route for vehicles. While it is right to encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling) to and from work for new residents living within the development, residents from the existing eastern side of the town can be expected to take up these new employment opportunities as well, and may well be travelling by car given the longer distances. Their logical route to/from work may well be using the new spine road through the residential areas, which will keep them away from the congested town centre. With what is proposed, however, they would have to join the Leamington Road for a short distance before leaving it again to access the employment area, adding extra congestion to this already busy road</p>	<p>helping to ensure this</p> <p>k) Noted</p> <p>l) Noted</p> <p>m) The specification for the spine road (as amended in light of representation received by the Local Highway Authority) is considered appropriate by the Highways authority to deliver a high quality, desirable cycle route. Comments regarding placement of crossings is noted and this will be a key consideration at the detailed planning stage</p> <p>n) Noted. This is a detailed matter that will be considered through the planning application process</p> <p>o) Noted. However, the spine road needs to remain an attractive route and the favoured alternative to using Birches lane to access the A46/Leamington Road. At lower speeds the route would become less attractive. Design features such as appropriate crossing points, wide footways and cycleways, limited on-street parking etc will ensure that the operation of the network is safe. Whilst the spine road will go through residential areas restricting this road to 20mph will reduce its effectiveness as</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>j) The comment about avoiding rat running is not understood. If the concern is about rat running through the whole development, the new spine road will provide this opportunity anyway, however it joins the Leamington Road. This needs to be addressed in the design of the spine road itself, not by creating an artificial barrier between the employment and residential areas</p> <p>k) Transport (p65-97) - We strongly support the statement on page 65 that "It is vital that good connectivity is provided from the site to key destinations...to ensure that the development provides residents with a choice of sustainable travel options". Turning this into reality in a town like Kenilworth, where the existing road and footpath network places severe constraints on sustainable travel options, will be a major challenge, and will require action and substantial investment not only within the boundaries of the new development but also elsewhere in the town</p> <p>l) We agree with the "Manual for Streets" providing the design basis for encouraging and prioritising walking and cycling within the site</p> <p>m) The cycling provision for the spine road is possibly over-specified. While it is highly desirable to have a cycle track on both sides of the carriageway, each could be a 3 metre shared use track (i.e. walking and cycling) rather than a 4 metre track with separation of use. What is more important is the design of safe crossings (of side roads on</p>	<p>a spine road and therefore in this instance there is a strong argument that material considerations would suggest a deviation from the precise wording of KNP policy KP4(g)</p> <p>p) Noted</p> <p>q) The drawings in the Kenilworth Development Brief are a proof of concept and do not present the final optimised layout. Through the development of the scheme further consideration will be given to the impact on all modes of travel including the routing of bus services</p> <p>r) Noted</p> <p>s) All junction schemes included within the Development Brief will be subject to further detailed assessment and will include provision for cyclists. A review of the pedestrian and cycle usage of the gyratory will be undertaken prior to committing to any change. A comprehensive cycle network is proposed for Kenilworth which includes links to K2L</p> <p>t) Noted</p> <p>u) Whilst not mentioned explicitly the Brief does identify support for similar type of provision to that found in a</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>to the spine road) with priority for both cyclists and pedestrians</p> <p>n) Shared paths through green areas should not be reduced below 3 metres minimum width. While reference is made to secondary networks being for pedestrian use, policing their non-use by cyclists is generally impracticable</p> <p>o) Strongly support the general principle of 20 mph speed limits throughout the site. However, the comments about the spine road are a concern, with a mixture of 20 mph and 30 mph sections planned for both the spine road and Glasshouse Lane. We would prefer a single 20 mph speed limit for the whole development, with appropriate traffic calming measures where required</p> <p>p) We prefer the option of access to/from the employment area directly on to the Thickthorn roundabout, to minimise the impact on the existing Leamington Road gateway into Kenilworth. This should also provide easy and safe access for cyclists on to the K2L cycle route between Kenilworth and Leamington, which is a major CIL priority investment</p> <p>q) Figure 28 (page 76), the plan for the Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane/ Hidcote Road junction, is not understood. It appears to show no entry from Hidcote Road into the junction, but there is no reference to this in the text. Hidcote Road is an important link from eastern Kenilworth out towards Coventry and the A46, and is on the strategic X17 bus route</p>	<p>couple of other named local centre (p97 of draft Brief) both of which have pub/restaurants. A public house is by no means ruled out and text on p98 and Development Principle 4A c) will be amended to also refer to A4 uses. However, the pattern of development throughout the country over the last decade or two suggests it is much more likely for there to be a café or restaurant within the local centre as opposed to a traditional pub</p> <p>v) Further discussion has been undertaken with WDC's Community Partnership team and the specification for the community centre will be revised – this will take into account what is planned at the secondary school site and therefore no sports hall will be required as part of the community centre. We agree that there will be a need to involve the community, including existing organisations, in detailed planning for the community centre</p> <p>w) Noted, thank you</p> <p>x) Noted</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>r) We support the idea of a section of Glasshouse Lane becoming the central section of the spine road, but every effort must be made to mitigate the impact of this on existing residents. Our comments about not over-specifying the spine road are particularly relevant here</p> <p>s) The signalisation of the St John's Gyratory is long overdue, and is a major priority for the town. However, the design in Figure 36 (p86) appears to have omitted any reference to improvements for cyclists, or integration with the K2L cycle route or the Kenilworth Cycle Network. This is currently a very dangerous junction for cyclists, and in fact a major barrier to many residents cycling into the town centre at all</p> <p>t) Local Centre &amp; Community Facilities (p97-101) – We support the development of these facilities, to support the needs not only of the new site but also of existing residents in the adjacent areas. Strongly support investment in such decentralised facilities, rather than concentrating further investment in the town centre</p> <p>u) While mention is made of possible restaurants/cafes within the Local Centre, no comment is made about the possibility of a pub. Eastern Kenilworth is currently poorly served by pubs compared with the rest of the town</p> <p>v) The outline specification for the community centre appears to be based on that for the (currently unbuilt) Whitnash Centre, which may not be appropriate for this site. Any new facility must be planned taking full account</p>		

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>of what is planned at the new Secondary School site, and what other community facilities already exist in the town. The earliest possible consultation with and involvement of existing community centre organisations is recommended to ensure a holistic approach is taken to meeting the needs of the whole town, and complementing rather than competing with what we already have. Financial sustainability of the community centre will be crucial in the longer term, even with developer funding to start with, and all opportunities to gain synergies with existing community centre organisations should be explored</p> <p>w) Open space provision – We support the general approach set out under Development Principle 5A: Delivery of green infrastructure, play and recreation provision on p109-110. In particular, we support the concept of concentrating open space provision as much as possible into a large central park (min 8 ha) within the development, with a range of facilities to attract residents of all ages</p> <p>x) Noise and air quality - Given the proximity of the new development to the A46 trunk road, these aspects of the design brief require careful attention if a good quality of life is to be provided to all of our new residents. It is already the case that noise pollution from the Kenilworth A46 can blight homes and gardens across eastern Kenilworth, particularly when the wind direction is from the south</p>		

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
71335	Mr A Limehouse		a) Whilst no objection in principle to the development, do not agree with the main 'spine road' using a section of Glasshouse Lane instead of being contained within the new development, as was shown in the original scheme. I believe this will encourage the development of 'rat runs' through existing residential areas and will have a significant negative affect on the quality of life in those areas affected	a) A continuous spine road is included in the plans and utilises existing infrastructure in places. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development and these have been identified in the Development Brief. WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic. No additional "rat runs" are encouraged through opening up the spine road. The spine road will offer more efficient routing to trip destinations and as such may reduce the propensity to rat run on alternative more congested routes	No amendments proposed
71307	Mrs K Limehouse		a) Whilst no objection in principle to the development, do not agree with the main 'spine road' using a section of Glasshouse Lane instead of being contained within the new development, as was shown in the original scheme. I believe this will encourage the development of 'rat runs' through existing residential areas and will have a significant negative affect on the quality of life in those areas affected	a) A continuous spine road is included in the plans and utilises existing infrastructure in places. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development and these have been identified in the Development Brief. WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic. No additional "rat runs" are encouraged through opening up the	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				spine road. The spine road will offer more efficient routing to trip destinations and as such may reduce the propensity to rat run on alternative more congested routes	
71385; 71386	Mrs D and Mr W Hirons		a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	a) Identical points raised to Mr E Kirwan (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)	See amendments to Mr E Kirwan's representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340)
71284	Ms A Paveley		<p>a) Spine Road - Shocked to see the earlier sensible plan for a spine road running north-south through the entire site has now been watered down so that traffic through the site will have to spill out onto Glasshouse Lane for the middle section. Glasshouse Lane already has heavy traffic especially in the early morning and end of the working day, frequently queuing at the Birches Lane/A452, so the extra traffic will make the situation much worse. Please revert to the earlier plan of a true spine road that allows traffic to go north/south through the site without having to use Glasshouse Lane</p> <p>b) Spine Road Southern Exit – Strongly prefer the proposal to exit southern end of the site directly onto the A46/A452 roundabout by adding a fifth arm to that roundabout. The alternative proposal of a T-junction with the A452 will cause much more congestion on the A452 for traffic travelling into Kenilworth and traffic going to the A46 or Leamington. This part of the A452 gets very busy at peak times</p>	<p>a) This is the only spine road that has been formally tabled by WDC/WCC. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development. These have been fully considered in the Development Brief. WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic</p> <p>b) Noted. The Brief sets out preferred access arrangements. However, the Highways Authority remain open to alternatives should this preferred option prove to be undeliverable or if there are better, more appropriate alternatives. Highways England will also be involved in any final decisions regarding access into the southern end</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				of the site given its relationship with A46/Thickthorn Roundabout	
71337	Mrs V A and Mr P J Jamieson		a) Object to the 'spine road'. This is not a spine road in that it will link up with Glasshouse Lane and come out of the development area altogether, thus putting further pressure onto Birches Lane which gets backed up from Moseley Rd and Farmer Ward Rd at rush hour. With the added school traffic this will be a nightmare	a) A continuous spine road is included in the plans and utilises existing infrastructure in places. There are various constraints in providing a spine road running entirely through the development and these have been identified in the Development Brief. WCC are satisfied that the spine road as planned is suitable for accommodating the forecast levels of traffic	No amendments proposed
71283	Mr S Simms	SSA Planning Limited (on behalf of Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Limited)	a) Consider the Healthy Community placemaking principle to be flawed in that it implies that food purchased at hot food takeaways is less healthy than that purchased at other food and drink establishments. There is increasing evidence that the reverse is, in fact, true. If restrictions are to be imposed on health grounds, then they should be imposed equally on all food and drink uses (including those operating within Class A1 or across A1, A2, A3, A4 or A5). The evidence for any causal effect of proximity or density on incidence of obesity is weak and conflicting. Therefore, suggest deleting 'restrictions on hot-food takeaway outlets' from the Healthy Community placemaking principle. Evidence cited – Robinson, Eric et al (2018) '(Over)eating out at major UK restaurant chains: observational study of energy content on major meals' British Medical Journal 2018	a) We are not aware of significantly increasing volumes of evidence that food purchased at hot takeaways is healthier than food purchased elsewhere. Whilst there has been a recent report published in the BMJ regarding the likelihood of over-consumption or unhealthy choices being available in all use classes, there is still a substantial body of evidence that supports the restriction of A5 uses in order to support healthy choices. The policy does not seek to refuse all A5 uses, but to restrict them to appropriate locations and quantum, where in harmony with the other	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				principles set out in the Brief	
71319	N and I Barber		<p>a) Concern over impact of increased traffic flow, and the implications on our childrens' safe route to secondary school (from Leamington Rd) via walking or cycling. We currently don't consider it safe for the children to cycle on Leamington Rd due to the volume and speed of traffic. We hope that our children will be able to cross Leamington Rd and travel to the new secondary school along a safe route</p> <p>b) Access to the A45 from Leamington Rd – it currently takes a great deal of time for us to turn right out of the service road onto Leamington Rd towards the A46, particularly during rush hour. We are concerned that we will be constrained to turn towards the Jet garage, rather than towards the A46 given that turning across 4 lanes of traffic will be difficult</p> <p>c) Access to Kenilworth town centre using public transport – It is currently very infrequent. Due to unsafe cycle and crossing points, we currently prefer to drive. We would like to see additional bus services along Leamington Rd</p> <p>d) Access to our driveway, which is currently off the service road – If the roundabout exit is to be widened, we are concerned about safe access and egress to the property</p> <p>e) Parking and pedestrian access to the new rugby ground – We currently have very little pedestrian traffic past our house. We are concerned about the possibility of people parking on Leamington Rd and accessing the rugby club on foot through Thickthorn Woods</p>	<p>a) A comprehensive Kenilworth cycle network is being planned which will improve opportunities for safer cycling routes. The indicative plans produced identify a signalised crossing over Leamington Road</p> <p>b) The impact on the existing network and residences will be considered through the detailed scheme development</p> <p>c) These are being planned and have been documented in the Brief, as have the proposed cycle improvements</p> <p>d) Detailed matters such as this will be considered fully through the scheme development process and at detailed planning stage</p> <p>e) This should be considered as part of the detailed planning application process</p>	No amendments proposed
71326	Ms R		a) The Council have always held strong on the view that	a) It is not a main access point, any	No amendments

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Stevenson		Thickthorn Close is not a suitable access point due to it being a narrow road. It is clear that it is now a main access point for the new estate. There was a commitment that the amenity of residents in Thickthorn would not be impacted and this clearly does impact	vehicular access would be to serve a limited number of dwellings and not provide a through route to the spine road	proposed
71445	Ms R McLean	Severn Trent	a) Supportive of the plan, particularly with reference to the drainage strategy and the SuDS policies	a) Noted, thank you	No amendments proposed
71461	Mr A Hickmott	Warwicks hire Fire & Rescue Service (WCC)	a) No objection in principle and reserve comment until more detailed plans are received b) Guidance for access for emergency vehicles and the fitting of sprinkler systems provided	a) Noted b) Noted. Such matters will be considered through Building Regulations	No amendments proposed
71446	Mr J Fox	HS2 Ltd	a) As no part of the land in question is within the area safeguarded for Phase One of HS2 we have no specific comments to make on the draft Development Brief	a) Noted	No amendments proposed
71447	Ms H L Bevins	Wood (on behalf of National Grid)	a) An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High-Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified it has no record of such apparatus within the area	a) Noted	No amendments proposed
71451	Mr C Telford	The Coal Authority	a) Having reviewed the document, no specific comments to make	a) Noted	No amendments proposed
71442	Mr R Timothy	Highways England	a) Given the close proximity of the A46 to the proposed sites it is considered there is likely to be both traffic and boundary issues which will need to be addressed at the appropriate times b) Our review of the of the East of Kenilworth Transport	a) Noted b) Noted c) Noted d) Noted, wording to be added to this effect	Additional wording to be added in Chapter 7, section 3 'Delivery of an

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Study, v.6 9 Aug 2018, has concluded that this document comprehensively outlines the potential infrastructure changes in support of the Land East of Kenilworth site. We have specific interest in alterations proposed at the A46/A452 roundabout, which forms parts of the Strategic Road Network (SRN)</p> <p>c) The Kenilworth Transport Study also provides turning flow movements from the site at the Thickthorn junction. Turning flow diagrams have been produced based on traffic have been produced based on traffic flows provided by Vectos Microsimulation from the 2029 Local Plan model year; as part of the recent revalidation of the Kenilworth and Stoneleigh Wide Area (KSWA) model. We therefore consider the Kenilworth Transport Study suitable for us in informing the Brief</p> <p>d) The production of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans for large-scale developments, as cited in Policy TR2 of the WDC Local Plan, is welcomed. However, for the avoidance of doubt it is recommended that the Brief explicitly state that the impact on Highways England’s network needs to be fully determined given the proximity of the A46 trunk road and Highways England should be consulted with regards to the scope of the required assessment in each case</p> <p>e) Figure 24 of the Brief indicates a desire to upgrade the Glasshouse Wood Path A46 footbridge to accommodate cyclists. It is noted that the bridge is not considered suitable for cyclists for safety reasons due to the parapet height. Connectivity from the development to the existing</p>	<p>e) Figure 24 doesn’t identify Glasshouse Wood path as a proposed cycle route owing to the narrow width of the bridge. We would however wish to encourage pedestrian movement across the bridge and therefore, to encourage usage, improvements will be sought to improve the safety of the bridges, where appropriate. Relevant sections of the Brief to be amended</p> <p>f) Noted, additional wording to be added</p> <p>g) Noted. Whilst this preferred access has been identified through the Kenilworth Transport Study undertaken by Atkins, further detailed consideration of the impacts of access arrangements to the southern end of the site will be undertaken and Highways England will be integral to this further detailed analysis</p> <p>h) Noted, see g). Whilst it is important to ensure proposals have an acceptable impact upon the highway network for road vehicles, it is also of significant importance to ensure the junction(s) in this area are designed to accommodate safe pedestrian and cycle movements to encourage sustainable modes of travel</p>	<p>effective and efficient transport system’ to state that Transport Assessments will need to fully consider the impact on Highways England’s network given the proximity of the A46 trunk road and that Highways England should be consulted with regards to the scope of the required assessment in each case</p> <p>To improve safety and further encourage their use, propose to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>footbridge will need to be carefully considered so not to encourage cyclists to utilise the existing footbridge for safety reasons. If an upgrade of the footpath is proposed, mitigation to the A46 Footbridge would be required to meet Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards</p> <p>f) Recommend that the wording of Principle 3A Cycling and Walking (p69) should also consider provision of cycling and walking improvements impacting on the SRN. Any improvements will need to be designed in accordance with DMRB standards and other relevant guidance notes applicable to the trunk road network</p> <p>g) The principal of a fifth arm at the Thickthorn roundabout (as shown in Fig 25 of the Brief) will affect its operation and consequently may have wider disbenefits to traffic flow at the junction. This needs to be considered in terms of the already identified need to improve the junction as identified within the Warwick District Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>h) Proposals to include new pedestrian and cycle links (in the form of Toucan crossings at the junction as outlined in the Brief) may also have implications on users of Thickthorn Roundabout due to intensification of use of the existing pedestrian and cycle facilities which may not be of acceptable standard. Detail of a new access to the proposed spine road off the A452 may have further (linked) implications for the operation of Thickthorn Roundabout which need to be agreed jointly. The proposals for the introduction of a spine road through the</p>	<p>i) We do not feel that the inclusion of indicative highway layout is unnecessary detail. We acknowledge that further detail will come forward through the planning application process, and that Highways England will require that information in order to confirm that access proposals are appropriate</p> <p>j) Noted</p> <p>k) It is acknowledged that the Brief does not include reference to the need to ensure lighting has an acceptable impact upon the A46. An additional Development Principle and associated text is proposed within the Environmental Quality section to cover matters relating to external lighting and the need to ensure that it is designed to be visually attractive and energy efficient and suitable in terms of its impact upon ecology, heritage assets and highways</p> <p>l) The drainage system referred to is a culverted watercourse and has not been installed specifically to service the A46. Site proposals will be limiting runoff to QBAR so there will be no increase in flows compared to existing</p>	<p>add further text in Public Rights of Way section to require improvements to the A46 footbridges, where appropriate. This will also be identified in Table 6, Infrastructure Requirements</p> <p>Additional wording to be added in Development Principle 3A to require cycling and walking improvements impacting on the SRN to have regard to DMRB standards and other relevant guidance notes</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>site may have further traffic implications for the distribution of traffic in the areas including affecting the A46 at Thickthorn and Stoneleigh junctions. However, the principal of a spine road appears sensible and is not a primary matter of concern for Highways England</p> <p>i) It is our view that the specific form of the access proposals should be matters for the planning application stage; rather than being detailed as preferred schemes within the Brief. This is the stage where the environmental, traffic and other planning implications should be appropriately considered. It has not yet been demonstrated to Highways England that the access proposals are appropriate and alternative proposals may still need to be considered for the access schemes. The final form of these proposals should therefore not be prejudiced by the inclusion of unnecessary detail regarding the highways layout within the Brief</p> <p>j) It is acknowledged that it is caveated that the developers of the employment site are strongly recommended to liaise with WCC and Highways England in any case. This is outlined in Principle 3D(b) which is welcomed by Highways England should fundamental safety-related concerns become apparent during the preliminary design stage(s)</p> <p>k) The Brief states that a Lighting Assessment would be required to be undertaken to support any planning application submission (p160). We recommend that the Brief is amended to ensure that, as well as taking account of heritage and ecology concerns, external lighting should</p>	m) Noted	<p>applicable to the trunk road network</p> <p>Additional Development Principle to be added in Environmental Quality section of Chapter 7 relating to external lighting</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>also be considered in accordance with Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011 to demonstrate compliance with DfT 02/2013 para 49 to identify if any proposed external artificial lighting may pose as a visual distraction to motorists of the SRN</p> <p>l) Drainage – there are two existing ordinary watercourses running through the site towards two different culverts underneath the A46 trunk road. Both culverts are Highways England Assets and are connected to the A46 Highway drainage system. It is likely that the majority of surface water run-off from the natural catchment of the existing Kenilworth allocation sites E1, H06, ED2 and H40, would outfall to the ordinary watercourse running through the site. As a result of this, any land drainage solution as a result of the development proposal will need to be carefully considered in accordance with DfT Circular 02/2013 para 50. This point should also be reiterated on page 115 under ‘Flood Risk’, as well as on page 136 for ‘Surface Water’ and page 147 ‘Sustainable Drainage’ which details SuDS features within close proximity to the SRN boundary and highway drainage system</p> <p>m) We consider that need for both Noise Impact and Air Quality impacts to be undertaken have been clearly outlined within the Development Brief, taking into consideration the A46 trunk road and the interests of Highways England in terms of compliance with DfT 02/2013 para 45</p>		
71465	Mr I Dickinson	Canal & River	a) No comments to make on this document	a) Noted	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
		Trust			
71350; 71351; 71352; 71353; 71354	Ms J Kaur	Warwicks hire County Council	<p>a) The Development Brief will provide clear direction for the development of the site. The County Council has been engaged in the preparation of the Brief and support this approach. We have had continuous engagement of this site</p> <p>b) More detailed comments from WCC Highways will follow</p> <p>c) Electric vehicle charging points – There appears to be an omission on EV charging point’s infrastructure for new developments. We assume this will be picked up at the detailed planning application stages and nevertheless it should be a requirement for the submission of the planning application. A reference to this should be included in the “Delivery” chapter of the Brief</p> <p>d) Employment land – short of smaller employment uses – Evidence from the LEP suggests there is a need for smaller employment units in the Warwick District area. The District should also consider meeting these needs</p> <p>e) Financial implications of the Brief – WCC cannot commit to any financial implications from any proposals emanating from the Brief. However, we will assist the District Council in delivering infrastructure providing they receive any funding that may arise from s106 agreements, Community Infrastructure Levy or any other sources</p> <p>f) The key tasks for the implementation of the Brief are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The District Council continues to lead on this successful collaborative work on the strong partnership working with stakeholders and landowners. This will ensure that the direction of the</li> </ol>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Reference to EV charging points was not made as it is not considered the Development Brief can add anything over and above requirements set out in the adopted Parking Standards SPD. However, given that the provision of EV charging facilities is undoubtedly required as part of the development, in this instance it is considered that emphasising this aspect of other adopted guidance is acceptable. Therefore, reference to the need for EV charging points to be provided as required by the Parking Standards SPD (2018) will be added to the appropriate section(s) of the Development Brief</p> <p>d) Whilst there is some evidence emerging regarding the size of employment units, it is beyond the powers of the Development Brief to limit the employment land development to a specific size of floorplate. However, we will continue to work with promoters and developers to deliver an appropriate mix of employment opportunities</p>	Reference to the requirement to include EV charging points within development, as required by the Parking Standards SPD (2018) to be added in the appropriate section(s)

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Brief and subsequent reserve matters/full applications for the sites relate effectively to the delivery of the site and ensure that on site and off site infrastructure is implemented in a timely way</p> <p>2. Non-sensitive information is shared in order for cumulative impacts to be fully considered comprehensively across the entire site and any impacts from other developments</p> <p>3. Businesses/Business forums are also included in the development proposals for Kenilworth including in the meaningful consultation events from the developers</p> <p>4. Housing mix – affordable housing and extra care provision. Our latest data shows that in the Kenilworth area demand for extra care outstrips supply. The County Council can offer assistance to the District in assessing these matters for extra care and housing needs for vulnerable residents</p> <p>g) As a general observation the expansion of Kenilworth, University of Warwick and South of Coventry will see significant development pressures in the wider locality from housing and employment, thus a joined up approach/ strategy is needed in delivering comprehensive development across both areas and a programme of supporting infrastructure would tie up the approach of this Development Brief. We would support a wider approach to ensure the timely delivery of the necessary infrastructure in the wider area</p>	<p>e) Noted</p> <p>f) Noted, although these would not necessarily be WDC's view of the key tasks for the implementation of the Brief</p> <p>g) Noted, although this point is beyond the scope of the Development Brief</p>	
71350; 71351;	Ms J Kaur	Warwicks hire	a) P52-53 Landscape Features; i. The LLFA are pleased that watercourses are described as having the potential to	a) i. Agree – word 'ordinary' to be added ii. Noted, will amend wording to	P52 – Add the word 'ordinary'

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
71352; 71353		County Council (comments from Flood Risk Management)	<p>form amenity features. The LLFA would recommend inserting the word 'ordinary' before watercourse to distinguish them in terms of size and responsibility; ii. Recommend adding that watercourses should remain open channel wherever possible; iii. Pleased to see the inclusion of advice in relation to site topography and SuDs. Would recommend adding 'overland flow routes' and the removal of 'attenuation ponds' to read 'This needs to be factored into the development when considering flood risk, overland flow routing and suitable locations for sustainable drainage' Ask for this change as sustainable drainage is not limited to pond features and the LLFA would encourage the use of multiple types of features to mimic best practice</p> <p>b) P107 Other open space and green corridors; i. Pleased to see the inclusion of 'well designed SuDs' in this section; ii. Would add that green corridors should be formed around existing watercourses, and ensure that existing watercourses remain open channel to provide water quantity, quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits</p> <p>c) f; ii. The section should highlight that any proposed SuDs features should be designed in accordance with best practice inclusive of the SuDs manual CIRIA C753 and adhere to the LLFA;s Standing Advice document; iii. Discharge rates must adhere to the WDC Local Plan policies. The downstream village of Ashow has experienced flooding, this must be mitigated by ensuring flows off-site are in accordance with LP policies; iv. Multiple SuDs features to provide maximum surface water</p>	<p>recommend that they remain open channel where possible iii. Agreed, changes will be made</p> <p>b) i. Noted, thank you ii. Noted, agree the changes would be beneficial</p> <p>c) The sustainable drainage section will be updated to take into account the points raised</p> <p>d) Additional text will be added to require relevant applications to determine flood zones for ordinary watercourses. Text to be amended to refer to points made in ii, iii, iv</p> <p>e) Noted, the text will be amended accordingly</p>	<p>before watercourses</p> <p>P52 – Amend wording to recommend that the watercourses remain open channel where possible</p> <p>P53 – Amend text in line with comments received in a) iii.</p> <p>P107 – Amend text to add that green corridors should be formed around existing watercourses, and ensure that existing watercourses remain open channel to provide water quantity, quality,</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>treatment should be encouraged and to ensure permanent standing water is kept to a reasonable depth, by spreading attenuation volume through source and site control features; v. Existing catchments should be maintained to ensure discharge is not moved cross-catchment, creating flooding or water supply issues to receiving watercourses. Cross-catchment discharge would be a concern on this site if the relevant landowners create small disconnected networks; vi. Provide amenity etc benefit in addition to mitigating flood risk</p> <p>d) P115 Flood Risk; i. Although the development is shown to be in Flood Zone 1, the national scale mapping only denotes flood zones for watercourses with larger than a 3km catchment. Proportionate modelling has been requested through pre-app advice to the application for the allocation for H40 to determine the flood zones for the ordinary watercourse within this allocation; ii. The two on site watercourses will require maintenance easements in accordance with LLFA Standing Advice to ensure that access is available to clear blockages and undertake maintenance once the development has been completed; iii. Any Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should include measures to control siltation and pollution to the downstream watercourse to mitigate an increase in flood risk due to siltation of the culverts crossing under the A46, and to protect water quality of the downstream Local Nature Reserve; iv. Any alterations, temporary or permanent, should not be made to the onsite watercourses without obtaining Ordinary</p>		<p>amenity and biodiversity benefits</p> <p>Amend text on p108 Sustainable Drainage – in line with comments in c)</p> <p>Additional text to be added on p115 Flood Risk in line with comments in d)</p> <p>Amend text on p147 relating to Figure 59 Sustainable Drainage to remove reference to oversized drainage pipes</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Watercourse Land Drainage consent from WCC as LLFA first</p> <p>e) P147 Sustainable Drainage – The LLFA does not consider oversized pipes as Sustainable Drainage and would not accept them as SuDs if submitted during the planning process. We would recommend this is removed and the sentence reworded to the following ‘Typically this will include both source control features such as permeable surfaces, conveyance features such as swales and site control features such as attenuation ponds to create a management train for surface water on the development site’</p>		
71430	Ms M Eaton	Warwickshire County Council (Ecology)	<p>a) Until we are able to view the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and/or the baseline ecological data of habitats and species from sufficient survey work, we can only provide general comments on the potential impacts of the proposed development and layout at this stage</p> <p>b) Biodiversity Impact – At this early stage, I can recommend that a Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) should be carried out to assess the biodiversity loss on site. This can only be completed once the baseline habitat data has been gathered. Should a significant loss be calculated on site, it is recommended to secure assurance through a draft habitat mitigation plan or biodiversity offsetting agreement that would be taken forward through a Section 106</p> <p>c) Habitats – It is vitally important that habitats of high conservation value, such as Thickthorn Wood (ancient woodland) and Glasshouse Spinney and Glasshouse Wood</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted, BIAs should be conducted and presented as part of the planning application process where appropriate</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) The provision of such a buffer is beyond the requirements of the NPPF and the local plan and is sufficiently restrictive as to affect the viability of delivery. Suitable buffers and interaction with natural features will come forward as part of the planning application process, to which the Ecology department of WCC will have an opportunity to comment upon</p> <p>e) Noted, and these will be considered with the other requirements and</p>	Objective 5 ‘Environmental Quality’ will be amended to include an additional Development Principle providing basic guidance regarding the expectations of development with regards to ecology

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are retained and protected by sufficient buffer zones. Full consideration should be given to maximising opportunities to enhance and strengthen these areas providing connectivity through Green Infrastructure across the site. We consider it is important to consider the cumulative impacts from each scheme with regards to the green infrastructure, enhancements/species mitigation measures/habitat creation on sites ensuring the sites link appropriated</p> <p>d) Habitats – From the Indicative Masterplan I note that the wooded areas are proposed to be retained. However, have concerns over the proximity of some of the sites to these areas. A sufficient buffer should be provided that extends sufficiently past the Root Protection Areas to protect these important habitats. It is also important that these habitats are no subject to public pressure. I would recommend that these areas are fenced off or incorporate a natural buffer that deters the public to this area and the woodland edge. We generally recommend a 30m buffer from works for construction near woodland with tall mature trees, predominantly for health and safety reasons. It should be ensured that natural buffer is retained between development and the woodland edge</p> <p>e) Strongly recommend that full consideration is given to maximising opportunities for retention and restoration/enhancement or creation of habitats of high conservation value, such as species rich grasslands, woodland (Thickthorn Wood LWS, Glasshouse Spinney and Glasshouse Wood LWS), water bodies, etc across the</p>	<p>constraints of the sites as they come forward through planning applications</p> <p>f) Noted</p> <p>g) Noted. It is acknowledged that the Brief does not have a specific Development Principle relating to Ecology. Therefore, Objective 5 'Environmental Quality' will be amended to include an additional Development Principle providing basic guidance regarding the expectations of development with regards to ecology</p> <p>h) Noted, such details will come forward as part of the detailed planning application process</p> <p>i) Noted</p> <p>j) Noted. The Brief will not include this as a requirement. However, the additional text indicated in response to g) can provide examples of appropriate features including this measure</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>site. The management of these habitats should be considered in order to provide good quality habitat. If this can be achieved, it would assist in minimising biodiversity impact. Areas proposed for public open space would not be able to support valuable habitat, such as a fully functioning semi-improved grassland habitat, due to the impact from public pressure</p> <p>f) Species – Protected species surveys should be carried out at the appropriate time of year prior to approval of plans and the results of the surveys should assist in producing the layout plans. It is important that such information is taken into consideration prior to finalising the layout plans</p> <p>g) Species – Schemes such as this can easily include measures/features for notable species such as ground nesting birds, amphibians, reptiles, and hedgehogs, so this is recommended to be considered at this stage with regards to the layout. Advise that some consideration is given towards designating an area for wildlife that is essentially fenced off from public pressure and associated pets such as dogs and cats</p> <p>h) Ground nesting birds, such as Skylark, should be taken into consideration if they are recorded on site. A sufficiently sized area would be required to mitigate for loss of ground nesting bird habitat. The area could also be managed in such a way that would make an enhancement for biodiversity. If this is not possible it will be recommended that any such loss is compensated for by a one-off agreed contribution made by the developer to support a scheme to mitigate for skylarks</p>		

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>i) In terms of amphibians in general, recommend the designs of kerbs and gully pots are considered. In general, standard gully pots are not recommended in schemes, although we appreciate this is likely to be unavoidable. Recommend full consideration is given to avoiding these in more sensitive areas where amphibians may be present. Amphibian-friendly wildlife kerbs are recommended to be incorporated along all new roads</p> <p>j) The hedgehog, a Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) Species is in great decline. For the species to be successful it is extremely important that the fences used throughout the development incorporate hedgehog friendly fences to facilitate movement. This is one of the main causes of their decline. This is a recommendation that can easily be incorporated into the scheme and will help ensure success of this species and contribute to the national project that is running to help address the decline</p>		
71257	Mr B Sharples	Sport England	<p>a) Chapter 1: Sport England would not support any development taking place on the Kenilworth RFC and Kenilworth Wardens Sports Club without the clubs first being operational on their new site. If this did not happen Sport England would raise a Statutory Objection to any planning application</p> <p>b) Chapter 5: Kenilworth Golf Club is situated on the northern side of Crewe Lane and therefore the impact of development on Crewe Lane must include consideration of how this will affect the golf course. This may require a ball strike assessment to be carried out by a qualified consultant such as Labosport, as part of any planning</p>	<p>a) Noted. We would also not support residential development on the sports club sites prior to them being operational on their proposed sites</p> <p>b) Noted. P54 of the draft Brief already requires proposed development in the vicinity of the Golf Club to include consideration of how it will affect the golf course</p> <p>c) Disagree. The proposed wording mirrors that within the Local Plan and provides suitable clarity as to the</p>	<p>Amendments to be made to the community centre requirements – omitting the need for a dedicated sports hall.</p> <p>Remove specific reference to a</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>application</p> <p>c) Section 2: I believe it is Development Principle Policy 2 should allow for employment generating uses as sport. I would recommend alterations to bullet point b): Uses within the employment land shall include only B1 and B2 uses and not B8 or non-employment uses; to: b) Uses within the employment land shall include only B1 and B2 uses and other employment uses which generates sustainable growth employment which would including training, not B8 or non-employment uses</p> <p>d) Chapter 6: Advise that WDC looks at our Active Design Guidance which is considered nationally as good practice in creating new communities:  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/</a>. It sets out established guidance on how the design and layout of new developments can be planned to make communities more active and healthier and some of the principles in this guidance could be incorporated into a new criterion in the policy. This is in line with Section 8 promoting healthy and safe communities in the revised NPPF. It is also referenced in the new Essex Design Guidance.</p> <p>e) Section 4: Gymnasium and community centre. These facilities should be justified using robust and recognised methodology. I am struggling to see an additional sports hall can be justified on top of the school sports hall. It would make more sense to increase the size of the school sports hall to a 5-court hall. The gymnasium needs to be</p>	<p>appropriate uses within the employment land</p> <p>d) Noted. However, we believe that the design and layout, as per our indicative masterplan, brings together urban design principles and site constraints to produce an appropriate aspiration for the development brief area</p> <p>e) As identified earlier in this table the sports hall will be omitted from the plans for the community centre. We agree it would make more sense to increase the size of the secondary school sports hall to 5-court hall and work with the school to see if this is possible, whilst taking into account our FPM modelling. The gymnasium was a reference to a private gym and the intention was for the private sector to potentially provide it – this reference was purely to identify potentially acceptable uses in the Local Centre. In light of planned investment into leisure facilities, including gyms, a further gym is not considered necessary. However, flexible space that can be used for a range of sports is welcome within the development</p> <p>f) Agree, WDC is working with Kenilworth</p>	<p>gym being a suitable use within the Local Centre</p> <p>Remove requirement for BMX/mountain bike facility</p> <p>Table 6 to be updated to reflect up-to-date advice and figures from WDC Cultural Services (Leisure) team relating to infrastructure requirements</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>clearly defined – is it a venue for gymnastics – is so what disciplines will it accommodate? Or is it a gym like Virgin Active? If the latter the private sector should provide it</p> <p>f) Section 4: Development Principle 4B. Refer to previous comments about sports halls. The sporting element of the school should be designed around dual use. Consideration should be given to WDC’s playing pitch strategy and the possibilities of including artificial grass pitches in the mix of outdoor pitch provision. Sport England have produced a lot of guidance on community use of schools: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/use-our-school/">https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/use-our-school/</a></p> <p>g) Outdoor sport and recreation – Justification is needed for the MUGA and consideration to its floodlighting and surface</p> <p>h) Justification for the BMX/Mountain Bike facility (including changing and bike storage &amp; toilets) is required. Sport England also requires to see support too from British Cycling and that the facilities are built to Sport England/Sport Scotland’s technical standards for BMX courses and Mountain bike courses. Finally has consideration been given to a closed road circuit? Ideal for young cyclists and the disabled</p> <p>i) The costs for the sports provision should be more acutely defined than just using our Sports Facility Calculator (SFC). A case in point is the proposed Artificial Grass Pitch at Castle Farm, depending on the surface the figure stated may be enough, however you also then have to factor in the ancillary facilities such as a pavilion and car parking.</p>	<p>School to ensure the sporting elements are designed around dual use. WDC is aware of its Playing Pitch Strategy and the possibility of including artificial pitches in the mix of outdoor pitch provision and this has been acknowledged in the LFFP work with the FA</p> <p>g) WDC’s greenspaces team support the provision of a MUGA within the development and due consideration of its surface and any lighting will be matters for consideration at the detailed planning stage</p> <p>h) The mountain bike/BMX facility is to be removed from the proposals. Such a facility would be land hungry and would be difficult to justify as necessary to make the development acceptable. Consideration has not been given to a closed road circuit and whilst this is an attractive idea, for the reasons identified above, it would not be appropriate to include this in the Brief</p> <p>i) The Sports Facility Calculator is a good starting point but more detail is required in working up the costs for each facility proposed. Further work</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			The SFC is a good starting point but more detail is required in working up the costs for each facility proposed. I am surprised that there is no contribution towards an indoor bowling facility in the District	with the Council's Leisure team has resulted in more up-to-date figures relating to infrastructure requirements for leisure infrastructure and the Brief will be amended accordingly. The figures are higher than those stated in the draft Brief. We no longer have indoor bowls as a priority in the district – this was debated with Bowls NGBs and the local indoor bowls club who at one point were looking for a new home but are now remaining in their current home venue	
71367; 71368	Ms A Ottaway	Warwicks hire Wildlife Trust	<p>a) P57 Vision – In the 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph recommend the wording is amended so that the vision is to 'protect and enhance' existing mature landscaping and woodland, rather than simply 'retain' it</p> <p>b) P58 Objectives – The revised NPPF and Government's 25-year plan for the environment are clear that we should be aiming for net gains to biodiversity so as to half the loss and decline of our natural environment and the services we receive from it. Recommend that Objective 5 is amended to include achieving net gains for biodiversity within the site</p> <p>c) Ancient Woodland Protection – Ancient woodland is irreplaceable and protected by paragraph 175 of the NPPF. The site contains a parcel of ancient woodland as identified on the constraints plan. However, no reference has been made to protecting it from direct or indirect</p>	<p>a) The current wording is appropriate. It would set the bar too high for the allocated development areas to enhance mature landscaping and woodland</p> <p>b) Agreed, Objective will be amended and associated text within Objective 5</p> <p>c) The protection of the ancient woodland is specifically listed under the Masterplan Design Principles on p.140 and is noted in the indicative drawings that follow. However, Development Principle 5A relating to green infrastructure is proposed to be amended to provide specific reference to Ancient Woodland</p>	<p>Objective 5 and associated text to be amended to include reference to biodiversity net gains</p> <p>Amend Development Principle 5A to provide specific reference to Ancient Woodland</p> <p>Text to be added</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>impacts from the proposed development</p> <p>d) Refer to Natural England’s Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees and also the Woodland Trust’s Planner’s Manual for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees. Both are clear that for large developments such as this a suitable buffer of semi-natural habitat along with other measures should be provided so as to mitigate impacts</p> <p>e) Recommend that specific references to protecting and enhancing the ancient woodland are made throughout the document and that Development Principle 5A is updated to include a paragraph on protecting and enhancing the ancient woodland and other high value ecological features</p> <p>f) Development Principle 5F: Flood Risk – Welcome the requirement for appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems to be used to minimise flood risk, however recommend the paragraph is expanded to state that where possible SuDS should be multifunctional and contribute towards biodiversity enhancement and landscape character</p>	<p>d) Noted. The Development Brief encourages the retention of such natural features where they exist along with the retention of such wildlife habitats as Thickthorn Spinney</p> <p>e) Noted, see response to c)</p> <p>f) Agree, text will be added to this effect</p>	<p>in/relating to Development Principle 5F ‘Flood Risk’ to state that where possible SuDS should be multifunctional and contribute towards biodiversity enhancement and landscape character</p>
71363; 71368	Mr A Morgan	Place Partnership Limited (on behalf of Warwick hire Police)	<p>a) Vision – Whilst supporting the content of the Vision, WP would like to see a strong reference to the aspiration of ensuring that the new community created at the site is safe, secure and enjoys low levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. This would better tie the Vision to: i. objective 6 and chapter 10; Paras 8(b), 91(b), 95(a) and 127(f) of the NPPF and Policies HS1 and HS7 of the Warwick District Local Plan. WP request that the following paragraph is</p>	<p>a) Noted, however in the interest of brevity it is not proposed to add additional aspects to the vision aside from incorporating the words ‘safe environment’ or similar</p> <p>b) Noted, thank you</p> <p>c) Noted, thank you</p> <p>d) Noted. The Brief will be amended</p>	<p>Add reference to a ‘safe environment’ or similar in the Vision (Chapter 6)</p> <p>Third bullet of</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>added to the Vision: 'The new community will be safe, secure and benefit from low levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. This will be achieved through a comprehensive package of design and infrastructure measures throughout the development'</p> <p>b) Objectives – WP welcome and support the proposed objectives for the new development, which are fully in accordance with the above paragraphs and policies of the NPPF and WDLP</p> <p>c) Development Principle 3C: Traffic Speeds – WP welcome and support the proposed maximum traffic speeds within the development. This will be vital to help motorists stay safe and reduce risk of accidents, collisions and fatalities.</p> <p>d) Development Principle 7A: Placemaking Principles – Whilst WP are pleased to see the inclusion of 'Safety and Security' as a placemaking principle and the promotion of Secured by Design (SBD), it is disappointing that the proposed text of the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point effectively states that incorporating SBD will compromise the aesthetics of the development. This is a misapprehension that the Police Service nationally has worked hard to overcome with commercial developers and other stakeholders. It is a false assumption that a development can either adopt the design standards recommended or be aesthetically pleasing, but not both. WP consider the current wording of the bullet point is contrary to paragraphs 8(b), 91(b), 95(a) and 127(f) of the NPPF and Paragraph 010 (Revision date: 06/03/2014) of the national planning practice guidance. WP contend that if both cannot be achieved,</p>	<p>accordingly</p> <p>e) Noted</p>	<p>'Safety and Security' Placemaking Principle to be amended to state: 'Aim to achieve Secured by Design accreditation throughout the development'</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>that is the failure of the proposed design, not the SBD guidance. Details provided for WP SBD advice free of charge via Design Out Crime Officers. Request the third bullet of the 'Safety and Security' placemaking principle be amended as follows to fully resolve this issue: 'Aim to achieve Secured by Design accreditation throughout the development'</p> <p>e) Table 6: Infrastructure Requirements – Emergency Services – The stated infrastructure requirements and indicative costs shown for WP are correct and reflect previous discussions with the Council about the site</p>		
71450	Ms A Hargrave	South Warwicks hire Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>a) The estate review in 2016 has established that existing GP capacity within the District is not sufficient to meet future demand arising from planned housing growth. The CCG has therefore clearly signalled its intent to seek appropriate mitigation via planning obligations and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)</p> <p>b) In relation to development east of Kenilworth, the CCG has noted the anticipated connectivity between the development area and the town centre, with 'connecting the site with the existing town' identified as one of the masterplan design principles. With this in mind, the CCG intends to seek developer contributions for the purpose of extending the capacity of the existing town centre practices in order to ensure that the population of the development area is able to access GP services</p> <p>c) The inclusion of accommodation for the elderly within the development area (extra care housing, residential care home, nursing home, etc) would be an issue of concern as</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted, this is reflected in the Development Brief</p> <p>c) There is a latent demand for such provision in the District and the Town and so advice on the appropriate location of such development would be welcome. We would welcome further discussion with the CCG</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			regards the specific requirements that the population are likely to have in relation to accessing GP services. As such, we would welcome the opportunity to engage with the District Council in relation to the planned inclusion of any such accommodation		
71369	Mr W Blincoe	Coventry & Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (CWLEP)	<p>a) The CWLEP is increasingly concerned to ensure that all relevant development plan documents address the provision of suitable and sufficient allocations for business and commercial space to meet current and future needs. There is evidence of shortages of suitable employment and commercial space in a number of key economic sectors to meet particular market and sub market sectors. This includes small workshop space, and smaller employment premises between 500-20,000 sq.ft which are suitable for small and medium enterprise (SME) types of business</p> <p>b) In view of the shortages in readily available employment land then bringing forward the employment content of the East of Kenilworth is crucial to maintain current economic growth across the District. The land has excellent location and accessibility credentials and as the Brief identifies is suitable for a range of high quality employment uses</p> <p>c) The current supplies of allocated employment land in Warwick District are now reducing and it is acknowledged that it is vital to maintain a flow of employment land capable of the provision and occupation of business units. In the District the stock of allocated land that is currently available to the market has reduced significantly in the</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted, agreed</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) The District has been proactive in allocation of significant parcels of land for employment use, including meeting sub-regional need at the Sub Regional Employment Site to the North East of Kenilworth. The employment land allocated as part of East of Kenilworth has been restricted to uses within Classes B1 and B2 to ensure that the development brings forward the appropriate mix of opportunities. It is felt that this is sufficient to meet the growth objectives of the Local Plan, and that additional restriction or detail may fetter the ability of a market-responsive development</p> <p>e) See response to d)</p> <p>f) The production of a housing trajectory is a requirement under the Act, and used when calculating the 5-year housing land supply. There are no such</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>last five years and this site (along with other nearby allocations) must be implemented at the earliest opportunity to maintain the buoyancy of the local economy and avoid growth going outside the sub-region</p> <p>d) Central concern is that the Brief takes a 'passive' position on the implementation of the employment land. The overriding implication is that the Council is prepared to leave matters to market forces to bring forward this important strategic employment release. This creates uncertainty in terms of meeting the joint economic growth objectives of both the Council and in a wider context the CWLEP</p> <p>e) The level of detail relating to the employment content of the development area is throughout the draft low and is general. The employment land is hardly dealt with in the 'Design Principles' and it is unclear what the Council's vision is for the type and character of the employment land. Consequently, it is difficult to see how this strategic employment site is likely to meet various types of need that exist across the District. Request more detailed consideration of the proposed employment area and its role in meeting current requirements</p> <p>f) Particularly concerned by the absence of any information related to the timing and implementation of the strategic employment area at Kenilworth. While a housing trajectory is set out at Table 5 in the Delivery Section of the guidance (and this already appears to be slipping?), the draft gives no clues to the likely timing of release of the employment area. This is a concern for the CWLEP</p>	<p>requirements set for employment land and so no such trajectory is created or maintained. The authority remains in close dialogue with land owners, promoters and developers with the intention of bringing forward the various elements of the wider development in an appropriate and timely manner, but the precise timing and phasing of the development is outside the scope of the Development Brief</p> <p>g) The Development Brief cannot restrict the employment land development further than use class restrictions set out in the Local Plan. The text associated with the Objective 2 does however highlight that WDC is supportive of a mix of employment including a range of different sized units and specifically identifies that it will be supportive of and encourage start-up business space, business growth space and flexible office space</p> <p>h) Whilst there is some emerging evidence this has yet to be published or adopted by either the LEP or any local authority, and therefore would not be appropriate for the Brief to take</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>because the site has strategic significance as part of the wider sub regional picture. Moreover, this makes monitoring of economic performance difficult. The latter is important in terms of the agreed Employment MOU agreed by all C&amp;W local authorities</p> <p>g) The draft Brief has no information about the likely content of the employment area in terms of the mix of uses or size range of units envisaged. We consider that instead of an implied position that this will be left to prevailing market forces an indication of the aspirations and market types that the District wishes to achieve would help guide developers. We appreciate the District Council has no direct land control but nevertheless consider the Brief represents an opportunity for the local authority to look at what type of employment land will have the most beneficial impact</p> <p>h) In relation to the ‘targeting’ of the site the Brief represents an opportunity to examine the requirements of local businesses and whether the site can provide for any of these needs. In particular, recent research has highlighted the absence of provision of expansion space for many SME businesses. The Brief provides an opportunity to provide a range of smaller units. The recent Market Signals work provides good evidence base for this. A clear policy framework in the Brief setting out the ambitions of the Council to achieve the provision of a tranche of small units would help reinforce the LPA position in future negotiations around planning obligations</p>	<p>into account. However, it is not the intention of the Brief to fetter the development of a market-responsive employment development by overly-restrictive requirements in the Brief</p> <p>i) See response to i)</p> <p>j) These matters will be considered as part of the planning application process</p> <p>k) Noted, and WDC have responded to the CWLEP requesting a meeting to discuss these matters in more detail</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>i) The land East of Kenilworth represents a very large area and in order to produce a generally sustainable and mixed community the Local Authority should look to provide a range of small business units that can sit comfortably within and perhaps mixed into predominantly residential units. This would provide both design variety and local employment opportunities. In particular land in or adjacent to the proposed local centre seems to hold potential for the provision of small business units</p> <p>j) Little detail about how the implementation will be managed and crucially when key infrastructure and facilities will be developed. Whilst the Brief contains various information about major infrastructure costs, not clear if the delivery of the employment land can be carried out in isolation or ahead of the surrounding residential areas? This may impact significantly on the timing of release</p> <p>k) The CWLEP would welcome the opportunity to discuss the issues raised in more detail with the Council</p>		
71448	Mr R Torkildsen	Historic England	<p>a) Historic England welcome reference in the Brief to the Scheduled Monument in Glasshouse Wood and the need for development to positively respond to it (para 5, page 53)</p> <p>b) However, to ensure an effective Brief could we suggest the following:</p> <p>i) Could the Brief refer to the need for a detailed Management Plan for the Scheduled Monument to set out the future approach, responsibilities and how management commitments will be secured in the long</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) i. Development Principle 5B, b) already does require such a Management Plan. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to include the Heads of Terms document to be included in the Brief</p> <p>ii. additional wording will be added to specifically refer to Glasshouse Wood and also Thickthorn Wood</p>	Additional wording to be added relating to Figure 19 to refer to Glasshouse Wood and Thickthorn Wood

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>term? Could the Heads of Terms document that has been agreed with the prospective developer for this site be included in the Development Brief?</p> <p>ii) Could the Brief include a greater reference to Glasshouse Wood in the Green and Blue Infrastructure sections of the document (Page 40)?</p> <p>iii) An important concern for Historic England is to ensure the Brief provides due consideration of the setting of affected Heritage assets. In the case of Glasshouse Wood we were very conscious of the rural landscaping setting of the Roman site that would be lost by a modern suburban housing estate, causing harm to the significance of the Scheduled Monument. As you know great weight needs to be afforded the conservation of the significance of designated heritage assets. It is therefore essential that a significant open buffer between the development and the Monument is provided including perhaps the relocation of allotments to maximise green space</p> <p>iv) The design response to the Monument must also be carefully considered and appropriately responsive, ensuring for example that development is orientated to face the Monument rather than turn its back on it. The Roman site should be appreciated and enjoyed rather than ignored</p> <p>v) A point of particular concern is in relation to a suggestion that a large acoustic barrier between the housing and the dual carriageway is introduced (between it and the housing), rather than along the</p>	<p>iii. The Brief does suggest a buffer between the Scheduled Monument and built development. However, it is important to balance the need to pay appropriate regard to the Scheduled Monument and other material considerations and the need to deliver dwellings. The extent and location of any buffer is a matter for detailed consideration for planning applications relating to this part of the site</p> <p>c) It is considered that the Brief already suitably addresses this point</p> <p>d) Part f) of Development Principle 5B does highlight that any acoustic screening would be best located abutting the A46. In Development Principle 5C it also highlights that the impact upon any heritage assets must be considered when designing acoustic mitigation relating to A46 noise</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			edge of the Monument and the road. If this were proposed, Historic England is likely to formally express objection as it would divorce the Monument from its setting and negate the positive initiatives described above. We would recommend the Brief address this matter		
71434	Mr R Lemon	Savills (on behalf of Gleeson Strategic Land Ltd)	<p>a) Gleeson is currently in pre-application discussions with WDC/WCC in respect of the delivery of residential development on part of the ED2 site</p> <p>b) Ch 6: Vision and Objectives – Owing to its broad consistency with both the adopted Warwick District Local Plan and the provisions of KP4 of the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan, Gleeson agrees with the overarching vision and objectives for land east of Kenilworth</p> <p>c) It is agreed that the site should be developed comprehensively as a high quality and integrated development including circa 1,400 dwellings, although we consider this should be a minimum figure and the policy amended accordingly. The specific quantum of development should be guided by site specific constraints and opportunities in keeping with national planning policies relating to the delivery of sustainable development. It is accepted that the vision includes for the provision of educational facilities, including both primary and secondary provision</p> <p>d) Objectives 1-8 relate well to the overarching vision proposed by the District Council. Gleeson particularly supports Objective 1, relating to the delivery of a mix of housing to create a sustainable community</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted, thank you</p> <p>c) Noted. The wording in the Brief reflects that of the explanatory text to Policy DS11 of the Local Plan which states that the number shown for each site is “An estimated figure for the number of dwellings for each site is shown”. Therefore, the use of the words ‘estimated’ and ‘approximately’ are consistent with the Local Plan. It is also owing to site specifics that the use of the term ‘estimated’ is also deemed appropriate as more detailed analysis of a site will take place to support a planning application than was required to support a Local Plan allocation</p> <p>d) Noted, thank you</p> <p>e) Noted, refer to response to c)</p> <p>f) Noted, thank you</p> <p>g) Agreed, text to be altered. The site should not necessarily be dependent on this improvement coming forward</p>	<p>Development Principle 3G b) to be amended to remove the requirement on the improvements being implemented at the junction prior to access being provided to the residential site</p> <p>All text and figures relating to the primary school will be amended to reflect the delivery of 2 1-form entry primary schools</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Chapter 7: Development Principles</p> <p>e) Principle 1 – The delivery of 1,400 dwellings is consistent with the requirements of Policy DS11 of the Local Plan. We emphasise that the specific quantum of development achieved across the site should be informed by site specific factors. This is acknowledged in supporting text to the Brief, which is welcomed. The policy as drafted is supported as it allows for sufficient flexibility to deliver more or less than the 1,400 figure, providing there is sufficient robust justification for doing so (although note that the figure should be a minimum)</p> <p>f) Principle 1a – Gleeson welcomes the clarity provided by the Brief. It is noted that the specific housing mix may itself be guided by site specific factors, and may vary occasionally to that set out in Table 1 of the Brief. We do, however, welcome the policy wording currently proposed which seeks to provide some degree of flexibility whilst also ensuring an appropriate housing mix across the wider site area</p> <p>g) Principle 3G ‘Other Accesses’, Point b. Scoping discussions have taken place with the Local Highway Authority and access to the residential element of ED2 is proposed from Glasshouse Lane. It is not necessary to have completed the preferred improvements to the Crewe Lane/Glasshouse Lane/Hidcote Rd junction to make the residential junction acceptable in highway terms. The wording of Development Principle 3G is therefore not considered appropriate and it is requested this paragraph be amended to remove the reliance on the improvements</p>	<p>although it would be our preference this can be achieved. The access arrangements will still be subject to appropriate scrutiny in terms of design, modelling and road safety requirements through the planning process</p> <p>h) The location of the primary school is to change in light of representations received and further dialogue with site promoters, WCC and the Department for Education. Two primary schools are proposed, one on the land promoted by Catesby and one on land promoted by Barwood. It is therefore unlikely that the remaining part of allocation ED2 not required by Kenilworth School will be needed for a primary school. No reserve primary school sites will be shown in the amended Brief. Land on ED2, as per the Local Plan policy, however will only be deemed suitable for residential use if the LPA confirm that it is not required for education purposes. In order to facilitate this, the District Council will be pursuing a formal mechanism to confirm the two new locations, which in tandem with the revised Development Brief, will</p>	<p>on the site – one to the north on land promoted by Catesby and one to the south on land promoted by Barwood</p> <p>Development Principle 4B a) (and any other similar references) amended to reflect the requirement for proportionate contributions towards the land costs associated with the new secondary school. Further detail will also be added to the Brief clarifying the mechanisms through which</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>being implemented at the junction prior to access being provided to the residential site. Discussions have taken place with WCC who agree that the residential site cannot be dependent on this infrastructure being delivered prior to access and that this will also be picked up in WCC's response to the Brief</p> <p>h) Principle 4B – We note that Policy DS12 specifically states that the ED2 site should provide a primary school 'if deemed the most appropriate location'. It is clear from the Brief that Southcrest Farm is not considered the most appropriate location for a primary school, since the preferred location is elsewhere within the Brief area and highlighted on the indicative masterplan. We therefore consider that the preferred location for the new primary school is as set out in the Brief and within the central parcel of the wider site, which we agree is the most logical and appropriate location for such a facility intended to serve the wider development. Southcrest Farm (the northern parcel) should therefore be removed as one of the reserve primary school sites. It is therefore clear that the whole site will not be required for educational uses and the release of the surplus land for housing is therefore supported</p> <p>i) There remains a level of ambiguity in relation to the reserve sites which should be addressed. It is not clear whether the 3 sites have been ranked in order of preference, nor when the Council anticipates the requirement for the delivery of the primary school in time (acknowledging that the proposed triggers relate simply</p>	<p>enable the remainder of ED2 to come forward for housing earlier than the original plan may have allowed</p> <p>i) This is no longer an issue with the revised proposals for delivering primary education on the site</p> <p>j) Agree. This is a drafting error (and Table 6 on p164 identifies the requirement for contributions towards land costs). Development Principle 4B a) (and any other similar references) will be amended to reflect the requirement for proportionate contributions towards the land costs associated with the new secondary school. Further detail will also be added to the Brief clarifying the mechanisms through which such costs will be sought</p> <p>k) A commuted sum will be required if WDC adopts. This is covered in detail in the Public Open Spaces SPD, currently out for public consultation. This refers to SuDs, maintenance and commuted sums - <a href="https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/downloads/file/5261/public_open_spaces_consultation_draft">https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/downloads/file/5261/public_open_spaces_consultation_draft</a>. Developers are required to provide a SuDS</p>	<p>such costs will be sought</p> <p>Amend wording Amend wording to Development Principle 8 c) to include words 'where applicable'</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>to the occupation of dwellings). This must be clearly articulated in the Brief. If the Vision of the Brief in providing comprehensive development is to be realised, the Brief should avoid the protracted delay in housing delivery across three parcels for an extended period. It may be prudent for officers to consider a 'long stop' date for the reserve sites, to provide certainty of delivery either of the primary school or of residential development. This is a significant factor impacting delivery of new homes in line with the provisions of adopted policy DS11, and one that requires to be reconsidered as it could otherwise stifle the bringing forward of much needed housing</p> <p>j) It is expressly noted that "...S106 contributions will be sought from residential development to fund both the land and build costs of the new school". We note that a similar provision is not explicitly referenced in respect of secondary provision at Southcrest Farm within the supporting text associated with Principle 4B. This is an oversight which should be corrected in the interests of parity and consistency in approach. Further detail of the mechanisms through which such costs will be covered should be provided</p> <p>k) Objective 5: Environmental Quality – Within the sub-text to 'Sustainable Drainage' on page 108 reference is made to the adoption of SuDS where located within areas of open space, with a commuted sum. However, no detail or calculation is provided in relation to what the sum could be. As a result, there is uncertainty as to the level of contributions that may be sought and whether there is an</p>	<p>specification. This includes a 'maintenance scheme' that advises how the SuDS are to be maintained, which in turn informs the commuted sum. We are not able to provide fixed prices because each SuD feature is different</p> <p>l) This change is considered acceptable and the wording will be amended to this effect, albeit likely to use the words 'associated with the A46' rather than 'adjacent to the A46'</p> <p>m) Disagree, we think the wording is appropriate. For ED2 we would use our discretion and professional opinion on whether air quality impacts are likely to occur. The current policy states that the air quality assessment will need to consider air quality impacts from the A46. If the developer is confident that the A46 would not adversely affect the development they can state this in their air quality assessment, however, it would need to be supported by evidence on why they form this opinion</p> <p>n) Noted. However, it is our understanding that the property owners are not looking to move.</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>associated impact on viability or values which the landowners would need to factor in. The requirement for a sum should be removed until further detail is provided</p> <p>l) Principle 5D Air Quality – we consider that there should be greater flexibility where extensive monitoring is unlikely to be required for less sensitive sites. We therefore suggest that part a) of this policy should be revised with the last two sentences changed to “Where a detailed air quality assessment indicates a potential development constraint as a result of poor air quality adjacent to the A46, the use of air quality monitoring data will be essential in support of a full planning application”</p> <p>m) Principle 8 Utilities – Following changes to water charging we consider that part c) of Principle 8 should be revised as follows so that contributions are only required where development is connecting to the pumping station: “c) Developers, <u>where relevant</u>, will be expected to contribute (directly to Severn Trent Water) towards capacity improvements at Dalehouse Lane Terminal Pumping Station”. We would also note that Infrastructure Charges that are payable on all new connected properties will cover the costs associated with any offsite reinforcement</p> <p>n) Chapters 8 and 9 provide an indicative masterplan together with masterplan principles and parameter plans which we are in general agreement. However, we would note that there is an additional area of the site that should be shaded as part of the relevant plans (namely the Land Use Plan and Indicative Site Masterplan). The</p>	<p>Therefore, we do not consider amending Figures 54, 55, the Indicative Masterplan or any other plan necessary. This would not however prevent future appropriate development on the site should the landowners wish to see their property developed</p> <p>o) Noted. Figure 58 is a high level concept plan and does not show every element of green space on the site and further areas of greenspace/play provision may be required elsewhere in the development and this will be a matter for consideration through the planning application process</p> <p>p) Noted, thank you</p> <p>q) Noted. Text in Chapter 10 will be amended to provide as much clarity as possible with regards to the phasing, triggers and delivery of education facilities</p> <p>r) Concerns about reserved primary education sites should no longer be applicable given the response to h). The trigger point for when land is required will be negotiated with the Developers at the time of their applications. We need to take account</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>area is to the east of the existing area shaded as part of Southcrest Farm on Figures 54 and 55. This has been acknowledged in pre-application discussions and the Council have confirmed the shading should be extended to this effect. Whilst this additional area is previously developed land which would allow for residential development of the site to come forward, for completeness and to allow for flexibility in bringing forward the site it is considered the allocation should be expanded accordingly</p> <p>o) Concept Proposal 6 of the Brief makes provision for two main areas of green open space which will provide children’s play areas as well as opportunities for recreation and leisure. We acknowledge that site specific open space requirements for Southcrest Farm will be considered as part of the planning application in due course</p> <p>p) Chapter 10 Delivery – It is useful for the Brief to include an overview of the suite of documents required in the submission of any planning applications across the site. This corresponds with the Council’s own validation checklist for outline and full planning applications, and is accepted by Gleeson as a detailed and thorough list of requirements for the consideration and determination of applications for development in the plan area</p> <p>q) Ch 10 – In respect of development phasing, Gleeson agree that development across the wider site is likely to take place over a number of years and will vary dependent on parcel size, market conditions, and necessary conditions.</p>	<p>of site accessibility and the subsequent safety of pupils attending provision on a live building site. At this stage it is intended that initial growth across Kenilworth will be met through the expansion of existing provision. This will also cater for the early development at East Kenilworth. Projections show that the absolute deadline for a new school to open is by the 1000th occupation. However, if land is transferred prior to the 500th occupation we would envisage the first primary school opening well in advance of the 1000th occupation. Pupil forecast data and resulting timetable for required new places will be made available to support the delivery of a shared infrastructure solution</p> <p>s) The current CIL 123 list does not include any specific items relating to land east of Kenilworth but does include two items relating to Kenilworth – improvements to destination parks (including Abbey Fields), wayfinding improvements (including Kenilworth) and Castle Farm Recreation Centre improvements. Secondary education contributions will</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>It is important, however, that any triggers imposed do not unduly restrict or limit the success of the Brief in reaching its primary purpose of delivering comprehensive development. This is however, recognised by supporting text contained within the Brief. Again, specificity on the delivery of education provision is required, particularly if the Brief is to retain reference to the 'suitable phasing of education provision to ensure residents have access to education' as in Ch10</p> <p>r) Ch 10 – Whilst there are delivery triggers relating to primary education provision, the policy wording remains somewhat broad reaching. The occupation of 1,000 dwellings is a significant proportion of dwellings in the plan area. It is acknowledged elsewhere in the Brief that delivery is unlikely to reach more than 175 dwellings per annum, meaning that the occupation of 1,000 dwellings is likely to take place a number of years into the future. For those sites identified as reserved primary education sites, this trigger leaves a great degree of uncertainty as to delivery timescales at the reserve sites. It also cannot be made certain that this broad trigger, on its own, is appropriate in securing comprehensive development across the wider site, simply because it incorporates a level of ambiguity as to when deliver across three additional parcels to the preferred primary school may take place. Likewise, if the transfer of the preferred site to WCC by the 500<sup>th</sup> occupation is to take place, and the fall-back position of reserve sites is to be activated, it must be made clearer which of the three sites is the next</p>	<p>only relate to the additional places to meet the needs of the development as it would not be appropriate to require more. However, the primary schools are required to meet the need of this development and therefore the full costs will be required</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>preferred, and so on. Discussion of this trigger is essential in ensuring its improvement and deliverability</p> <p>s) It is agreed that for conformity with Local Plan Policy DS11, there needs to be a series of robust mechanisms to secure key infrastructure delivery. The current CIL 123 List does not include specific items relating to land east of Kenilworth, and so alternative mechanisms are required likely to include legal agreement, i.e. s106 contributions. There should be a greater degree of certainty outlined in respect of both secondary and primary school contributions. Table 6 currently outlines that both primary and secondary provision will generate contributions from residential development to cover land and build costs. However, for secondary education it appears such contributions will relate only to the additional school places to meet the needs of the development, rather than any all-encompassing costs as seems to be the case for the primary school</p>		
71437	Ms S Butterfield	WYG (on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd)	<p>a) Confirm support for the Brief's principles in seeking to bring forward comprehensive development 'East of Kenilworth'. The approach taken by WDC, engaging in positive discussions with all stakeholders to inform the document is supported</p> <p>b) Catesby's land interests relate to allocation H40 of the Local Plan and have a planning application currently under consideration relating to this</p> <p>c) Chapter 1 – The Brief states, at p7, that once adopted it “will be a material consideration to be afforded significant weight in the determination of planning applications”. The</p>	<p>a) Noted, thank you</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Agreed, word ‘significant’ to be removed</p> <p>d) Noted, however we do not feel that the Brief reads that way nor does it attempt to alter the Local Plan</p> <p>e) See response to d)</p> <p>f) For brevity the Brief cannot re-write all relevant policy verbatim. With regards to the example raised, the text in the</p>	<p>Ch1, p7 – remove word “significant” when referring to the Brief being a material consideration to be afforded weight</p> <p>Ch3, p24 -</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>T&amp;CP (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 state “SPDs are allowed to contain policy, but it must be justified and must not conflict with the development plan” (Reg 8(3)). SPD policy cannot supersede Development Plan policy and is merely a material consideration. Any reference to it being afforded ‘significant weight’ should be deleted</p> <p>d) Ch1 - Certain sections of the Brief read as an attempt to introduce swathes of untested, unjustified and ineffective policy via a document not subject to independent scrutiny. WDC should ensure the Brief does not attempt to alter Local Plan policy and it should be construed as containing policy identifying alternative development uses/site allocation policies/setting additional development management policy</p> <p>e) Ch1 - SPDs should simply build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on the policies in the Local Plan. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF highlights that they ‘should not be used to add unnecessarily to the final burdens on development’</p> <p>f) Ch3 – In places it is considered that the Brief cherry picks references to certain parts of the policies, omitting certain key aspects. For example, on p24, the reference to Policy DS15 does not reflect the adopted Local Plan as it does not also refer to Policy DS12, which states that land at Southcrest Farm shall be used for the “secondary school, 6<sup>th</sup> form centre and, if deemed the most appropriate location, a primary school”. This hierarchy of locational criteria should be referenced within the policy chapter</p>	<p>Brief outlining Policy DS12 does refer to this hierarchy of locational criteria. However, it is acknowledged that this is not reiterated with regards to Policy DS15 and the document will be updated accordingly</p> <p>g) Agreed. The wording in this section will be amended, albeit acknowledging that the Delivery and Monitoring section of the Local Plan identifies that WDC will prepare a Development Brief for this area</p> <p>h) Agreed, wording to be amended to ensure consistency with KNP policy KP4 e) and additional wording to be added in the supporting text regarding the release mechanism for such plots</p> <p>i) Noted. Contributions would not be sought unless it was considered that they meet the relevant CIL Regulation tests and Section 106 pooling restrictions</p> <p>j) It is clear that the Brief must be consistent regarding cycle/footways along the spine road. As per the response from the Local Highway Authority to this consultation and in light of the strong public response regarding the need to encourage</p>	<p>Amend first bullet relating to Policy DS15 to refer to Policy DS12 for consistency with the Local Plan wording</p> <p>Ch3, p24 – Amend text relating to Policy DS15 to ensure consistency with the wording of the Local Plan</p> <p>Ch7, p62 – Amend text relating to Self-Build and Custom-build housing to ensure consistency with KNP policy KP4 e) and add additional text regarding the</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>g) Ch3 - Neither Policy BE2 nor Policy DS15 require the LPA to adopt Development Briefs as supplementary planning guidance. Rather, they require each strategic site allocation in the Local Plan to be supported by a Development Brief or Layout and Design Statement to demonstrate that the development can come forward comprehensively. This reference (p24) should therefore be amended in Section 3 of the draft Brief</p> <p>Self-Build and Custom-Build housing</p> <p>h) Ch7 – The requirement for up to 5% of all plots to be provided as self-build plots is consistent with the requirement of Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP4 e) and is not objected to. The supporting text to Development Principle 1B is however not consistent with the policy wording and should be amended as follows to ensure it is consistent: “In harmony with the Local Plan policy and Neighbourhood Plan this Development Brief sets out a requirement that all major housing sites within the overall site shall provide a proportion of the open market homes as self-serviced plots for self-build and custom build commensurate with demand evidenced on the local authority self-build register of interest, not exceeding 5% of the total number of dwellings”. The supporting text accompanying Development Principle 1B should also be amended so as to reflect the wording at subsection d) regarding the release mechanism for such plots, if there is no take-up of the plots by self-builders after a period of 12 months</p> <p>Delivery of an Effective and Efficient Transport System</p>	<p>cycling within the development, 4-metre wide cycle/footways should be the aspiration on the spine road as this is the minimum width you could segregate pedestrians/cyclists if this is decided as the preferred option as detailed schemes are progressed and 4m would allow more space for all users at busy times, such as school trips. Therefore, the final bullet point on p78 will be amended accordingly. The wording in the text still affords flexibility where 4m is not achievable or for 4m provision on one side only if acceptable. The acceptability of any deviation from this will be a matter for consideration through planning applications</p> <p>k) Agree, amendment will be made</p> <p>l) Agree, amendment will be made</p> <p>m) Noted</p> <p>n) It is noted that Catesby’s planning application does not propose these accesses. However, it is not the case that this Development Brief should necessarily follow what is proposed through that application. It should also be acknowledged that the Catesby application is yet to be determined,</p>	<p>release mechanism for such plots (in line with Development Principle 1B,d))</p> <p>Spine road specification - Amend wording in final bullet of p78 to refer to 4m rather than 3-4m wide shared footways/ cycleways</p> <p>Draft Development Principle 3A c) to be amended to “...The minimum usable width for shared links is 3.0m...”</p> <p>Bullet d) of Development Policy 3E to be</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>i) Ch7 – Support is given to the promotion of sustainable transport modes set out on pages 65-67 although any financial contributions will need to meet the relevant CIL Regulation tests and Section 106 pooling restrictions</p> <p>j) Ch7 - The requirement for a 4m surface width for a footway/cycleway at p67 is not supported and is inconsistent with the final bullet point of p78. Page 67 should be amended to read as per p78</p> <p>k) Ch7 – Draft Development Principle 3A c) should be amended to read “...The minimum usable width for shared links is 3.0m...”. The bullet point refers to the provision of integrated pedestrian and cycle routes and should reflect its meaning, which is to ensure a variety of such links are provided</p> <p>l) Bullet d) of Development Policy 3E does not define ‘early’ in terms of the delivery of alterations to Crewe Lane to accommodate the spine road junction. It is therefore not effective and should be amended to read “...to enable access to the northern parcels of land within H40 and to complete the spine road link”</p> <p>m) The alterations proposed to Crewe Lane are supported, as is their delivery through Section 106 contributions</p> <p>n) Figures 30 and 32, 41, Table 2 Map Ref 6 and p81 should be amended to delete any references to an upgrade to the existing conference centre access or secondary residential access. As per Catesby’s outline planning application (ref: W/18/1635) no such access upgrades are either proposed, or necessary and these references are therefore not justified</p>	<p>WCC as Local Highway Authority have yet to formally respond to the application and the Development Brief is a material consideration in the assessment of the application. The drawing within the Development Brief has originated from the Kenilworth Transport Study undertaken by Atkins and was partially informed by initial discussions with Catesby about access. WCC as highway authority have a preference for fewer junctions on the corridor, it is not ideal having an access on the bend and would appear to be more safe if Woodside was accessed via the roundabout or an access off the northern spine road. The proposal in Figure 32 would improve safety at the Woodside Hotel/Woodside Lodge access. The Brief does however afford sufficient flexibility to allow for alternative schemes to come forward but as part of those schemes it would be expected that appropriate consideration will be given to providing safe accesses both for the new development and the retained properties. No amendments proposed</p> <p>o) If the Catesby planning application</p>	<p>amended to: “...to enable access to the northern parcels of land within H40 and to complete the spine road link” (see point l)</p> <p>Amend Table 2, item 9 funding source to state ‘s278 / s106’</p> <p>Amend Development Principle 3H so that the second sentence reads as: “All new development shown to have a material impact at this location shall contribute towards these improvements through S106</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>o) The St John's Gyrotory improvements will be delivered by WCC through Section 106 or CIL contributions and therefore WCC will design this scheme. The reference on page 86 to the 'applicants' needing to consider such matters further should therefore be deleted</p> <p>p) As drafted, Development Principle 3H does not reflect the latest WCC position and is therefore not justified, nor would it be effective. It is requested that the draft Development Principle be amended to read: "... full signalisation of the St John's Gyrotory shall have been delivered. All new development shown to have a material impact at this location shall contribute towards these improvements through S106 contributions."</p> <p>q) As WCC will be responsible for the design of the improvements scheme at Dalehouse Lane, reference to the scheme needing to be agreed with WCC Highways should be removed</p> <p>r) The requirement for residential developments to contribute to the scheme for the realignment of Leyes Lane at Development Principle 3J have not been justified and should be deleted. The realignment is necessary to facilitate access to the proposed secondary school and not to accommodate the residential development. In addition, it is considered that the Leyes Lane / Dencer Drive signalised junction should be delivered as one scheme, as shown at Figure 39 in the draft Development Brief</p> <p>s) The proposals for public transport improvements p89-91 of the draft Brief are fully supported although bullet c) of Development Principle 3K should be amended to read: "A</p>	<p>relies on the St.Johns improvements to provide capacity (which it is understood is the case) then WCC would expect them to deliver the scheme under Section 278. However, if another development parcel comes forward prior to the Catesby trigger for this work, then that developer could become liable for the scheme. Given that it is highly likely to be delivered through s278, the wording is not proposed to change. The funding source in Table 2 will be amended to state 's278/s106'</p> <p>p) The wording as drafted in the Development Brief allows for sufficient flexibility for either a developer or WCC led scheme and so will not be changed. It is agreed that the second sentence should be amended to reflect that other uses – e.g. employment or education uses – may have an impact and therefore be required to contribute</p> <p>q) Agree, amendment will be made</p> <p>r) The realignment scheme also provides pedestrian and cycle access from the Catesby site to the existing school site and to other destinations in the town</p>	<p>contributions"</p> <p>Wording in Development Principle 3I 'Dalehouse Lane/Knowle Hill Junction Improvements' to be amended to reflect the scheme will be designed/delivered by WCC</p> <p>Development Principle 3K c) to be amended to state "A bus turning facility and lay-over area shall be provided towards the north of the site at a location to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>bus turning facility and lay-over area shall be provided towards the north of the site at a location to be agreed with WCC." The lay-over area can be provided at any location along the spine road and should not be prescribed by the Development Brief. The indicative masterplan submitted with Catesby's outline planning application (ref: W/18/1635) shows a layover within the site and also includes a loop road to avoid the need for a bespoke bus turning area. The proposed amended wording would allow flexibility but ensure an appropriate facility is provided</p> <p>t) Table 2, Map Ref 7 (Crewe Lane Restricted Vehicle Movement) should be amended to be a 'County Council led scheme' and not developer led. This is because WCC will be delivering the scheme, through S106 funding</p> <p>u) Table 2, Map Ref 17 (Crewe Garden Farm A452/B4115 Link Road Phase 1) should be referred to as the 'Spine Road through Crewe Garden Farm development to connect Glasshouse Land to Crewe Lane' scheme and references to the B4115 and A46 should all be removed as they are unnecessary and not part of the identified scheme. In addition, the funding source should be changed to S278/S38</p> <p>v) Table 2, Map Ref 22 (Leyes Lane Realignment) should be linked to Map Ref 11 in terms of the funding source. It is also considered that it should be delivered by the school, as it forms one complete scheme with the Dencer Drive signalisation (Figure 39) (see comments at para 5.2.10 above)</p>	<p>centre. A contribution is therefore considered appropriate and it is a matter for consideration at the planning application stage what contributions are considered fair and proportionate</p> <p>s) Agree, amendment will be made to this effect but will likely reference both the LPA and LHA rather than just the LHA (WCC) as suggested</p> <p>t) At present it is unknown who will deliver this scheme. Table 2 item 7 to be amended to refer to 'Developer-led scheme/WCC scheme' and the funding source as 's278/s106'</p> <p>u) Disagree. We consider this to be a whole route linking to the Strategic Road Network. There may be a need for highway improvements on the route from the spine road through to the Crewe Lane/B4115 junction, at the B4115 junction and on the B4115. This will be considered in more detail through the planning application process</p> <p>v) Disagree. See response to r). It is however proposed to change the estimated date for delivery to 2021 to be in line with the school access</p>	<p>Local Highway Authority" or similar wording</p> <p>Table 2 item 7 to be amended to refer to 'Developer-led scheme/WCC scheme' and the funding source as 's278/s106'</p> <p>Table 2- Amend estimated date for delivery of Scheme 22 'Leyes Lane Realignment' to reflect the date in Scheme 11 'Leyes Lane Access to School Site'. Wording of that scheme to also change to 'Leyes Lane/Glasshouse Lane Access to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>w) Local Centre and Community Facilities – no evidence has been provided to justify the prescriptive requirements for the community centre, which go beyond the adopted Local Plan Policy DS14 which simply requires “a community meeting place”. Whilst the Development Brief’s identification of a broad location for such facilities is not objected to, Development Principle 4A is considered too prescriptive as drafted, and should include greater flexibility in its requirements, to reflect the potential for alternative forms of provision</p> <p>x) Education Facilities - Catesby Estates is concerned that the Brief’s proposed location for the primary school on the Wardens Sports Ground risks the school not being delivered promptly given the potential timing constraints associated with the relocation of the Club, potentially resulting in a constraint on housing delivery across the east of Kenilworth area. Following discussions with WCC and WDC and other east of Kenilworth promoters, Catesby Estates is therefore proposing the inclusion of land for a one form entry primary school (1.5ha to provide scope for potential future expansion to two form entry) within its proposals for Crewe Lane and Woodside Training Centre. An illustrative masterplan is provided showing an indicative location for the primary school within the Catesby site. The Development Brief policy and Indicative Masterplan (Figure 60) should therefore be amended to be flexible in terms of the location and format of the primary school provision, which will, in turn reflect the outcome of the currently ongoing discussions</p>	<p>estimated date. Scheme name of scheme 11 also to be changed to ‘Leyes Lane/Glasshouse Lane Access to School Site’ to accurately reflect the location of the proposed access</p> <p>w) The detailed articulation of the community centre requirements is in accordance with the Local Plan. Policy DS11 requires “community facilities” from the site, and the proposed community centre clearly meets this requirement. The details are appropriate and justified in the text preceding the Development Principle box. However, we acknowledge that the Principle could allow for greater flexibility should an applicant be able to deliver the significant benefits expected in an alternative provision, and the Principle will be amended accordingly</p> <p>x) Noted. WDC support the approach to the delivery of primary education provision that has been put forward by promoters Catesby and Barwood and believe this will help in terms of the delivery of comprehensive development on land East of Kenilworth. This approach is also</p>	<p>School Site’</p> <p>Amend estimated delivery date of Scheme 22 in Table 2 to 2021</p> <p>Development Principle 4A to be amended to allow greater flexibility</p> <p>All references to the primary school site and plans showing this site to be amended to reflect the revised approach to delivery of primary education facilities</p> <p>Wording of Development Principle 5B f) to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>y) We question the pupil yield figure used which is higher than in many other Warwickshire districts. In our opinion, the child yield figure is unrealistic and likely to significantly over-state the actual number of primary and secondary pupil places required as a result of new housing development in Warwick district. The evidence base for the figure is not currently available in the public domain and should be published for scrutiny</p> <p>z) On Page 101 the Brief states that developers of residential land within land east of Kenilworth will be expected to contribute towards the provision of around 473 additional secondary school places. Following the submission of a FOI request, it is noted that in 2017 a total of 229 children were attending the secondary school who did not live in Warwickshire. Reflecting the scale of this figure, Catesby would be interested to ascertain how the County takes these figures into account with regards to when any additional secondary school places are planned in the Kenilworth area</p> <p>aa) P107 and Development Principle 5A g) refers to the provision of a BMX/mountain bike facility. No evidence is provided to justify its need. The current use of the area for this use is done so illegally and is not a formal provision. There is no evidence on its current level of use or justification for its re-provision through either any adopted Local Plan policy or Development Brief. There are also similar, existing facilities elsewhere in Kenilworth. The illegally built BMX jumps are clearly attractive to youths given their location out of general sight in an area of</p>	<p>supported by WCC and the Department for Education</p> <p>y) Pupil yields are assessed regularly and take account of evidence from actual developments locally. Previous pupil yield calculations varied in terms of methodology and data sources across the five District and Boroughs. A review was undertaken earlier in 2018 to provide a more consistent, transparent and up to date calculator whereby the 2011 Census data was used to provide estimates of the number of people who could be expected to live in a new housing development once it is completed. Where possible 2011 Census output areas were matched to developments completed or ongoing during the intercensal period within each District and Borough. If no suitable developments could be identified and matched to 2011 Census data an overall yield for the District/Borough has been calculated. For Warwick District the review looked at developments built between 2001 and 2011. The 2011 Census Output Areas were matched to development areas where the Output Area consisted</p>	<p>be reviewed to consider if it can be worded to allow more flexibility whilst still identifying the preferred option with regards to acoustic screening in the vicinity of the Scheduled Monument</p> <p>Remove requirement for and references to BMX/Mountain bike facility</p> <p>Ch10 Delivery – wording to be amended in collaboration and consultation section to clarify that one single planning</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>woodland. Reflecting this, there is no guarantee that a new purpose-built facility surrounded by new housing would be attractive to those who currently use the area. Also question the relationship of this to residential properties, its appearance and maintenance. Catesby consider that it is neither a necessary, justified or practical requirement and should be deleted</p> <p>bb) The 'need' for two allotment sites has not been justified in the Development Brief, Development Principle 5A i). It is acknowledged that allotments will need to be provided but the Development Brief should be flexible in their location and the number of sites that are provided, unless evidence can justify the Development Brief wording as drafted</p> <p>cc) Development Principle 5B f) requires any acoustic screening to be adjacent to the A46 dual carriageway, so as not to obscure areas of the Scheduled Ancient Monument and 5B h) requires the retention of inter visibility to the Stoneleigh Abbey Grade II* listed Registered Park and Garden. The location of the proposed acoustic fence within the Catesby outline planning application is currently being discussed and designed in conjunction with relevant consultees including the WDC Environmental Health Officer, Natural England and Historic England, to ensure all heritage and tree protection (in the Ancient Woodland) matters are also taken into account when determining the most appropriate noise mitigation measures to serve the proposed development. It is therefore requested that</p>	<p>wholly or primarily of the intercensal development. Census Output Areas were aggregated together to create a sample size between 2000 and 3000 households. The Census data was then used to identify the number of dependent children aged 0 to 18 by Census Output Area. This review resulted in a new, more up to date Pupil yield figure for each District and Borough. These Pupil Yield figures are now being applied consistently for all S106 calculations. For Warwick District the New Pupil Yield (per 100 homes) based on 2011 Census Data is 4.54</p> <p>z) When looking at the potential impact development will have in an area, account is taken of the number of 'out of area' pupils in the system but this can only be a factor for projected future years of entry, i.e. Reception at primary and Year 7 at secondary. Once in a school we cannot expect out of area pupils to leave to make way for in area pupils. If an out of area pupil applies for a place in a school and one is available, they have to be offered that place. Schools cannot leave places 'vacant' for in year admissions from in</p>	<p>application covering the entire area will not be sought</p> <p>Mechanism for securing contributions towards the land and build costs of the new secondary school to be added to the Brief – this will be proportionate and only relate to the additional places required to be provided at the school</p> <p>Reference to 30mph relating to both the secondary routes and lanes will however be amended to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Development Principle 5B f) be amended to recognise the competing interests involved and recognise that a balance of those interests will be required to allow the mitigation measure to come forward to the benefit of the development, in a way which is practical and achievable</p> <p>dd) Development Principle 5B h) should be amended as it is not effective. Requiring development proposals to ensure inter-visibility between the site and Stoneleigh Abbey is unrealistic and unachievable as the existing A46 carriageway already obscures such visibility. This requirement should therefore be deleted</p> <p>ee) Development Principle 5C d) requires all future applications to demonstrate that noise from rail traffic on the HS2 route has been considered, and mitigation included where appropriate. Catesby consider this requirement is not currently feasible given no detailed line or train information is available to allow that consideration to be made and the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) did not request this information for Catesby's planning application. Such a requirement is therefore not currently justified and should be amended to only require such information at such time as it is able to be fully considered or is required by the District Council EHO for planning applications</p> <p>ff) Street Typologies and Street Level Design Principles - It is reassuring that WDC has emphasised the important role high quality design plays in the delivery of successful and sustainable developments. Setting out clearly defined design standards and expectations at the earliest</p>	<p>area children. Kenilworth School has historically taken a number of children from out of it's immediate area, both from within and outside Warwickshire. However, over recent years the number of in-area children has increased significantly and over recent years the number of out of area children has reduced significantly</p> <p>aa) The Development Brief identifies that providing an alternative facility for BMX/Mountain bikers would assist in the protection of the Scheduled Monument as there would be alternative local facilities – this could be a component in helping remove the Scheduled Monument from the 'At Risk' Register. It should be noted that whilst this activity is not lawful, the land in question is within the land controlled by Catesby and this use has been allowed by land owners and they therefore must take some responsibility for allowing this continued use on their land. Notwithstanding the above, WDC notes the comments made through this representation and further discussions have taken place with the</p>	<p>20mph in line with the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP4</p> <p>Public Art section to refer to Local Plan policy BE1</p> <p>The wording of Development Principle8 c) and e) will be amended to state "Developers, where relevant, will be expected to..."</p> <p>Amend Indicative Masterplan to ensure that both Victoria Spinney and existing woodland along the ordinary watercourse in H40 and to the</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>opportunity is key when delivering a multi-phased development of the scale associated with Land East of Kenilworth</p> <p>gg) In line with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance, in setting design expectations for the site, it is requested that WDC ensure a suitable balance is achieved in the wording of the Brief. Local planning policies, and guidance should seek to set clearly defined standards that are suitable, viable and reasonable in a way which is neither overly prescriptive or that inhibits innovation or deliverability</p> <p>hh) Development Principle 7A: Placemaking Principles sets out the design principles which WDC expects from future developments, but then lacks clear definition on how these principles will be appraised. Reference is also made with regard to national guidance including Building for Life 12 and Secured by Design, but still is not clear on whether such tools are merely suggested or are to be strictly adhered to</p> <p>ii) In contrast, Development Principle 7B: Street Typologies appears to suffer from an overly prescriptive approach. This section sets out a number of design principles relating to the form and dimensions of streets typologies across the site. Whilst these principles are useful, they appear too restrictive and inhibitive. An example of this is the requirement of Main and/or Primary Streets to include a 6.0m wide carriageway and contain on-street parking. This is in conflict with the requirement of local bus operators which require and minimum carriageway of</p>	<p>WDC greenspaces team and it is agreed that there is not a strong identified need for such facilities and on balance it is considered that such a facility is not required to be provided. Therefore, all references to this facility will be removed in the final Development Brief</p> <p>bb) Noted. This Development Brief seeks to achieve the comprehensive development of the east of Kenilworth site. With regards to allotments, p107 identifies why multiple allotment sites are not desirable and WDC maintains this position. It is expected that developers/land owners will work together (as supported by the Local Plan) to ensure equalisation of non-income generating uses such as allotments</p> <p>cc) It is considered that the wording already provides some flexibility. Whilst there are competing interests it is our professional opinion that the location suggested would in principle be preferable to any alternative. However, it is acknowledged that there are competing interests and therefore we will consider whether there is a</p>	<p>western edge of the Scheduled Monument are shown more clearly, as 'Existing Woodland Retained'. Figure 59 will also be amended to remove the inclusion of SuDS immediately to the west of the Scheduled Monument</p> <p>Text in Chapter 10 will be tweaked to make it clearer that a single application covering the entire site will not be a requirement</p> <p>Amend Brief to include location</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>6.8m and restriction of on-street parking where possible. Other requirements which limit certain street typologies to either on-street parking only or on-plot parking only also seem overly prescriptive and have the potential to unnecessarily impact the marketability of individual plots</p> <p>jj) In response to the above, we would therefore urge WDC to review the content and tone of Principle 7B in order to promote and secure high-quality design standards in a way which will not have a detrimental impact on the delivery of the wider project</p> <p>kk) Development Principle 7E of the draft Brief states that all major applications for development should include a scheme for the provision of public art, but makes no reference to any adopted Development Plan policy on which this requirement is based. While the provision of some form of public art could help enhance the development, Catesby would be concerned if the implementation of the Development Brief policy simply resulted in a request for a sizeable financial S106 contribution for the provision of public art, which it is considered would not be fully justified with reference to the CIL Regulation tests. Catesby consider that the Development Principle 7E should be clear that financial contributions will not be requested for public art provision.</p> <p>ll) Development Principle 8 e) requires developers to contribute to improvements to Kenilworth's existing primary substation, but this requirement is not considered to be a planning issue and regardless is neither evidenced</p>	<p>suitable alternative form of wording to highlight this as being the most desirable option should it be feasible when taking into account the competing interests</p> <p>dd) This was a recommendation in the Historic Environment Appraisal, Jan 2015 (p38), prepared by Archaeology Warwickshire which formed part of the Local Plan evidence base. The requirement is to consider this and therefore through the detailed planning process it may be possible to demonstrate, that for a particular site, that such inter-visibility is not achievable</p> <p>ee) HS2 on their website as part of their Environmental Statement (ES have published information that includes Map Books which show predicted sound impacts along the route, illustrated using noise contours. The ES can be found at the following link: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/colle ctions/hs2-phase-one-environmental-statement-documents">https://www.gov.uk/government/colle ctions/hs2-phase-one-environmental-statement-documents</a> . The Map books indicate that the East of Kenilworth sites fall outside of the area where adverse impacts from operational</p>	<p>of the new primary schools. The text on page 162 regarding the phasing of development will be amended to be clear that the development would be preferred to begin at the western end of the site but that there may be circumstances where the early provision of infrastructure might mitigate this need</p> <p>Agree to changes suggested in qq)</p> <p>A new section will be added that will set out the in-principle</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>nor justified. Even were such contributions justified they would also be subject to relevant CIL Regulations and S106 pooling restrictions. This requirement should be reconsidered and deleted. Page 167 of the draft Brief also refers to contributions that will be requested toward capacity improvements for, inter alia, Kenilworth substation.</p> <p>mm) Page 148 of the draft Brief explains that whilst the masterplan and associated supplementary plans are indicative in nature, "...development is expected to be in general accordance with the Masterplan and where infrastructure is shown on a particular landholding, it is expected that it will be delivered in that location." The inclusion within the Brief of an Illustrative Masterplan and other supplementary plans providing additional narrative to key design principles is welcomed and can help to articulate the key design objectives. Notwithstanding, being part of the introduction to this chapter, it is felt that the text quoted above is too rigid and inhibitive and should be amended accordingly to allow a greater degree of flexibility to responding to unforeseen circumstances and site constraints</p> <p>nn) It is also noted that a number of site constraints identified by Catesby Estates in their data collection informing the current outline planning application (ref: W/18/1635) have not been recognised in the Illustrative Masterplan. An example being that the Illustrative Masterplan included within the draft Development Brief advocates the removal of an Ancient semi-natural woodland and</p>	<p>noise are predicted, including the application site W18/1635 which is close to the predicted affected area along its northern boundary. However, in Sub-Group meetings involving WDC Environmental Health officers, HS2 have made it clear that the Map Book contours cannot be absolutely relied upon and that the final operational noise levels may exceed the predicted levels. For instance, they have recently advised of a change to the planned construction of the track, moving from a ballast track to a slab track which is likely to increase noise levels by 3dB. This uncertainty leaves Local Authorities in a difficult position when making decisions on appropriate development near to the track, but in the absence of any other guidance we recommend that applicants assess the noise impact to dwellings nearest the route using the Map Book noise contours and adding 3dB due to the likely increase in operational noise from use of a slab track construction. On this basis it is considered appropriate to retain Development Principle 4C d)</p>	<p>mechanism for ensuring that the appropriate quantum and typology of Public Open Space will be provided across the Development Brief area</p> <p>Amendments to Table 6 in light of response uu). Reference will be made to 'off-site' bus stops. Changes will also be made to include reference to on-site bus stop infrastructure in the first item in Table 6</p> <p>The mechanism for securing fair and</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>proposes the location of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDs) within the setting and buffer of a Scheduled Ancient Monument. This would not be deemed acceptable by a number of statutory stakeholders and would bring into question the suitability and deliverability of the development.</p> <p>oo) Catesby has worked collaboratively with WDC and the other east of Kenilworth promoters/ landowners in developing their proposals for the H40 allocation. As the Brief acknowledges it is unrealistic to require the submission of a single outline application for the whole area. The various landowners / promoters across the area are at differing stages in the preparation of their individual proposals / proceeding to different timescales. It is considered that the 'Delivery' section of the Brief should specifically acknowledge this reality</p> <p>pp) Phasing for the delivery of Catesby's H40 allocation will not be determined until housebuilder(s) have been selected to take forward the development. Reflecting this, Catesby consider that it is unnecessarily prescriptive to seek to control the direction of development across the site. Given the requirement for the early delivery of the spine road, it is not necessarily the case that the development of Crewe Gardens Farm would be disconnected. It should also be acknowledged that Crewe Gardens Farm is also the proposed location for the required primary school</p> <p>qq) P163 of the draft Brief sets out a number of triggers for the provision of infrastructure associated with the land</p>	<p>ff) Noted</p> <p>gg) Noted</p> <p>hh) The Development Brief sets out placemaking principles and refers to national guidance. It will be for planning applications to demonstrate that they are broadly in accordance with the principles set out. It is suggested that the developments use national guidance and best practice in order to deliver high quality design. The Council will be producing a Development Design Framework SPD that will more rigorously set the criteria and process, and this will be built on the Building for Life 12 principles</p> <p>ii) The street typologies offer a best practice hierarchy and an initial guide. When detailed planning applications are developed, the specific location of bus stops, carriageway requirements for buses and on-street parking will be determined in consultation with our Parking Standards SPD and consultees and it may be that an alternative approach is acceptable. Furthermore, the Principle is clear in allowing variation to these principles where</p>	<p>proportionate education land contributions towards the secondary school will be added</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>east of Kenilworth. It is requested that some of these be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Bullet Point 1 – amend wording to read “Unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority and Local Highways Authority ...”. As worded, this has not been fully justified or evidenced and the proposed amended wording would allow flexibility in the delivery of such improvements, to be delivered in accordance with requirements agreed during the course of planning applications</li> <li>• Highways Bullet Point 2 – This requires the spine road within Catesby’s land interests to be provided and operational prior to the occupation of any dwelling but again has not been justified or evidenced. This requirement is onerous and should be removed. There is no evidence to suggest that the spine road, as it will be designed, is necessary prior to the occupation of any dwellings on the site. Instead, a trigger will be agreed as part of the Catesby outline planning application and included on any permission, to ensure the spine road is delivered. Based on the transport modelling undertaken it is proposed that the threshold for the completion of the spine road should be the occupation of the 200th dwelling</li> </ul> <p>rr) The Development Brief aspires to the delivery of a comprehensive development across the entire area comprising the ‘land east of Kenilworth’. Notwithstanding this desire, the land across the area is in separate ownership and therefore the submission of a single</p>	<p>robust justification exists. A 6.8m wide carriageway is appropriate for the primary route and a slight narrowing of this may be appropriate on the main street in the vicinity of the Local Centre to aid a reduction in traffic speed and assist in providing more attractive pedestrian and cycle crossing points. Reference to 30mph relating to both the secondary routes and lanes will however be amended to 20mph in line with the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP4</p> <p>jj) We do feel that the principles are appropriate and justified. Furthermore, the Principle is clear in allowing variation to these principles where robust justification exists</p> <p>kk) This section will refer to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan, which whilst not specifically referring to public art, does state that new development “will be permitted where it positively contributes to the character and quality of its environment through good layout and design”. It is considered that public art can play a valuable role in achieving this aim. Development Principle 7E supports and</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>outline planning application is considered to be an unrealistic expectation. Each individual development proposal that is submitted will therefore need to be capable of being acceptable on its own merits, whilst also taking into account the aspirations of the Development Brief to ensure a comprehensive development comes forward</p> <p>ss) Catesby therefore consider that the Development Brief should include some form of appropriate mechanism to ensure that the total necessary open space requirements (as set out on Table 3 of the Brief) is equally shared and delivered across the various landownerships/separate applications. The agreed mechanism should recognise and reflect the existing open space typologies already contained on the individual sites. For example, the land under Catesby's promotion includes approximately 3.9ha of woodland / orchard / land designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument which will provide publically accessible open space, but cannot be used for alternative purposes. Catesby is working with the LPA and other promoters in the area to consider and develop a mechanism for inclusion within the final Brief that will allow for appropriate and policy compliant apportionment of open space across the land interests present within the 'land east of Kenilworth area'</p> <p>tt) There is no in principle objection to the general content of Table 6: Infrastructure Requirements at p164-165 of the draft Brief. However, all such requirements must be fully justified, CIL Regulation compliant and must meet the</p>	<p>encourages public art which is considered appropriate wording given the lack of specific reference to public art in the Local Plan. The wording seeks to incorporate public art into development and therefore this could be achieved without a financial contribution. This section will refer to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan, which whilst not specifically referring to public art, does state that new development "will be permitted where it positively contributes to the character and quality of its environment through good layout and design". It is considered that public art can play a valuable role in achieving this aim. Development Principle 7E supports and encourages public art which is considered appropriate wording given the lack of specific reference to public art in the Local Plan. The wording seeks to incorporate public art into development and therefore this could be achieved without a financial contribution. Furthermore, the Principle strongly supports the inclusion of public art but does not make it a requirement</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>relevant tests for pooling of contributions for Section 106 Agreements. At present, the derivation of the indicative costs in Table 6 is not provided, nor is there any indication as to specific schemes on which the contributions would be spent. The Council must ensure that any requested contributions are CIL Regulation compliant and would not fail the S106 pooling restriction tests as currently drafted</p> <p>uu) The 'Public Transport' row of Table 6 sets out costs for bus stops along the spine road. The cost of bus stop provision along the spine road within the associated development parcels would be built into the construction costs of the road and delivered within a Section 278/38 Agreement. Therefore, only contributions toward 'off-site' bus stops should be included in Table 6</p> <p>vv) The 'per dwelling' contribution toward the costs of off-site highways infrastructure at page 167 of the draft Brief is supported and is considered a simpler approach that determining a per trip cost at each junction or through leaving the site/s</p> <p>ww) Page 167 of the draft Development Brief sets out the LPAs stance on the provision of contributions from developments to primary and secondary education matters, the Local Centre and Community Centre and Allotments. All requested contributions from housing developments must be proportionate to the proposed development, and sought only to mitigate the impacts of that proposed development. In addition, as referred to elsewhere within these representations, all contributions must be CIL Regulation compliant and meet with relevant</p>	<p>ll) As part of the strategic planning of an area it is entirely appropriate to consider power requirements. As with any contributions we agree that they will need to be justified and will be subject to relevant CIL Regulations and s106 pooling restrictions (if they are still applicable at the time of application). The wording of the principle will be amended to state "Developers, where relevant, will be expected to...". The reference on p167 about contributions regarding power are entirely appropriate and reflect discussions WDC have had with Western Power in the preparation of the Development Brief</p> <p>mm) Disagree, the wording as currently framed provides sufficient flexibility whilst also ensuring the integrity of the Brief</p> <p>nn) Such details should come forward as part of the planning application process which, of course, includes consultation with statutory consultees. It is unclear what woodland is being referred to. However, the Indicative Masterplan will be amended to ensure that both Victoria Spinney and existing</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>S106 Agreement pooling restrictions</p> <p>xx) Notwithstanding, and in addition to the above comments, Page 167 also states that development of housing sites “will be required to contribute proportionately to the land and build costs of the new secondary school...”. This position is not objected to in principle but the mechanism for securing such contributions and the proportion of build costs / land against which contributions are sought must be transparent and ensure that the development sites are only required to contribute where the proposed development will impact the existing infrastructure (i.e. the additional places required to be provided at the school)</p> <p>yy) Reflecting the separate land ownerships across the area, as well as the uncertainties and practicalities associated with the delivery of self-build/custom build as part of larger volume housebuilder developments, Catesby consider that it is not feasible or practical to require fewer, larger areas of self-build/custom build. The Council should recognise and accept that for commercial reasons no individual promoter/ landowner is likely to be willing to accommodate a larger proportion of self/custom build on one individual site and that a method of equalising the requirement across the area would be extremely difficult to devise. Catesby consider that the Brief should be amended to reflect this</p>	<p>woodland along the ordinary watercourse in H40 and to the western edge of the Scheduled Monument are shown more clearly, as ‘Existing Woodland Retained’. Appropriately designed SuDS features may be appropriate near to the Scheduled Monument, however Figure 59 will also be amended to remove the inclusion of SuDS immediately to the west of the Scheduled Monument</p> <p>oo) Whilst separate planning applications will be able to come forward, they will only be supported if they accord with the Development Plan and other material considerations including this Development Brief, unless other material considerations suggest otherwise. It is considered that the Delivery section already does acknowledge this. However, the wording will be tweaked to make it clearer that a single application covering the entire site will not be a requirement</p> <p>pp) Noted. The Development Brief is to be amended with the location of the new primary school. The text on page 162 regarding the phasing of development</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>will be amended to be clear that the development would be preferred to begin at the western end of the site but that there may be circumstances where the early provision of infrastructure might mitigate this need</p> <p>qq) Agree to change in point 1. Point 2, agree, wording will be amended to allow more flexibility</p> <p>rr) See response to oo)</p> <p>ss) Noted. The Development Brief will be amended so that it includes a new section that will set out the in-principle mechanism for ensuring that the appropriate quantum and typology of Public Open Space will be provided across the Development Brief area</p> <p>tt) Noted</p> <p>uu) Agree, appropriate amendments will be made to Table 6 in light of this response – reference will be made to ‘off-site’ bus stops. However, changes will also be made to include reference to on-site bus stop infrastructure in the first item in Table 6</p> <p>vv) Noted</p> <p>ww) Noted</p> <p>xx) Noted. Additional text will be added to the Development Brief to clarify the</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				<p>mechanism for securing such contributions and this will be proportionate and only relate to additional school places</p> <p>yy) Disagree. The volume of custom and self-build housing is low, and will be no greater than 5% of the total number of the open market homes (as per KP4 (e) in the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan). Therefore, we are expecting around 42 services plots across the whole site and it is not unreasonable for applications to be encouraged to cluster these plots and avoid pepper-potting them around their application</p>	
71431	Mr P Frampton	Frampton s (on behalf of Kenilworth Warden's Cricket Club)	<p>a) Details provided on the Kenilworth Wardens illustrating the significance of the Club to the provision of sports facilities for the local community</p> <p>b) Support the underlying intention of the Brief to provide specific guidance for a comprehensive development of Land East of Kenilworth as allocated in the Local Plan. That said, it is fundamental to the planning process to have proper regards to the underlying objective of Kenilworth Wardens (and Kenilworth RFC) to maximise the development value of the land holding in order to enable:</p> <p>i. To relocate and establish new and enlarged sports facilities suitable for the existing and new residents of Kenilworth</p>	<p>a) Noted. We agree that the Wardens are an important club that provides sports facilities and serves the local community</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) This section of the Brief will be updated to highlight constraints and opportunities relating to the sports clubs</p> <p>d) A sentence to this effect will be added</p> <p>e) A separate objective is not considered necessary. However, the contents of Objective 4 will be updated to include reference to this</p>	<p>Site constraints and opportunities section to be updated to refer to constraints and opportunities associated with the sports clubs</p> <p>Include a sentence in the vision relating to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>ii. In order to ensure that the development value realises sufficient capital value so that the club is financially sustainable for the long term These objectives are matters of a wider community interest – and contrast distinctly with the objectives of other land owners to realise maximum value as a private interest</p> <p>c) Site Analysis/Constraints &amp; Opportunities – The Brief at page 54 considering other constraints and opportunities is deficient in not:</p> <p>i. Considering how the planning guidance will ensure the successful relocation and expansion of the two sports clubs</p> <p>ii. Identifying the opportunity comprehensive development may provide to deliver enhanced sports facilities to the existing &amp; future community in Kenilworth</p> <p>d) Vision and Objectives – In failing to identify the constraints upon the existing sports clubs and the potential opportunities comprehensive development may deliver, the vision and objectives for the development are also deficient in failing to make reference to the particular circumstances of the sports clubs. The vision should include: ‘The development will lead to the successful and sustainable relocation of the existing sports clubs, enhancing in quality and quantity of sports pitch provision within the town’</p> <p>e) The East of Kenilworth objectives should therefore include: ‘Securing the delivery of replacement sports</p>	<p>f) Table 3 details the accepted typologies of Public Open Spaces, of which sports pitches and sporting club land is not one, playing pitches being defined separately. As such table 3 remains appropriate and accurate. In the Public Open Spaces SPD currently out for public consultation there is a provision for playing pitches linked to the District Council’s Playing Pitch Strategy which demonstrates the additional playing pitch requirements derived from the growth of the district. This is the appropriate path for the Authority to seek S106 payments for playing pitch obligations, and the onward distribution where appropriate and suitable agreements are in place</p> <p>g) Noted. The proposed location of the primary school is to change which will help the Wardens with reaching their required land value</p> <p>h) Consideration was given to the Wardens and this was discussed with landowners/promoters in the area – equalisation between was required to ensure the successful relocation of the Wardens. However, the primary school is no longer proposed on the Wardens</p>	<p>the successful and sustainable relocation of the existing sports clubs, enhancing in quality and quantity of sports pitch provision within the town</p> <p>Update Objective 4 ‘Social and Community Infrastructure’ and its contents</p> <p>Relevant sections of the Brief relating to the location and delivery of primary education facilities will be amended to reflect the revised proposals, which will assist the</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>itches, and an enhanced provision to meet the needs of the new community'. This objective is entirely consistent with the provisions of the Local Plan. Policy HS4 – and especially in the circumstances of East of Kenilworth where formal sports pitch provision is reliant upon the relocation and expansion of the existing sports clubs</p> <p>f) Biodiversity, Greenspace, Play and Recreation Provision – the final para of p103 considers existing provision and states that ‘the type of space to be provided within the development site should be considered in this context’. Table 3 identifies ‘Potential Open Space Requirements’ but makes no provision for ‘outdoor sport’ and is not consistent with Policy HS4. The Brief should make a requirement for developers at East of Kenilworth to make an appropriate financial contribution towards the provision of outdoor sports facilities, the demand for which arises from the proposed housing development. Where the LPA is reliant upon these enhanced facilities being provided by Kenilworth Wardens and KRFC, such contributions should be made available to the Clubs to assist with the relocation and expansion of facilities. This is consistent with the statement at p107: ‘Contributions will be required towards further off-site sports and leisure facilities’</p> <p>g) The underlying concern of Kenilworth Wardens is that the provisions of the Development Brief for their existing sports ground may generate insufficient land value to enable a successful and sustainable relocation and enhancement of sports pitch facilities. The land use</p>	<p>site and therefore this is no longer an issue</p> <p>i) Correct, noted</p> <p>j) Any relevant figures will be updated to acknowledge the primary school will not be on the Wardens site. However, as identified elsewhere, the Masterplan will also identify a greater extent of green buffer between proposed housing and the A46 as this will be desirable (and possibly necessary) as part of noise and air quality mitigation</p> <p>k) Noted, however, the individual phasing requirements of landowners has not been laid out within the Development Brief</p> <p>l) The Local Plan and therefore Development Brief require the comprehensive redevelopment of the area and all sites must contribute to achieving this aim. This includes a requirement for each development within the site to make a fair contribution towards overall development infrastructure costs</p>	<p>delivery of the comprehensive development of the area</p> <p>Any relevant figures will be updated to acknowledge the primary school will not be on the Wardens site. However, the Masterplan will also identify a greater extent of green buffer between proposed housing and the A46</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>proposals for their land holding compound this situation</p> <p>h) Education facilities – The location shown on the illustrative masterplan for primary school location is ‘within the central parcel of land’ on the existing sports grounds where the maximisation of development value is required in the overall public interest. It would appear that in considering the merits of this location, no consideration has been given to the development implications for Kenilworth Wardens. The Brief prejudices the successful relocation of Kenilworth Wardens</p> <p>i) It is understood that there have been recent discussions with the developers of the northern section and southern section concerning the provision of two single form entry schools to serve these developments. This proposal is evidently supported by the County Education Authority. Kenilworth Wardens support this revised proposal for the provision of primary education in an endeavour to realise sufficient development value to achieve a successful and sustainable relocation of the Club. The identification of a primary school on the Wardens land holding should be deleted accordingly</p> <p>j) The Spatial Concept Plan (Fig 53), Land Use (54 and Housing Density (Fig 55) should be revised to identify housing development across the entirety of Kenilworth Wardens land so as to achieve relocation and expansion of sports pitches and associated facilities in the overall public interest. The Indicative Site Masterplan (Figure 10) and Indicative Scale Parameters Plan (Figure 61) should be similarly amended to remove the siting of school provision</p>		

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>on the Wardens site</p> <p>k) The delivery of housing on the Wardens site necessitates the realisation of a capital receipt from the land to enable replacement facilities to be provided PRIOR to the loss of the existing sports facilities. In this context, the Brief should encourage the release of the Wardens site at an early stage of the development</p> <p>l) It is submitted that the redevelopment of the Wardens site is not dependent upon the 'central section of Glasshouse Lane between the two roundabout junctions' being upgraded. It is submitted that the scale of housing which could be accommodated on the Wardens sports ground would not result in a 'severe' residual cumulative impact on the road network. The provisions of the Brief should fully recognise the special circumstances appertaining to the re-development of the existing sports clubs, and fundamentally the need to avoid unnecessary constraints on the timing of the delivery of new housing. The provision for the widening of the central section of Glasshouse Lane should be secured by a reasonable requirement upon the development of the northern parcel of land (H40) and the southern parcel of land (H06). The Brief should avoid burdening costs upon the existing sports clubs – especially in the circumstances where such investment is not necessary to serve the traffic implications of the development. The provision of a suitable access into the central section of the development will of course be provided by the development</p>		

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment</b>
71411	Ms K Ventham	Barton Willmore (on behalf of Barwood Land)	<p>a) Barwood Land are working with the landowners to deliver a parcel of land to the south of the development in allocations H06 and E1</p> <p>b) Both Barwood Land and the landowners are supportive in principle of the use of a Development Brief however provide comments in seeking to refine the document and ensure its practical application and suggest this is done in collaboration with the interested parties to ensure that the scheme remains deliverable</p> <p>c) It is considered that the document is overly lengthy and prescriptive, and it would serve a more appropriate purpose being a more concise document – acting as a guide rather than provision of more prescriptive requirements with a lack of perceived flexibility</p> <p>d) Submissions relate in the main to Sections 7 onwards – the first 6 chapters being background information (much of which, whilst of interest, could be significantly reduced given that this is not a stand-alone Development Plan Document, it is designed to be read alongside the Development Plan)</p> <p>e) P7 – There is reference to the Brief being afforded significant weight in the determination of planning applications. Whilst an SPD is capable of being afforded such weight, it cannot override the primacy of the Development Plan. The Development Plan policies are wider strategic policies, with the detail being left to the Brief – as such, there is currently a greater degree of flexibility to be gained through the Development Plan than through the SPD. The prescriptive nature of the SPD</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) The level of detail is considered appropriate given the complexity and strategic importance of the development site</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) The wording will be amended to reflect that the weight afforded should be subsidiary to the weight given to the Local Plan. There has been no intention to supersede the policies of the Local Plan, and the content of the SPD remains in harmony with them</p> <p>f) The text will be made clear that when applications are submitted if the 2013 SHMA has been replaced that the new mix should be used, and the potential for flexibility from this mix in the exceptional circumstances outlined in H4</p> <p>g) The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a live document that is continually updated as research is progressed and new proposals come forward. The position set out in the Brief and the Kenilworth Transport Study is the most up-to-date and relevant preference</p> <p>h) Any changes to the highway network</p>	<p>P7 text will be amended to reflect the weight afforded to the Brief should be subsidiary to the weight given to the Local Plan</p> <p>Amend text relating to the housing mix as per response f)</p> <p>Custom and Self-Build – supporting text to be amended to reflect the Development Principle and the KNP</p> <p>Details of primary school locations to be amended throughout text and figures in the Brief</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>may mean that the flexibility afforded through a strategic Development Plan policy is not realised due to the overly detailed nature of the SPD. If the SPD is to be afforded significant weight, then it must be made clear that this weight remains secondary to the Development Plan. This is of particular importance when the SPD seeks to introduce additional policy provisions under the guise of the SPD, without recourse to guidance advising that they should build on existing policies in the Local Plan. The SPD should not seek to introduce policies via the ‘back door’ into a document which is not subject to the same level of scrutiny or testing as a Development Plan Document</p> <p>f) Housing Mix – Policy H4 of the Local Plan advises that housing mix should be provided in accordance with the latest Coventry &amp; Warwickshire SHMA as opposed to the Brief which specifically references to the 2013 SHMA. Furthermore, within the supporting text to Policy H4, advice is provided as to where some flexibility could be considered. The Brief, is more prescriptive than policy H4 for which no justification is provided. Furthermore, Policy H4 is a District-wide Development Plan policy and there is no need for this to be replicated within the Brief. This can be accommodated if required by a simple cross reference but could be eliminated altogether</p> <p>g) On &amp; Off-site Highway Infrastructure – An appendix of a previous version of the WDC Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (April 2017) recommended that direct access via the A46/a452 roundabout should not be provided. Instead it recommended that access should be provided from the</p>	<p>will be subject to detailed modelling analysis and road safety assessments. The additional arm is one option to be considered, however through the development and analysis of the scheme alternative arrangements may be identified. The final option must be demonstrated to be a workable solution for both Warwickshire County Council and Highways England</p> <p>i) Noted</p> <p>j) These concerns should come forward as part of the Transport Assessment in the submission of the planning application, or preferably as part of detailed pre-application discussions with the planning authority and the highways authority. Such evidence can be reviewed in detail at this point</p> <p>k) See response to j)</p> <p>l) The preference articulated in the Study and the Brief remains for there to be a separate access to alleviate conflict and congestion between the new (and existing) residential traffic and the new employment traffic. However, whilst it remains the preference, WCC Highways remain open to the concept of an alternative model with</p>	<p>The 473 pupil figure will be reviewed and the final Brief will include an up-to-date figure</p> <p>A clear mechanism will be set out relating to land costs associated with the secondary school</p> <p>A table defining the non-value generating land uses and how they may be shared will be added</p> <p>Additional text added to ‘Open Space Requirements and Standards’ to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>A452 Leamington Rd; The Brief and Kenilworth Transport Study recommend that direct access via the A46/A452 roundabout would be preferred for the employment allocation</p> <p>h) The Atkins Transport Study concludes that the preferred option to provide access to the employment land is Option 1 and this has informed 'Development Principle 3d'. The reason for this recommendation appeared to be solely to separate commercial and residential traffic, but without any quantifiable justification</p> <p>i) There have clearly been conflicting recommendations made in the past regarding the preferred form and location of the site access, therefore Phil Jones Associates (PJA), on behalf of Barwood Lane has considered the various alternatives</p> <p>j) It is envisaged that there may be difficulties in providing direct access to the A46/A452 roundabout; in terms of design standards, safety, capacity and restrict wider aspirations for the junction and the A46 mainline</p> <p>k) In addition, the previous recommendations included in the IDP specified that direct access via the A46/A452 was not suitable. Furthermore, both WCC and WDC have advised they would consider alternative access arrangements</p> <p>l) Consideration has therefore been given to the provision of a signal-controlled junction formed between the spine road and the A452 Leamington Rd providing access to both the employment and residential allocations. The employment access would form a junction with the spine</p>	<p>sufficiently robust justification and mitigation of any issues with revised concepts</p> <p>m) Acknowledged, further assessment will be required through the planning application process</p> <p>n) These details will be determined through the planning application process</p> <p>o) Change 1. The original wording focusses on avoiding or mitigating any potential conflict whilst allowing scope for suitable flexibility. However, we acknowledge that there may be alternative access solutions that retain these priorities and the wording will be amended to allow for greater flexibility of design whilst retaining the priority of minimising conflict</p> <p>Change 2. We acknowledge that alternative access arrangements are feasible that still reach the requirements regarding traffic flows, sustainability and safety, and the wording will be amended to reflect this</p> <p>Change 3. Accepted, this amend will be made The supporting text will be amended to reflect the Development Principle and wording will reflect that</p>	<p>highlight that in some instances existing natural assets will contribute towards the open space requirements</p> <p>Wording in Development Principle 5B to be amended as per bb)</p> <p>Amendments as per point o)</p> <p>Sections and associated bullet points for the Street Level Design Principles will be checked to ensure they are consistent and amendments will be made where necessary</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>road a short distance into the site to separate the residential and employment traffic and minimise the interaction between the two elements of the development. A preliminary layout for this option has been designed and subjected to capacity testing by PJA and is enclosed in the response</p> <p>m) Assessment Traffic Flows – Traffic flows have been extracted from the 2029 Local Plan Model which are appended in the Atkins Transport Study. The mode flows provided assume a site access/spine road junction formed with Leamington Rd. The model does not include a direct access formed with the A46/A452 junction</p> <p>n) The traffic flows have been assessed by PJA for the signal-controlled junction shown in Drawing 3140-01 (included in this representation) and the junction has been modelled in LinSig V3. The junction is forecast to operate at approaching theoretical capacity thresholds. The modelling does not include signal-controlled pedestrian crossing facilities. Due to the likely demand however, a signal-controlled facility would not be required across Leamington Rd in the vicinity of the junction. Instead, an uncontrolled facility would be appropriate. This facility would have tactile paving/dropped kerbs to denote the crossing point and a pedestrian refuge area. To the north of the junction where there is likely to be a higher pedestrian demand, a signal-controlled facility would be provided. In terms of crossing facilities across the spine road, it would be possible to provide a staggered crossing which could be staged with traffic thus would not affect</p>	<p>in the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>p) The local centre detail (i.e. quantum of floor space, appropriate use classes) are already set out in the local plan, and so are appropriate to be detailed here. It should be noted that any further detail within this policy is not directive, but is something that applicants should be aware of as the vision for this development site</p> <p>q) Policy DS15 states the requirement for the provision of a community centre, and the Development Brief articulates the specification of that community centre. It therefore does not surpass the provisions of the Local Plan but offers an enhanced level of detail on the Policy. Notwithstanding this, some elements of the specification have been revised in light of comments received to this consultation to take full account of proposed leisure facilities elsewhere in the development and to ensure there is no unnecessary burden on developers</p> <p>r) Noted and appreciated. The Development Brief will be updated to reflect this</p> <p>s) Noted and the masterplan will be</p>	<p>and appropriate. Furthermore, the section will be reviewed and further amendments will be made if considered appropriate, in light of the concerns raised</p> <p>The density range will be amended as per ff)</p> <p>SuDS concept drawing to be amended as per gg)</p> <p>Brief to be updated to outline the proposed methodology as per ll)</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>the operation of the junctions</p> <p>o) Based on the assessment set out above, it is suggested that there are feasible alternative access options which would not require direct access onto the A46/A452 roundabout. It is therefore suggested that the wording of the Brief is amended to provide more flexibility as the access strategy for the site is developed in more detail, as follows:</p> <p>“Access to the southern end of the site shall accord with the following:</p> <p>Original: Separate accesses shall be provided to the employment land (allocation E1) and the housing allocation (H06) to minimise conflict between employment and residential uses unless it is demonstrated that this is not feasible, unviable or undesirable in terms of safety</p> <p>Suggested revision: Site access junction(s) shall be provided to facilitate appropriate access to the employment land (allocation E1) and the housing allocation (H06). Where possible and necessary, conflict between employment and residential uses should be minimised</p> <p>Original: Primary access to the employment site shall be via a direct access/egress off the A46/A452 circulatory unless it is demonstrated that it is not feasible, unviable or undesirable in terms of safety. The access or any alternatives must operate well with the new spine road access</p> <p>Suggested revision: Access to the employment site shall</p>	<p>updated to reflect new sites for primary education</p> <p>t) We feel that it is appropriate in terms of the requirements of the Local Plan and in the interests of ensuring a coherent, integrated development that this Masterplan is adopted and guides future development in the area</p> <p>u) When looking at the potential impact development will have in an area, account is taken of the number of 'out of area' pupils in the system but this can only be a factor for projected future years of entry. i.e. Reception at primary and Year 7 at secondary. Once in a school we cannot expect out of area pupils to leave to make way for in area pupils. If an out of area pupil applies for a place in a school and one is available, they have to be offered that place. Schools cannot leave places 'vacant' for in year admissions from in area children. Kenilworth School has historically taken a number of children from out of its immediate area, both from within and outside Warwickshire. However, over recent years the number of in-area children has increased significantly and over recent</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>either be provided via a direct access/egress off the A46/A452 circulatory or from Leamington Road. Appropriate assessment should be undertaken to demonstrate the access strategy is feasible in terms of safety, multi-modal access, permeability, connectivity and capacity</p> <p>Original: The spine road access from Leamington Rd shall provide for appropriate pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities both across Leamington Rd and across the spine road itself and these shall connect with existing footway/cycleways in the immediate vicinity as well as provision of the new spine road</p> <p>Suggested revision: The spine road access from Leamington Rd shall provide for appropriate pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities both across Leamington Rd and across the spine road itself to reflect desire lines, demand and to ensure the most efficient layout. These shall connect with existing footways/cycleways in the immediate vicinity as well as provision on the new spine road</p> <p>p) Custom and Self-Build Housing – this is unnecessary duplication. Provisions in this regard are already set out in the Local Plan and the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan. If the policy is to remain, the supporting text and Development Principle 1B are at odds with the Neighbourhood Plan, advising that a proportion of self-build will be sought not exceeding 5% of the total dwellings. However, the supporting policy text sets 5% as the target percentage – this text does not reflect either</p>	<p>years the number of out of area children has reduced significantly</p> <p>v) It appears that the 473 figure may now be outdated and it is important that the Brief is accurate. Therefore, this will be reviewed and the final Brief will include an up-to-date figure, the rationale behind which will either be included in the Brief or shared separately with developers</p> <p>w) Noted. A clear mechanism will be set out in the revised Brief relating to land costs associated with the secondary school site. This will make it clear that housing developers will only be required to contribute on a proportionate basis</p> <p>x) Noted. It is proposed to amend the Development Brief with an outline table that defines the non-value generating land uses and sharing them through the development site</p> <p>y) The use of areas such as Thickthorn Wood is dependent on their accessibility to the public. It is expected that such matters will be resolved through the detailed planning application process. Nevertheless, it is considered appropriate to add text in</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Policy 1B or the Neighbourhood Plan and should be corrected so as to avoid confusion</p> <p>q) Local Centre &amp; Community Facilities – Whilst the provision of a local centre is supported in principle, the level of detail as set out within the policy is overly prescriptive and does not facilitate market demand. Clearly if a centre which meets market demand is not provided, the units will not be let, the scheme will not be occupied, and the centre will fail. It is in no way considered that this site would provide such a quantum or configuration of retail floorspace such as to detract from the centre of Kenilworth and as such greater flexibility on unit size and use should be provided. With regard to the size and location of the local centre the masterplan is identified as being ‘indicative’ and yet prescriptive requirements are being made in relation to the ‘non-residential’ elements with no apparent justification for this and no consideration of the impact of this. The Policy recommends predominantly A1 uses within the local centre and yet there is no basis for this</p> <p>r) The community centre proposals are even more prescriptive with no evidence to justify such an approach. The specification for the community centre is extensive and we would question the justification for such an extensive facility and the associated land required to accommodate it. This goes significantly beyond the provisions of Policy DS14 (which is the Development Plan policy). We consider that Development Principle 4A requires significant revision to better reflect Development</p>	<p>relation to the ‘Open Space Requirements and Standards’ to highlight that in some instances, existing natural assets, such as Thickthorn Wood, will contribute towards the open space requirements for the site</p> <p>z) The Brief will be updated to reference the intentions regarding distribution of all of the non-value generating uses</p> <p>aa) Agree upon further reflection. The wording in Development Principle 5B (and any associated supporting text) will be amended accordingly</p> <p>bb) Noted, however, there is still significant work to be done within a Design Code that will be expected to adhere to the principles laid out in the Development Brief. They therefore will be expected as part of the application process, although they will perhaps be shorter than many other codes for sites of a similar scale</p> <p>cc) Noted, however it is felt that the level of detail is appropriate</p> <p>dd) The pavement width in the Section drawing for the Primary Route does accurately reflect the associated bullet point for ‘Pavement’. As detailed in the</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Plan policy and to secure a less prescriptive and onerous provision</p> <p>s) Education – It is evident from recent landowner discussions that if WDC continue to pursue a primary school on the Wardens/KRC land that this jeopardises the delivery of the entire site in a timely manner. Given that WDC is keen to see the site come forward in a comprehensive manner, Barwood Land has been involved in discussions with other landowners and is proposing the inclusion of land for a one form entry primary school within its proposals</p> <p>t) It is for reasons such as that in t) that we request the District Council move away from seeking to impose a finalised masterplan within the Development Brief. The masterplan has been developed within the involvement of the landowners or promoters and as a result has settled on a potentially undeliverable solution. In the absence of an iterative masterplanning process, the Brief must facilitate flexibility to the masterplan as the scheme(s) evolve</p> <p>u) It is understood that Catesby Estates submitted an FOI request to WCC which highlighted that in 2017, 229 children attended the secondary school who did not live in Warwickshire. It is customary practice, when assessing school capacity to discount those who are travelling from out of catchment as clearly those in catchment will take priority. It therefore appears that there is capacity at the existing school, and we seek clarification therefore as to the way in which the secondary school demand has been</p>	<p>Development Brief the 3d illustrations are for indicative purposes only. The Sections and associated bullet points for the Street Level Design Principles will however be checked to ensure they are consistent and amendments will be made where necessary and appropriate. Furthermore, the section will be reviewed, and amended where it is considered appropriate, in light of the concerns raised</p> <p>ee) Noted. The density range will be amended to 30-40 dph. This will also ensure conformity with Local Plan paragraph 5.19)</p> <p>ff) The drawing is a concept plan and developers will not be required to provide SuDS in the locations indicated – this will be a matter for full consideration at the detailed planning application stage. The broad locations of the SuDS indicated reflects the general topography of the site and also the fact that there will most likely be a need for a buffer between built development and the A46 owing to air quality and noise considerations. The drawing will however be updated to show additional areas of SuDS within</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>calculated</p> <p>v) Secondary school provision – the Development Brief refers to 473 additional pupil places being required to meet the additional need generated by East of Kenilworth. However, this figure is significantly higher than the output associated with WCC’s pupil place calculator which suggests 397 additional school places would be generated by 1,400 new homes and clarification of the correct figure is sought</p> <p>w) It is understood that there is potential difficulty with the acquisition of the land at Southcrest Farm to facilitate the relocation of Kenilworth School. It has been suggested that the East of Kenilworth Development maybe required to ‘gap fund’ the difference between the landowner’s aspiration and the amount Kenilworth School is prepared to pay for the land which would be in addition to the S106 contribution calculated with reference to WCC’s SPD. Currently the Brief makes a passing reference to the costs associated with the purchase of the land. We consider that the Brief should make reference to the East of Kenilworth being required to fund the gap based on its pro-rata requirement (e.g. 397 pupil places of 2,200 therefore 18%) and that the methodology for calculating the gap should be fully transparent. Furthermore, this matter needs to be agreed in principle with a reasonable approach taken as clearly it is not the job of this site to fund excessive landowner expectations</p> <p>x) Biodiversity, greenspaces, play and recreation – whilst the desire to create a central park is appreciated, WDC’s</p>	<p>land to the north-western end of the site and amend the location of SuDS in the vicinity of Scheduled Monument</p> <p>gg) Noted. Whilst the addition of public art to the Central Park is to be welcomed, the provision of public art throughout the site was intended to help convey a sense of place and identity, and so it would be counterproductive to limit to a single space</p> <p>hh) The indicative masterplan is for illustrative purposes, and so may not precisely match other plans used within the document. At the point of adoption, the Development Brief, containing the masterplan, will have gone through extensive and thorough consultation, in excess of that of a planning application. As such, it is appropriate that subsequent applications adhere to the principles in the Brief including the adopted indicative masterplan. Should there be significant issues raised during the consultation period of a planning application then that will have weight during the planning determination. It is unclear what the discrepancies</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>'wishlist' from the site is significant. Taking the land under the control of Barwood Land, for example, further land from their site may now need to be given up in order to deliver a primary school for the good of the site as a whole. There needs to be a balance between the desires of WDC and the viability and deliverability of the site as clearly if this balance cannot be achieved the site will not come forward</p> <p>y) Within the Brief reference should be made to existing natural assets, such as Thickthorn Wood, which will contribute towards the Open Space Requirements for the site which are set-out within table 3 on p105 of the Brief</p> <p>z) With regard to the need for flexibility within the masterplan, if Catesby and Barwood are now accommodating primary school sites, it may be that the allotment sites should be amalgamated onto a single site perhaps centrally located within the allocation on the Wardens/KRC land?</p> <p>aa) Heritage Assets – the Brief seeks the retention of views of Thickthorn Manor over the roundabout on the A46. Given that this view is over the area of the site where the Council are seeking employment uses, it is considered that these floorplates are unlikely to facilitate such views. Furthermore, users of the A46 will not be stopping to appreciate the view as they are driving past the site and will not be focusing on the view to the Manor. We consider it more prudent to focus on views and protection of setting within the site rather than transient views as one drives past</p>	<p>referred to are</p> <p>ii) We consider that the level of detail in the Development Brief reflects the importance and sensitivity of this highly significant development, spanning 2 strategic housing sites and sites allocated for employment and education purposes</p> <p>jj) See answer to jj)</p> <p>kk) Noted and your suggestion is appreciated. The Development Brief will be updated to outline the proposed methodology</p> <p>ll) Noted. As the table suggest, these are indicative costs. The costs have been derived from engagement between WDC and infrastructure providers through the preparation of the Brief. Given the length of time that delivery of the site is likely to be undertaken over, more specific costs are not possible. However, all Section 106 agreements will be negotiated cognisant of the relevant regulations</p> <p>mm) It is considered that the wording in the Brief is appropriate and that the Brief allows sufficient flexibility for detailed planning applications to propose alternative phasing</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>bb) Street Typologies and Street Level Design Principles – Whilst Barwood is supportive of high-quality design principles, it is again important that prescriptive design standards are not set and that any expectations are sufficiently flexible to allow designs to come forward which are appropriate for the site and the wider area. However, in addition, the design standards must not render the scheme unviable or, for example, prevent adoption of public highways. To this end, as currently drafted, the Brief reads akin to a Design Code and is too prescriptive for this stage of the scheme. It is noted on p158 that the Council is seeking a Design Code with any applications, however, given the level of detail within this document, we would suggest that individual Design Codes are not required to support planning applications</p> <p>cc) Placemaking – the level of detail (relating to different block sizes/boundary treatments etc) is significantly beyond that which would normally be expected within a Development Brief</p> <p>dd) Streets – there is an error on p125 as pavement (as shown in the section) is 4.0m wide whereas it should be 2.0m, as per the bullet points. The guidance specifies materials – this is considered overly prescriptive at this stage. In addition, the approach towards parking is problematic. There are shown to be a lot of terraces/continuous built frontages with limited opportunities for parking at the front, perpendicular to the road. This can arguably create a more attractive street in terms of enclosure, etc but it does severely limit parking options and would mean</p>	<p>nn) Noted. Significant development of this nature necessarily carries a large infrastructure burden, and this recognised by the CIL tariff for East of Kenilworth being lower than in some other locations. All contributions will be CIL compliant, and these will be agreed during the application process</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>parking needing to go to the rear of the blocks. There is no way of meeting local standards without putting parking in courtyards and this will lead to conflict on the road. P132 actually says rear parking courts are discouraged. It is difficult to encourage the use of courtyards by residents and whilst some are possible, the approach here would necessitate a significant number. Even the Lanes have an urban appearance whereas we would normally expect to include semi-detached and detached properties with side parking and garages, plus potential visitor parking with the verges or areas of open space. P133 does however show on-plot parking as possible within primary, secondary and lands. Overall, the street sections/plans are inconsistent with the 3d illustrations</p> <p>ee) Density – the average density of 35-40dph could provide insufficient flexibility and when coupled with the need to find parking solutions which are acceptable to all parties, we consider 30-40 dph is more appropriate</p> <p>ff) We query whether the details on p146-147 (particularly the drainage plan) are required at this stage. We consider that this could be best dealt with via text</p> <p>gg) Public Art – Principle 7E seeks the incorporation of public art from each application regardless of size/scale/location. It would seem more appropriate for public art to be incorporated in significant areas of open space where they would form a logical and complementary addition – e.g. the Central Park</p> <p>hh) Indicative Masterplan &amp; Scale Parameters Plan – p148-149 – the introductory text advised that applications should</p>		

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>follow the Brief. This provides insufficient flexibility to amend the masterplan through either public consultation or in response to comments from statutory consultees. There are also discrepancies between the illustrative masterplan and the land use plan</p> <p>ii) Scale – the scale details are prescriptive, and we consider that if these details are required, they should be set out for broad areas rather than at the plot level. The same applied for the ‘street’ details’, where at this stage, details such as secondary routes or lands should not be included. We also consider that the street sections are far too detailed for a Development Brief and are more akin to something which would appear within a Design and Access Statement</p> <p>jj) The Brief provides insufficient flexibility in approach for an ‘overarching’ document. Whilst we support the Council’s aspirations for the site, much of this detail can be provided through a Design and Access Statement which would form part of any planning application. This approach would allow the masterplan to come forward under broad parameters but provide sufficient flexibility for the masterplan/design details to flex as more detailed work is undertaken</p> <p>kk) Ch 10 Delivery – With regard to the overall delivery of the site, it is noted that the Brief refers to private equalisation agreements being employed to enable delivery of the site. Given the site is in multiple ownerships, whilst laudable, this is not something which can (or should) be achieved through this Brief. Instead, it is considered the Council and</p>		

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>the promoters/landowners should seek agreement to a land use budget which identifies those areas of the development that do not generate land value (such as open space/community centre/school etc) – and seek to ensure, through appropriate masterplanning, that these uses are divided as equally as possible across the respective land ownerships. In this way, individual landowners/promoters are not prevented from coming forward by others; the is parity across the development parcels; and the Council’s aspirations can be realised through early delivery</p> <p>ll) The infrastructure requirements are included in Table 6 and include indicative costs. However, in order to achieve CIL compliance, it is necessary to understand how these costs are derived and no evidence is provided in this regard. However, the principle of a tariff style contribution per dwelling for off-site highways infrastructure is supported subject to agreement on the appropriate sum</p> <p>mm) We consider it premature to include detailed planning condition wording within the Brief in the absence of comprehensive site-specific Transport Assessments which will be the subject of further discussion with the Highway Authority and Highways England. The imposition of appropriate planning conditions is an iterative process and should not be fixed within a Development Brief in the absence of full information. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is flexibility for discussion, the document clearly states that it is not possible to set out clear triggers and</p>		

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>yet proposes conditions with such triggers. We consider this element is overly prescriptive and should be removed from the Brief</p> <p>nn) With regard to the other items identified in Table 6, the list is extensive and when coupled with the Council's CIL tariff which does not cover many items of relevance to this scheme, it is clear that this site has the potential to carry a significant financial burden through a combination of on-site infrastructure; off-site infrastructure costs and CIL. As set out in the NPPF, SPD's cannot impose a significant financial burden on projects and therefore it is important to ensure that any and all contributions are CIL compliant and that the contributions are proportionate to the development and do not prohibit the scheme from being delivered</p>		
71439	Ms S Murray	Natural England	<p>a) Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on designated sites and has no objection</p> <p>b) Natural England considers the SPD in compliance with the Policies of adopted Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029, and specifically, Policy DS10 'Broad Location of Allocated Housing Sites'. Furthermore, consider it acceptably aligned with the general policies of The Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan, and specifically Policy KP4 'Land East of Kenilworth'</p> <p>c) Natural England considers that the proposed development is unlikely to have likely significant effects upon European/International Sites and has not objection. Advise that the SPD need not proceed to Appropriate</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) Noted</p> <p>f) As the site has been allocated for significant development of housing, employment and educational uses, the retention of soil resources and other similar technical matters are not an appropriate burden to place on developers through the Brief</p> <p>g) Noted</p>	No amendments proposed

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Assessment, under the Habitat Regulations. To meet the requirements of the Habitat Regulations, advise WDC to record our decision that a likely significant effect can be ruled out</p> <p>d) Natural England considers that the proposed development will not damage or destroy the interest features of national protected sites (SSSI) and has no objection</p> <p>e) Attention drawn to land quality and soil considerations. However, recognise that the loss of agricultural land within the site has been deemed acceptable through the Local Plan process</p> <p>f) Recognised that a proportion of agricultural land affected by the development may remain undeveloped (for example as habitat creation, landscaping, allotments and public open space) and support these measures. In order to retain the long term potential of this land and to safeguard soil resources as part of the overall sustainability of the while development, it is important that the soil is able to retain as many of its important functions and ecosystem services as possible through careful soil management. Consequently, advise that developers use an appropriately experienced soil specialist to advise on, and supervise, soil handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled and how to make best use of different soils on site. Detailed guidance is available in Defra 'Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites'</p>		

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			g) There are a number of woodland areas dispersed in the locality including ancient woodland immediately adjacent to the site and extending into the site. These are also neighbouring areas of ecological importance. We encourage proposals which seek a biodiversity net gain from development and support the expansion, enhancement and improved connectivity of habitat and multi-functional green infrastructure corridors in accordance with Lawton principles		
71424; 71245; 71426; 71427; 71428; 71429	Miss M S Field	Kenilworth Town Council	<p>a) Welcomes the detailed Brief and appreciate the cooperation with the Town Council during the drafting process and particularly the reflection of certain policies in the KNP</p> <p>b) Concerned that the sheer size of the document and the need to read online may limit the feedback and comments from residents</p> <p>c) It is unfortunate that the Vision on p57 of the Draft is not more prominent as it might have encouraged public reaction</p> <p>d) KTC has a number of comments which are offered in the spirit of improving the document and ultimately improving the resulting development. It is obvious that much time and effort has been expended in producing the draft and there are various points of detail</p> <p>Four major issues:</p> <p>e) 1. Overall view and coordination – It is crucial that a holistic view is taken of the whole development as indicated on p159. This will affect many issues from location of facilities to housing mix and traffic analysis.</p>	<p>a) Noted, thank you</p> <p>b) The document is large as there are many important matters to cover. The higher level of response to the consultation, when compared to consultations on other SPDs suggests that this is unlikely to have been a significant factor</p> <p>c) Noted. However, the Vision has been included where it has as the background, planning policy framework, site and wider analyses all influence how the vision has been formulated</p> <p>d) Noted, thank you</p> <p>e) Noted. One of the key reasons for the production of this Development Brief was to respond to, and mitigate, these concerns</p> <p>f) The Development Brief, once adopted,</p>	<p>We will consider whether it would be appropriate to include the Vision towards the beginning of the document</p> <p>The wording of the introduction will be amended to reflect the need for the development to be well connected to the existing town</p> <p>A key will be added to Figure 2</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Concerned that because of the fragmentation of land ownership and the resulting multiple planning applications over varying timescales, the necessary coordination and cooperation will be achieved despite the hopes expressed</p> <p>f) 2. Quality of development – Whilst the Brief on p117-135 seeks to achieve a suitable quality of build of houses both respecting the local vernacular and achieving high standards of construction, we suspect developers will offer their standard solutions. We seek reassurance that the Brief will carry sufficient weight to manage this issue</p> <p>g) 3. Traffic Issues – Despite the more detailed analysis of junctions, which now goes way beyond that proffered at Enquiry in Public for the Local Plan, we are still very concerned for traffic issues particularly in Glasshouse Lane and Knowle Hill where the School is proposed and there are several awkward junctions. In particular, we suspect that much University and other through traffic will use the southern part of the spine road to reach Common Lane and Crackley Lane. Although beyond the scope of this Brief a holistic view is needed of the effects of all the developments proposed in the town. All these junctions must also make provision for pedestrians, cyclists and other forms of movement</p> <p>h) 4. Linking to existing community – The need to link the new community to the Town is identified in the Brief on p117 but could be expressed more strongly and earlier. We are concerned that there are few indications of how this can be ensured physically whether by foot, cycle,</p>	<p>will carry a material weight in determining planning applications</p> <p>g) Noted. As per your representation, the production of such a view is beyond the scope of the Development Brief</p> <p>h) Noted. The Vision, p57, highlights the desire to see the development fully integrated into the existing town. This document identifies the need for improved cycle links, wayfinding and public transport all to connect the development to the existing town</p> <p>i) The wording in the introduction will be amended to reflect the need for the development to be well connected to the existing town</p> <p>j) A key will be added</p> <p>k) Noted, however we do not feel it appropriate for this to be mentioned at this point</p> <p>l) Wording to be changed to ‘by almost a quarter’</p> <p>m) Change not considered necessary</p> <p>n) All references to SPDs will be checked to ensure they reflect the current position on the SPDs and also highlight other particularly relevant emerging SPDs</p> <p>o) This will be amended with appropriate</p>	<p>Minor amendment to wording on p12</p> <p>References to other SPDs and the KNP to be updated to reflect current position regarding each document</p> <p>Headings in Chapter 4 to be reviewed for consistency in style</p> <p>Reference to the Arden Landscape Character Area development guidance to be added to the ‘Biodiversity, Ecology and Greenspaces’</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>public transport or car. Ultimately the links will result from relationships and organisations outside the scope of spatial planning</p> <p>i) P6 Introduction – This reads as though we are creating a new community distinct from the rest of the town. It is unfortunate that the need to link, in various ways, into the existing community of Kenilworth is not included. We do not want any ‘gated’ communities. This relates to the initial Major Issue 4</p> <p>j) P8-9 Housing – To make the second paragraph of p8 easier to understand Figure 5 on p9 requires a key to the different colours</p> <p>k) P8 Transport links – The third paragraph refers to good public transport links. This is a matter of opinion. This part could usefully refer to the existing high car ownership and the potential effects of this significant additional development</p> <p>l) P12 Paragraph 3 – The current population of the town is only 23,000 so an increase of 5000-6000 will be closer to a quarter than a fifth</p> <p>m) P23 Policies DS10 and DS11 – To explain the discrepancy between the 1,593 dwellings in DS10 and the apparent 1,400 in DS11 add the words “among others” after “sites” on the first line of the DS11 paragraph</p> <p>n) P25 Supplementary Planning Documents – The reference to the Open Space SPD should now be to the consultation draft Public Open Space SPD, Jan 2019. Any subsequent references to quantified requirements should now reflect this latest version. We note that the list does not intend to</p>	<p>wording to reflect the KNP has now been made</p> <p>p) This figure relates to the strategic transport network and buses and coaches would use the roads. As such, there is no requirement for a specific reference to buses and coaches. Note re: typo – all headings in this section will be reviewed to ensure consistency</p> <p>q) Agreed. Reference to the Arden Landscape Character Area development guidance to be added to the ‘Biodiversity, Ecology and Greenspaces’ section of the Placemaking Principles in Objective 7</p> <p>r) An additional sentence can be added to highlight the limited services. This should state ‘Primary’ and the wording will be amended</p> <p>s) Agree. An additional sentence will be added to cover this</p> <p>t) The wording follows that used by Historic England in the respective listings. Therefore, no changes proposed</p> <p>u) Figure to be updated to reflect this new designation</p> <p>v) Reference to arboretum to be added here</p>	<p>section of the Placemaking Principles in Objective 7</p> <p>Add additional sentence to p35 (of the draft) to highlight the limitations of the rail services. Amend word to ‘primary’ as per point r)</p> <p>Add additional sentence to text relating to Fig.15 – and the need to improve cycle links to Leamington and Warwick University</p> <p>Fig.18 to be updated to include Abbey Fields as a Local</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>be exhaustive but later in the Brief reference is made to both the Self-Build SPD and the Purpose-built Student Accommodation SPD which could be included</p> <p>o) P25 Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan – As the Kenilworth Neighbourhood has now been made (16 Nov 18) this paragraph needs to be updated. The second sentence could perhaps read: “The plan was ‘made’ following a referendum in November 2018 and now forms part of...”</p> <p>p) P29 Strategic Level Movement and connectivity – Although road, rail and cycle are included there is no specific mention of buses and coaches. There is a typo as connectivity should have a capital letter</p> <p>q) P31 Landscape Character Areas – The relevant development guidelines are potentially powerful statements but to carry more weight surely a source should be given?</p> <p>r) P35 Transport Connectivity – In the first paragraph should it not be admitted that the current railway service is very limited with infrequent trains and no Sunday services. In the second paragraph the A452 is a “Primary” road rather than “Priority” – a typo?</p> <p>s) P36 Figure 15 Non-motorised Transport Connectivity – Although this is the current situation it would be useful to emphasise the need to improve cycle links to Leamington (K2L) and the University of Warwick</p> <p>t) P38 Figure 17 Heritage Assets – As far as we are aware Wantage is still Wantage and so we do not understand the “formerly” though it is indeed 1 Castle Hill. Abbotsford School is now a private residence and should revert to the</p>	<p>w) Text will be expanded to refer to the other uses mentioned and acknowledge that the map does not show all of the social infrastructure</p> <p>x) Agree. Wording to refer to ‘swimming pools’</p> <p>y) Noted. The top of the drawing has been cut off when formatting the document. This will be amended</p> <p>z) Agree. Fig.22 will be amended to include Leyes Lane as a key route</p> <p>aa) The Figure is correct; they are all part of one Local Wildlife Site. We also note that the Figure number and title has been lost in formatting and so will reinstate this</p> <p>bb) References to the KNP policies will be added and/or a statement of relevance will be added at the start of the section</p> <p>cc) Noted. The estimated 1400 assumes an estimated 70 dwellings on site ED2. Therefore, this is already accounted for in the 1400 figure</p> <p>dd) Noted, however, the JSHMA figures are the correct figure to use as these were adopted as part of the Local Plan Examination and not the previous figures that were split by town/parish</p> <p>ee) Disagree. There will be areas of the</p>	<p>Wildlife site</p> <p>Reference to Crewe Lane arboretum to be added to text relating to Fig.18</p> <p>Update text relating to Fig.20 to refer to additional social infrastructure / and amend wording relating to swimming pools</p> <p>Amend Fig.21 to ensure all of the drawing is visible (and double check all figures and titles for similar)</p> <p>Amend Fig.22 to show Leyes Lane as a key route</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>name Abbotsford House</p> <p>u) P39 Figure 18 Biodiversity – Abbey Fields has recently been designated a Local Wildlife Site by WCC</p> <p>v) P39 Final paragraph – The arboretum along Crewe Lane could usefully be added here, although it is mentioned later in the Brief on p45</p> <p>w) P41 Social Infrastructure – Whilst we appreciate the impossibility of covering every aspect of social infrastructure the list does appear to favour educational and sporting. There are a wide range of organisations catering for the young, the old, the charitable, the civic, the social and the religious and these all reflect the strength of community which we would wish the new development to be part of</p> <p>x) P42 Social Infrastructure, first paragraph – The words could be changed to “two swimming pools” following the Executive decision of 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019. The statement would then be true both now and in the future</p> <p>y) P45 Figure 21 Views, Topography Landscape Features – the northern part of Figure 21 has been lost. In particular, item 1, the Crewe Lane Arboretum, does not show</p> <p>z) P49 Figure 22 Access and Connectivity – Despite the 20mph speed restriction due to the School, Leyes Lane remains a key connection and we are surprised it is not identified as such in the future</p> <p>aa) P51 Site Constraints and Opportunities – On the map there are two sites identified as “14”</p> <p>bb) P59 Ch 7 Development Principles – Throughout this Chapter reference is made to the relevant policies in the</p>	<p>Development Brief area that conform with the PBSA SPD requirement, specifically those on thoroughfares within Zone 3 as per the SPD. It is therefore relevant to highlight this, especially given the proximity of the development to the University of Warwick via sustainable transport routes</p> <p>ff) Noted, thank you. Please see response to Mr I Moss’s representations (rep ref: 71343)</p> <p>gg) Noted</p> <p>hh) We agree that there is some repetition on the issue of crossings and that the matter of cycle priority at side roads could be made clearer. This text section of the Brief will be amended for clarity</p> <p>ii) Roundabouts work well where traffic flows can be balanced on each arm, however they do not work well for junctions where the flows are unbalanced, where there are cyclists (due to safety issues), providing cyclists with appropriate safe crossing points and where the area is constrained. All new signals will communicate across the network in order to manage flows</p>	<p>Add Figure 23 number and title</p> <p>Ch.7 Development Principles – references to the KNP and relevant policies to be added</p> <p>Amend text relating to crossings in Walking and Cycling section for clarity and to avoid repetition</p> <p>Additional wording relating to the gradient at the Dalehouse Lane/Knowle Hill junction to be added</p> <p>Fig.40 Future Bus</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Local Plan. Now that the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan has been made either reference should be made to the relevant policies or a general statement of relevance should be included in the introductory statement on p60</p> <p>cc) P60 Delivery of a mix of housing – We welcome the clear statement that any significant change in the number of dwellings proposed must be robustly justified. We are concerned that there is possible confusion in the number proposed should the full education provision on allocation ED2 not be required</p> <p>dd) P61 Housing Mix – Concerned that there is an implication that the JSHMA is a one-size-all requirement although there is a phrase “unless further local information is provided”. This cannot be the right solution for this site. We understand that the District Council does have housing mix requirements related to individual towns and we would expect that information to be provided in Table 1 rather than JSHMA, appreciating that the figures might still be liable to revision over time. We note the requirements for “specialist housing for older people” – the specific requirements outlined might also suit people with special needs who are not “older”. Although not specified here we would welcome the provision (and retention) of some bungalow accommodation in the area</p> <p>ee) P61 Purpose Built Student Accommodation – This paragraph does not appear to be in accordance with the draft consultation SPD on Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Jan 2019) which is not referred to. This SPD lays down a strict hierarchy for such accommodation</p>	<p>and minimise delays</p> <p>jj) This queue propagation is caused by congestion south of the junction on Leamington Road and will be addressed through the dualling proposal, the signalisation scheme will help manage the flow but will not completely address the issue in isolation. Additionally, the significant improvements to be implemented at A46 Stoneleigh and the proposed improvements for accessing the junction via the Spine Road should reduce the propensity for trips to use the A46 Stoneleigh junction to travel north</p> <p>kk) The figure has been drawn to focus on proposed alterations. Whilst it may be useful to show the southern side of Leamington Road more clearly, it is not considered necessary to change the Figure, particularly as all details are visible, albeit some faint. The junction has been designed to facilitate the movements on to/off the Spine Road and maintain the movements into the town centre. It is a signalised junction, there is no priority movement</p> <p>ll) Agree that this is a difficult area</p>	<p>Network Proposals Map to be updated to show the site (and include any other updates that may be necessary)</p> <p>Omit reference to gymnasium on p98 of the draft</p> <p>Objective 4 - Reference to a sports hall being required as part of the community centre to be removed / wording to be added to refer to community use facilities at education facilities. Community centre specification to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>and identifies the whole of Kenilworth outside the town centre as residential area with subsequent restrictions. This paragraph could be interpreted as encouraging if not actually requiring student accommodation. It is unnecessary and should be deleted</p> <p>ff) P66 Walking and Cycling – We welcome this detailed section which builds on policies in the KNP but draw attention to the very detailed response of Mr I Moss to this specific area</p> <p>gg) P68 Cycling provision on spine roads – The northern section of Glasshouse Lane is likely to be equivalent to a spine road for through traffic including cyclists from Leamington to Warwick University. It is essential that appropriate design standards and priorities are maintained there, particularly because of the interaction with school traffic</p> <p>hh) P68 Crossings – The issue of priority for cyclists at side roads is a complicated one for which the County do not appear to have a clear policy. Logically cyclists on a cycleway should have the same priority at a junction as if they were in the roadway, irrespective of traffic flows. We understand that is the system in the Netherlands and support it here. There is confusing repetition between the fourth paragraph of the previous section and this section as both deal with crossings. We suggest that paragraph should be deleted and suitably rewritten within this section or at least rewritten to be less obviously repetitive.</p> <p>ii) P70 On and off-site highway infrastructure – See also</p>	<p>requiring considerable thought. WCC will be giving further thought to these proposals in order to identify a workable solution which meets our aims. Additional wording will be added to acknowledge the challenges associated with the gradient</p> <p>mm) Noted, the developer will have to undertake a with local Plan forecast year modelling assessment</p> <p>nn) The final proposal is still being developed. A review of the pedestrian usage of this section will be undertaken prior to committing to any change. Pedestrian facilities will be provided on the outside of the gyratory with appropriate crossing points. Any safety issues will be identified through the Road Safety Audit</p> <p>oo) Additional wording will be added to acknowledge the challenges associated with the gradient</p> <p>pp) Circumstances have changed with the Local Plan allocations and it is considered that the realignment of Leyes Lane will be a better solution in providing safe and legible access to the proposed school. The network has been planned in a way which can</p>	<p>be amended</p> <p>Add heading to Objective 7 on p117 of draft</p> <p>The car parking principles will be revisited in the context of the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant policy in the KNP will be referenced</p> <p>Car Parking principles relating to Principle 7D will be revisited in the context of the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan and WDC's Parking Standards SPD to ensure both are</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Major Issue 3. Concerned that the solution on many junctions both old and new is traffic lights. We are well aware of the effects on traffic flow and air quality of the four sets of lights in Warwick Road between Abbey End and St John's. If the traffic lights are necessary, rather than simple roundabouts, then it is essential that their control systems are linked to ensure freer flows. They must also adjust to the varying traffic pressures at different times of day including cycle routes and pedestrian crossings</p> <p>jj) P73 Figure 25 Employment site preferred access – One of the existing problems on this junction in busy periods is that traffic from Kenilworth attempting to go left on the empty slip road to the A46 towards Coventry is held up by traffic backing up from the road to Leamington. We appreciate that in due course signalisation is proposed but seek reassurance that the proposed junction will free traffic for Coventry</p> <p>kk) P74 Figure 26 Indicative access arrangement for Thickthorn – This drawing appears incomplete with the southern side of Leamington Rd missing. Our concerns are that it will be easier to leave Kenilworth by turning left rather than turn right into the town. We wish to encourage links to the town centre and seek priority signals or some other means of encouraging this</p> <p>ll) P75 Crewe Lane junctions – This is a difficult area and we suspect that even more thought needs to be given to it. We can see no easy solution. The spine road north encourages people to leave the town although it is a</p>	<p>accommodate cyclists and pedestrians safely. Simplifying the network (removing staggered junctions), providing signalised junctions with cross facilities and slowing the speed of traffic down in this vicinity are all features designed to help facilitate more use of cycles. The signalisation at this location is not required for capacity reasons, it has been identified to manage the traffic flows and primarily to ensure safe movements for pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>qq) Service X17 is a commercial service operated by Stagecoach. The company have indicated that they are not prepared to further divert this service via the new developments. This already operates a very circuitous route and any further diversion would be to the detriment of passengers travelling through on this service. This service competes with National Express service 11 and the railway and any additional time added to the journey would result in passengers using competing services. The proposal is therefore to divert service X18 via the new developments to give direct</p>	<p>referenced and the principles are consistent with both</p> <p>Amend text in third paragraph relating to allotments on p107 to read as follows:  'Developers should approach Kenilworth Town Council to ascertain whether they would be willing to own or undertake the future management (either directly or by a tenant's association on their behalf) of these new allotments'</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>complicated route to reach the A46. Much through traffic is likely therefore to continue on Glasshouse Lane. Restricting Crewe Lane causes complications for the Golf Club which is a busy facility and significant business and for Reservoir House. The junction at Knowle Hill and Glasshouse Lane is a very difficult one as it is on the top of a hill. The junction at Knowle Hill and Dalehouse Lane/Common Lane is both constricted and a steep hill. Locating a large school in the area is another complication, as is possible additional housing and we suspect that as a new route the spine road will attract through traffic from Leamington and Warwick to North Kenilworth and the University</p> <p>mm) P84 Other Accesses – It is essential that any proposals for additional housing on any surplus ED2 allocation are taken into account when considering traffic issues in that area</p> <p>nn) P86 St John’s Gyratory – Whilst we appreciate this is not a finalised proposal we are very concerned about the loss of a footway outside the petrol station. This is an unusual site with buildings within the island as well as the petrol station and there should remain a continuous footway around the centre. The wording should be changed as there are two petrol stations on Warwick Rd and it would therefore be less confusing to simply say “outside the petrol station” as the subject is the gyratory</p> <p>oo) P88 Figure 38 Dalehouse Lane/Knowle Hill junction – It is important that the steepness of Knowle Hill at this junction is made clear as it is not apparent from a 2-</p>	<p>fast access to both Coventry City Centre and to Leamington Spa. The service will come off at the Kenilworth A46 junction operate via the new developments then rejoin the A46 at the Stoneleigh junction. This is a commercial service operated by Stagecoach and the company have indicated that they would be prepared to divert this service. There are no plans to extend the operation of the Station Link service. The County Council are seeking funding from developers to run a new bespoke service linking the new developments with the town centre. The service would operate every 30 minutes from the new developments then via St. Johns, Warwick Road, Kenilworth Town Centre, Abbey End, Abbey Hill, Southbank Road, Station Road, Railway Station, Forecourt then Waverley Avenue returning to Warwick Road, St. Johns and to the new developments</p> <p>rr) The map will be updated to include the development site. WCC will also update the map if there are changes</p> <p>ss) Infrastructure delivery is dependent on funding and how quickly the sites can</p>	<p>Amend Brief to ensure it addresses the requirements of KNP Policy KP4L</p> <p>P167 – reference to anticipated CIL income will be amended to highlight that 25% of the total figure will go to Kenilworth Town Council to spend on infrastructure in the local area</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>dimensional plan</p> <p>pp) P88 Leyes Lane Realignment – Leyes Lane originally took the now proposed straight course and the current deviation was created for good purpose at the time</p> <p>qq) Page 90 Public Transport - As the existing X17 service already reaches a corner of the site we are surprised that with relatively minor deviation it could not reach more of the site. The route was extended several years ago when a diversion, necessary to avoid sewer works in Mill End, resulted in a permanent change to the route. The X18 will require quite a deviation from the A46 and this seems odd for an express service. It does not provide any link to the town centre and we are therefore pleased to see a dedicated shuttle bus suggested though it is not clear how this relates to the current Station bus service around the East of the town</p> <p>rr) P91 Figure 40 Future Bus Network Proposals Plan – This map would be easier to interpret if the development site were marked on it. We are not clear whether that map is totally up to date with current changes to services, particular to the X68, though this may not be directly relevant to the Brief. There are existing residential areas in the North of the town which do not currently enjoy good local bus services and we note the aspirational service to that area marked in Figure 17</p> <p>ss) P94 Table 2 Kenilworth Transport Development Plan Key – Concerns on the timing of infrastructure delivery. For example, according to serial 3 the Thickthorn Development Site Access will be delivered by 2021 but in</p>	<p>come forward. The timescales are based on both requirement and when funding is likely to be coming forward. Our hope is that infrastructure can be delivered ahead of the timescales stated. Some infrastructure such as the dualling on between Thickthorn and Bericote also requires central government funding and will be dependent upon funding announcements</p> <p>tt) Noted. The figures provided are based on detailed feedback provided by WDC’s Community Partnership Team through the preparation of this Brief. In light of consultation responses received, WDC have reviewed the requirements of the community centre as outlined in the Development Brief and these will be amended. Notably, the changes will include the removal of the sports hall and the request for contributions towards a centre manager. It will be important to involve the community in the development of detailed proposals for the community centre and it is expected that WDC’s Community Partnership Team will be involved in</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>serial 1 the Thickthorn junction improvements which may interlink will not be delivered until 2023 by when, according to p161 Table 5, 650 dwellings will have been completed, not to mention potential HS2 traffic at that junction. We think that infrastructure delivery needs to be earlier</p> <p>tt) P97-101 Social and Community Infrastructure – We appreciate the very detailed information included on the proposed Local Centre and Community Centre but there is no real explanation or justification given for the details or for the financial assumptions behind the running costs and support, particularly in the longer term. support, particularly in the longer term. Careful consideration of the facilities at the proposed Community Centre is vital and flexibility of use essential. For example, provision of washing facilities in one of the meeting rooms would enable it to be used for health care. The provision of sporting facilities must complement rather than compete with the proposed public access facilities on the proposed school development. Comparison with Whitnash could mislead as we believe that is also a centre for sports facilities. We wonder what consultation there has been with organisations within Kenilworth. Detailed liaison is essential</p> <p>uu) P98 Local Centre and Community Facilities – The third paragraph mentions student accommodation. For reasons given in the comments to p61 we question whether this should be specifically mentioned. The fifth paragraph mentions a gymnasium. We are surprised by this as in the</p>	<p>this process</p> <p>uu) For the reasons set out in response to ee) reference to student accommodation is considered appropriate. Reference to a gymnasium will be omitted as planned investment in such facilities in the town will mean there is unlikely to be further significant demand</p> <p>vv) Following further discussion with WDC’s Community Partnership and Leisure sections it is acknowledged that a sports hall at the community centre will not be required given the community access arrangement proposed for the school. However, a multi-purpose hall is proposed at the community centre. Reference will be added to the community use facilities at Kenilworth School and potentially the primary schools</p> <p>ww) The section will be reviewed in light of this comment and will ensure consistency with the KNP and notably reference to Policy KP4 I) will be added</p> <p>xx) The allotments and golf course was not included in the 2008 study as they were not considered unrestricted Public Open Space. However, there</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>current strategy for the restructuring of such facilities in Kenilworth we are only aware of the expanded facilities proposed at Castle Farm</p> <p>vv) P99 Community centre configuration – Surprised by the inclusion of a sports hall as this would seem to duplicate publicly available facilities we understand will be provided on the new school site. Surely some details of these facilities should be included within this Section of the Brief?</p> <p>ww) P103 Biodiversity, Greenspaces, Play and Recreation provision – We note that this section concentrates on human requirements rather than the natural environment. KNP has several policies including KP4L which are directly relevant. See also p160 comment below</p> <p>xx) P103 Existing open space provision in Kenilworth – There seems to be confusion here between Open Space and unrestricted (Public?) Open Space. Whilst we appreciate and agree the need for Public Open Space in the new development we feel that the statements on existing space are misleading. The 2008 audit statement regarding Park Hill appears completely out of date. There is a green corridor along Finham Brook which is designated a Local Green Space by Policy KP19 of the Kenilworth Local Plan. This area includes Kenilworth Common and Odibourne Allotments. Parliament Piece and Crackley Woods are also in Park Hill, as is Kenilworth Golf Course which whilst not a public access area provides well-maintained landscaped parkland on the edge of the town. These paragraphs require significant revision and updating and</p>	<p>are two amendments that we will make to the Brief for greater clarity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In paragraph 3, the word allotments (in the first sentence) will be removed.</li> <li>• For clarity, the word ‘unrestricted’ will be inserted before reference to open space.</li> </ul> <p>Finally, the provision on P103 are consistent with the draft consultation SPD on Public Open Space which requires the same volume of unrestricted POS (5.47ha) as identified in the 2008 Audit</p> <p>yy) For greater clarity, the third paragraph on p107 relating to allotments will be amended to read as follows: “Developers should approach Kenilworth Town Council to ascertain whether they would be willing to own or undertake the future management (either directly or by a tenant’s association on their behalf) of these new allotments”</p> <p>zz) Noted</p> <p>aaa) Correct, the heading appears to have been lost through formatting. It will be reinstated</p> <p>bbb) Noted. The car parking principles</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>should be related to the draft consultation SPD on Public Open Space, January 2019</p> <p>yy) P107 Allotments – Is the reference to the Town Council managing the new allotments meant to refer to the Town Council owning them? Currently the Town Council owns two allotment sites in the town but they are effectively managed by the tenants’ association</p> <p>zz) P113 Noise – We fully support the requirements for mitigation for the noise from the A46 to be sensitive to the location and to be acceptable within the landscape</p> <p>aaa) P117 Objective 7 Creating a high quality environment – This is a very important objective and relates to our Major Issue 2 and yet it appears to be in the sub-heading on Health. We suspect that there is a heading, or possibly more text, missing here</p> <p>bbb) P132 Car Parking – Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan has a specific policy KP12 which may strengthen some of these requirements</p> <p>ccc) P134 – Incorporating high-quality public art – Could we suggest that artists with local links should be preferred or at least encouraged?</p> <p>ddd) P136 Surface water drainage - This is a technical subject but we are surprised at the lack of more specific requirement from the Local Flood Authority and Severn Trent. There are two significant watercourses on the site. Both are illustrated in Figure 13 on p34. The northern one drains directly to the River Avon and is presumably no problem. The southern one, drains through the village of Ashow where there is an existing flood risk. For this</p>	<p>will be revisited in the context of the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant policy in the KNP will be referenced</p> <p>ccc) It would not be appropriate for the Development Brief to require public art to be by artists that are from a specific location. The criteria laid out in Development Principle 7E and its preceding text it sufficient to ensure that the art that comes forward is appropriate to the town and the development site</p> <p>ddd) As they come forward, planning policy requires that each site must demonstrate that they are not increasing flood risk through a site specific Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. Comments from WCC Flood Risk Management include the requirement to produce modelling of the watercourses running through the site to understand the flood risk associated with them</p> <p>eee) See response to Mr E Kirwan’s representations (rep refs: 71339 and 71340) and associated amendments</p> <p>fff) Noted, however the timelines and phasing plan of the HS2 works is not</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>reason when Severn Trent, in a major project several years ago, upgraded the surface water drainage system in the southern part of the town they built a large sewer down the Warwick Road to Cattle Brook in Leek Wootton to avoid any effect on Ashow under storm conditions. We are therefore surprised that the effect of storm conditions on the draining of the site is not specifically mentioned.</p> <p>eee) P145 Figure 57 Street Hierarchy/Connectivity – The map indicates a vehicular access in the southern area of the development off Thickthorn Close, which is currently a quiet residential cul-de-sac off Birches Lane. The access appears to lead only to a short right-angled spur which simply extends the cul-de-sac, with no connection to the rest of the road network. This lack of through connection is essential and should be made very clear</p> <p>fff) P159 Collaboration and Consultation – Suggest that in this section or possibly in some other paragraph, there should be mention of the construction of HS2 during the same time period as the development of this site. There are no proposed HS2 traffic routes directly affecting the development area except at Thickthorn Junction on the A46 but a large compound is planned off the B4115 affecting Crewe Lane to the east of the A46 and the actual trace of the route is just to the north of the area as shown in Figure 2 on p9. In the event of any conflict the Act gives HS2 priority over other local road works</p> <p>ggg) P160 Biodiversity, Ecology and Geodiversity Statement – Policy KP4L in the KNP requires that an environmental strategy should establish how the</p>	<p>yet known in sufficient detail in order to be incorporated</p> <p>ggg) Noted and agreed, the Development Brief will be amended to reflect this</p> <p>hhh) The estimated £2m figure includes the 25% due to Kenilworth Town Council. A note will be added that 25% of the total figure will go to the Town Council to spend on infrastructure in the local area</p>	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			development will provide opportunities for net biodiversity gain and manage the sustainable drainage of the land. This should be included in the requirements hhh) P167 CIL – Does the £2m for CIL include or exclude the 25% due to the Kenilworth Town Council? How and where that portion is to be spent has yet to be discussed and decided		
71360	Mr A Law	Warwicks hire County Council (Highways)	<p>a) 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</p> <p>b) Access to Education facilities - Consideration will need to be given as to how access to the identified cycle network can be provided from/to each education site</p> <p>c) Access to Education facilities - 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 low in comparison to wider scheme costs but may not be considered fair to burden the schools with</p> <p>d) Highways England response to the 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 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2019.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Noted, as per comment these will need to come forward as part of the planning application. The Brief will be updated to acknowledge these likely measures and the desire to share the burden of such costs across developments in East Kenilworth</p> <p>d) Noted, amendments recommended will be made where it is considered they are necessary</p> <p>e) Agreed. Development Principle 3G b) to be amended to remove the requirement on the improvements being implemented at the junction prior to access being provided to the residential site</p> <p>f) Agree. The Brief needs to be consistent. As we are striving to achieve a cycle and pedestrian friendly development that promotes these uses</p>	<p>Text to be added to acknowledge the likely need for traffic speed reduction measures relating to schools and sharing the burden of associated costs across the development site</p> <p>Review Highways England response and make amendments, if, it is considered the Brief does not allow sufficient</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>The Kenilworth Development Brief should be amended to reflect the recommendations made</p> <p>e) 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 Principle 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;"</p> <p>f) 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</p>	<p>and therefore the change is supported. As indicated the Brief still allows some flexibility</p> <p>g) Agree, sentence to be removed</p> <p>h) Catesby's response refers to Development Principle 3A and it is considered that the alteration suggested by Catesby in point k) of their response to this consultation is acceptable</p> <p>i) Noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Text to be amended to provide reference to connecting with the proposed K2L/other nearby proposed cycle infrastructure;</li> <li>2. Agree that this scheme should be funded and delivered by the applicant for the Castle Farm site. The Development Brief identifies a cycle network plan and Table 2 identifies an estimated cost of £3.7m from East of Kenilworth developments towards delivery of the cycle network and factored into this is a contribution towards connections from the site to Castle Farm. It will be a matter for detailed consideration through planning applications as to what are reasonable and proportionate</li> </ol>	<p>flexibility in relation to proposed junctions</p> <p>Development Principle 3G b) to be amended to remove the requirement on the improvements being implemented at the junction prior to access being provided to the residential site</p> <p>Final paragraph on p78 should be amended to be consistent with p68 and remove third sentence of paragraph</p> <p>Text to be amended to</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>suggested that the final paragraph on p 78 should be amended to be consistent with p 68 ie '<i>ideally 4 m shared footways / cycleways</i>' rather than '<i>3 – 4m</i>'. 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.</p> <p>g) Cycling - However, it may be best to remove the next sentence on p78 '<i>As an absolute minimum, a 4m shared provision should be provided on one side and a 2m footway on the other side</i>' as this may not be achievable on Glasshouse Lane section of spine road</p> <p>h) Cycling - On p66, it is not considered necessary to change the wording in the fifth paragraph as Catesby have requested, 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</p> <p>i) Comparison of Atkins Transport Study / 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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development Principle 3D discusses connection to existing cycle/pedestrian infrastructure but omits access to proposed infrastructure (e.g. K2L and the Kenilworth circular routes etc identified in the cycle</li> </ol>	<p>contributions from each development and these will be required to meet the CIL Regulation tests</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Agree, the text will be amended to refer to a 'footway / cycleway'</li> <li>4. Agree, the text associated with this junction scheme should refer to the provision of pedestrian and cycling facilities at the junction and will be amended. The drawing does identify pedestrian improvements and the cycle network plan does show a route traversing the junction</li> <li>5. Agree, additional text relating to the A46 Link Rd will be added for the reason identified</li> <li>6. Noted. The Development Brief identifies an estimated £3.7m contribution from the development site towards cycle network improvements and includes a Cycle Network Plan. The infrastructure Sections in the Brief relating to cycle infrastructure are already detailed and we are mindful not to unnecessarily increase the length of the document. However, a review of the Kenilworth Transport Study</li> </ol>	<p>provide reference to connecting with the proposed K2L/other nearby proposed highway infrastructure</p> <p>Text to be added to the On and Off Site Highway Infrastructure section to highlight that all "preferred schemes" are still current concepts and substantial work is still required to determine their feasibility</p> <p>Changes to be made as per points in i)</p> <p>Typos on p77</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>network plan)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. 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</li> <li>3. Dev Principle 3E (b) should we be saying footway/cycleway at this stage rather than just footway?</li> <li>4. 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</li> <li>5. 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</li> <li>6. 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</li> </ol>	<p>Chapter 7 and the Development Brief will be undertaken to see if any additional more detailed references should be made and a Figure will be added/or an existing figure amended to show key destinations that it is important that the development is suitably linked with</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j) Text will be added in the On and Off Site Highway Infrastructure section to highlight this point</li> <li>k) Typo to be amended</li> <li>l) Typo to be amended</li> </ol>	<p>(change word to ‘modal’) and on p95 (change word to ‘junction’) to be amended</p> <p>Trip generators Figure to be added</p>

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>them within this document would provide them with further status and may help bring forward delivery</p> <p>j) 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</p> <p>k) P77 typo – modol rather than modal</p> <p>l) P95 typo – unction rather than junction</p>		
71466	Ms G McKinnon	WCC (Public Health)	a) The Development Principles are great and really pleased to see that they incorporate information from our Public Health documents and that health and wellbeing is a theme throughout	a) Noted, thank you	No amendments proposed
71467	Ms D Clarke	Network Rail	a) The site is in travelling distance of the Kenilworth Railway Station such that people will drive, walk and cycle to the station. Due to the size and location of this development, it will likely have an impact on Kenilworth Railway Station due to increased footfall. The developer(s) of the site should fully fund all station enhancements to address the impact from the development. An assessment of the proposals’ impact upon the station should be undertaken in association with Network Rail and the TOC	a) It is likely that there will be an impact upon the railway station. However, it is considered that this will be a positive impact as additional footfall will help support the viability of the railway station and services operating through it. It is not appropriate for the Development Brief to require the funding of unknown and unquantified future improvements, although Network Rail will be able to respond through the planning application process and seek contributions should	

Ref	Name	Company/ Organisation	Comment	Response	Amendment
				there be appropriate and relevant capacity improvement projects that it believes meet the CIL tests	