

# A429 Coventry Road, Warwick, Active Travel Corridor

## Appendix C: Summary of Traffic Regulation Order public consultation.

### Overview

Between 15<sup>th</sup> December and 13<sup>th</sup> January 2023, local residents and local stakeholders were invited to provide feedback on the Traffic Regulation Orders needed within the A429 Coventry Road scheme.

Scheme information, consultation plans and public notices were erected on site in the vicinity of the proposed route, with the information also held at Shire Hall in Warwick for people to view. A press release was issued by Warwickshire County Council to advertise the scheme, and 184 properties along the route had letters posted to them.

This was supported by a dedicated web page, with scheme drawings and a link to take part in the consultation: <https://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/cycling/cycle-route-schemes-consultation/4>

In addition to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders, notices were publicised to demonstrate Warwickshire County Council's intention to convert existing footways to shared footway/cycleway, which can be carried out using the powers of the highway authority under Section 65 and 66 of the Highways Act 1980

## Consultation Responses

### Feedback from events

Face-to-face discussions with local residents, at The Woodloes Tavern in Warwick picked up on the same themes as those mentioned in the emails and online survey responses (see below).

### Comments received

19 respondents provided comments directly to Warwickshire County Council. Respondents were all local residents, with representation also made by Vodafone. The table below outlines the objections that were raised during the consultation stage.

Written Response Data Summary		
Theme Ref	Theme	Emailed responses Number of Responses
A	Segregated facilities needed throughout	5
B	Cycle priority issues on Side roads	1
C	Against banned right-turn because of Piers Close/Gaveston junction	6
D	Against banned right-turn because of risk of increased: Congestion, Pollution, Added journey time	5

<b>E</b>	Property accesses restricted, due to: Cycleway close to driveway. Banned Right turn	4
<b>F</b>	Speeding Cyclists	3
<b>G</b>	On-road Parking affected	1
<b>H</b>	Cycle Track Order. Not Highway Land	1
<b>I</b>	Cycle Track Order. Contravention to Local Plan BE3	1
<b>J</b>	Cycle Track Order. Ecology	2
<b>K</b>	Cycle Track Order. Light, noise and littering pollution	2
<b>L</b>	Cycle Track Order. Anti-social behaviour	2
<b>M</b>	Priority Crossing setback. (Visibility Issues)	1
<b>N</b>	Additional Design Solutions Suggested	10
<b>O</b>	General - Supportive	5
<b>P</b>	General - Negative	12

## Feedback received and WCC response

The feedback received during the consultation process is listed in the table below, together with responses from Transport Planning/Engineering Design Services and details of any amendments that will be made to the design to reflect the comments made.

### A429 Coventry Road, Warwick

Consultation feedback to inform any design changes. Key themes and design responses are detailed below:

#### A. Segregated facilities needed (4 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response from TPU/ EDS/ LS
1	Segregated cycleway on the Coventry Road hill, but why not on other sections?	The segregated cycleway is proposed where there is sufficient width within the adoptable highway. Other sections are constrained in terms of existing narrow lane widths where there is no room for reducing the lane width in order to create sufficient width for the cycle segregation, additionally a number of existing bus stops along Coventry Road require shared facilities for passengers to access, this would create very short lengths of segregation.

	Detailed requests	Initial response from TPU/ EDS/ LS
2	Why not build directional cycle tracks on both sides of the road?	This was considered as an option however the cost would be significantly more. Additionally, there are a number of constraints including a large number of existing parking spaces which would need to be removed, this would not be a popular proposal as parking is already very limited. There are a number of existing mature trees which would need to be removed to accommodate the cycle facilities.
3	The Cycle Track should continue through the green space on Hayle Avenue, to avoid conflict with cars leaving their driveways.	The scheme budget cannot accommodate the additional groundworks and streetlighting required to connect this route to Primrose Hill, which may require tree removal.

### B. Cycle priority crossing concerns (1 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
4	Visibility of the parallel crossing when turning into GCP from St Johns.	The final arrangement at Guys Cross Park Road shows that with some vegetation cutback it is possible to achieve the required visibility of 40m.
5	Location of parallel crossing is close to rear of property (Piers Close). Confirmation needed that the crossing and any signs associated with it will not interfere with rear access.	No impact.
6	Design of priority crossing needs to mitigate risk of speeding cyclists	Ground markings can be used to encourage cyclists to 'SLOW' on the approach to crossing points.

### C. Objection to banned right-turn - Piers Close residents (6 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
7	The right turn out of Piers Close is very dangerous and a mirror could be installed to have sight of any oncoming traffic.	Any visibility issues relating to turning movements at the junction of Piers Close with Guys Cross Park Road are beyond the scope of this scheme and will not be made worse by banning the right turn from Guys Cross Park Road onto Coventry Road. Any journey time inconvenience arising from the prohibited right turn can be overcome by alternative routing.

### D. Against banned right-turn because of increased: Congestion, Pollution and Journey Time congestion (5 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
8	I believe the best option is to continue to allow 2 lanes of traffic at Guys Cross Park Road (allowing the right turn), with a crossing for cyclists and pedestrians.	Removal of the right turn lane would reduce the distance for cyclists/pedestrians to cross Guys Cross Park Road and aid safe crossing. It would also remove a potential blind-spot for pedestrians/cyclists who may begin to cross without having a clear sight of the adjacent lane (where high-sided vehicles obstruct views).

	<b>Detailed requests</b>	<b>Initial response</b>
9	The plans do not make it clear WHY it is necessary to reduce the road to a single lane, as it is perfectly normal for pedestrian/cycle crossings to cross 2 lanes of traffic (as per other parts of this scheme).	As above.
10	Even if it were considered necessary to narrow the carriageway at the point of the crossing, it would be possible to widen the carriageway afterwards at the mouth of the junction, to allow at least one car to wait to turn right whilst other cars can pass safely on the left.	There is not sufficient room to achieve this and deliver a parallel crossing.
11	This proposal will undoubtedly force residents wishing to get to the town centre into taking unnecessary risk by turning right out of the close rather than the alternative of having to travel an unfair distance, to the petrol station island and then queue back up the road they have just come down	Active travel journeys along the Coventry Road must be prioritised over the inconvenience experienced by those who choose to travel by motor vehicles, on the grounds of safety. This scheme does not force residents to make the right-turn.
12	By forcing every vehicle to turn left you will be adding in additional vehicles in this direction, worsening the traffic problems and air quality from idling vehicles.	Over the course of the day, right turns only account for 5% of the total vehicles exiting Guys Cross Park Road and no concerns have been raised by the Transport Planning Traffic Data and Modelling team.
13	There will also be a knock-on effect along Lakin Road as people attempt to take that route to head towards St Johns instead. This is a narrow road that will suffer further problems as vehicles try and turn right from the end. This also represents a potential issue for ambulance response times as they attempt to leave the hospital.	See above.  Engagement with the Ambulance service provided no concerns about Lakin Road and no issue with exiting Guys Cross Park Road, where blue lights can be used to exit the junction quickly, where it is required.

### E. Property access concerns (4 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
14	Shared driveway at 124a Coventry Road will not be accessible directly from Guys Cross Park Road as a result of the banned right turn	Objection understood. Alternative route options are available.
15	Right-turning traffic (Coventry Rd into Guys Cross Park Road) may back up event more because of the parallel crossing install. This will make it difficult for residents around 124 Coventry Rd to turn right from properties to head north.	Objection understood, but the objective of the parallel crossing is supported by the narrowing of the carriageway which will help pedestrians and cyclists to clear the crossing quickly and safely. The construction of this route will encourage a modal shift for people making short local car journeys that can be made using this new scheme, where appropriate.
16	If I am travelling northbound on the Coventry Road, I am currently unable to safely turn right into my driveway due to a bollard in the middle of the road and traffic trying to turn right onto Guys Cross Park Road, so I rely on being able to turn left onto Guys Cross Park Road, and turning right onto the Coventry Road to be able to access my driveway.	We may be able to slightly modify the position and/or size of the traffic refuge bollard to accommodate a right-turn movement into the property. Alternatively, access can be obtained via a U-turn movement at Spinney Hill roundabout.
17	Bins on Coventry Road will force pedestrians to walk on the cycle track where there is always high-speed cyclists	Any shared footway/cycleway requires users to share with care. It is possible to include some 'SLOW' markings on the cycle track to encourage cyclists to take care,
18	From what I can see on your plan the cycle path / footpath will come up to the edge of our drive, I must then raise the question of how can I get vehicles onto or off of my property safely without driving across the cycle path?	Residents currently have to drive their vehicles over a footway, which will remain the same. The proposed scheme will link cycling movements to Huddison Close via the turning head at the end of the Cul de Sac. This is further away from any driveways, requiring a Cycle Track Order to complete.
19	The proposed cycleway is excessive in covering all of the road. This will be problematic for parking (visitors and people with multiple cars)	Huddison Close and it's link to the eastern part of Hayle Avenue is a quiet route, with no through-traffic movements. Cyclists will use this part of the route as an on-carriageway route which cyclists are entitled to use. Both cyclists and motor-vehicle drivers will need to look out for each other and communicate intentions to each other as and when necessary, as expected on any typical road.

### F. Speeding Cyclists (3 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
20	Can a speed limit be imposed on a cycle route?	This is not possible, as there is no enforcement available to monitor this. WCC are keen to promote safe cycling practices and behaviour via social media and we will extend this messaging into our website information.

21	Some cyclists will try to cross road junctions at high speed without checking motorists have actually stopped as required. Although cyclists have right of way, they should still check they have actually been seen. As far as possible the design should try to mitigate this risk.	Setback of priority crossings support the speed reduction of cyclists using the crossing.  Cyclists using the highway should adhere to the Highway Code, doing so with awareness of all others also using the highway. This will help all users efficiently use the infrastructure that is provided within the highway, but at the same time, drivers will need to prepare to give way to the crossing before giving way to the motor traffic on Coventry Road. This should be done in two stages.
22	We are extremely concerned that it will be even more difficult to drive a car out of our driveway onto Coventry Road with bicycles going up and down the footpath on our side of the road. They are often difficult to see.	Cyclists using Coventry Road, travelling towards St Johns will benefit from the segregated section that places cyclists away from frontages and adjacent to the carriageway. It is expected that residents will give way to pedestrians passing their driveways and the same courtesy should be extended to bicycles, adapted bicycles, mobility scooters and scooters.
23	Cyclists are still freewheeling down the hill without any regard for pedestrians or residents (either exiting their drives in their vehicles or on foot).	As above (22)

### G. On-road parking affected (1 response)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
2 4	At present, parking is allowed on the western side of the street, after 6pm and at the weekends. Many people park on the footway, to keep the road clear	Parking on the footway causes obstructions to pedestrians. Parking on the widened footway/cycleway will obstruct pedestrians and cyclists. Properties on the west side of A429 Coventry Road have large frontages and driveways providing sufficient space to accommodate residents and visitors.

### H. Cycle Track Order – Not Highway Land (1 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
25	This land is covenanted green space, resulting from a planning requirement placed on the estate developers to incorporate green space. Could you please provide documentary evidence that this land is indeed "highway land", and is actually owned by WDC or WCC, and that you have the right to build on this land?	The strip of land in question was dedicated as highway maintainable at public expense under an agreement under section 40 of the Highways Act 1959 (which has been superseded by s38 of the Highways act 1980) between the Developers of this housing site and Warwick District Council who were the Highway Authority at the time, which has since been transferred to Warwickshire County Council.

### I. Cycle Track Order – Contravention to Local Plan Policy BE3 (1 response)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
2 6	Construction of a 3m wide paved cycle path within this wooded green space at the rear of our property will have an adverse impact on the amenity of our property and other neighbouring residential dwellings, contrary to Policy BE3 of the Warwick District Council Local Plan	<p>The Local Plan must be taken into consideration by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) when considering <u>applications for planning permission</u>. Warwick District Council is the LPA.</p> <p>However, WCC does not need to make a planning application for planning permission for works in the highway. This is because highway works are classified as permitted development under the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) 2015, Schedule 2, Part 9.</p>

### J. Cycle Track Order – Ecology (2 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
2 7	The destruction of trees and shrubs resulting from the proposed development, and the consequent loss of natural habitats that flourish throughout the estate, will inevitably cause significant harm to biodiversity in this area. This situation could also be mitigated by adopting an alternative route on Coventry Road.	No existing vegetation acting as a natural barrier to Coventry Road will be removed as part of this scheme. Two trees on the alignment of the proposed track have been marked for removal, but alternative routes around these trees will be explored. Alternative route options have been explored, with the proposed scheme providing the most direct and safe route to connect onto Coventry Road at the canal crossing.
2 8	I strongly believe the proposed path will disrupt wildlife that is already losing its natural habitat, especially with the housing estate being built off Montague Road area on the opposite side of the Coventry Road	An ecology study has been carried out to understand if there are any impacts to wildlife as part of the surfacing of the path. No issues were raised.

### K. Cycle Track Order – Light, Noise and littering pollution (2 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
2 9	The position of the numerous trees within this green space means that the cycle path cannot be constructed to a width of 3m without the destruction of trees and shrubbery. These trees and shrubs provide a visual and noise screen to both traffic on the Coventry Road and also to the new Montague Point housing estate, where we note the Council has actually allowed the destruction of trees, hedges, and shrubs that were shown to be retained in the estate proposals.	(See point 27)
3 0	We note that it is proposed to install street lights on the new cycle path. Such street lighting will illuminate the rear of our property, disturb our sleep, adversely impact on any remaining wildlife in the area, and cause other negative impacts associated with light pollution.	We will work with the streetlighting team to ensure that the lights provided are placed in such a way that their light splays focus on the track and do not spill into residential properties. Light shields will also be applied to the lighting columns, to prevent any rearward light spillage into any adjacent properties.



3 1	The green foliage during the warmer months creates a natural barrier for noise and the view between my property and the Coventry Road, however, I am sure that if a formal path is made, a certain amount of foliage/bushes/trees will be removed or at the minimum drastically cut back in order to keep the path clear from leaves to provide a safe footpath. If this happens, it will open up my property to increased noise pollution from the Coventry Road behind	As above (27)
--------	--	---------------

### L. Cycle Track Order – Anti-social behaviour (2 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
3 2	The cycle path will inevitably expose our property and others on the route to a much greater risk of vandalism and hooliganism from the pedestrian and cycle traffic using this route.	With a lit route and regular usage from pedestrians, cyclists and other users, this should not be seen as an attractive location for anti-social behaviour.
3 3	I am concerned having a formal pathway made here with lighting will increase the chance of individuals spending time hanging around and loitering here, possibly resulting in noise at the back of the property, especially during unsociable hours, and feeling more unsafe knowing people are hanging around in this area	See above (32)

### M. Priority Crossing Setback –Issues (1 response)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
3 4	Visibility of Vehicles coming from the direction of St Johns towards Guys Cross Park Rd - the visibility is currently quite poor, and will be worsened at the new crossing point as this will be set back some distance from Coventry Rd. A significant amount of vegetation will need to be removed to improve visibility	(See point 4)

3 5	Distance between Cycle / Pedestrian Crossings across Guys Cross Park Rd and Coventry Rd - I have not been able to gauge the exact distance between the cycle crossing and the entrance to Coventry Rd. I believe this should be at least the length of a small lorry in order to allow longer vehicles to wait there safely to turn, without blocking the crossing at the northern junction. At the southern junction, there should be space for at least one car to wait on Guys Cross Park Rd whilst pedestrians / cyclists are crossing, without blocking Coventry Rd.	A 5m setback is being used for the Parallel Crossings, which is in line with the guidance in LTN 1/20.
--------	---	--

### N. Additional Design Solutions Suggested (10 responses)

	Detailed requests	Initial response
3 6	Traffic Mirror for Piers Close residents	<p>The County Council does not supply or give agreement to the erection of mirrors on public highways for which it is the highway authority. A mirror would be an obstruction on the highway which could make the person or organisation responsible for placing the mirror liable in the event of an accident.</p> <p>Mirrors can give a distorted view of the road and a misleading impression of the speed of approaching vehicles. Convex mirrors will not give a clear view of smaller vehicles, such as motorcycles and pedal cycles. Flat mirrors have a very limited field of view.</p> <p>Mirrors can cause drivers to feel a sense of security when entering a main road, to such an extent that due care may not be taken when completing the manoeuvre.</p>
3 7	Pinch point at Grand Union canal bridge after Rowan Drive	The carriageway will be re-aligned to provide a 3m wide footway/cycleway
3 8	Can a speed limit be imposed on cyclists descending down Coventry Road towards Lakin Road?	No.  (See comment 20)
3 9	Please ensure there is clear signage to send cyclists along Coventry Road through St Johns, instead of speeding through the service road	This form part of the St Johns junction improvement scheme, which is set to be delivered in 2024.
4 0	Either sign cyclists down Cherry Street or formalise a contra-flow on Broad Street, as cyclists use the pavement.	Outside of scope. Will be considered as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.

4 1	The road width along Coventry Road is being reduced and so presumably new road markings will be necessary. Please consider applying appropriate and clear markings at the entrance to Beech Cliffe	Outside of scope.
4 2	Currently there is a daily issue of a van or car parked on the pavement opposite us by a resident of No. 96. Other vehicles also park on the pavement from time to time usually to aid deliveries. Obviously parking on a cycle track should not be allowable so please consider making the road adjacent to the entire length of the cycleway subject to a double yellow line. In addition, please consider adding No Parking signs adjacent to the cycleway	Transport Planning Unit will monitor this and consider this in the future.
4 3	During the re-alignment of the road to accommodate the new cycleway please consider introducing measures to discourage speeding. I understand that one successful method may be to introduce a pinch point in the road (similar to that installed in Myton Road near Warwick School). Cars in the main seem to accelerate from Guys Cross Park Road to Station Road and vice versa.	This request is outside of the project scope.
4 4	Why couldn't you widen the existing pathway from the roundabout along to the pedestrian crossing on the A429 Coventry Road and then cut inside the fence onto the grass adjacent to Huddisdon Close which could then link up with the current well-trodden path that cyclists and pedestrians currently use.	The proposed route has been based on the current desire lines that have been created over a period of time and provide a route which is more in line with the core design principles of cycling infrastructure, as set out in Local Transport Note 1/20: Cycling Infrastructure Design.
4 5	I only see the majority of people walk and cycle up the many local Closes and Roads that open out onto the walk way next to the canal or use the footpath on the Coventry Road, as has always happened.	The desire lines trodden and cycled in over time suggest otherwise, and once upgraded, this track would provide a viable route option for people of all ages and abilities to actively travel into Warwick, both from the Woodloes and from Kenilworth, which forms part of National Cycle Network route 51.
4 6	That will become more dangerous and messier with the trash that the cyclist drops in the cycle way.	Bins are located along this route, and additional bins can be considered if appropriate.