

Appendix B: Correspondence During Consultation

Correspondent no. 1

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 May 2023 10:02  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School

OFFICIAL

Good morning [REDACTED]

The safe crossing is for pedestrians and cyclists accessing the shared surfaces on either side of Dencer Drive. The original proposal had a controlled crossing for pedestrians only across Leyes Lane as part of the traffic signal arrangement. As there were objections to these traffic signals the controlled crossing of Leyes Lane has been removed.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services  
**Warwickshire County Council**

T: [REDACTED]

P: Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street | Warwick | CV34 4SP

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 May 2023 21:47  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School

Hi [REDACTED]  
Many thanks for this  
Pls could you just clarify -

Regarding “ some form of safe crossing of Dencer Drive has to be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to continue their journey safely to the new School. Further there is a planning requirement that this crossing is provided”

Does this extend to a specific requirement for Leyes lane(the end dog leg bit outside our house)  
Eg if there was a safe crossing across Dencer drive and then the children could access the school via footpaths etc from this point onwards then there isn't a specific requirement for a crossing over our bit of Leyes lane

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

On Thu, 18 May 2023 at 23:55, Graham Hemmings <[grahamhemmings@warwickshire.gov.uk](mailto:grahamhemmings@warwickshire.gov.uk)> wrote:

OFFICIAL

Dear Resident,

The proposed traffic signals with a combined toucan crossing on Dencer Drive were consulted in January and February this year. A number of objections were received to these proposals and the School's design team were approached to consider making some amendments to the proposals.

I am writing to you to let you know that the revised proposals are being advertised from today, Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> May.

It has to be emphasised that some form of safe crossing of Dencer Drive has to be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to continue their journey safely to the new School. Further there is a planning requirement that this crossing is provided. Feedback from this second consultation will determine whether the original signal design or the toucan crossing alone is provided.

Please do not hesitate if you would like further information regarding these proposals. A meeting at the location of the proposed crossing will be arranged during the consultation period and you will be notified when this is arranged.

Kind Regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services

**Warwickshire County Council**

T: [Redacted]

P: Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street | Warwick | CV34 4SP

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain confidential, sensitive or personal information and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All email traffic sent to or from us may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Correspondent no. 2

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 May 2023 10:40  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School

OFFICIAL

Good morning [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email and I have noted your comments. I appreciate it is difficult to predict which route the schoolchildren will follow to get to the new School but by providing a defined route that follows the predicted desire lines then it is expected that they are more likely to use that route and the crossing provided than not. We will monitor the situation when the School opens when we will have the benefit of understanding which routes are being used and make any necessary adjustments or additional measures.

Regarding traffic speeds on Dencer Drive and Rawnsley Drive we will look at undertaking a survey and speed monitoring exercise to see if traffic patterns or driver behaviours have changed following the School opening.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services  
**Warwickshire County Council**  
**T:** [REDACTED]  
**P:** Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street | Warwick | CV34 4SP

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 May 2023 17:16  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

My name is [REDACTED] I am the neighbour at 50 Leyes Lane.

I could not agree more that some sort of safe crossing needs to be provided. What I am not so sure about, as we mentioned on our email with objections/observations is if ALL the kids will be crossing only in 1 place in Dencer Drive. There are plenty of other routes from Dencer Drive and Rawnsley Road to get to Glasshouse Lane, I counted at least 4 routes. I understand the need of a crossing in Dencer/Leyes Lane, but at the very least another crossing would be required at the end of Dencer Drive with Glasshouse lane. I do not think anyone thinks a kid walking along Glasshouse late towards the secondary school will go up Dencer Drive, to cross the road on the Toucan Crossing? that would be absolutely unrealistic... but as mentioned somewhere, I think it is proposed to not do much yet and see how the flow works out?

Something that would definitely need to be done in my opinion is that Rawnsley Road and Dencer drive is becoming a bit of a motorway, cars are going significantly faster than they should and the fact that Glasshouse lane will be limited to 20mph (I think) and bumps, more cars will divert to a faster route. Speed

bumps like currently in Leyes Lane for calming measures and use them as zebra crossing would not be an outrageous solution.

It would be good to have that meeting, I believe safer routes for kids (and adults) are required.

Best regards,

[Redacted]

On Thu, 18 May 2023 at 16:55, [Redacted] wrote:

OFFICIAL

Dear Resident,

The proposed traffic signals with a combined toucan crossing on Dencer Drive were consulted in January and February this year. A number of objections were received to these proposals and the School's design team were approached to consider making some amendments to the proposals.

I am writing to you to let you know that the revised proposals are being advertised from today, Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> May.

It has to be emphasised that some form of safe crossing of Dencer Drive has to be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to continue their journey safely to the new School. Further there is a planning requirement that this crossing is provided. Feedback from this second consultation will determine whether the original signal design or the toucan crossing alone is provided.

Please do not hesitate if you would like further information regarding these proposals. A meeting at the location of the proposed crossing will be arranged during the consultation period and you will be notified when this is arranged.

Kind Regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services

**Warwickshire County Council**

T: [Redacted]

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain confidential, sensitive or personal information and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All email traffic sent to or from us may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Correspondent no. 3

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 May 2023 23:04  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School

OFFICIAL

Hi [REDACTED]

Just to confirm that at this moment all of the no waiting (double yellow) lines have been removed as they were on the original plans to protect the traffic signals from indiscriminate parking. The toucan crossings are protected by zig-zag markings which have wider restrictions.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services

**Warwickshire County Council**

**T:** [REDACTED]

**P:** Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street | Warwick | CV34 4SP

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 May 2023 08:15  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School

Hi [REDACTED]

I am one of the residents from Leyes Lane.  
Thank you for your recent correspondence and for listening to our concerns.  
The plan that you attached to the email looks like a much more appropriate solution.  
I just wanted to confirm though, on the revised plan, have the double yellow lines been removed from Leyes lane?  
It looks like they have according to the plan, which would be fantastic, but wondered if you could clarify as previously different views of the junction haven't showed all aspects proposed.

Kindest regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

On 19 May 2023, at 09:32, [REDACTED] wrote:

OFFICIAL

Good morning [REDACTED]

Please find attached plan of the proposed toucan crossing across Dencer Drive. According to the public notice, the consultation period will end on the 12<sup>th</sup> June when all objections and representations should be received.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services

**Warwickshire County Council**

T: [REDACTED]

P: Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street | Warwick | CV34 4SP

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 18 May 2023 23:09

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your correspondence.

If you could send through a copy of the revised proposals, we would all be grateful.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding a date of a meeting as mentioned in your email.

Please could you confirm when this current consultation period ends?

Best wishes

[REDACTED]

On Thu, 18 May 2023, 16:55 [REDACTED] wrote:

OFFICIAL

Dear Resident,

The proposed traffic signals with a combined toucan crossing on Dencer Drive were consulted in January and February this year. A number of objections were received to these proposals and the School's design team were approached to consider making some amendments to the proposals.

I am writing to you to let you know that the revised proposals are being advertised from today, Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> May.

It has to be emphasised that some form of safe crossing of Dencer Drive has to be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to continue their journey safely to the new School. Further there is a planning requirement that this crossing is provided. Feedback from this second consultation will determine whether the original signal design or the toucan crossing alone is provided.

Please do not hesitate if you would like further information regarding these proposals. A meeting at the location of the proposed crossing will be arranged during the consultation period and you will be notified when this is arranged.

Kind Regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services

**Warwickshire County Council**

T [Redacted]

**P:** Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street | Warwick | CV34 4SP

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain confidential, sensitive or personal information and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All email traffic sent to or from us may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain confidential, sensitive or personal information and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All email traffic sent to or from us may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

<10848-100-192A Public Consultation Plan.pdf>



Correspondent no. 4

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 June 2023 09:12  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Dencer Drive / Leyes Lane consultation

OFFICIAL

Good morning [REDACTED]

Pedestrians and cyclists will have a controlled crossing of Dencer Drive in both options. The difference is that in the first option, full signalisation of the junction, that a controlled crossing for pedestrians is provided across Leyes Lane. This cannot be provided in the second option without full signalisation of the junction.

Unfortunately for safety reasons it is not possible to have two controlled crossings this close, therefore the whole junction has to be signalised if two crossings are to be provided. Neither option has been rejected to date and that is why we are undertaking this second consultation.

Please do get back to me if you have any more questions or need further clarification of what is being proposed.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services  
**Warwickshire County Council**  
**T:** [REDACTED]  
**P:** Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street | Warwick | CV34 4SP

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 June 2023 13:51  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Dencer Drive / Leyes Lane consultation

Hi again [REDACTED]

Just a couple of further questions so that I can understand:

- what is the difference between the crossing at Dencer Drive before and what is now proposed - it was original a traffic signal design and now a toucan - can you just explain the difference and rationale for this change? how does it differ for cyclists and pedestrians using a shared cycleway?

- on question 3, I assume this means that the original 2 crossing version is no longer on the table - i.e. the choice will be between the original Denyer Drive design and the current Denyer Drive crossing design?

Many thanks!

On Fri, 2 Jun 2023 at 15:39, [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for this information. I'm away at present so didn't join you at 3pm but may be in touch again early next week.

Best wishes

On Fri, 2 Jun 2023, 08:55 [REDACTED] wrote:

OFFICIAL - Sensitive

Good morning [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email and I will respond to the questions that you have raised as follows:

1. The main objections were that they didn't want the traffic signals outside their homes because it affected their accesses, caused queuing traffic (noise, pollution and visual intrusion quoted) and general appearance of the signal equipment.
2. Two controlled crossings were included as part of the traffic signal scheme because the initial traffic modelling suggested traffic signals would be required at this junction and to provide safe crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists. The double yellow lines were required to keep the traffic signals clear of inconsiderate parking and for safety reasons. The toucan controlled crossing on Dencer Drive will have zig-zag markings which have the same affect. Following a request from the School, the traffic modelling has been revisited and confirmed that the traffic signals were no longer required. A safety review has been undertaken on replacing the traffic signals with a single controlled crossing and no concerns were raised.
3. If objections are received to the toucan crossing on Dencer Drive then a decision will be made whether to install the original traffic signal design or the toucan crossing as a controlled crossing linking the two footpath/cyclepath is required for safety reasons.

I am meeting with local residents at 3pm this afternoon on site at the location of the proposed crossing and you are welcome to attend if you are available.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services | Environment Services

**Warwickshire County Council**

T: [REDACTED]

P: Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street | Warwick | CV34 4SP

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 June 2023 18:11  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: Dencer Drive / Leyes Lane consultation

Dear [REDACTED]

I am one of the new Town Councillors in Kenilworth and a member of the Cycling group

Alison has pointed me in your direction to ask some questions about the ongoing consultation on the changes to the scheme at Dencer Drive / Leyes Lane.

Please see message below - hope this is all self-explanatory. Happy to discuss by phone if easier. Very grateful for your help on this.

Best wishes

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 June 2023 09:55  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Dencer Drive / Leyes Lane consultation

Dear [REDACTED]

I'm one of the new elected Town councillors and have joined the cycling group. Good to e- meet you and look forward to working with you on this.

We have been looking at the ongoing consultation on the above and had a couple of questions please :

1) please can you give us a gist of the residents' objections which are mentioned in the consultation notice as having given rise to the changes from the original proposal ( i.e. the change from two crossings as originally proposed, and the removal of the crossing at the end of Leyes lane and the removal of the yellow lines).

2) please can you explain what the Highways reasons were for having the two crossings in the first place and whether / how these can be achieved with the removal of one of the crossings?

3) the consultation notice indicates that, following the consultation, WCC will decide which of the two schemes will proceed. Is that correct i.e. the original scheme is still being considered alongside the proposed altered scheme?

Many thanks in advance for this information- we are liaising with our group and the wider Town Council to formulate a response and it would really to understand the above ASAP.

Kind regards

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

Kenilworth Town Council

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain confidential, sensitive or personal information and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All email traffic sent to or from us may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain confidential, sensitive or personal information and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All email traffic sent to or from us may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Correspondent no. 5

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 15 June 2023 15:37

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School. Objections/Questions

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email from earlier this week, confirming that if we do not choose the latest option of a Toucan crossing on Dencer Drive, then the earlier option of a signalised crossing (detailed in the letter dated 24th January 2023, which we raised our objections to) - will be implemented on Leyes Lane and Dencer Drive as per the plans originally supplied.

We would like to confirm that we prefer just the Toucan crossing which was outlined in your email of 18th May, more than the signalled crossing which was outlined in the letter dated 24th January 2023.

If you need anything further, please let us know.

Thank you for your time.

[REDACTED]

On Tue, 13 Jun 2023 at 21:04, [REDACTED] wrote:

- >
- > OFFICIAL - Sensitive
- >
- > Good evening [REDACTED]
- >
- > Thank you for your email dated 10th June and again for meeting with me on the 2nd June to discuss the proposed toucan crossing and other concerns.
- >
- > As explained at our meeting the location of the toucan crossing is considered at its most optimal position where the greatest concentration of school pupils walking or cycling to the new School is likely to occur. It is appreciated that some pupils will find other routes between Rawnsley or Dencer Drive to Glasshouse Lane but these will be

much fewer in number. Also new footpaths and cyclepaths will be constructed along Glasshouse Lane from the new Vistry Homes development which will provide safe access routes for those pupils.

>

> The Council has an obligation to provide a controlled crossing at this location. Where a highway scheme is considered and approved as part of the planning process, the courts have made it clear that the highway / traffic authority is expected to co-operate in its implementation. The planning consent for the School development deemed that the junction of Dencer Drive and Leyes Lane should be signalised. Following advertising of these proposals several objections were received and that is why we are looking at installing a toucan crossing as an alternative. This would still meet the planning objectives.

>

> In your email you mentioned design standards for toucan crossings and the Section Manager for traffic signals has provided you with a link to the current guidance. I can meet with you again to go through the points you have raised as it is difficult to explain in an email but essentially the Council is satisfied with the proposed signal arrangement and that it complies with design standards.

>

> With regards to the other issues addressed in your email and during our site meeting, we will consider addressing those within the current s278 works. Like you, I am concerned with the visibility between Rawnsley Drive and Leyes Lane footpath and will ask the School design team to consider this. There will also be a safety review of the completed works and any issues will be addressed.

>

> We are currently assessing the responses we have received following advertising of the toucan crossing. I would be grateful if you could confirm your preference for either the traffic signalised junction that was advertised first or the toucan crossing. Please note that if we still have objections to both options then the signalised junction will be installed as that option is contained within the specific planning requirements.

>

> Kind Regards,

>

> [Redacted]

>

> [Redacted]

> Team Leader (S278 Major Schemes) | Engineering Design Services |

> Environment Services Warwickshire County Council

> T: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

> P: Communities Directorate | Shire Hall Post Room | Northgate Street |

> Warwick | CV34 4SP

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: [Redacted]

> Sent: 10 June 2023 09:09

> To: [Redacted]

> Cc: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

> [REDACTED]  
> [REDACTED]  
> [REDACTED]  
> [REDACTED]

> Subject: S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School. Objections/Questions

>  
> Dear [REDACTED]

>  
> Thank you for your email of 18th May regarding S278 Glasshouse Lane Kenilworth School.

>  
> We feel that this option is much more appropriate than the last proposal, however we still have concerns/objections relating to the positioning of the toucan crossing on Dencer Drive detailed in your letter of 18th May and we will outline these in our letter.

>  
> We would like to understand the reasoning around why this is the safest and the most appropriate position for a crossing on Dencer Drive - if a crossing is needed.

>  
> The crossings on Glasshouse Lane are closer to the school and looking at the various walking routes to the school, most routes go via these two crossings, so we understand the need for these. As you move further away from the school, we would guess that pupils will find the shortest and most direct route through the various walkways positioned along the full length of Rawnsley Drive and Dencer Drive, of which we think there is at least 4 (detailed on the attached map), which do not naturally go via the new proposed toucan crossing on Dencer Drive.

> Will pupils go out of their way to use the crossing?

>  
> We also feel that given the positioning of the junction on Leyes Lane  
> and Dencer Drive, adding a crossing will only add to the complications  
> of the junction. If the proposed crossing is implemented, we would  
> also like to ask how the plans proposed comply with the following  
> regulations:

>  
> Department for Transport document for the design of pedestrian crossings, document "LTN 2/95 The Design of Pedestrian Crossings".

>  
> 2 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

>  
> This section contains advice on the design of pedestrian crossings generally. Advice which is specific to one type of crossing is presented in the appropriate section.

>  
> 2.1 Proximity of Junctions

>  
> 2.1.1 Approach to a Side Road

>  
> 2.1.1.1 Crossings should be located away from conflict points at uncontrolled junctions. This will give drivers an adequate opportunity to appreciate the existence of a crossing and to brake safely. The 'safe' distance will depend on the geometry of the junction and type of side road. However, a minimum distance of 20 metres is suggested for a signalled-controlled crossing and an absolute minimum of 5 metres for a Zebra crossing. It is suggested that the distance be measured from the position of a driver waiting at the give-way line of the side road. Where it is impossible to obtain a 'safe' distance, consider banning turning movements towards the crossing or make the side road one way away from the junction.

>  
> 2.1.2 Minor Road Approach

>  
> 2.1.2.1 Crossings on a minor road should not be sited very close to a 'GIVE WAY' or 'STOP' line. Generally the nearer the crossing is to the major road the greater will be the distance to be crossed. Drivers of vehicles turning into the minor road need time to judge the situation and space in which to stop.

>

> 2.1.2.2 There should be sufficient distance between the crossing and the priority marking for at least one waiting vehicle; the optimum will depend on the volume of turning vehicles. Care should be taken to ensure that drivers do not mistake a vehicular green signal on the signal-controlled crossing as a priority signal over traffic on the major road.

>

> END

>

> At this proposed new crossing, there is such a short stopping distance coming from Leyes Lane (moving away from the direction of Windy Arbour), that we feel the location of the proposed crossing does not give sufficient time to assess the crossing and stop, and we feel that it will mean more safety issues for cars, and given the volume of traffic around the school opening and closing times, it could cause issues, which will impact on pedestrians. The same applies when driving along the shorter part of Leyes Lane, away from the new School site, and turning right onto Rawnsley Drive where the proposed Toucan Crossing would be.

>

> We also have great concern with pupils coming from Rawnsley Drive, crossing Leyes Lane to get to the proposed toucan crossing on Dencer Drive (again, as discussed with you on your visit to the site on 2nd June, where you acknowledged how bad this crossing as now become due to the width of the road, the positioning of the path and the loss of visibility down Leyes Lane due to the large hedge and the curve of the road (See attached photographs of this junction).

>

> Due to these concerns, we feel it would be more appropriate to look at the possible walking routes from other areas of Kenilworth (we have tried to highlight these on the attached map, showing how the majority of walking routes to the school go on part of either Rawnsley Drive/Dencer Drive), look at footfall and concentrate on making the area safer as a whole, rather than putting all the emphasis on one crossing which will only be used by a small percentage of pupils who are walking to school due to the other routes which will may be used.

> Would traffic calming/management along Rawnsley Drive and Dencer Drive be a more appropriate approach, along with ensuring pedestrian paths are have appropriate visibility, at all routes leading to Glasshouse Lane, from the different areas around Kenilworth, thus creating a safe environment on all routes that are most likely to be used by the pupils?

>

> Also, living by Dencer Drive and Rawnsley Drive, we see how fast some cars currently go down this road and how difficult visibility becomes when cars start parking down this road. The concern is that with the increased focus and traffic volume around the new school site but with restrictions/crossings/congestion immediately outside the school on Glasshouse Lane, more traffic will opt for driving down Dencer Drive/Rawnsley drive to avoid Glasshouse Lane. Will this mean Rawnsley Drive and Dencer Drive become a hotspot for drop offs and congestion down the length of the road where many pupils will be crossing at several points?

>

> Thank you for your time. We look forward to receiving feedback.

>

> Best wishes

>

>

>

> [Redacted signature block]



> [REDACTED] This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain confidential, sensitive or personal information and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All email traffic sent to or from us may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.