



# Technical Note

**Project:** Land North of Rounds Gardens, Rugby

**Subject:** Response to Appeal Representations - Highways

Client:	Miller Homes (previously St Modwen Homes)		
Project No:	05554	Version:	A
Document Ref:		Author:	JW
Date:	09/12/2025	Approved:	JW

## I Introduction

### I.1 Overview

1.1.1 This technical note provides a response to highways matters raised by interested parties (Core Documents (CD) 8.1 – 8.8) in relation to appeal reference APP/E3715/W/25/3373251. Those matters primarily relate to the access to the site via Princes Street and the associated one-way system which would be implemented on the roads to the east of the Site.

### I.2 Work undertaken to Date

1.2.1 The proposed one-way system has been subject to extensive discussion with the Local Highway Authority (LHA), which is detailed in the Statement of Common Ground under Issue iii) Safe and Suitable Access. Most notably:

- The impact of the development on the local highway network has been modelled using the Rugby Wide Area Model
- The individual junctions of Duke Street, Hill Street and St John Street have also been individually modelled using Junctions 10
- A cycle contraflow scheme has been implemented on parts of the one-way system at the request of the LHA
- Traffic calming has been proposed in this area at the request of the LHA
- An independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) of the one-way system was commissioned by the appellant, which has been reviewed and agreed by the LHA's road safety team.

1.2.2 It should therefore be noted that the one-way system has been subject to extensive scrutiny by the LHA, leading to the withdrawal of Reason for Refusal (RfR) 3.

**LOCATION**  
Park Point  
17 High Street  
Longbridge  
B31 2UQ  
UK

**TELEPHONE** 0121 475 0234  
**EMAIL** birmingham@pja.co.uk

**WEBSITE** pja.co.uk

### 1.3 Traffic Regulation Order

- 1.3.1 It should further be noted that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be required to implement the one-way system, separately to the planning process. The TRO will be subject to a separate public consultation period.

## 2 Response to Matters Raised

### 2.1 Cycle Lanes

- 2.1.1 The responses raise concerns of vehicle conflict with contraflow cycle lanes. This is accepted practice in a lightly trafficked, low speed environment. LTN 1/20 notes:

An assessment should be undertaken to review whether cyclists can be safely exempted from turning bans, No Entry and one way restrictions and be permitted access to vehicle restricted areas either at all times or within peak hours.

Permitting contraflow cycling in one way streets and using point-closures to close certain streets to motor vehicle through traffic will generally provide a more direct route for cyclists and should always be considered. On quiet low speed streets, there may be no need for a cycle lane (see Figure 7.4 and Section 6.4), enabling cyclists to use narrow streets in both directions. Where there is good visibility cyclists and on-coming drivers should be able to negotiate passage safely. Contraflow cycling should be signed in accordance with the advice in the Traffic Signs Manual.

Where speed is low in urban areas, contraflow cycling without a dedicated cycle lane has been found to be successful even on narrow streets with on-street car parking. The following minimum carriageway widths are recommended:

- 2.6m with no car parking
- 3.9m based on car passing cycle, no car parking 4.6m with car parking on one side of the road
- 6.6m with car parking on both sides of the road

LTN 1/20 CD xx Para 7.3.3 – 7.3.5

- 2.1.2 The proposed contraflow system has been designed in accordance with the above guidance.

Commented [JW1]: CD ref needed

## **2.2 Vehicle Tracking and Service Vehicle Access**

- 2.2.1 Concern has been raised as to the size of the 'large car' used in the swept path analysis software. As shown in the vehicle profile on the drawings, the car has a length of 5.079 and width of 1.872m. By comparison a standard wheelbase Range Rover has a length of 5.052m and width of 1.704m.
- 2.2.2 The existing parking bay positions and vehicle routeing for a refuse vehicle is maintained, as per the current routeing, which will allow such vehicles to navigate the streets.
- 2.2.3 Whilst concerns relating to vehicles passing each other are noted, the one-way system will remove occasions where cars must pass each other, often with a need to reverse. A one-way system is a common approach to dealing with traffic flows on residential streets. Examples of this can be seen locally at junctions off Edward Street, adjacent to the site (George Street, Rowland Street and Victoria Avenue).

## **2.3 Highway Capacity**

- 2.3.1 Concerns are raised relating to highway capacity at the junctions of St John Street, Hill Street and Duke Street with Newbold Road. These have been modelled in Junctions 10 software and delays found not to substantially increase compared to the reference case (without development) scenario.

## **2.4 Requests to Change One-Way System**

- 2.4.1 It has been requested that the one-way system changes so that vehicles exit southbound from Dale Street onto Oliver Street, making it easier for residents to access A426 Newbold Road at via the roundabout with Oliver Street.
- 2.4.2 The road widths, corner radii and on-street parking meant it was impossible to 'prove' with vehicle tracking software that refuse vehicles are able to navigate the existing streets. Instead the approach was to allow refuse vehicles to maintain their existing routes as advised by the LHA on behalf of the Rugby Borough Council (RBC) which is responsible for waste collection.
- 2.4.3 The Appellant would have no objection to an alternative route, if it was acceptable to the LHA.
- 2.4.4 If this appeal is allowed, then the one-way system will be subject to S278 detailed design, a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit, and a Traffic Regulation Order process. If the LHA and RBC supported this arrangement, then an alternative route could be implemented.



- 2.4.5 If this were not permissible, then the one-way scheme presented with this appeal is considered to be appropriate.

## **2.5 Parking**

- 2.5.1 Concerns were raised relating to the loss of parking on Princes Street. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment [CD 1.24 Para 4.5.8 – 4.5.13].
- 2.5.2 The existing parking capacity was surveyed overnight, and whilst parking would be displaced from the northern end of Princes Street, there would be capacity on surrounding streets to accommodate this.
- 2.5.3 The LHA has not objected to the loss of parking.