

Your ref: R25/0565

My ref: 250565



Head of Planning & Culture
RUGBY BOROUGH COUNCIL
Town Hall
Rugby
CV21 2RR

Communities

Shire Hall
Warwick
CV34 4RL

Tel: (01926) 412907

highwayconsultation@warwickshire.gov.uk

www.warwickshire.gov.uk

FAO: Lucy Davison

13th February 2026

PROPOSAL: Outline application with some matters reserved for the demolition of all buildings and the residential development of up to 160 dwellings, and creation of associated vehicular access off Rugby Road, pedestrian/cycle access points, parking, landscaping, drainage features, open space, childrens play area and associated infrastructure (all matters reserved except for vehicular access off Rugby Road).

LOCATION: Land South East Of, Rugby Road, Clifton Upon Dunsmore

Warwickshire County Council, hereby known as the 'Highway Authority', has undertaken a full assessment, of the planning application, at the request of Rugby Borough Council in its capacity at the Local Planning Authority.

Insufficient information has been submitted to allow the Highway Authority to fully assess the proposals, specifically in relation to the off-site impacts and proposed mitigation.

The current proposed mitigation of the shuttle working has not been supported with a stage 1 Road Safety Audit. It is therefore unclear whether this proposal would be acceptable in principle in regard to road safety. A Stage 1 RSA is therefore considered necessary to ensure the proposed mitigation is safe/suitable.

The applicant has submitted traffic modelling and a TA addendum which interprets those results. This has been reviewed by WCCs Transport Planning team who have noted that a number of development impacts shown by the modelling have not been interpreted/assessed in the TA Addendum. WCCs Modelling protocol advice note sets out different thresholds for off-site impacts of:

Queueing Criteria:

63. The following queue comparison criteria is suggested for consideration when assessing queues:
- **Moderate Increase** (an increase in queue lengths of between 5 and 10 vehicles)
 - **Significant Increase** (an increase in queue lengths of between 10 and 20 vehicles)
 - **Very Significant Increase** (an increase in queue length of over 20 vehicles)

Journey Time Criteria

64. The following journey time comparison criteria is suggested for consideration when assessing journey time impacts along key routes. The following criteria also assumed that the starting journey time for the comparative route exceeds 60 seconds:
- **No Significant Change** - A difference in journey times of up to +5% falls within this category.
 - **Moderate Increase** - An increase in journey times of more than 5% but less than 10%.
 - **Significant Increase** – An increase in journey times of more than 10% but less than 20%.
 - **Very Significant Increase** – An increase in journey times, when compared to the Reference Case, of more than 20%.

Upon reviewing the model outputs the following areas have been identified and are not included within the TAA:

(a) Average Maximum Queues

(i) Weekday AM period (07:00-10:00)

Junction 17 Arm D Bilton Road - **Significant Increase**

Junction 37 Arm A Leicester Road (N) - **Significant Increase**

Junction 37 Arm D Brownsover Road - **Moderate Increase**

Junction 47 Arm C Mill Road - **Significant Increase**

Junction 82 Arm B Boughton Road (S) - **Significant Increase**

(ii) Weekday PM period (16:00-19:00)

Junction 39 Arm D A426 - **Moderate Increase**

Junction 47 Arm B Butlers Leap - **Significant Increase**

(b) Average Journey Times

(i) Weekday AM period (07:00-10:00)

R4 S1 NB - **Significant Increase**

(ii) Weekday PM period (16:00-19:00)

R6 S4 WB - **Significant Increase**

R13 S1 EB - **Significant Increase**

Given the above impacts the Highway Authority therefore required Confidence Interval Analysis to gain a better understanding of the impacts reported above. Without this information it is not currently possible to determine whether these impacts would be classified as severe, as this will be dependent on their extent and duration. The CIA would provide this detail to determine the need for any mitigation at these locations.

It would also be helpful for explanation why there is such a large decrease in average journey times on R8 S5 EB during the AM peak hour (08:00-09:00) and AM post-peak hour (09:00-10:00).

We would also recommend checking with National Highways whether they would require any further analysis at R16 S2 SB (A5 southbound approach to A5/A426 Gibbet Hill roundabout)

General comments:

These comments are not necessarily reasons for objection rather are recommendations/comments that are considered would be an improvement to the site if it were approved.

The site comes close to Houlton Way in the southwestern corner and a connection being made to Houlton Way would be a large benefit to potential future pedestrians/cyclists being able to access the Houlton Area, including Houlton School. The original TA states that this connection would require 3rd party land however the extent of which has not been clarified. It is noted that the parameters plan, location plan etc are not accurate as Houlton Way is not shown, it is therefore not possible to determine whether the

connection is possible or not, or if 3rd party land is required to what extent it is. This route would also allow an emergency access to be provided.

Whilst the shuttle signals are shown to operate modelling wise it is considered that alternate options could be explored to avoid the need for signals which are costly to install and for the Highway Authority to maintain. Signals also have various environmental impacts such as energy consumption etc. Forward visibility to the bridge appears to be good and so a priority give-way arrangement may be achievable rather than signals and this should be explored.

At the shuttle signals other detail will be required such as Advanced Stop Lines for cyclists as well as a maintenance bay, these would however be detailed design points.

Given the on-street cycling reliance and to provide a more attractive environment for pedestrians it is recommended that a scheme for traffic calming could be explored on Rugby Road. A speed survey would be required to determine what extent of measures would be required to achieve a reduction however satnav data the Highway Authority holds suggests average speeds of low to mid 20s and a suitable calming scheme could therefore be relatively simple to implement.

Based on the appraisal of the development proposals and the supporting information in the planning application the Highway Authority submits a response of **OBJECTION**.

Yours sincerely

Chris Lancett

Chris Lancett
Planning & Environment