

Planning Application Assessment Report

Application details

Summary of proposal	Outline planning application (with all four matters reserved apart from access) for a phased mixed-use development comprising about 470 dwellings (Use Class C3) or, in the alternative, about 450 dwellings and care home/extra care facility (Use Class C2/C3). Provision of a community hub (Use Class F2); 1FE primary school (Use Class F1); and associated operations and infrastructure including but not limited to site re-profiling works, sustainable urban drainage system, public open space, landscaping, habitat creation, internal roads/routes, and upgrades to the public highway.
Application type	Outline planning permission
Site address	BURROUGHS ROAD RECREATION GROUND, BURROUGHS ROAD, RATBY, LE6 0XZ
Local planning authority	Hinckley and Bosworth
Local highway authority	Leicestershire
Local authority reference (if available)	24/00914/OUT
ATE reference (if available)	ATE/24/01346/OUT
Completed by (User and Organisation)	HL
Date	2024-11-29

Assessment report

Criterion	Rating	Appraiser Comments	Relevant Policy & Guidance
1. Trip generation and assignment	Concern	Trips are only considered in the peak times for vehicles and using 2011 census data an assumed modal split, again only for peak times. It is important to consider all day trips to ensure a more accurate picture of all likely trips and not just peak times. Only 11% likely with this base data to be by active modes and only 8% by public transport is not aspirational. It is disappointing that vehicle trips are forecast only for the primary school, when walking, wheeling and cycling to school should be the default option for those new residents living close to this amenity. No traffic impact is presented for active modes and access points proposed.	Leicestershire County Council - Cycling and Walking Strategy - Policies 2-5 inclusive Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy - Vision - The Environment - reduce the reliance on car travel

2. Active travel route audit	Concern	<p>Local pedestrian and cycling routes are only identified in application documents by their location, with no assessment provided on whether these are safe, direct, convenient and accessible for people of all abilities (paragraph 82 of the National Design Guide) or coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive (core design principles in LTN 1/20). New access points are not assessed to ascertain whether traffic volumes mean shared used infrastructure is appropriate, continuous, meets desire lines and meets the other principles of LTN 1/20, Whilst there would be a new primary school on site the application has not demonstrated how local secondary schools and colleges will be accessed by active travel modes. There is a secondary academy available in the region on 2km from the site, this may be a route that can be cycled by those studying and employed there. Qualitative analysis to inform any necessary improvements to the design and accessibility of key routes does not include maps, photographs and comments nor has regard to the following guidance, tools and plans in the assessment of key routes: Inclusive Mobility (Chapters 3, 4, 6, 7 and 15; and Sections 5.2, 5.7, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4 and 9.7 as appropriate) PAS 6463: Design for the Mind (Sections 5.2.1, 5.2.3, 6.4, 7.6.2, 7.6.3, 7.7 and 11.12) LTN 1/20: Cycle Infrastructure Design (including Appendix A: Cycling Level of Service Tool; and Appendix B: Junction Assessment Tool) the government's Walking Route Audit Tool, and any adopted or emerging Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs)</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council - Cycling and Walking Strategy - Policies 2-5 inclusive Hinkley and Bosworth Core Strategy - Vision - The Environment - reduce the reliance on car travel Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3</p>
3. Pedestrian access to local amenities	Concern	<p>The proposal expands an established town with a range of facilities. The proposal will include a relocated primary school and community hub building, along with an improved play area. All other amenities will require trips off site. Whilst the distances for walking and cycling in the TA and Travel Plan are feasible, ATE consider the manual for streets threshold of 800m the better distance threshold where regular walking to all amenities is very likely. The table 1 in the Travel Plan lists amenities by approximate walking distances, over half are beyond this 800m distance. It is not known how these distances have been measured, whether this has been from the site edge, centre or furthest point away from the access point. ATE would always recommend the distance is measured from the furthest house, to ensure the distance works for everyone. Given there are few on site facilities, to support more walking trips, and given there are several adjoining developments adding to the scale of this one, is there not a case for more on site facilities such as a daily needs shop to prevent car trips into the narrow high street.</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council - Cycling and Walking Strategy - Policies 2-5 inclusive Hinkley and Bosworth Core Strategy - Vision - The Environment - reduce the reliance on car travel Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3</p>
4. Cycling accessibility	Concern	<p>Whilst LTN 1/20 and 2020's Gear Change are referred to within the opening policy section of the TA, there is no analysis within the assessment to understand if there is infrastructure outside the site can comply with the design and technical standards recommended. As stated access to all amenities and facilities locally including employment and education should be assessed. This will include routes to higher order settlements, including Leicester, the edge of which is close by at 4km to the south east.</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council - Cycling and Walking Strategy - Policies 2-5 inclusive Hinkley and Bosworth Core Strategy - Vision</p>

- The Environment - reduce the reliance on car travel
Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3

5. Access to public transport	Concern	<p>All existing nodes are beyond the 400m/5mins walking time threshold. No quality information is provided but from streetview all but one (The Bulls head PH) appear to have a flag but no shelter or timetable/real time information. Roads are in places narrow without wide footways and raised kerbs. Some natural surveillance is possible but none have benches. The illustrative plan includes a recreation route to the pub, which may also help access to this bus stop, streetview indicates a change in levels which if not planned effectively may exclude wheelers. It is not described whether footpaths/ways to public transport nodes do not conform to the National Design Guide standards of being safe, direct, convenient and accessible for people of all abilities, which includes but is not limited to routes that: - have a minimum width of 2m, with limited pinch points no less than 1.5m - are step-free - have a smooth, even surface - have seating at regular intervals are uncluttered - have good natural surveillance and clear lines of sight - have street lighting - have wayfinding, and - have crossing points suitable for the speed and traffic flow of the road(s). It may be possible to secure improved routing towards nodes within the red line boundary and a condition or design code should refer to the above standards. There is no plans at this stay to support bus access to the development. This is a key omission and requires further consideration to help make modal shift happen. The TA and travel plan only indicate very limited services which are insufficient to support use for typical working hours at a higher order settlement. A contribution to increasing services and local nodes should be pursued.</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council - Cycling and Walking Strategy - Policies 2-5 inclusive Hinkley and Bosworth Core Strategy - Vision - The Environment - reduce the reliance on car travel Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3</p>
6. Off-site transport infrastructure	Concern	<p>Please note that shared use routes for pedestrians and cyclists are proposed and these have not been shown to do meet the limited situations listed in paragraph 6.5.6 of LTN 1/20. Where shared use routes are acceptable, their widths are below 3m (<300 cyclists per hour) or below 4.5m elsewhere, contrary to LTN 1/20 Table 6-3. LTN 1/20 promotes segregated design to avoid conflicts between modes in the majority of circumstances. The Desford lane access includes shared infrastructure with cycle off shoot the east of the access point. No onward additional infrastructure is proposed to help routing to key amenities within Ratby or beyond. Routing into the site requires use of a proposed toucan crossing to the west of the access beyond the direct desire line. It also appears to require a further uncontrolled crossing of a further side road. It is likely active travellers will use on road or attempt to cross the Desford road further east closer to Main street, which is narrower with narrow footways. This will not support wheelers, the less able and children/pushchairs and buggies well. Routes are less direct than travelling by car, breaking one of the principles of LTN 1/20. Crossing points on the bell mouth of junctions put pedestrians and wheelers in the road for longer and should not be used. It appears this access will be shared with Pear</p>	<p>As quoted above</p>

Tree business park, a small employment site. There appears to be many parked cars on this access on Streetview images which could jeopardise the shared use infrastructure. A method of parking control maybe required to prevent pavement parking. Will national speed limit sign be moved beyond the site entrance? No designs are apparent in the TA to show any improvements to Burroughs lane, despite this being narrow and sloping with no footways and only limited lighting. Does the gradient meet the requirements of Inclusive Mobility (2022) to be able to support access by wheelers? There could be conflict between modes and users of the pub car park, how will this be managed or signage used to support active modes. It seems a shame the turning head has taken priority in the designs so far tabled. Similarly the spine road intersection with Burroughs road offers very little for active travellers and does nothing to help prioritise their movements either along Burroughs lane, several woodland areas and open space plus paintball centre lie beyond the site to the west along with part of the National Cycle Network. Crossing the site south/north on the spine road, where the wide radii junction proposed promotes vehicles rather than other modes given the size of the bell mouth. Other connections to the north into consented or under construction schemes have 2m wide footways which are welcome, and one instance of a change in surface material. But there is no provision off road for cyclists and no detailed plans are provided to demonstrate connection into shared use infrastructure approved to the north under 20/00462/FUL, as shown in figure 7 of the framework travel plan. As there is no detailed quality assessment of off site provision there is no insight to understand whether further off site quality improvements need to be made. Once this research has been carried ATE would welcome a discussion to understand whether further off site infrastructure is required. There are tools to accompany LTN 1/20 such as the Cycling Level of Service Tool and the JAT. Walking Route Audit tool and Inclusive Mobility are also important considerations.

7. Site permeability	Condition / Obligation to make acceptable	Plans are illustrative only, however there is a network of established PRoWs and 'recreational paths', which could help form the basis for a heirachy of active travel corridors and access points if designed and improved to support wheelers and pushchairs with appropriate surfaces, widths and lighting where they match desire lines. The development of such a network should form a planning condition either in its own right or as part of a design code condition. Please note; 1. the development must provide or safeguard pedestrian and cycling connections to neighbouring sites including future phases of development 2. routes for pedestrians and cyclists are at least as direct – and preferably more direct – than the equivalent by car 3. routes must be fully accessible or do not have adjacent accessible alternatives (e.g. ramps alongside steps or bound paths next to unbound paths) 4. appropriate or infrequent crossings must be proposed (see Inclusive Mobility Sections 4.10-4.11, PAS 6463 Section 7.6.2, LTN 1/20 Table 10-2, Manual for Streets Section 6.3 and Manual for Steets 2 Section 9.3) 5.pedestrians and cyclists are not prioritised at side road crossing points (see LTN 1/20 Figure 10.13) priority junctions have radii that interrupts the pedestrian desire line (see Manual for Streets Sections 6.3-6.4 and Manual for Streets 2 Section 9.4) 6. Avoid red/zero scores when applying the Junction Assessment Tool in LTN 1/20 7. signalised	As above
----------------------	---	--	----------

junctions must have pedestrian aspects on some arms where cyclists would mix with motor vehicles, 8. lane widths are between 3.2m and 3.9m (paragraph 7.2.5 of LTN 1/20 identifies that such widths allow motor vehicles to drive alongside a cyclist without a safety margin for their comfort and protection) 9. there are unsafe transitions for cyclists when moving between cycleways on and off the carriageway, or cycleways within commercial sites are not continuous through to cycle parking areas 10. shared use routes for pedestrians and cyclists are proposed and these are only acceptable where the limited situations listed in paragraph 6.5.6 of LTN 1/20 can be met. Where shared use routes are acceptable, their widths are below 3m (<300 cyclists per hour) or below 4.5m elsewhere, contrary to LTN 1/20 Table 6-3.

8. Placemaking	Condition / Obligation to make acceptable	The design and access statement has some images and themes within it which offer a positive response to this criterion, with regards to the Building for a Healthy Life framework. ATE would support making active frontages and a mixed materials approach to street design to help establish the road hierarchy. It is welcome that the interface with Burroughs lane is included in an image on page 53, however this is at odds with the motor vehicle dominated design shown on the transport assessment. This could be a central heart to the development, a meeting point by the public art or a village square, and is in need of place creation. ATE strongly feel street design should help make active modes the first choice with design cues to support this. Shade and benches and a network of play and open spaces and public art could help support those less able and small families to use active modes as their first choice. Spaces should feel safe and secure for all to make this an any time mode. Routes must avoid blind-spots', sharp turns or high-sided boundary treatments. The development must provide continuous and legible routes and be supported by an effective wayfinding strategy. The residential or local streets encourage traffic movements through the site and be designed for a 20mph speed limit (see Manual for Streets Section 7.4 for guidance on achieving appropriate traffic speeds). There are no new on site facilities proposed beyond a relocated school, community hub and additional play areas. Amenities beyond the site will fall outside the 800m threshold for many, which will encourages private car use. Consideration should be given as to whether additional on site facilities are required given the cumulative impact of this residential scheme alongside its consented neighbours. The aim should be for the development establish a strong sense of place, with well-designed streets, public spaces that feel safe and key amenities provided. As the plans are illustrative only, the development of such should form a planning condition either in its own right or as part of a design code condition. A conditioned overarching parameters plan may help consider the networks of places and hierarchies in more detail, and we would encourage the development of such a plan.	As above
9. Cycle parking and trip-end facilities	Condition / Obligation to make acceptable	Plans are illustrative only, the implementation of the travel plan objectives to provide for cycling must form a planning condition either in its own right or as part of a design code condition. The standard of cycle parking must meet the locally adopted cycle parking standard or those within LTN 1/20 that proposes 1 space per bedroom for dwellings and short stay visitors at care homes of 0.05 space per bedroom and	As above

matched for long stay. Education uses are recommended to have separate parking for students and teachers, and to be based on travel plan mode share targets, but with a minimum of 1 space per 20 staff and 1 per 10 students. For assembly halls, 1 space per 50 sqm. Parking must be well located have shelter for short stay and enclosure for long stay and have security, good natural surveillance or CCTV. It must have lighting and provide for all abilities. LTN 1/20 recommends 5% of spaces support cargo and adapted cycles and tricycles. Sheds in gardens are very vulnerable to theft, parking should be within garages or located within the built footprint, via an externally accessible store, such as under stairs cupboard. Space for the storage of tools and cycling equipment is also important. Showers and drying areas are vital to support the modal shift of employees on site within the care home. The details proposed within the travel plan must be reflected in further reiterations of the application.

10. Travel planning	Condition / Obligation to make acceptable	A framework travel plan is included. It is high level and does not meet the full requirements of the para 117 of the NPPF (2024). It is disappointing that no clear direction at this stage is presented for mode shift and the Government's target that by 2030 50% of all journeys in towns and cities should be by active modes. The aims are woolly and do not sufficiently hold the development to account and should not be based on simply raising awareness of sustainable travel. Targets are only based on decreasing private car use and there is no obvious target for the care home. Green travel vouchers can be useful but as highlighted above local bus services are very limited and without further investment cannot support employment well. Cycle training and purchase scheme should be explored also. Different targets and interventions will be likely required for the different uses on site. The travel plan does not provide sufficient detail on the active travel and public transport infrastructure to be provided or improved (both on and off-site) or how its use will be embedded by initiatives and incentives to be secured through planning conditions and obligations, or there are no details of effective and influential actions to be taken if targets are not met, with the intention for these to be secured and monitored (if triggered) through planning conditions and obligations. It may be possible to use a planning obligation or condition to ensure the submission of a comprehensive travel plan before or at the time of reserved matters. ATE can recommend model condition wording. There must be a strong relationship between the reserved matters scheme(s) layout and design and the travel plan commitments as meeting modal shift targets begins at the front door.	As above.
---------------------	---	---	-----------

OGL

All content is available under the [Open Government Licence v3.0](https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/) (<https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/>), except where otherwise stated

[ht \(<https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/re-using-public-sector-information/uk-government-licensing-framework>](https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/re-using-public-sector-information/uk-government-licensing-framework)