



25/01192/FUL HINCKLEY, NUTTS LANE

Planning Statement Addendum

- 1.1 This Planning Statement Addendum Note responds to comments made pursuant to the development proposals at Nutts Lane, Hinckley, LE10 0NT (“the Site”) submitted via application 25/01192/FUL for the erection of an industrial / logistics unit within flexible B2 / B8 Use Class (General Industrial / Storage and Distribution) with associated landscaping, yard, parking, access and other supporting infrastructure (“the Proposed development”), and provides clarification regarding concerns the proposal will result in the loss of a sports playing field.
- 1.2 This Note demonstrates a clear and tested position has been established through a recent appeal decision issued on the 13th March 2026 (ref. APP/E3715/W/25/3373251) at Land North of Rounds Garden, Rugby, CV21 2BS. Whilst the appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on design grounds, it established some key positions on the loss of sports land.
- 1.3 The decision draws a clear distinction between the development plan policies seeking to safeguard sports land and the requirements of Paragraph 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework (‘NPPF’), which focuses on safeguarding existing provision. Specifically, Paragraph 104 of the NPPF states:

“Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing field and formal play spaces, should not be built on unless:
 - a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; and*
 - b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or*
 - c) the development is for alternative sports and recreation provision and the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.”*
- 1.4 As part of the appeal decision, it was established the NPPF takes precedence over conflicting local policies (as per paragraph 232) and importantly concluded the sport facilities had not been in use for 23 years which alone draws the conclusion that the facilities could not “exist”. The Inspector concluded the sports facilities do not in practical reality exist and accordingly there would not be an unacceptable loss of sports facilities in the Frameworks terms.
- 1.5 This appeal is important to take into consideration in the context of application 25/01192/FUL which is currently pending consideration. The Site has been vacant and unused for sporting purposes for over a decade and the Site does not exhibit the characteristics of an active or maintained playing field. The Site’s condition and context do not indicate land currently fulfilling a sporting function and does not suggest any realistic prospect of reinstating such use. There is therefore no “existing” sports provision to be lost.



Note continued

- 1.6 This position has already been acknowledged by the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council in its consideration of planning application ref. 23/00368/FUL, where it was concluded that the Site was unlikely to return to sports use and that no meaningful loss of usable playing field would arise.
- 1.7 Based on the evidence provided, it is clear the Site has been subject to long-term disuse which no longer performs as a sporting function and cannot reasonably be defined as an “existing” playing field and the recent appeal decision against Rugby Borough Council establishes a clear and defensible position. When considered alongside the Council’s previous assessment of the Site as part of application 23/00368/FUL, it is evident that the Proposed Development would not result in the loss of an active or protected sporting field and the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any former use.