

From: Admin Admin <admin@coalvillepublicradio.com>
Sent: 22 February 2026 23:59:04 UTC+00:00
To: "PF - Planning" <planningapplications@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>; "Chris Brown" <Chris.Brown2@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Cc: "Claire Harris" <Claire.Harris@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>; "Ozzy O'Shea" <Ozzy.O'Shea@leics.gov.uk>
Subject: 25/00676/OUT – Land South of Jacqueline Road, Field Head
Categories: Yasmin

Dear Planer,

I write further to my previous representations regarding the above application and specifically in relation to the BACTEC Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Risk Assessments submitted in Appendix E of both the 2016 application (15/00889/OUT) and the current 2025 submission.

The UXO assessments in both cases were prepared by the same specialist consultancy and adopt a desk-based methodology based upon historic bomb census data.

It is important to note that the 2016 report did not state that the site was clear of UXO. Rather, it acknowledged potential wartime risk and recommended precautionary mitigation during intrusive ground works. This confirms that the site was not considered free from abnormal ground constraints at the time of the 2016 refusal.

The 2025 BACTEC report adopts a similar approach and again does not declare the site clear of UXO, instead recommending managed risk procedures.

As you are aware, I have submitted Ministry of Defence bomb census mapping showing three recorded bomb strikes within the vicinity of the site, together with a contemporaneous local newspaper photograph evidencing a crater and damage to nearby properties following a WWII explosion.

Given that this evidence has now been placed before the Local Planning Authority, I respectfully request clarification as to:

- Whether the applicant's consultant has formally reviewed the submitted MOD bomb mapping;
- Whether the recorded strike locations fall within or immediately adjacent to the application boundary;
- Whether the current UXO risk categorisation remains robust in light of this additional historic evidence;
- Whether further intrusive investigation or enhanced mitigation should be secured prior to determination.

As this is a new application, it is important that the authority is satisfied that the technical baseline is accurate and complete. If recorded strikes are present within or immediately adjacent to the site boundary, the abnormal ground constraint profile may be more significant than reflected in the desk-based assessment.

The presence of UXO risk was acknowledged in 2016 and remains acknowledged in 2025. However, where additional official mapping and photographic evidence have been submitted, it would be prudent to ensure that the consultant's conclusions fully reflect all available historic data before the application proceeds further.

I would therefore be grateful for confirmation that the submitted evidence has been taken into account and, if necessary, referred back to BACTEC for formal review and response.

Kind regards,