



Planning Statement Addendum

Land West of Ratby

Burroughs Road Recreation Ground Burroughs Road
Ratby Leicester Leicestershire LE6 0XZ

Lagan Homes

May 2026

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Local and National Policy Update.....	4
	Local Policy	4
	National Policy	4
	Housing Land Supply.....	6
3.	Technical Matters and Material Considerations	7
	Principle of Development.....	7
	Highways	7
	Flood Risk and Drainage	10
	Air Quality	11
	Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain.....	11
	Trees and Forestry.....	12
	Heritage	12
	Viability, Affordable Housing and Contributions	13
4.	Conclusion on Planning Balance	14
5.	List of Plans to be Approved.....	16

Document Control

Project Name: Land West of Ratby
Matter Code: 2000738.3.
Report Title: Planning Statement Addendum
Author: Sarah Marsh MRTPI

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Marrons submitted application reference 24/00914/OUT to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC) on 30th September 2024, on behalf of Lagan Homes.
- 1.2. Given the length of time that has passed since submission documents were drafted, at this juncture in May 2026 it is considered appropriate and worthwhile to produce a short addendum to the submitted Planning Statement. The purpose of this document is firstly, to provide an update, where necessary, following changes to national and local planning policy since the time of submission. Secondly, to outline the position in relation to the technical matters and material considerations, following a process of consultation and amendment. Following this review, a conclusion is drawn, bringing together the planning balance, based on the current status of each area. Finally, included at Chapter 5 is a list of the documents which in the Applicant's consideration should be listed on the Decision Notice should the application be approved.
- 1.3. The amended description, as agreed with officers, formally amended and included in later consultations, is:

Outline planning application (with all matters reserved apart from access) for a phased mixed-use development comprising about 470 dwellings (Use Class C3) and provision of 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

2. Local and National Policy Update

Local Policy

- 2.1. At the time of submission, the statutory development plan for HBBC comprised the Core Strategy DPD (adopted December 2009) and the Site Allocations & Development Management Policies DPD (adopted July 2016).
- 2.2. As noted within the submitted Planning Statement, HBBC has been engaged in a Local Plan Review for several years. At the time of submission in September 2024, the authority was mid-way through a Regulation 18 consultation. A further Regulation 18 consultation then took place between 17th October 2025 and 28th November 2025. The purpose of this consultation was to add several additional draft allocations to meet the increased housing target that arose following updated to national policy (discussed below).
- 2.3. According to the Local Development Scheme (published March 2025), consultation on a draft plan (Regulation 19) was intended to occur in January/February 2026. This has not yet happened. HBBC's website is now indicating the consultation will take place in Summer 2026. It is therefore assumed that the proposed submission target of September 2026 will not be met, with submission potentially being at the end of 2026.
- 2.4. In terms of weight to be accorded to the draft plan, having regard to Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the draft plan is considered to be at a fairly advanced stage, with one final consultation phase envisaged before submission. The draft plan is also considered to be closely aligned to the policies in the Framework, as it has been drafted following the introduction of the most recent version. However, as the final consultation is yet to occur, and the plan has not yet been submitted for examination, it is considered that only limited weight can be attached to its policies.
- 2.5. That said, it should be noted that the draft plan represents the most up-to-date evidence base which should be used to inform decision making, and is based upon up-to-date housing requirement and supply information.

National Policy

- 2.6. At the time of submission of the application in September 2024, the version of the NPPF which was 'in force' was the December 2023 version. At the time, a consultation was underway for a new version.

2.7. On 12th December 2024 a new version of the NPPF was published and immediately came into force. Key changes to the NPPF, which are considered pertinent to the consideration of this application, include the following (text which has been removed is ~~stuck-through~~, new text is underlined):

- Amendment to Paragraph 11d(i), which now reads: the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a ~~clear~~ strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- Addition to Paragraph 11d(ii), which now reads: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination
- Removal of the ‘four-year rule’ of Paragraph 226, which had been included in the December 2023 version.
- At Paragraph 78, an amendment to the requirement of LPAs in relation to housing land supply, which shall be measured against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old. The supply is also subject to a 5% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, a 20% buffer where there has been significant under-delivery over the previous three years, and 20% which will be applied to authorities (from July 2026) who adopted a plan under a previous version of the NPPF and have an adopted housing requirement which meets less than 80% of their local housing need as defined by the standard method.
- At Paragraph 101, it is noted that “Significant weight should be placed on the importance of new, expanded or upgraded public service infrastructure when considering proposals for development.”

2.8. It should also be noted that a further revision to the NPPF is anticipated in Spring/Summer 2026. At the time of writing this Addendum in May 2026 it has been described as ‘imminent’. The draft text of the revised framework, as consulted upon in 2025, would show a much-changed NPPF, as opposed to the recent series of revisions which have retained the same structure. The draft would split the Framework into two broad parts, the Plan-making Policies, and the National Development Management Policies. At this stage however, it is not known how closely the published version will follow the consultation draft, and as such it would not

be appropriate to give weight to the policies within the draft. However, it is not considered that there is anything within the draft which would materially alter the consideration of this application such that a different conclusion would ultimately be drawn.

Housing Land Supply

- 2.9. At the time of submission, HBBC's housing land supply position had been published within a Statement covering 1st April 2023 to 31st March 2028, giving a supply of 5.6 years.
- 2.10. This position was updated to reflect the position from 1st April 2024 to 31st March 2029, which found a supply of 5.26 years.
- 2.11. However, this pre-dates the introduction of the revised NPPF in December 2024 and therefore is not an up-to-date figure.
- 2.12. As part of APP/K2420/W/24/3357570 at the Oddfellows Arms, 25 Main Street, Higham on the Hill the Council provided an indicative housing land supply figure via an Interim Five-Year Housing Land Supply Statement (2024 and 2025). When applying the standard method figure and the 5% buffer to the Council's requirement of land for housing, the Policy Team confirmed that, as of 29 July 2024, the Local Planning Authority could demonstrate a 3.89-year supply of land for housing.
- 2.13. As far as the Applicant is aware, this figure remains the Council's most recent published position at the time of writing.

3. Technical Matters and Material Considerations

Principle of Development

- 3.1. Given the acknowledged shortfall in housing land supply, and the significant age of the adopted Development Plan, HBBC has acknowledged that the ‘tilted balance’ at Paragraph 11d of the NPPF is engaged.
- 3.2. This means that planning permission should be granted unless:
- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance⁷ provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
 - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination⁹.*
- 3.3. Footnote 7, as referenced above, states: *The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 194) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 75); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.*
- 3.4. None of the above ‘Footnote 7 Constraints’ are considered to be engaged in this instance.
- 3.5. In light of the above, the ‘tilted’ balance of Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged and the provision of up to 470 dwellings to the Borough’s supply of land for housing is considered to attract **significant weight** within the planning balance.

Highways

- 3.6. Since the submission of the application, several consultation responses have been received from LCC Highways as Local Highways Authority, as well as from National Highways (NH) and Active Travel England (ATE).
- 3.7. This has resulted in the production and submission of a series of response notes, all of which have been published on the LPA’s website and available to the public.

- 3.8. This section aims to summarise the position in terms of each of these consultees.

LCC Highways

- 3.9. In their response of 19th December 2025, LCC Highways advised that:

“The Local Highway Authority advice is that, in its view, the impacts of the development on highway safety would not be unacceptable, and when considered cumulatively with other developments, the impacts on the road network would not be severe. Based on the information provided, the development therefore does not conflict with paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), subject to the conditions and/or planning obligations outlined in this report.”

- 3.10. In their response, the proposed access drawings are considered and are found to be acceptable.
- 3.11. Additionally, the officers confirmed their satisfaction with the supplied Personal Injury Collision data, concluding that in their view the proposed development will not exacerbate an existing highway safety situation.
- 3.12. Officers have reviewed the modelling which has been undertaken in respect of key local junctions and agree with the conclusion that there are two junctions where mitigation will be required, those being at Desford Lane and Groby Road/Sacheverell Way. The modes of mitigation proposed are accepted subject to further information to be provided by condition and/or during detailed design stage.
- 3.13. A series of conditions have been recommended, to which the Applicant has no objection, as well as requests for financial and infrastructure contributions, which are likewise acceptable, including for the provision of bus stops within the development.

National Highways

- 3.14. Following an initial objection, and detailed correspondence between the Applicant’s consultant team and NH, response was received from NH on 27th November 2025, stating:

Leicester Road/Sacheverell Way Roundabout Model

Model Geometry

- *Based on our review, National Highways is content that the modelled geometry is now in line with real world conditions.*

Model Validation

- *Thank you for providing the model validation for our review. National Highways has noted that the slope and intercepts have been manually adjusted. The junction 11 user guide states that these should not be adjusted by more than 20%. However, as the adjustments have reduced capacity equally across all scenarios, we are content that this is robust. Additionally, National Highways is content the model validates correctly in the base year.*

Lane Simulation

- *Thank you for providing a lane simulation version of the model. We are content that the model has been set up correctly.*

A46/ Groby Road/ Markfield Road Roundabout Model

Traffic Flows

- *National Highways is now content that the flows contained within the model match those presented.*

Traffic Impact

National Highways are content with the information provided and therefore have no further queries. Overall, we believe that this development is unlikely to severely impact the safety or operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

You will see that I have cc'd the planning case officer Alex Jelley into this email, I will also be issuing a formal 'No Objection' planning response to reflect this.

- 3.15. While this formal 'No Objection' response is yet to be received (or at least, is yet to be published), the email correspondence as pasted above is considered sufficient to confirm that NH are satisfied with the proposals.

Active Travel England

- 3.16. As a statutory consultee, Active Travel England have provided comments on the application. In their first comments of 29th November 2024, comments addressed several areas, including trip generation, existing provision audit, pedestrian and cycle accessibility, access to public transport and off-site transport infrastructure.
- 3.17. Since then, there have been several rounds of additional consultation, where the Applicant has sought to address ATE's comments but they have continued to be dissatisfied. This has included a meeting between ATE and the Applicant's transport consultant Pell Frischmann.

- 3.18. Most recently, the Applicant provided a response note dated 23rd April 2026, authored by Pell Frischmann. ATE's response to this was provided on 13th May 2026.
- 3.19. Therein, ATE describe that their comments throughout have focussed on two key issues:
1. *Whether the proposed development would enable future residents to conveniently and safely access local facilities and public transport nodes, through direct, coherent and legible walking/wheeling and cycling routes; In particular with regard to off-site connections to education, employment and Ratby Main Street via Burroughs road*
 2. *The effectiveness of the proposed travel plan measures in reducing reliance on the private car and promoting sustainable and active modes of travel for future residents, in delivering a vision led approach to transport planning and a high aspiration to modal shift through the transport assessment and travel plan.*
- 3.20. In making the point above, ATE have explained that as 'access' is a matter being considered under this outline application (and not as a reserved matter), they feel this should include access for cyclists and pedestrians, as well as vehicles. In order to respond to ATE's previous comments the Applicant had produced an arrangement plan showing how Burroughs Road would function as an active travel corridor.
- 3.21. In regard to their matter #2 above, ATE consider that subject to a condition requiring submission of a full travel plan at the appropriate time, that this concern would be addressed, leaving only matter #1 remaining outstanding.
- 3.22. The matters remaining appear to be focussed on how active travel routes, in particular the active travel corridor of Burroughs Road, would be integrated both into the development layout, and out of the development onto the wider network. The Applicant finds that whilst indeed 'access' is under consideration as part of this application, layout and design are not, so there is ample opportunity at reserved matters to provide appropriate details of those matters. Furthermore, should officers wish to attach a condition to the outline permission requiring the submission of, for example, an Active Travel Scheme, or inclusion of particular details, they would be able to do so. Subject to appropriate wording of such a condition, the Applicant would not object.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 3.23. The application was supported by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Report.

- 3.24. On 8th October 2024 the Environment Agency confirmed they had no fluvial flood risk concerns given the Site's location in Flood Zone 1, and that as there were no other environmental constraints falling within their remit, they had no formal comment to make.
- 3.25. LCC Drainage sought some further detail in their first consultation response in October 2024. This was provided and a further consultation undertaken. In their response on 19th February 2025, LCC Drainage confirmed they consider the proposals to be acceptable, and recommended a series of conditions.
- 3.26. HBBC Drainage responded on 23rd October 2024 to the effect that they had no objection subject to conditions pertaining to provision of additional drainage details prior to the commencement of development.
- 3.27. The Applicant has no objection to the recommended conditions.

Air Quality

- 3.28. In their response of 3rd February 2026, the consultee from HBBC Environmental Services responded following the submission of an Air Quality Assessment to support the application.
- 3.29. Their response notes that the measures identified within the report should be incorporated into the Construction Environmental Management Plan which is to be provided under an appropriately worded condition. This follows an earlier response on 7th October 2024 where 'no objection' was given as the response subject to receipt of the AQA report, and the recommendation of conditions in relation to noise, ventilation and light, which the Applicant has no objection to.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

- 3.30. Following an initial consultation, the LCC Ecology officer requested some additional information to enable them to be satisfied with the proposals. This was duly provided and on 12th February 2026 a response of 'no objection subject to conditions' was given. These conditions require submission of a 30-year Habitat Monitoring and Management Plan (HMMP), and a Construction Environment Management Plan for biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity). The Applicant has no objection to these conditions.
- 3.31. Natural England were also consulted and raised no objection to the proposals, though recommended at a GI Strategy is required at Reserved Matters Stage.

Trees and Forestry

- 3.32. The Forestry Commission were consulted on the application, and in their response of 22nd October 2024 confirmed that there are no Ancient Woodlands or ancient/veteran trees on Site. While the Site contains a 2ha plantation woodland, and is adjacent to a woodland, these would be retained. The majority of trees within the Site would also be retained and the plans include significant additional planting. They advised that in their role they do not give support or objection, simply advising on potential impacts. However, no negative impacts were raised.
- 3.33. The National Forest Company (NFC) were also consulted as the Site lies within the National Forest area and as such Policy 21 requires that significant National Forest planting be included within the scheme. Their initial consultation response on 6th November 2024 identified concern that the proposed planting did not comply with requirements. Subsequently, a series of amendments and clarifications were made, with further consultation to NF.
- 3.34. In their response of 20th January 2026, NF reviewed this additional information, including the 'Technical Note: National Forest, Green Infrastructure' and accompanying plans. They note that the plans respond positively to their earlier comments, and recommend a series of conditions, including that the National Forest Compliance Plan Rev P06 is cited as an approved plan. The Applicant has no objection to the recommended conditions.
- 3.35. Following this, the application is considered to meet the requirements of Policy 21 adequately.

Heritage

- 3.36. The Site does not contain any designated heritage assets but is close to the Ratby Conservation Area. The Site also lies within an area of archaeological interest.
- 3.37. Historic England, in their response of 23rd October 2024, declined to comment on the application.
- 3.38. In their first response 30th October 2024, LCC Archaeology sought additional information including geo-physical survey, pre-determination fieldwalking, topographic survey, and trial trenching. These details were provided, alongside a Ridge and Furrow Assessment, following correspondence with the Archaeology officer and a programme of trenching.
- 3.39. In their response of 23rd February 2026, LCC Archaeology confirmed they had no objections subject to suitable conditions, to include further trial trenching prior to commencement, which the Applicant is content to agree to.
- 3.40. No comments have been received with regards to built heritage or the conservation area, and as such it is considered that no concerns are raised and no harm is caused.

Viability, Affordable Housing and Contributions

- 3.41. Throughout this application there have been ongoing discussions on the viability of the Site. This has included the Applicant providing a detailed Viability Appraisal of the development, with the LPA's external advisor Aspinall Verdi thoroughly reviewing this. Following a period of correspondence and meetings, both parties are agreed on the basis upon which the Viability Appraisal should proceed, and the primary financial 'inputs' into the calculations, including Benchmark Land Value, build costs, and ancillary costs/fees.
- 3.42. The current position at the time of writing is that the Applicant has provided a revised Viability Appraisal, outlining three scenarios, including the proposed/most preferable scenario which in the Applicant's view represents the most optimal and realistic outcome, balancing the need for the development to be financially viable with the need to provide suitable infrastructure to meet the needs of the development, and some amount of affordable housing.
- 3.43. A significant factor affecting the viability of the scheme is that the scheme is to provide a 1-form-entry primary school (210 places), for which estimated cost is £9.1million. Owing to the numbers of pupils to be 'generated' by the proposed development (136 pupils) the financial contribution required as a direct result of the development is £5,893,332.88. This means that the full cost of the school is not met. When contributions from other development in the locality is combined with this development, there is still a shortfall of some £2,187,909 which does not have any readily available means to be met by other planned development.
- 3.44. As such, the Applicant has proposed that the land for building the school within the Site is gifted to the LEA, and that they would also be willing and able to provide the £2,187,909 to make up the funding shortfall.
- 3.45. However, doing so would compromise the ability to provide a high proportion of affordable housing on Site, with this being limited to 5%.
- 3.46. The proposal would provide a total of £10million financial contributions (to include the school shortfall), 5% affordable housing, and the gift of land for the school. This is based on the Applicant accepting a reduced profit, but would still be viable on that basis.

4. Conclusion on Planning Balance

- 4.1. As noted in the preceding chapters, HBBC have acknowledged that the ‘tilted balance’ as set out in Paragraph 11d of the NPPF due to the shortfall in housing land supply and the age of the Development Plan.
- 4.2. There are no ‘Footnote 7 Constraints’ relevant to this Site which would provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed.
- 4.3. Therefore, the development should be approved without delay unless there are any adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- 4.4. The Applicant’s view of the benefits of the development is provided below, alongside the weight they should be afforded in the planning balance.
- Provision of up to 470 new homes, in a Borough with a significant shortfall in deliverable supply compared to housing requirements; **significant weight**
 - Provision of 5% affordable housing, equating to 23 homes, to contribute towards affordable need in the Borough; **moderate weight**
 - Gift of land for construction of 1FE Primary School; **significant weight**
 - Provision of additional £2.1million towards construction of Primary School, in addition to the £5.8million which is required due to pupil generation, to enable the school to be delivered and without reliance upon other development which might not come forward; **significant weight**
 - Total s106 contribution package of £10million, including the £7.9million for primary education as noted above, plus contributions towards other infrastructure including healthcare, highways, public transport, waste, libraries and open space; **significant weight**
 - Provision of a LEAP and a NEAP within the development; **moderate weight**
 - Provision of considerable amenity green space for use by new and existing residents, comprising 2.5ha in total; **moderate weight**
 - Considerable natural and semi-natural green space, comprising 5.34ha; **moderate weight**
 - Biodiversity Net Gain comfortably in excess of 10%; **moderate weight**

- Economic benefits including through the generation of jobs during construction and operational phases, as well as through Council Tax receipts; **moderate weight**

4.5. Likewise, a summary of any adverse impacts which may result from the development is provided below.

- The proposed development would conflict with the adopted development plan. In a plan-led system, this would inevitably accrue some harm. However, given the datedness of these strategic policies, such a conflict is inevitable if housing needs are to be met and based on the number of planning permissions that have been granted on this basis, both by the local planning authority itself and by Planning Inspectors at appeal, it is not a novel proposition that unallocated land needs to be brought forward now. In addition, whilst it is only at its formative stages, the emerging LPR sets out a clear direction travel, with the Site included as part of the LPR's strategy for delivering growth. Therefore, only **limited weight** is accorded to the conflict with the strategic policies of the Development Plan.
- Introduction of built development where there is currently fields would inevitably give rise to some landscape harm, however, as evidenced within the application this is considered to be localised, and able to be mitigated, such that the harm should be given no more than **moderate weight**.

4.6. As is evident from the lists above, there are significant benefits to granting planning permission, and by contrast very few adverse impacts. Those impacts which are present do not consider to amount to such significance that the benefits are outweighed.

4.7. Accordingly, in the view of the Applicant, outline planning permission should be granted without delay.

5. List of Plans to be Approved

5.1. Should officers be minded to recommend approval of this application, the following lists specifies the plans, provided through the course of the application, which the Applicant would wish to see listed on the decision notice as ‘approved plans’, which development should accord with:

- National Forest Compliance Plan (FPCR) 10783-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0020 P03
- Public Open Space Typologies Compliance Plan (FPCR) 10783-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0021 P03
- Illustrative Framework Plan (FPCR) 10783-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-007 P14
- Stopping Up of Burroughs Road (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00015 P02
- Burroughs Road Internal Access (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00002 P03
- Desford Lane Site Access Drawing (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-000021 P01
- Site Access Drawing (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00008 P02
- Phase 2 - Site Access Drawing (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00009 P01
- Desford Lane Junction Improvements (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00010 P01
- Groby Road/Sacheverell Way Junction Improvements (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00012 P01
- Proposed Turning Head with Associated Tracking (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00007 P01
- Burroughs Road Arrangement (Pell Frischmann) 109003-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00016 P01
- Site Location Plan (FPCR) 10783-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0015 P02



