



## National Highways Planning Response (NHPR 25-01) Formal Recommendation to an Application for Planning Permission

From: Kamaljit Khokhar (Head of Planning & Development)  
Operations Directorate  
Midlands Region  
National Highways  
[PlanningM@nationalhighways.co.uk](mailto:PlanningM@nationalhighways.co.uk)

To: Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (FAO Ashleigh Gade)  
[planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk](mailto:planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk)

CC: [transportplanning@dft.gov.uk](mailto:transportplanning@dft.gov.uk)  
[spatialplanning@nationalhighways.co.uk](mailto:spatialplanning@nationalhighways.co.uk)

**Council's Reference:** 25/01213/OUT

**Location:** Land South of Sacheverell Way, Groby, Leicestershire

**Proposal:** Outline planning application for a residential development of up to 180 dwellings, alongside associated access via two junctions from Sacheverell Way, green and blue infrastructure (including drainage, landscaping and public open space), ancillary infrastructure, and enabling ground remodelling (all matters reserved except access)

**National Highways Ref:** NH/26/14553

Referring to the consultation on a planning application dated 14 January 2026 referenced above, in the vicinity of the A46 Trunk Road that forms part of the Strategic Road Network, notice is hereby given that National Highways' formal recommendation is as follows:

- ~~a) offer no objection (see reasons at Annex A);~~
- ~~b) recommend that conditions should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted (see Annex A – National Highways recommended Planning Conditions & reasons);~~
- c) recommend that planning permission not be granted for a specified period (see reasons at Annex A);
- ~~d) recommend that the application be refused (see reasons at Annex A)~~

Highways Act 1980 Section 175B is not relevant to this application.<sup>1</sup>

This represents National Highways' formal recommendation and is copied to the Department for Transport as per the terms of our Licence.

Should the Local Planning Authority propose not to determine the application in accordance with this recommendation they are required to consult the Secretary of State for Transport, as set out in the [Town and Country Planning \(Development Affecting Trunk Roads\) Direction 2018](#), via [transportplanning@dft.gov.uk](mailto:transportplanning@dft.gov.uk) and may not determine the application until the consultation process is complete.

The Local Planning Authority must also copy any consultation under the 2018 Direction to [PlanningM@nationalhighways.co.uk](mailto:PlanningM@nationalhighways.co.uk).

This response and all comments outlined herein are made in respect of planning matters only in National Highways' position as a statutory planning consultee, and does not confer any proprietary rights nor amount to the giving or refusal of consent, assent, approval, or awareness of or by National Highways in or of any other aspects or matters (including, but not limited to, the use of property belonging to National Highways). If anyone wishes for National Highways to consider any aspects which do not relate to planning submissions, they should call our contact centre on 0300 123 5000.

**Signature:** *THewitt*

**Date:** 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2026

**Name:** Thomas Hewitt

**Position:** Assistant Spatial Planner

**National Highways**

Three Snow Hill, Snow Hill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA

---

<sup>1</sup> Where relevant, further information will be provided within Annex A.

## **Annex A National Highways' assessment of the proposed development**

National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

### **Deferral**

It is recommended that the application should not be determined for a period of 3 months from the date of this notification to allow the applicant sufficient time to provide additional information.

### **Reasons**

National Highways key interest is the A46/A50 junction, which forms the nearest connection to the SRN and is located approximately 1.5km northeast of the proposed site. The proposed site also shares a boundary with the A46 northbound carriageway.

National Highways has been engaging with the applicant in ongoing pre-application discussions since March 2025 to agree on the scope of traffic-related matters, including, but not limited to, trip rates, trip generation, and PRTM modelling methodology.

As part of the planning application submission, a deferral letter was first issued on 4 February 2026, to allow the applicant sufficient time to provide additional information on matters, including but not limited to traffic, boundary, and drainage aspects of the application.

Since then, the applicant has provided additional information to address these outstanding matters, and our comments are provided below.

### **Standalone Junction Assessment**

To address our comments regarding the LinSig model audit of the A46/A50/Leicester Road signalled roundabout junction, we have reviewed the following documents, submitted via email dated 13 February 2026:

- A46-A50 Rbt Existing + Calibration.lsg3x
- A46-A50 Arcady Coefficients.j11
- 14555 Groby CTC Data - To Issue.xlsx

Following this review, we have the following comments:

### Signal Data

Whilst we understand that the applicant has received the LinSig model from Leicestershire County Council (LCC), please supply the Controller Specification documents so that we can confirm the model corresponds with the existing signal operation. Please supply us with the LinSig model received from LCC so that we can fully understand the changes made.

### Model Structure

Please review the cruise times used on all connectors to ensure they accurately represent the time it takes vehicles to get from node to node. For example, the cruise time from Arm 6 (eastern circulatory) to Arm 13 (circulatory adjacent to A46 South approach) is zero seconds which is not realistic, as Arms 11 and 14 will not be seeing the platoon of vehicles from Arm 6 at the correct duration after Arm 6 turns green.

Also, the combined cruise time from Arm 6 (eastern circulatory) to Arm 2 (western circulatory) is 18 seconds, whilst the cruise time from Arm 8 (A50 East) to Arm 2 is 24 seconds and the cruise time from Arm 11 (Leicester Road) to Arm 2 is 28 seconds. The Leicester Road approach is closer to the western circulatory than the other two arms, but has the longer cruise time. Comparing these three values, these input values do not appear correct.

The cruise time from Arm 11 (Leicester Road) to Arm 13 Lane 1 has been entered as 18 seconds, whereas the connector to Arm 13 Lane 2 has been entered as 10 seconds. This difference in cruise times may affect the routing of traffic between Zones C and E. Vehicles are unlikely to use the nearside lane (lane 1) due to the journey time penalty compared to using lane 2. This lane usage may affect how vehicles on the A46 sliproad enter the roundabout.

Therefore, please update the model by determining accurate cruise times by entering suitable mean cruise speeds and custom lane lengths on each connector.

Please supply us with a CAD drawing of the junction so that we can check measurements for lane lengths and the JUNCTIONS 11 give way entry parameters. It would be helpful if this CAD file showed the measurements used in the base model builds.

As per LinSig modelling best practice, please ensure that all non-signalised lanes have an Unconstrained Infinite Saturation Flow. Saturation flows place a capacity constraint on lanes and when lanes are not signalised, this constraint does not exist. Such constraints could also affect the vehicle routing.

As the Leicester Road (Arm 11) and A46 South (Arm 14) approaches have different destinations on each lane of both approaches, we would like to see these approaches modelled with two lanes at the roundabout entry. From the queue data obtained for

each lane, we would like to understand how queues are split across each lane of both approaches. When entering the Slope and Intercept values into LinSig, please note that JUNCTIONS 11 calculates them for the approach, whilst in LinSig they need to be entered per lane. Please also make sure the effect the flares have on these give way parameters is understood. It may not be suitable to equally divide the give way parameters across each lane when flares are present.

On Arm 14 (A46 South), the Clear Conflict values have been reduced to zero (from the default value of 2 seconds) on two of the three movements. Please explain why these values have been adjusted.

Please ensure Queue de-sliver threshold values are only used when the queue graph for that respective lane shows a sliver queue in any of the modelled scenarios. The LinSig User Guide states they should not be used to hide a genuine queue and the threshold value entered should be as small as necessary to remove the sliver queue.

### Traffic Flows

The supplied traffic survey data only shows the total number of vehicles for each time period and these will have been converted into Passenger Car Unit (PCU) for input in the LinSig models. Please confirm the PCU factors which have been used and the classifications used by the survey company. To help us understand how the traffic flows for all modelled scenarios have been developed, please provide traffic flow analysis spreadsheet.

Please show how peak hours have been determined. We wish to see the junction assessed in the peak hours with the highest traffic flows. 08:00 to 09:00 and 17:00 to 18:00 have been modelled, but our analysis of the traffic survey data shows that highway peaks are 07:30 to 08:30 and 16:30 to 17:30. The analysis shows that the total roundabout PM Peak flows are 7% higher than those modelled.

### Observed Queue Length Data

We note that queue data has been recorded in vehicles, so these values will need to be converted into PCUs so that they can be compared to the LinSig model output data. As HGV percentages can vary from approach to approach, we recommend that a PCU conversion factor be determined for each approach; please ensure assumptions in any calculations are provided.

Queue data shows that queues on three of the lanes exceeded the recorded queue length in both peaks. The applicant will therefore need to adjust these maximum values to accurately reflect the observed queuing to produce an accurately validated base model. As excess queuing on will potentially affect the operation of the SRN, our main area of concern is that the queues observed on the two A46 sliproads, specifically the northern sliproad (Arm 5), be accurately replicated.

On the A46 North approach (Arm 5), the queue data shows the observed queues on Lane 2 are lower than on Lane 3. To help with base model validation, it may be more appropriate to model the flare on lane 2, rather than lane 3.

### Base Model Validation

Please can supply a model validation table, for each peak hour, comparing the observed and modelled queue lengths on a lane-by-lane basis. Please provide a narrative explaining how well the model validates across each approach. When recording the modelled queue lengths on flared lanes, we recommend that the respective “storage graph for short lane” be referred to. When looking to achieve the validity of the model that is required, please determine the suitability of all the input parameters such as signal timings and saturation flows.

The model currently does not show good validation on the A46 North slip road in both peaks. Please note that traffic surveys only record vehicles that get through the stopline. They will not record vehicles that fail to get through the stopline in periods of high demand. In these situations, it may be necessary to add back in this latent demand to ensure the model accurately represents the observed queues.

As observed queues appear to be exceeding the area that it was possible to record on some arms, it may have been more suitable to validate off Degree of Saturation surveys, rather than queue surveys. However, as only queue length data was collected, we shall support as best as possible to achieve validation of the model on the information available.

### General Comments

Please ensure any relevant guidance is noted from Local Transport Note 1/09 – Signal Controlled Roundabouts.

Once we are content with the base model validation, we will then move on to understand the impact of the development in the future year tests.

### Important Note

These comments do not imply a pre-determined view on the acceptability of the proposed development in traffic, environmental or highway terms. They specifically address matters related to National Highways’ responsibilities to manage and maintain the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England, in line with DfT’s Circular 01/2022, to support the sustainable delivery of growth. Comments on the Local Road Network should be sought from the Local Highway Authority.

### **Standing advice to the local planning authority**

The Climate Change Committee's [2022 Report to Parliament](#) notes that for the UK to achieve net zero carbon status by 2050, action is needed to support a modal shift away from car travel. The NPPF supports this position, with paragraphs 77 and 110 prescribing that significant development should offer a genuine choice of transport modes, while paragraphs 109 and 115 advise that appropriate opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport should be taken up as part of a vision-led approach.

Moreover, the carbon reduction hierarchy (avoid-switch-improve) as set out in clause 4.3 of PAS2080:2023 promotes approaches and measures to minimise resource consumption and thereby reduce carbon emissions.

These considerations should be weighed alongside any relevant Local Plan policies to ensure that planning decisions are in line with the necessary transition to net zero carbon.