

Public Document Pack

Bill Cullen MBA (ISM), BA(Hons) MRTPI
Chief Executive



**Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council**

Date: 08 April 2026

To: Members of the Planning Committee

Cllr MJ Crooks (Chair)	Cllr C Gibbens
Cllr J Moore (Vice-Chair)	Cllr SM Gibbens
Cllr CM Allen	Cllr CE Green
Cllr RG Allen	Cllr KWP Lynch
Cllr SL Bray	Cllr LJ Mullaney
Cllr MA Cook	Cllr H Smith
Cllr DS Cope	Cllr BR Walker
Cllr REH Flemming	Cllr R Webber-Jones
	(1 vacancy)

Copy to all other Members of the Council

(other recipients for information)

Dear Councillor,

Please see overleaf a Supplementary Agenda for the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** on **TUESDAY, 7 APRIL 2026** at **6.30 pm**.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R Owen'.

Rebecca Owen
Democratic Services Manager

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

7. 25/01125/FUL - FIELD MAPLE HOUSE, 34 LINDRIDGE LANE, DESFORD

Application for erection of four detached residential dwellings with associated garaging on land to the rear of 34 Lindridge Lane, Desford.

Late items received after preparation of agenda:

Condition 16 is to be amended to account for the materials details which have been submitted during the course of the application.

Condition 16:

16. The materials to be used in on the external elevations of the dwellings and hard landscaped surfaces hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the list of Materials and Finishes on the approved Site Layout- Drawing No. 25.330.01 A.

Reason: *To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM1, DM4 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016).*

9. 25/00676/OUT - LAND SOUTH OF JACQUELINE ROAD, FIELD HEAD

Outline application for the erection of up to 135 dwellings, amenity space, areas for outdoor play, landscaping and all associated infrastructure (all matters reserved except access).

Late items received after preparation of agenda:

Introduction:

Since the publication of the committee report there are a number of items that require updates being provided the committee. They are listed in turn below

Consultations:

Ecology Matters

At the point the committee report was published, the County Ecologist was considering information provided by the applicant in respect of their holding objection in respect of the possibility of the site being used by Great Crested Newts (GCN). The Ecologist is now satisfied that they have sufficient information to assess the likely impacts of the development on GCN

Overall, the County Ecologist has confirmed that sufficient ecological information has been provided to support the determination of the application.

The Ecologist has recommended that the mitigation measures recommended in

the Ecological Impact Assessment (CSA Environmental, May 2025) should be detailed in a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for Biodiversity and which should be secured by condition and implemented in full. This should include protective buffer zones for retained hedgerows and woodland, control of lighting during construction to avoid unnecessary illuminance of boundary features important for foraging and commuting bats, a detailed badger mitigation strategy which is informed by updated survey information may include the requirement for a licence to be obtained prior to any works within proximity to active setts, and avoidance measures for Great Crested Newt during construction which will also support a mitigation licence application.

They have requested that a copy of the Natural England Mitigation Licence for Great Crested Newt should also be secured by a separate condition of any consent and that any new lighting proposed be part of a sensitive lighting strategy for bats in line with Guidance Note GN08/23 (Institute of Lighting Professionals). This would be secured by condition to ensure that the long term disturbance to foraging and commuting routes for bats is minimised.

They have confirmed that a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan can be secured by condition to ensure the mandatory net gain are achieved along with a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) to manage all significant on site enhancements.

The maintenance and monitoring of significant on-site enhancements should be secured via planning obligation for a period of up to 30 years from the completion of development. This will be required to be submitted concurrent with the discharge of the biodiversity gain condition. This can be secured by draft heads of terms at application stage, to be finalised as part of the biodiversity gain condition. Alternatively, the management and monitoring of significant on-site enhancements could be secured as a condition of any consent.

The securing of the CEMP and HMMP have been covered by conditions 19 and 20 set out in the committee report. The additional conditions to cover the lighting strategy, biodiversity and the GCN mitigation license are set out in the recommendation section below.

Environmental Health

Since the publication of the committee report HBBC's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has provided a response to the Phase 2 Site Investigation that was provided by the Applicant in response to earlier comments and queries regarding the possible presence of asbestos on the site.

The EHO now raises no objection to the development subject to conditions. These conditions include conditions 12 and 15 of the published committee report with the addition of a preceding section to condition 12. An additional informative is also suggested in the recommendations section below.

Planning Obligations

Playing Pitch Contributions

Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports contributions are required for improvements to playing pitches and changing room facilities within the North East and Leicester Analysis Area as identified in the HBBC Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy (2025) as outlined below:

	Capital Cost for Improvements (£):	Lifecycle Costs (£) (for 10 year period):	Changing Room Improvement Costs (£)
Adult Football	N/A	N/A	£22,737
Youth Football	£25, 546	£51, 600	£40,483
Mini Soccer	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rugby Union	£8,700	£16, 090	£13,844
Cricket	£12, 357	£22,740	£9,559
3G Pitch	£23, 605	£6940	£8,114
Total:	£69, 209	£77, 970	£94, 737

The contributions outlined above would be included in a S106 Agreement if members are minded to grant permission.

On/Off site Space Contributions

Based on the updated Public Open Space Calculator the following provision for the different typologies of open space are sought:

Typology		Allotments	Amenity Green Space	Equipped Play Provision	
Provision Contribution	Hectares (ha)	0.1134	0.432	0.081	LEAP
	Square Metres (sqm)	1134	4320	810	
On-Site or Off-Site?		Off	On	On	
Contribution Cost (£)	Hectares (ha)	£8,402.94	£28,771.20	£121,953.60	
	Square Metres (sqm)	£8,402.94	£28,771.20	£121,953.60	
Maintenance Contribution	Hectares (ha)	£317.52	£5,745.60	£6,471.90	
	Square Metres (sqm)	£317.52	£5,745.60	£6,471.90	

Natural & Semi-Natural	Parks & Gardens	Provision for Young People	
			Equivalent type
0.648	0.1161	0.0945	MUGA
6480	1161	945	
On	Off	On	
£34,538.40	£30,104.73	£107,021.25	
£34,538.40	£30,104.73	£107,021.25	
£6,156.00	£1,648.62	£5,036.85	
£6,156.00	£1,648.62	£5,036.85	

As noted on the table, the Allotment and Parks & Gardens Contribution would be sought through an off-site contribution to Markfield Road and Ratby Road Allotments and Stamford Memorial Park respectively. A MUGA is anticipated to be provided on site and provision will be made for this in the first instance.

Due to the application being prepared in line with the previous Open Space requirements, there is a shortfall in some of the typologies of open space/facilities to be provided. For example a 0.049 hectare leap is indicated on the illustrative land use plan whereas, under the new standards, a 0.081 hectare area is required. Similarly 0.432 hectares of amenity greenspace is required compared to 0.26 proposed. 0.91 hectares (an overprovision) of natural and semi natural space is proposed against the 0.648 hectares required. As the application in outline form this can be remedied at reserved matters stage and where shortfall cannot be provided on site, off site contributions would be sought as an alternative. This can be worked into a legal agreement to cover both eventualities if permission is granted.

Position on Police Force Planning Obligations

It should be recorded that an additional representation has been received from Leicestershire Police objecting to Officer's approach to requested contributions, as set out in paragraph 8.115 of the published committee report. They have referenced and raised concerns with a number of applications where HBBC has not sought the planning obligations that have been requested by the police force. As noted in the letter from the Police Force, HBBC are currently obtaining further legal advice on this matter, to ensure the approach taken in paragraph 8.115 remains lawful. Until such a time that updated legal advice is received, Officers advise, it would not be reasonable to defer decision making in respect of this planning application particularly in the light of the consistent approach of the Council to date.

Late Objections:-

Late objections have been received by 2 interested parties. The areas of concern can be summarised as follows:

- Concern regarding transport modelling
- Concern regarding land ownership within site boundary
- Road accidents not considered in PIC data

A late or supplementary objection has also been received from Groby Parish Council and their areas of concerns can be summarised as follows:

- Concern regarding land ownership within site boundary
- Impact Commemorative Oak Tree
- Highway Safety Concerns
- Increased traffic
- Impact on walking routes
- Increased pressure on local infrastructure

With regards to site ownership and deliverability, the Applicant has served notice on parties with an interest in the land and this is evident from the application form. The Council would not seek to verify land ownership as part of the determination of the planning application, although this would form part of the process of devising the legal agreement. If third party land is included in the development site it would present a civil matter to be resolved outside of the remit of planning legislation.

There is no reason why the Commemorative Oak Tree should not be retained as part of the development. This can be worked into the Reserved Matters considerations if permission is granted.

The Parish raise concerns about the need for a weight restriction in the vicinity of the access. The precise details of road surfaces and or road signage would be the subject of a s278 Highways Agreement and would be the subject of legislation that is separate to planning.

New and/or replacement walking routes will be considered as part of a Reserved Matters submission. All indications in the details provided at outline stage is that there will be improvements to the walking/recreational environment.

Increased pressure on infrastructure is considered in the Planning Obligations section of the committee report.

Due to concerns raised regarding the transport modelling/highway safety issues raised by interested parties, the LHA has provided the following additional explanatory notes:

Personal Injury Collisions

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) currently hold Personal Injury Collision data up until early February 2026.

The LHA can only review PIC information which has been submitted by the police once investigation of any incident is complete. Whilst incidents may have occurred since this time, the LHA are not in a position to request any PIC data from the police, whom will provide this in their own time. It should be noted that whilst additional incidents may have occurred in the area, the police only provide data on incidents where slight, serious or fatal injuries occurred, not damage only claims. The LHA cannot advise whether reported incidents resulted in injury or not or, whether any report will be received from the police.

After reviewing the latest data, there are no recorded PIC's at the junction of Ratby Lane/ Launde Road/ Ratby Lane junction. Since the LHA's observations were issued on 1st September 2025, the following additional PIC's have been recorded in the area:

- A PIC on the Leicester bound carriageway of the A50 on the approach to the Field Head roundabout involving a rear end shunt. This was recorded as slight in severity.
- A PIC on London Road involving a vehicle and a number of parked vehicles in August 2025. This occurred approximately 160m west of the Hopwood Drive junction with London Road and was recorded as slight in severity.

The LHA advise that it has requested a contribution towards improvements at the Field Head roundabout and that the additional PIC on London Road appears to be an isolated incident and would not indicate a wider trend of PIC's along the road. On this basis it would be considered unreasonable to request the applicant re-assesses PIC data for the surrounding area.

Highways Modelling

Following the Local Highway Authority's (LHA) original request for the applicant to undertake trip distribution using the Pan Regional Transport Model (PRTM), the applicant subsequently provided the LHA with the PRTM trip distribution modelling, along with the area of influence. The use of PRTM is highlighted in the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide and considered more robust assessment for developments of this size and is an independent tool for the Local Planning Authority / applicant / LHA. The applicant highlighted that there was an anomaly in that PRTM did not route traffic along Ratby Lane, whilst the 2011 Census data analysis did route traffic along this route. The LHA considered this and accepted that Ratby Lane could be used to access the site as opposed to traffic routing along the A50 and accessing via the Field Head roundabout, Launde Road and Ratby Lane. The LHA considers it would have been unreasonable to require the applicant to amend the PRTM modelling given the following points:

- The findings of the Census data analysis;
- The census data analysis routing would likely reduce the number of vehicles travelling through the Field Head Roundabout;
- The LHA had previously advised the development was acceptable as in connection with previous application reference 15/00889/OUT for 140 dwellings; and
- An improvement scheme has been identified at the Field Head Roundabout to which the applicant could contribute.

The LHA advise that turning counts for future junction modelling scenarios should be based on future growth from PRTM and recent turning counts using an iterative 'furnessing' process, not TEMPro factors. However, the LHA is willing to accept the methodology in these site-specific circumstances because the highway impacts of development in this location have been identified before and received planning permission. Furthermore, the LHA has the Coalville Transport Strategy which identified the junctions in the vicinity of the proposed development, which are approaching or over capacity in the future.

The Employment Hub (application 25/00931/FUL) was submitted to the Local Planning Authority after the Jacqueline Road proposals, with the LHA being formally consulted by the LPA on 14th October 2025. The development is also not a committed development, the LHA can only consider developments that have been determined by the LPA and are committed development in the modelling.

The LHA have further clarified their position in respect of use of Census data use within traffic modelling. They have confirmed that whilst 2021 data would have been available at the time of the modelling exercise, the LHA accept that the 2011 data is more likely to provide a more robust approach given the 2021 census was undertaken during a pandemic which may have adversely impacted travel patterns. The 2011 data is considered a more robust baseline to follow on this occasion.

The LHA has also addressed specific detailed concerns raised by an interested party which are listed and addressed in turn below:

Resident's Comment 1:

'1) The LHA's position shifts in a way that's internally inconsistent

A. "PRTM required" → later "TA assignment is robust" despite PRTM anomalies

- In R1, the LHA says Census-based trip distribution is not accepted and that PRTM is necessary.*
- In R2, after receiving PRTM, the Applicant says PRTM produces an "anomaly" (no traffic north on Ratby Lane) and therefore they override PRTM with their own TA assignment. The LHA then accepts the TA approach.*

Highway objection point: the LHA required PRTM as the basis for assignment, but then accepts a manual "fix" of PRTM outputs without explaining how that alternative assignment is validated. That leaves trip routing open to challenge.

B. Turning counts growth methodology is admitted to be "wrong"... but accepted anyway

R2 explicitly says future turning counts "should" be grown using:

*PRTM future growth + recent turning counts + "iterative furnessing", not TEMPro growth factors,
but then states it will accept TEMPro in these circumstances.*

Highway objection point: that's a self-acknowledged methodological weakness. It gives you a fair basis to argue the junction modelling is not in line with the LHA's own stated standards.'

LHA Response to Comment 1:

1A: Following the Local Highway Authority's (LHA) original request for the applicant to undertake trip distribution using the Pan Regional Transport Model (PRTM), the applicant subsequently provided the LHA with the PRTM trip distribution modelling, along with the area of influence. The applicant highlighted that there was an anomaly in that PRTM did not route traffic along Ratby Lane, whilst the 2011 Census data analysis did route traffic along this route. The LHA considered this and accepted that Ratby Lane could be used to access the site as opposed to traffic routing along the A50 and accessing via the Field Head roundabout, Launde Road and Ratby Lane. The LHA considers it would have been unreasonable to require the applicant to amend the PRTM modelling given the following points:

- The findings of the Census data analysis;
- The census data analysis routing would be likely reduce the number of vehicles travelling through the Field Head Roundabout;
- The LHA had previously advised the development was acceptable as in connection with previous application reference 15/00889/OUT for 140 dwellings; and
- An improvement scheme has been identified at the Field Head Roundabout to

which the Applicant could contribute.

1B: The LHA advised the following within the R2 observations:

'The LHA advise that turning counts for future junction modelling scenarios should be based on future growth from PRTM and recent turning counts using an iterative 'furnessing' process, not TEMPro factors. However, the LHA is willing to accept the methodology in these site-specific circumstances because the highway impacts of development in this location have been identified before and received planning permission. Furthermore, the LHA has the Coalville Transport Strategy which identified the junctions in the vicinity of the proposed development, which are approaching or over capacity in the future.'

Resident's Comment 2:

'2) The evidence shows key junctions are already failing — and the development worsens them

A. Ratby Lane / London Road junction is over-capacity in baseline

R2 states:

- *By 2031 baseline it is over capacity (RFC 1.03) from background growth alone.*
- *Adding the development increases RFC to 1.04, with additional queueing/delay.*

The LHA says it's "not material" and hard to justify improvements.

Highway objection point: the junction is forecast to fail regardless, and the development adds demand. Even if the increment is small, it's still worsening a known capacity failure — which is relevant to "residual cumulative impacts".

B. Field Head Roundabout impacts are serious on the Launde Road arm

R2 states (2031 Baseline + Development):

- *Launde Road arm queueing increases by ~25 vehicles in AM peak*
- *RFC increases from 0.97 to 1.06*
- *Queue time increases by ~150 seconds*

Highway objection point: those are very large delays/queues attributed to the proposal, on top of an already constrained junction. This is the strongest factual basis to argue "severe" impacts are plausible unless mitigation is timely and deliverable.'

LHA Response to Comment 2:

2A: Paragraph 116 of the National Planning policy Framework (2024) states that, 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into

account all reasonable future scenarios.'

Unlike with the Field Head Roundabout, Leicestershire County Council does not have an identified improvement scheme for the Ratby Lane/ London Road priority junction, to which the applicant could pay a proportional cost towards the scheme. On this basis, the applicant would need to design and cover the full costs of any junction improvement scheme. The LHA consider it would be difficult to justify a reason for refusal solely based on the Ratio to Flow (RFC) being reduced by 0.01, an additional 10 second delay and one additional vehicle queueing at the junction. Whilst the LHA have advised the LPA it would not seek to resist the proposals on this basis, should the LPA as the determining authority consider it reasonable to resist the proposals on highway ground because there is not a junction improvement scheme, it is within their gift to do so as the authority responsible for determining the planning application.

2B: See responses to the resident's comments 3 and 4 below.

Resident's Comment 3:

'3) The "not severe" conclusion conflicts with their own wording about "otherwise severe"

R2 opens with:

- *impacts "would not be severe" cumulatively (subject to obligations).*

But the Contributions section says the £659,340 is required:

- *"To mitigate the otherwise severe impact of the development..."*

Highway objection point: this is contradictory drafting. It matters because:

- *if impacts are "not severe", why are they "otherwise severe" without the money?*
- *if they are otherwise severe, then the scheme is reliant on strategic works that may not be delivered in time.*

This is a legitimate point to press the LPA/LHA on.'

LHA Response to Comment 3:

The LHA's formal opening response on the R2 observations states that the cumulative impact of the development is not considered to be severe. This is the formal view of the LHA in response to the proposals. It is correct that without the £659,340 contribution towards the A511 Growth Corridor, the LHA *would* consider the impact of the development on the surrounding network to be severe. Hence, the LHA has advised the LPA that it considers the contribution to be necessary to mitigate the otherwise severe impact of the development on the surrounding highway network. As detailed within the R2 observations, the developer has confirmed they are willing to pay a contribution towards the A511 Growth Corridor

project.

The gathering of contributions towards large scale improvements to mitigate a cumulative traffic impact is an entirely acceptable approach which is used throughout the country. Whilst there will be contributing development coming forward in advance of mitigation in these cases, the LHA considers that the ultimate benefits of this reasonable and widespread approach outweigh the temporary disbenefits that may arise in terms of traffic impact in the interim.

Resident's Comment 4:

'4) Deliverability/timing risk: the mitigation is a financial contribution, not a committed scheme

The LHA asks for:

- *£659,340 toward Coalville Transport Strategy / A511 Growth Corridor / Field Head improvements.*

But the letter itself doesn't secure:

- *a specific design,*
- *an approved programme,*
- *a delivery date aligned to occupations,*
- *or a guarantee the junction scheme will be built before impacts occur.*

Highway objection point: if the junction is already forecast to be over-capacity, then "paying into a pot" is not the same as delivering mitigation. You can object on the basis that the development should not proceed unless the improvement scheme is secured, costed, and timed to prevent harm during early occupations.'

LHA Response to Comment 4:

Details of the A511 Growth Corridor project web page were provided within the R2 observations. This included details of the currently proposed scheme for the Field Head Roundabout (Junction 9) as well as progress updates. The web page is available via this link: <https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/road-projects/a511-growth-corridor>.

Given the scale of the highway works required at the Field Head junction, the cost for this development alone to implement the entire scheme would be considered unreasonable.

As also set out the LHA's response to comment 3, the gathering of contributions towards large scale improvements to mitigate a cumulative traffic impact is an entirely acceptable approach which is used throughout the country. Whilst there will be contributing development coming forward in advance of mitigation in these cases, the LHA considers that the ultimate benefits of this reasonable and widespread approach outweigh the temporary disbenefits that may arise in terms of traffic impact in the interim.

Resident's Comment 5:

'5) The applicant's own Design & Access Statement contains transport inaccuracies

The Design & Access Statement says:

- *London Road bus stops are served by the 125 service.*

But the LHA (in the earlier response) says:

- *the 125 has been replaced by the LCC-funded LC15 at mainly two-hourly frequency.*

Highway objection point: the DAS overstates public transport provision / uses outdated service data. That undermines the sustainable travel case and affects mode share assumptions.'

LHA Response to Comment 5:

Whilst the LHA acknowledges bus routes and frequencies have been changed since the application was submitted, it would be difficult to resist the proposed development on the grounds that bus services/ frequencies have changed. The centre of the site is still within an approximate 700m walk to bus stops on the A50, which are served by approximately half hourly bus services between Leicester and Coalville and connected by an existing Toucan Crossing. The applicant has also submitted a Travel Plan which references the current bus services in the area, including the LC15.

Resident's Comment 6:

'6) Pedestrian refuge: accepted, but scope can still be challenged

*R2 accepts the refuge design and RSA outcome.
That said, the mitigation is limited to a single refuge.*

Possible objection line (reasonable, evidence-based):

- *With 135 dwellings generating peak hour trips, and with access to village services requiring crossings, a single refuge may not be proportionate if the sustainable transport case depends on walking/cycling uptake (especially given bus service downgrade noted by LHA in R1).'*

LHA Response to Comment 6:

Within Paragraph 4.4.4 of the applicants Transport Assessment , it was stated:

'A new uncontrolled crossing with central refuge is also proposed on Launde Road to the south of Countryman Way, which will facilitate movements to/ from key local

facilities located within Markfield including retail, health, education and leisure uses, as well as nearby bus stops.'

An officer has walked the route and is aware there is a traffic free network of footpaths from Woodland Close through to Mayflower Close which link to a number of facilities, including the medical centre, school and post office. An existing Zebra crossing is also in place linking the traffic free route over Chitterman Way. Therefore, it was accepted there is likely to be a strong pedestrian desire line along the route. Whilst it is acknowledged pedestrians may want to cross the road elsewhere in the area, unfortunately it is not possible to cover every eventuality or location with new crossing facilities, especially if other suitable existing crossing points are available.

Resident's Comment 7:

'7) PRow R21: evidence of inconsistency about links (connectivity issue)

R1 notes inconsistency:

- *Illustrative Masterplan/Landscape plan shows no direct link to Footpath R21, yet community material shows links to ponds/woodland/play area.*

R2 pushes this into a condition requiring a PRow treatment scheme.

Highway objection point: non-car connectivity is still not clearly fixed at outline stage; this affects whether sustainable access is genuinely achievable.'

LHA Response to Comment 7:

The application has been submitted in Outline form, with access being the only matter for consideration at this stage. The LHA will consider the applicants firm proposals for the layout of the development, including connectivity to Footpath R1 at the Reserved Matters stage in the event this outline application is granted planning permission by the LPA. The LHA has however secured the treatment scheme for the Public Right of Way (PRow) along its legal route at this stage, which includes matters such as surfacing, signing and management during construction, which it would normally do at the Outline stage. In addition, a financial contribution has been requested to improve off-site infrastructure along the route. Notwithstanding this, the LHA has highlighted connectivity with Footpath R21 within the R1 observations, based on the indicative plans which were submitted by the applicant.

Highway Summary

The LHA maintain that 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 use of the recommended conditions and/or planning obligations.

Recommendation: -

The recommendation remains as per the published committee report but with the following additional conditions:

1. No development or site clearance hereby permitted shall take place until local planning authority has been provided with either:
 - a) a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 55 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) authorizing the specified activity/development to go ahead; or
 - b) a statement in writing from the Natural England to the effect that it does not consider that the specified activity/development will require a licence.

Reason: To conserve protected species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.
2. No development above slab level in respect of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for protected, Priority and threatened species, prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist in line with the recommendations in Section 5.46 of the Ecological Impact Assessment (CSA Environmental, May 2025) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:
 - a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;
 - b) detailed designs or product descriptions to achieve stated objectives;
 - c) locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans (where relevant);
 - d) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures; and
 - e) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

The development thereafter shall only be carried out in accordance with the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy .

Reason: To enhance protected, Priority and threatened species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under paragraph 187d of NPPF 2024 and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

3. Prior to occupation, a “lighting design strategy for biodiversity” in accordance with Guidance Note 08/23 (Institute of Lighting Professionals) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:
 - a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
 - b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites

and resting places.

Thereafter all external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the scheme and maintained thereafter in accordance with the scheme. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Reason: To allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

4. No development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for the investigation of any potential land contamination on the site has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall include details of how any contamination shall be dealt with.

The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and any remediation works so approved shall be carried out prior to the site first being occupied

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised in accordance with Policy DM7 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

Informatives:

1. In relation to condition 12 advice from Environmental Health should be sought via esadmin@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk to ensure that any investigation of land contamination is in accordance with their policy.
10. **22/00839/FUL - TRINITY MARINA, COVENTRY ROAD, HINCKLEY**

Application for three apartment blocks comprising 76 one and two bedroom apartments with associated parking and landscaping.

Late items received after preparation of agenda:

As set out at paragraph d4 of the committee report, the details of new and revised proposed conditions are set out below.

Condition 2 is updated to reflect the latest revised plans which relate to changes at ground floor level only. Condition 4 is expanded to include details regarding that no loss of parking should occur for any existing residents of business and that security and safety for existing marina residents and existing pedestrians is maintained/improved. The reason for the condition is also updated to reflect the requirement in Policy DM17 for convenient and safe access for walking and cycling and the requirement in paragraph 115 of the NPPF for safe and suitable access for all users. Condition 15 is updated to demonstrate how the pedestrian route shall

provide safe pedestrian access to both the east and west of the existing access and egress points and how the route shall be maintained free from parked vehicles. It is also made a pre-commencement condition in line with Condition 4. Condition 17 is updated to reflect the increased size of the cycle storage and the revised plans. A new pre-commencement Condition 19 is proposed that requires a scheme of traffic calming and security features that adequately maintains the amenity and safety of residents and users of Trinity Marina. The amended and conditions are set out below.

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

- Site Location Plan 24255-CWA-XX-ZZ DR-A-0201 Rev P-01
- Site Plan 24255-CWA-XX-XX-DR-A-0301 Rev P-03
- Site Plan 24255-CWA-XX-ZZ-DR-A- 0302 Rev P-03
- Proposed Site Plan and Pedestrian Path 24255-CWA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0303 Rev P-01
- Proposed Block A Ground Floor Plan 24255-CWA-XX-00-DR-A-0310 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block B Ground Floor Plan 24255-CWA-XX-00-DR-A-0314 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block C Ground Floor Plan 24255-CWA-XX-00-DR-A-0318 Rev P-01
- Proposed Block A First Floor Plan 24255-CWA-XX-01-DR-A-0311 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block B First Floor Plan 24255-CWA-XX-01-DR-A-0315 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block C First and Second Floor Plan 24255-CWA-XX-XX-DR-A-0319 Rev P-01
- Proposed Block A Second Floor Plan 24255-CWA-XX-02-DR-A-0312 Rev P-02 -
- Proposed Block B Second Floor Plan 24255-CWA-XX-02-DR-A-0316 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block C Third Floor and Roof Plan 24255-CWA-XX-XX-DR-A-0320 Rev P-01
- Proposed Block A Roof Plan 24255-CWA-XX-RL-DR-A-0313 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block B Roof Plan 24255-CWA-XX-RL-DR-A-0317 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block A Elevation A1 and A3 24255-CWA-XX-XX-DR-A-0330 Rev P-01
- Proposed Block A Elevations A2 and A4 24255-CWA-XX-XX-DR-A-0331 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block B Elevations B1 and B3 24255-CWA-XX-XX-DR-A-0340 Rev P-01
- Proposed Block B Elevations B2 and B4 24255-CWA-XX-XX-DR-A-0341 Rev P-01
- Proposed Block C Elevations 24255-CWA-XX-XX-DR-A-0350 Rev P-02
- Proposed Block A & B Bay Elevations 24255-CWA-XX-ZZ DR-A-0392 Rev P-00
- Proposed Block C Bay Elevation Study 24255-CWA-XX-ZZ DR-A-0394 Rev P-00

4. No development shall commence on the site until such time as a construction traffic management plan, including as a minimum details of wheel cleansing facilities, vehicle parking facilities, mechanisms to maintain security for residents, boat owners, users and visitors of Trinity Marina, mechanisms to ensure the improvement of pedestrian safety for residents of Trinity Marina and other users of the access and a timetable for their provision, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and

timetable.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian safety and safe and suitable access for all users in accordance with Policy DM17 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and paragraph 115 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework and to reduce the possibility of deleterious material (mud, stones etc.) being deposited in the highway and becoming a hazard for road users, to ensure that construction traffic does not use unsatisfactory roads and lead to on-street parking problems in the area.

15. No dwelling shall be occupied until an Access Management Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Access Management Strategy shall detail how a safe pedestrian route from the apartments to Coventry Road both to the east and west of the access and egress points on Coventry Road shall be secured and maintained at all times. The Strategy shall detail how the safe pedestrian route shall be maintained free from parked vehicles at all times. The pedestrian route shall operate in accordance with the approved strategy thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

17. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until such time as secure cycle parking has been provided in accordance with Corstorphine and Wright drawing numbers 24255-CWA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0302 Rev P03 and 24255-CWA-XX-01-DR-A-0311 Rev P02. Thereafter the onsite cycle parking provision shall be kept available for such use in perpetuity.

19. No development shall commence on the site until such time as a scheme of traffic calming and security features that adequately maintains the amenity, safety and security of residents and users of Trinity Marina has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable and the approved measures shall remain in place for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian safety and safe and suitable access for all users in accordance with Policy DM17 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and paragraph 115 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

This page is intentionally left blank