National Highways Planning Response (NHPR 26-09)
Formal Recommendation to an Application for Planning Permission

From: Ian Doust (Head of Planning & Development)
Operations Directorate
Midlands Region
National Highways
PlanningM@nationalhighways.co.uk

To: Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (FAO Emma Baumber)
planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk

CC: transportplanning@dft.gov.uk
spatialplanning@nationalhighways.co.uk

Council's Reference: 25/00931/FUL

Location: Cliffe Hill Farm Little Shaw Lane Markfield Leicestershire LE67 9PP

Proposal: Redevelopment of a logistics park for storage and distribution (Class B8), general industry (Class B2), ancillary office space (Class E) and associated infrastructure.

National Highways Ref: NH/25/13260

Referring to the consultation on a planning application dated 10th October 2025 referenced above, in the vicinity of the M1 that forms part of the Strategic Road Network, notice is hereby given that National Highways' formal recommendation is that we:

~~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, regarding the highway authority consent required for trunk road access, is not relevant to this application.[1]

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 must 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 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.

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: [redacted]	**Date:** 4 November 2026
Name: Adrian Chadha	**Position:** Spatial Planner

National Highways
Three Snowhill, Snow Hill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA
Adrian.Chadha@nationalhighways.co.uk

[1] 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.

Recommended Non-Approval

It is recommended that the application should not be approved for a period of three months from the date of this response. This will allow sufficient time for the applicant to provide further information and for National Highways to review and respond to the information provided.

Reason

National Highways has reviewed Technical Note 8, dated October 2026. The document has been provided to support the planning application for the proposed development of 72,500 sqm of B8/B2 land use located on the northeast quadrant of M1 Junction 22, which is part of the SRN.

Based on National Highways' review of the document, our comments are set out below.

General Note

Whilst the LinSig model has been provided by Leicestershire County Council (LCC) as used in another development, the model still needs to be accurate. This will allow National Highways to compare the current on-site conditions and model accuracy against the 2025 traffic survey data.

We therefore consider that the LinSig model you have received can be used as the starting point for your analysis, rather than assuming any accuracy checks of that model are not required. You should look to revalidate your model against the survey data, so any existing input parameters can be updated if needed to demonstrate the validation of your new models.

Model Files

Technical Note 8 states that the updated base and proposed LinSig models have been provided alongside the technical note, but we have only received the model output files included within the appendices. As the output files do not contain all of the LinSig input data, the actual LinSig models need to be provided.

Model Validation

The model validation analysis spreadsheet was previously requested but has not yet been provided for review. National Highways requests this so that we can understand how you have analysed the observed queue data that has been presented in Table 4 of your response.

It should be noted that reviewing the LinSig storage graphs can provide an indication of the level of queuing being predicted on the short (flared) lanes.

Model Geometry

Drawing T22523.015 has been referenced to demonstrate the flare length on the A50 East approach existing layout, but this has not been included within the submitted technical note. This should be submitted to National Highways for review.

Give Way Parameters

We note the updates to the give way parameters on the Cliffe Lane approach (Arm 14). However, we query whether the movement to Arm 3 Lane 1 should also give way to the vehicles that are entering the adjacent Arm 3 Lane 2. The requirement to include these movements should be determined by the accuracy of the model validation on this approach.

Cruise Speeds

With your clear conflict calculations your use of variable cruise speeds on each of the two upstream arms has produced an unusual anomaly whereby the longest distance from the southern circulatory (lane 1) produces a lower clear conflict value (9 seconds) than the offside lane which has a shorter distance (a clear conflict value of 10 seconds). Are the variable cruise speeds across the different lanes from the approach and circulatory in this short section of the roundabout realistic?

Whilst we appreciate your comments about receiving the models from LCC, we can't understand the variation of modelled cruise speeds across the roundabout (varying between 31kph and 48kph). It is not clear if this previous modelling work recorded observed cruise times across the roundabout. Some of the connectors in your model have an entered cruise time, but also a directly entered custom lane length. As the entered mean cruise time will overwrite any contribution of the custom lane length, we are unsure why a custom lane length value has been entered. We therefore recommend that you undertake a review of the modelled cruise speed values to ensure your model produces realistic stopline to stopline cruise time values.

Cycle Times

As you have taken the modelled cycle times from the models you received from LCC, they have different cycle times for the east and west sides of the roundabout. As the LinSig model has different cycle times, the model will not see platoons of vehicles travelling from one side of the roundabout to the other. Although the distance between the two sides of the roundabout is approximately 150 metres, this issue may make it

harder for you to demonstrate the validation of the model. This is not seen as a critical issue, so we will review again once we receive your model validation analysis.

Traffic Flows

Whilst reviewing the latest submission, we have noticed an unusual issue with the surveyed traffic flows on the roundabout that requires some further explanation. Your 2025 traffic surveys show that there is a noticeable number of vehicles entering the roundabout on the M1 Southbound offslip (Arm A) who leave the roundabout via the M1 Southbound onslip (Arm C), which seems an unusual movement to undertake in normal traffic conditions. Your October 2025 traffic survey shows the following number of vehicles that make this manoeuvre:

- 07:00 to 08:00 – 111 vehicles
- 08:00 to 09:00 – 125 vehicles
- 09:00 to 10:00 – 35 vehicles
- 16:00 to 17:00 – 99 vehicles
- 17:00 to 18:00 – 79 vehicles
- 18:00 to 19:00 – 20 vehicles

We have seen another traffic survey of this junction from April 2026 and this movement is being undertaken by a very small number of vehicles (low single digit values per peak hour). Please can you therefore confirm whether these recorded movements were actually being undertaken or whether there has been a data input error in the survey spreadsheets you received? If vehicles were undertaking this manoeuvre, it should be explained why they were doing it, for example by using available camera footage.

Due to the flow methodology you have followed, the 2036 future base flows on this movement increase to 164pcu in the AM Peak hour.

Calculation Spreadsheet

Although we have not yet reviewed the analysis undertaken as part of your sensitivity test chapter, we ask that you submit your updated traffic flow analysis spreadsheet so that we can understand how the modelled traffic flows have been derived.

Traffic Impacts

National Highways will be in better position to comment on the potential traffic impacts of the proposed development on the SRN once the above queries have been resolved.

Standing advice to the local planning authority

The UK Government has committed to achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 through amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports this objective, with Chapter 5 recognising the need to support the transition to a low carbon future and contribute to achieving net zero by 2050. Policies CC2 and TR3 promote sustainable patterns of movement, reduce

reliance on the private car and seek to ensure that significant development is located where it offers a genuine choice of transport modes.

Policies TR3 and TR4 also advise that opportunities to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport should be taken up as part of a vision-led approach to creating sustainable, inclusive and well-connected places.

These considerations should be weighed alongside any relevant Development Plan policies to ensure that planning decisions support sustainable travel patterns and align with the transition to net zero by 2050.