

Public Document Pack

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

Date: 16 July 2025



**Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council**

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, 15 JULY 2025 at 6.30 pm.**

Yours sincerely

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

Rebecca Owen
Democratic Services Manager

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 JULY 2025

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

7. **25/00461/FUL - HINCKLEY AND DISTRICT GENERAL HOSPITAL, MOUNT ROAD, HINCKLEY**

Application for demolition of former cottage hospital and development of new day case surgery building with associated landscaping and parking.

Late items received after publication of the agenda:

Additional Support Comments:

Since publication of the report, one additional support comment was received, stating that the building frontage of the old cottage hospital is architecturally insignificant given the huge number of similar properties still in existence.

A petition has been received with approximately 1642 signatures stating "We the undersigned support the £10m investment for a Day Case Unit in Hinckley and ask that Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council permits the planning application." The petition contains the names and postcodes for each signatory.

Additional Consultee Comments:

Consultee comments from LCC Ecology have been received. LCC Ecology raise no objection subject to the imposition of conditions which are set out below.

The Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings (Tetra Tech Ltd., June 2025) found no bats emerging from the remaining building on site. LCC ecology are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available to support determination of this application. The mitigation measures identified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Geosphere Environmental, April 2025) will conserve and enhance protected and Priority species particularly those recorded in the locality.

Amended Conditions:

Condition 6 is to be deleted as details of dust and construction hours are contained within Construction Environmental Management Plan included within condition 5.

Additional Conditions:

1. All ecological mitigation measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Geosphere Environmental, April 2025). This will include the appointment of an appropriately competent person e.g. an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) to provide on-site ecological expertise during construction. The appointed person shall undertake all activities, and works shall be carried out, in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To conserve protected and Priority species in accordance with

Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) 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 s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

2. Prior to commencement of the development a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

3. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”.
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To conserve protected and Priority species in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) 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 s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

4. Prior to any works above slab level, a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for protected, Priority and threatened species, prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist in line with the recommendations of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Geosphere Environmental, April 2025) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The content of 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 works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: To enhance protected, Priority and threatened species in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under paragraph 187d of NPPF 2024 and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

5. Prior to first use of the development, 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.

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) and in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

6. Prior to commencement of the development a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) for significant on-site enhancements, prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the local authority, including:
 - a) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the HMMP;
 - b) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the on-site significant enhancements in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;
 - c) the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the

completion of development;

d) the monitoring methodology in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority; and

e) details of the content of monitoring reports to be submitted to the LPA including details of adaptive management which will be undertaken to ensure the aims and objectives of the Biodiversity Gain Plan are achieved.

Notice in writing shall be given to the Council when the:

- initial enhancements, as set in the HMMP, have been implemented; and
- habitat creation and enhancement works, as set out in the HMMP, have been completed after 30 years.

The created and/or enhanced habitat specified in the approved HMMP shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved HMMP.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing, monitoring reports shall be submitted in years 1, 2, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 to the Council, in accordance with the methodology specified in the approved HMMP.

Reason: To satisfy the requirement of Schedule 7A, Part 1, section 9(3) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that significant on-site habitat is delivered, managed, and monitored for a period of at least 30 years from completion of development.

The mandatory biodiversity net gain condition is also relevant:

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition “(the biodiversity gain condition”) that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

8. **22/00882/OUT - LAND ADJACENT TO MIRA TECHNOLOGY PARK, CALDECOTE**

Outline application (all matters reserved) for extension of MIRA Technology Park to comprise employment use (class B2), associated office and service uses (class E g), storage (class B8), new spine road, car parking, landscaping and enabling works (cross boundary application with North Warwickshire Borough Council).

Late items received after publication of agenda:

Following consideration of the item at the Planning Committee of 17 June 2025, the item was deferred to allow for a site visit to take place. A site visit took place this morning, 15 July 2025, to view the junctions of the A5 with Drayton Lane and Woodford Lane, Fenny Drayton.

Further, the item was deferred following comments made with regards to National Highways reviewing information submitted by the objector, Extra Room Self Storage (ERSS). ERSS submitted additional information to National Highways on 19 June 2025, including data underpinning their transport modelling, and an

independent audit of their modelling undertaken.

National Highways

National Highways have subsequently confirmed that, as further information has been submitted by a 3rd party, not by the applicant, National Highways will not review this information. National Highways confirmed to the Council on 20 June 2025 that:

'...National Highways is unable to consider any further the 'Updated Review of A5 Mitigation Report' and the subsequent information supplied by DTA consultants in support of the report, given that this information does not form part of the proposals put forward by the applicant.

Therefore, our position on the proposals remains as stated in the formal conditioned response issued by Russell Gray on 22 November 2024'.

This confirmation was provided by National Highways to ERSS on 3 July 2025.

Information provided by the applicant:

The applicant has provided a summary of the history of the application with regards to proposed works to Drayton Lane and Woodford Lane junctions with the A5. This can be summarised as below:

- August 2022 – application submitted showing traffic lights to both Drayton Lane and Woodford Lane junctions
- June 2023 – junctions reassessed following completion of PRTM traffic modelling. Traffic lights at both junctions considered to result in queuing to the A5 and objection from Witherley PC due to potential for increase in rat running through Fenny Drayton
- October 2023 – left in, left out mitigation proposed to both Drayton Lane and Woodford Lane junctions
- December 2023 – proposal for junctions to remain unchanged and financial contribution to National Highways for a feasibility assessment for safety enhancement scheme. Application considered and approved by North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) subject to final approval from highway consultees. Meeting with Police in June 2024 included police concerns over enforcement of a 40mph limit to the A5 and discussions regarding speed cameras. National Highways confirmed average speed camera scheme not supported
- October 2024 – current proposal for traffic lights at Woodford Lane and left in, left out at Drayton Lane. Design review undertaken and verbal confirmation provided by National Highways, Leicestershire County Council and Warwickshire County Council that proposal would be acceptable and road safety audit instructed.
- December 2024 – National Highways confirm acceptance of current proposal for junction mitigation to Drayton Lane and Woodford Lane

Other options for the junctions as proposed by ERSS have been considered by the

applicant and have been discounted as below:

Option 1 Leave Drayton Lane Junction as existing	Highway Authorities would not support (on safety grounds) – there is insufficient gaps in through-traffic on the A5 for vehicles exiting the junction to enter the main carriageway leading to excessive queues and delays under future year operational conditions. As flows on Drayton Lane and Woodford Lane increase through growth and displacement (rat-running) from other routes, this will be exacerbated. Increased delays will encourage drivers to take risks in pulling out onto the A5 leading to a significant increase in accident risk
Option 2 Traffic Lights at both Woodford Lane and Drayton Lane	This was the original proposal in the application and was not supported by the Highway Authorities because of significant concerns regarding queue build-up on the A5 (strategic road network). The Highway Authorities also deemed that the benefits in terms of significant reductions in queues and delays on Woodford Lane and Drayton Lane will further encourage rat running through Mancetter and Fenny Drayton that they are seeking to eradicate.
Option 3 Traffic Lights at Drayton Lane and LILLO at Woodford Lane	This would displace more traffic towards Mancetter leading to a marked reduction in capacity and a significant increase in queues and delays on the B4111 approach to the Mancetter Island. It also does not address the significant accident record at the Woodford Lane junction that includes several severe incidents involving traffic turning left out of Woodford Lane.
Option 4 Longabout like existing Redgate junction	Roundabout is an expensive solution (in context of wider enhancements already being delivered) and would not address the rat running traffic through Fenny Drayton, which the Highway Authorities are seeking to eradicate. There is also insufficient land within the adopted public highway to deliver the minimum sized half-roundabouts at both ends of the junction complex to accommodate turning of larger vehicles within the required highway geometric / safety standards.
Option 5 – Roundabout at Drayton Lane and LILLO at Woodford Lane	A roundabout at Drayton Lane to the required highway geometric / safety standards cannot be delivered with the adopted public highway at Drayton Lane. Roundabout is an expensive solution (in context of wider enhancements already being delivered) and would not address the rat running traffic through Fenny Drayton, which National Highways are seeking to eradicate. LILLO of Woodford Lane pushes traffic through Mancetter and leads to significant increase in queues and delays on the B4111 approach to the Mancetter Island.

In addition to their review as above, the applicant maintains that the proposed option put forward by ERSS, to include traffic lights at Drayton Lane, would go against the wishes of the Local Highway Authority to remove vehicular trips from

Fenny Drayton, instead increasing trips through the village.

Further, the linked signals scheme put forward by ERSS relies on land outside of the control of the applicant to be delivered. There is no guarantee that this can be made available and therefore it is not within the gift of the applicant to offer such a solution.

Information provided by ERSS:

The objector, ERSS, has provided a document to all Planning Committee Members on 14 July 2025. This can be summarised as below:

- ERSS welcome a deferral for a site visit to be undertaken;
- Further information has been provided in the form of traffic survey data and an independent audit to National Highways;
- Request a refusal of the application or a deferral to allow for the applicant to engage with National Highways
- Maintain a view that the proposed mitigation works to Drayton Lane will negatively impact on the ERSS business

The document submitted goes on to state that 75% of ERSS users will experience longer journey times and that all traffic using ERSS will pass through the village of Fenny Drayton (*note, this is not considered to be accurate, some users will still only use Drayton Lane and the A5*). The applicant considers that any rat running concerns to Fenny Drayton could be mitigated by additional measures at the eastern side of the village or within the village.

ERSS maintain that the proposal will include an unreasonable restriction on the business and propose that there is a safe and workable solution. If the application is not to be refused, ERSS propose a further deferral of the application to allow the applicant to engage further with National Highways.

Conclusion:

Further information has been provided by ERSS with regards to modelling data and an audit of their proposed highway works to include traffic lights to Drayton Lane / A5 junction.

However, National Highways have declined to review this information provided, as the information is not submitted by the applicant, instead being submitted by a 3rd party, in this case an objector. The stance of National Highways is their decision to be taken. ERSS have suggested that a further deferral of the application could include the applicant engaging further with ERSS, however the applicant is not pursuing this, instead proposing a scheme for left in left out at Drayton Lane that has been reviewed and approved by National Highways and both Leicestershire and Warwickshire local highway authorities. Further, it is not clear how deliverable the proposal by ERSS is. Any delivery of a mitigation scheme is dependent on the applicant, not on a 3rd party, and in this case the applicant is not seeking to deliver a 3rd party mitigation scheme.

Other options have been proposed for Woodford Lane/Drayton Lane and these have been assessed by the applicant and discounted as above. Without any review by statutory consultees, including three highway authorities, and without any degree of confidence over being a deliverable scheme, the proposal for traffic lights at Drayton Lane by ERSS is not considered to be taken forward.

Recommendation:

Taking into account the report, including paras 8.37 – 8.45, together with the further information submitted by an objector, response from the applicant and the subsequent resolution to grant permission by NWBC on 9 June, the recommendation remains that planning permission be granted, subject to a S106 agreement and planning conditions as set out in para 11 of the report.

This page is intentionally left blank