

HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

18 November 2025 AT 6.30 pm

PRESENT: CLLR REH FLEMMING – MAYOR
 CLLR C GIBBENS – DEPUTY MAYOR

Cllr RG Allen, Cllr MC Bools, Cllr SL Bray, Cllr MB Cartwright,
Cllr MA Cook, Cllr MJ Crooks, Cllr WJ Crooks, Cllr DT Glenville,
Cllr CE Green, Cllr C Harris, Cllr L Hodgkins, Cllr E Hollick,
Cllr C Lambert, Cllr KWP Lynch, Cllr J Moore, Cllr LJ Mullaney,
Cllr MT Mullaney, Cllr LJP O'Shea, Cllr A Pendlebury,
Cllr M Simmons, Cllr H Smith, Cllr P Stead-Davis, Cllr BE Sutton,
Cllr BR Walker and Cllr P Williams

Officers in attendance: Bill Cullen, Julie Kenny, Rebecca Owen, Madeline Shellard and Sharon Stacey

239. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors C Allen, Boothby, Cope, S Gibbens, Surtees, Webber-Jones and Weightman.

240. Minutes of the previous meeting

It was moved by Councillor Bray, seconded by Councillor Bools and

RESOLVED – the minutes of the meeting held on 30 September be confirmed as a correct record.

241. Declarations of interest

Councillor Pendlebury stated that she was on the board of Hinckley Homeless Group but this did not constitute an interest in the report on the supplementary income request for homeless demands and temporary accommodation.

242. Mayor's Communications

The Mayor presented long service awards to two members of staff, Ian Pinfold and Andy Upton who had completed 30 and 40 years of service respectively. He then went on to talk about events that he and the Deputy Mayor had attended recently.

243. Questions

(a) Question from Councillor Sutton to the Executive member for Planning

- (i) How long has the Council been in discussion with Nurton Developments with regard to the proposed development at Norton Heath?
- (ii) How many landowners have signed up to the proposed development?

- (iii) Can the Norton Heath development be removed from the Local Plan given the misinformation that is being circulated?

Response from Councillor Crooks:

- “(i) The Council is currently consulting on its Regulation 18 draft Local Plan consultation. As the name suggests, this is a draft document for consultation purposes and is at an early stage of the Local Plan process. The site was submitted to the Council for the first time as part of the 2024 Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). This is available to view on the Council’s website.

This site was presented to members in a planning policy meeting held via MS Teams earlier this year and the developer recently offered a presentation to all councillors on their proposals. It is a shame Cllr Sutton was unable to attend either of these.

As Cllr Sutton will be aware, the concept of delivering housing growth in the west of the borough is not new. Back in 2017 the administration he was part of proposed new “garden villages” as a way of providing the housing that the government required.

The Conservative leader at the time said “one option that is being considered to deliver this growth is the creation of garden villages. I personally believe this option to be of great value and if we can create more villages with an appropriate level of infrastructure we can deliver some fantastic new places to live, rather than destroying the ones that we already have.”

- (ii) The site has been submitted to the Council by Nurton Developments Ltd, not by any landowners. Any agreements between landowners and Nurton Developments are not a matter for the Council. The Council welcomes any correspondence from any landowners if they do not consider their land to be available for development. Any received will be investigated. Some of the site has previously been put forward to the Council for development through the SHELAA process prior to any involvement from Nurton Developments.
- (iii) No. The current consultation is for the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan only. The Council welcomes representations on the Local Plan. This site is one of many proposed sites at this Regulation 18 stage and is proposed in order to meet a nationally set housing target of over 15,000 dwellings to 2045. The Council will provide further statements and a further FAQ page on its website to provide a response to current misinformation circulating outside of the formal council statements.
I remind Cllr Sutton that the Conservative group voted in favour of proceeding with the Local Plan – with this site in it.

Should this site be removed at the next stage then I must remind Cllr Sutton and everyone else that the shortfall will need to be found elsewhere in the borough. I look forward to hearing from Cllr Sutton as to where he thinks these should go.”

(b) Question from Councillor C Allen to the Executive member for Climate Change

"I note with concern the stated position on climate change of Reform UK nationally, and more locally the comments of former deputy leader of Leicestershire County Council Joseph Boam who said "I think it is absolutely great to see Reform UK starting to scrap the wasteful net stupid zero agenda". Can the Executive member please advise if any current or future climate change projects of this Council have been or are anticipated to be adversely affected by the policies and actions of the Reform UK administration at Leicestershire County Council?"

Response from Councillor Cartwright:

"I also share grave concerns over the messages that were coming from the new Reform administration at County Hall and I hope that the sacking of Mr Boam will see a change of tone. To deny climate change is, in my view, pretty stupid when virtually all scientific experts agree that not only does it exist but it is having catastrophic consequences across the globe.

Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council primarily funds and delivers its own climate change projects at the borough level. We do, however, take part in some partnership initiatives with other Leicestershire authorities, for example the Green Living Leicestershire programme, where delivery or funding is shared.

At present, there has been no direct impact on Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council's own climate projects or funding streams, and we do not anticipate any immediate adverse effects. Our commitments and progress towards our targets remain unchanged.

We will continue to monitor developments at the county level, particularly where they may affect partnership projects or shared funding arrangements, and will report any material changes to members.

I welcome Councillor Allen raising this and the fact she appears to be distancing herself from her own party leadership on this matter who appear to be following Reform down this dangerous path. I will remind Councillor Allen that only last month Kemi Badenoch vowed to scrap the 2008 Climate Act and the man out to try and unseat her, Robert Jenrick, has described carbon reduction plans as "something out of Putin's Russia".

I look forward to working with Councillor Allen and all other members on further ways we can reduce carbon emissions locally – including planting 1,000 more trees in the borough.

I hope you will join me in celebrating the successful launch of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Nature Recovery strategy.

Outside of Leicestershire County Council, my concern in relation to delivery of climate change and biodiversity initiatives go far wider right up to Westminster and the government of the day.

I would very much welcome talks with our elected members closest to the two MPs who have an impact upon Hinckley & Bosworth residents to learn and discover what they know about the future in this vial area from the top down. I am happy to arrange a meeting at a mutually convenient time.”

(c) Question from Councillor R Allen to the Executive member for Planning

“In recent years there have been several instances where developers who have received planning permission have come back to Council to advise they cannot find a registered provider to take on the permitted affordable homes element of their development. This has often resulted in no affordable homes being delivered and the Council being offered a much reduced number of properties to add to the Council’s housing stock.

Can the Executive member confirm the details including developer, site, affordable homes promised, affordable or social housing units actually delivered and resultant shortfall of all such variations please?”

Response from Councillor W Crooks:

“For sites that have received planning permission and then had difficulty finding a registered provider to take on the affordable housing units, this equates to 11 sites in the borough in total. These 11 sites are in Burbage (x3), Thornton, Stanton Under Bardon, Higham, Hinckley, Markfield, Earl Shilton and Stoke Golding. Registered providers have not taken forward S106 contribution dwellings for a number of reasons and this is a national, not a local, issue, and has been raised with Homes England who oversee the role of registered providers and affordable housing. This has also been part of a recent scrutiny review which concluded earlier this year and with its findings reported back through the Scrutiny Commission.

Of the 11 sites where registered providers have not come forward, a range of solutions have been found. These include acceptance of a commuted sum in lieu of on site affordable provision with close to £2m received from two sites (both in Burbage). Elsewhere, gifted units have been accepted at sites at Higham and Twycross, the Council has acquired properties at two sites (Earl Shilton and Hinckley), affordable tenure units have been changed to rent plus properties at one site (Burbage) and on two sites (Stoke Golding and Stanton Under Bardon) the tenure mix has been changed to a discounted market housing product. Two sites (Thornton and Markfield) do not yet have a solution, with the Thornton site recently made available for sale following commencement on site and hope that a registered provider will take on the Markfield site.

Whilst the reduction in the number of registered providers taking on new sites is a national issue, the above solutions demonstrate that the Council is being proactive in finding alternative solutions that still deliver affordable housing, including a mix of tenures and a mix of housing products.

The reduction in the number of registered providers taking on new sites is a national issue. The above solutions demonstrate that this Council is being proactive in finding alternative solutions that still deliver affordable housing, including a mix of tenures and a mix of housing products.

Due to the concerns right across this chamber on this issue, it would be helpful if our local Member of Parliament could raise this in Parliament instead of his usual misinformation about the Council's planning department."

244. Leader of the Council's Position Statement

In his position statement, the Leader referred to Remembrance events, the Making a Difference awards, Hinckley area foodbank, partnership working, the free tree scheme, Peggs Close and the Christmas lights switch on events around the borough. He drew attention to the recent local plan consultation event in Twycross and the unacceptable abuse that staff had been subjected to and unhelpful false information being circulated on social media in relation to HMOs.

Councillor Hollick entered the meeting at 6.55pm.

245. Minutes of the Scrutiny Commission

The minutes of the Scrutiny Commission were received for information.

246. Local Government Reorganisation proposal

Council gave consideration to the draft local government reorganisation (LGR) proposal produced by the Leicestershire Districts and Rutland County Council. Members felt that there was no need for reorganisation of local government as the current system was successful in providing local services for local people, and it was the lack of government funding that was the issue. However, it was noted that change was being imposed by the government and the "North, City, South" proposal was the option that would best serve the residents of Hinckley and Bosworth, and across Leicestershire and Rutland more generally.

Members thanked officers for their work on the proposal and acknowledged the good collaborative working across several authorities to achieve such a comprehensive proposal.

It was moved by Councillor Bray and seconded by Councillor Bools that the report be endorsed.

Councillor Bray and a further seven members stood to request voting on the motion be recorded. The vote was taken as follows:

Councillors R Allen, Bools, Bray, Cartwright, Cook, M Crooks, W Crooks, Flemming, Gibbens, Glenville, Green, Hodgkins, Hollick, Lambert, Lynch, L Mullaney, M Mullaney, Pendlebury, Simmons, Smith, Stead-Davis, Walker and Williams voted FOR the motion (23);

Councillors Harris, Moore, O'Shea and Walker abstained from voting.

The motion was therefore declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED –

- (i) The final draft Local Government Reorganisation proposal for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland be endorsed and RECOMMENDED to the Executive;
- (ii) The Executive be RECOMMENDED to delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader for any final changes to the proposal prior to submission.

247. Supplementary income request - Homelessness demands and temporary accommodation

Members received a supplementary income request in order to meet escalating demands in relation to homelessness and temporary accommodation. Concern was expressed that 27% of those seeking temporary accommodation were doing so as a result of domestic abuse, and officers were commended for their work to support them. The impact of changes to requirements for landlords which had resulted in many selling their properties was also highlighted. It was moved by Councillor M Mullaney, seconded by Councillor Lynch and unanimously

RESOLVED –

- (i) A supplementary income allocation of £900,000 be approved for 2025/26;
- (ii) The pressures facing local authorities locally and nationally in relation to homelessness and temporary accommodation be noted;
- (iii) The risk of longer stays in costly and unsuitable bed & breakfast accommodation should sufficient resources not be available be acknowledged;
- (iv) The work being progressed to prevent future reliance on costly accommodation such as bed & breakfast be noted.

248. Calendar of meetings 2026/27

Consideration was given to the calendar of meetings for 2026/27. It was moved by Councillor Bray, seconded by Councillor Bools and unanimously

RESOLVED – the calendar of meetings for 2026/27 be approved.

249. **Motions received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17**

(a) Motion on notice from Councillor Harris and seconded by Councillor Lambert

“Council notes that:

- Construction and development projects in rural areas often bring significant heavy vehicle traffic through villages and countryside roads that were not designed to accommodate such usage
- Residents in rural parts of Hinckley & Bosworth have raised concerns about road safety, environmental damage, noise, disruption to daily life and damage to local infrastructure caused by construction traffic
- Current construction traffic management plans (CTMPs) often fail to sufficiently account for the unique characteristics and limitations of rural road networks.

Council believes that:

- Rural communities deserve the same level of consideration and protection from construction disruption as urban areas
- Strengthened CTMPs, developed in consultation with local parish councils and residents, can help mitigate adverse impacts and ensure more sustainable and respectful development.

Council resolves to:

1. An action review by the Scrutiny Commission at regular intervals (for example, quarterly)
2. Require that all future CTMPs for developments in rural Hinckley & Bosworth:
 - Include a clear assessment of narrow lanes, vulnerable road users and school zones
 - Mandate designated routes for construction vehicles, avoiding sensitive areas where possible
 - Include restrictions on hours of operation to protect residents' quality of life
 - Set out plans for regular road condition monitoring and reinstatement where necessary.
3. Advocate for early engagement with ward councillors during the preparation of CTMPs, in exceptional circumstances where construction traffic is expected to have a significant impact on the surrounding area – such as the recent application in Desford
4. Write to Leicestershire County Council's Highways department requesting collaboration on stronger enforcement of traffic routes and vehicle size restrictions in rural areas
5. Ensure planning enforcement officers have the resources and direction to monitor and address non-compliance with CTMPs.”

Whilst some members disagreed that the issue was greater in rural areas than urban, members supported the motion. It was moved by Councillor Harris, seconded by Councillor Lambert and unanimously

RESOLVED –

- (i) An action review be undertaken by the Scrutiny Commission at regular intervals;
- (ii) All future construction traffic management plans for developments in rural Hinckley & Bosworth:
 - Include a clear assessment of narrow lanes, vulnerable road users and school zones
 - Mandate designated routes for construction vehicles, avoiding sensitive areas where possible
 - Include restrictions on hours of operation to protect residents' quality of life
 - Set out plans for regular road condition monitoring and reinstatement where necessary.
- (iii) Early engagement with ward councillors be required during the preparation of construction traffic management plans, in exceptional circumstances where construction traffic is expected to have a significant impact on the surrounding area;
- (iv) A request be sent to Leicestershire County Council highways department requesting collaboration on stronger enforcement of traffic routes and vehicle size restrictions in rural areas;
- (v) Planning enforcement officers be given the resources and direction to monitor and address non-compliance with construction traffic management plans.

- (b) Motion on notice from Councillor R Allen and seconded by Councillor Harris

“There are many young people in Hinckley & Bosworth who, for a variety of reasons, are unable to use traditional secure toddler swing seats or straight swing seats.

To address this there are specially designed accessible swing seats to provide such children with the simple joy of having a swing.

An accessible swing seat has already been installed by Barwell Parish Council in one of their parks, and has been so well received that the parish council hopes to introduce them to all of their parks.

Burbage Parish Council is also considering the installation of an accessible swing seat, hopefully by the end of this year.

This motion proposes that, as part of all future planning approvals for residential developments that include a formal play area, at least one accessible swing seat be provided as part of this provision by the developer.”

It was moved by Councillor R Allen, seconded by Councillor Harris and unanimously

RESOLVED – all future planning approvals for residential developments that include a formal play area require at least one accessible swing seat to be provided by the developer.

- (c) Motion on notice from Councillor Pendlebury and seconded by Councillor Williams

“HGV strikes at the A5 railway bridge cause economic losses and major delays on local and national roads, costing residents time and money.

In 2023 this authority reluctantly approved the proposed development on the adjoining area of Warwickshire for a massive warehouse development on the condition that the part of the development which lies within HBBC control (the bridge and access road and Dodwells roundabout) should be improved.

The bridge and roundabout frequently cause major delays and congestion. Resolving these problems was seen as crucial before approving large-scale development and was central to planning decisions.

When the developers presented their plans, work on the bridge was expected within six months. However, a senior representative of National Highways has stated that the A5 carriageway design has only just been completed and must still be thoroughly reviewed to ensure long-term safety and reliability. As the representative highlighted fundamental concerns, full approval is not yet in place.

Despite the lack of progress in the design, validation and implementation of the necessary highways works, including lowering the carriageway, the warehouse development is close to completion with the obvious danger that pressure will be brought to bring the development into use prior to the very necessary highways improvements have been completed.

Accordingly, this authority resolves to write to the other parties involved including Rugby Borough Council, Warwickshire County Council, Leicestershire County Council, National Highways and the Department for Transport and stress that it is essential that all infrastructure listed in the planning conditions as to be delivered prior to the development first being brought into use, are delivered. This is particularly important for condition 13 – the scheme of works for lowering of the A5 carriageway under the railway bridge. These conditions remain an essential element for the safe operation of our local highways and should not be relaxed in any way.”

A member updated that at a recent multi-agency meeting it had been confirmed that the work would be undertaken in 2026. It was moved by Councillor Pendlebury, seconded by Councillor Sutton and unanimously

RESOLVED – a letter be sent to the other parties involved including Rugby Borough Council, Warwickshire County Council, Leicestershire County Council, National Highways and the Department for Transport to stress the importance that all infrastructure listed in the planning conditions as being required to be delivered prior to the development first being brought into use, are delivered

(d) Motion on notice from Councillor M Mullaney and seconded by Councillor Bools

“Council notes the recent announcement by Keir Starmer’s Labour government of plans to introduce a mandatory digital ID scheme for all UK residents.

Council further notes that the government’s plan:

- Could require every resident to obtain a digital ID to access public services and entitlements
- Could risk criminalising millions of people, particularly older people, those on lower incomes, or those without access to digital technology
- Raises significant privacy and civil liberty concerns
- Could result in billions of pounds of taxpayers’ money being wasted on a massive IT project, with no clear benefit or safeguards.

Council believes that Labour’s scheme:

- Represents an expensive measure that will undermine public trust
- Will do nothing to address the real priorities facing communities such as delivering more police on the streets, properly funding local schools and fixing broken roads and pavements
- Fails to protect our core British values of liberty, privacy and fairness.

Council welcomes the Liberal Democrats’ consistent national opposition to Labour’s ID cards, having previously defeated Labour’s original plans for ID cards in 2010, and opposes Labour’s renewed attempt to impose them in digital form.

Council resolves:

- To formally oppose the Labour government’s digital ID plans
- To request the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for the Home Department and the Minister for Digital Infrastructure expressing this Council’s firm opposition to Labour’s mandatory digital ID system and calling for the plans to be scrapped
- To work with local voluntary, digital inclusion and civil liberties groups to ensure that no resident in Hinckley & Bosworth is penalised or excluded as a result of any national identification scheme.”

Members expressed concern about the cost of implementing digital ID and the number of residents living in digital poverty who would not be able to comply. It was moved by Councillor M Mullaney, seconded by Councillor Bools and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The government's digital ID plans be opposed;
 - (ii) The Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive be requested to write to the Secretary of State for the Home Department and the Minister for Digital Infrastructure expressing this Council's firm opposition to Labour's mandatory digital ID system and calling for the plans to be scrapped;
 - (iii) Work be undertaken with local voluntary, digital inclusion and civil liberties groups to ensure that no resident in Hinckley & Bosworth is penalised or excluded as a result of any national identification scheme.
- (e) Motion on notice from Councillor R Allen and seconded by Councillor Cook

This motion was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

(The Meeting closed at 8.27 pm)

MAYOR