

Groby Parish Council



Parish Council Office, Village Hall, Leicester Road, Groby, Leicester. LE6 0DQ
Tel: 0116 2876985 www.grobyparishcouncil.gov.uk Email: admin@grobyparishcouncil.gov.uk

Planning and Development Control
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Hinckley Hub
Rugby Road
Hinckley
Leicestershire
LE10 0FR

3rd February 2026

Representations to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council on Planning Application 25/01213/OUT – Land South of Sacheverell Way, Groby, Leicester

This representation is submitted on behalf of Groby Parish Council following the Groby Parish Council's Planning & Development Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 29th January 2026.

Groby Parish Council formally objects to the proposed residential development at Land South of Sacheverell Way, Groby.

This submission comprises:

- Part 1 – Committee-ready Objection Report
- Appendix A – Detailed Schedule of Issues and Policy Conflicts

Together, these documents set out the full basis of the Parish Council's objection. The Council does not object to the principle of residential development, but considers the scale, density, layout and location of this proposal to be unacceptable and contrary to planning policy.

PART 1 – COMMITTEE-READY OBJECTION REPORT

1. Site Context and Strategic Location

1.1 Function of Sacheverell Way

Sacheverell Way is a busy local distributor road linking Groby and Ratby. Existing conditions include regular peak-time congestion, limited network resilience, and routine network failure when a single incident or breakdown occurs.

1.2 Relationship to Groby Village Centre

The functional centre of Groby is located at the junction of Markfield Lane and Ratby Road, where shops, services and the public house are situated. The site lies approximately 1.1 miles away, with a longer and less safe pedestrian route.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 105 requires development to be located where the need to travel will be minimised. This test is not met.

2. Failure to Address Pre-Application Comments

2.1 Lack of Scheme Evolution

Concerns raised at the pre-application stage regarding scale, highways, pedestrian safety and infrastructure capacity have not resulted in any meaningful redesign or reduction in housing numbers.

2.2 Policy Context

NPPF paragraph 39 states that early engagement should improve outcomes. The absence of scheme evolution weighs against the proposal.

3. Design Quality, Density and Residential Amenity

3.1 Over-Intensive Layout

Separation distances of approximately 7.2 metres occur in places, with extensive reliance on shared streets and private drives. This results in loss of privacy, poor outlook and reduced residential amenity.

3.2 Policy Conflict

NPPF paragraphs 130, 131 and 135 and Site Allocations and Development Management (SADM) Policy DM10 require high-quality living environments. These standards are not achieved.

4. Density-Led Design and Reliance on Mitigation

4.1 Evidence from Assessments

The scheme relies on acoustic fencing, enhanced glazing and future planting, confirming that dwellings are positioned too close to the A46 and Sacheverell Way.

4.2 Policy Context

NPPF paragraph 130(c) requires harm to be designed out. Reliance on mitigation demonstrates that the proposed housing quantum exceeds site capacity.

5. Highways, Transport and Network Resilience

5.1 Existing Conditions

Sacheverell Way operates at 40mph and is not a low-speed residential street. Automatic Traffic Counts confirm its distributor function.

5.2 Transport Assessment Limitations

The Transport Assessment assumes free-flow conditions and does not assess network resilience, incident-based congestion or cumulative impacts.

5.3 Policy Conflict

NPPF paragraphs 108, 110 and 116 require safe, suitable and resilient networks. These tests are not met.

6. Pedestrian Safety and Inclusive Access

Pedestrian access requires walking alongside and crossing a congested distributor road, presenting risk to children, elderly and infirm users. Children from Ratby attend schools in Groby, intensifying peak-time movements.

This conflicts with NPPF paragraphs 92 and 110.

7. Green Infrastructure, Landscape and Biodiversity

7.1 Green Infrastructure and Landscape

The site is part of the Rothley Brook Meadow Green Wedge and Groby Parish Council's position is that they are opposed to any erosion of this Green Wedge. A strategic role of the Rothley Brook Meadow Green Wedge is to ensure that there is clear separation between the Leicester urban area and the surrounding rural centres. The settlement of Groby, Ratby and Kirby Muxloe are within close proximity and the Green Wedge acts as a buffer between the settlements. It is important to ensure that the separate identities of these settlements are retained providing a sense of leaving one village and entering another.

Any development of the site conflicts with HBBC's Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020) which notes the important role the Green Wedge has in regards to the separation of the Borough's developed areas.

The site forms part of a wider green infrastructure network linked to the Rothley Brook corridor and occupies a sensitive settlement edge.

This conflicts with SADM Policies DM6 and DM8.

7.2 Biodiversity and Nature Recovery

The site is identified in the Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Local Nature Recovery Strategy as land that could become of particular importance for biodiversity, including rail corridor buffering.

NPPF paragraph 182 requires support for LNRS delivery. This requirement is not met.

8. Infrastructure Provision

The application does not demonstrate secured provision for healthcare, education or formal sports facilities, conflicting with NPPF paragraphs 92 and 104 and SADM Policy DM3.

9. Construction Impacts and Outline Stage Concerns

No Construction Traffic Management Plan is provided. The outline nature of the application defers resolution of known and fundamental harms.

10. Planning Balance and Conclusion

The proposal would result in overdevelopment, poor amenity, highway failure, reduced network resilience, biodiversity loss and undeliverable infrastructure. These harms are not outweighed by housing delivery. Groby Parish Council therefore objects to the proposal.

APPENDIX A – DETAILED SCHEDULE OF ISSUES AND POLICY CONFLICTS

Issue 1 – Distributor road congestion on Sacheverell Way

Policy: NPPF 108, 110

Issue 2 – Lack of highway network resilience

Policy: NPPF 110

Issue 3 – Single-incident network failure

Policy: NPPF 116

Issue 4 – Distance from village centre increases car dependency

Policy: NPPF 105

Issue 5 – Unsafe pedestrian environment

Policy: NPPF 92, 110

Issue 6 – School-related pedestrian movements not assessed

Policy: NPPF 92, 108

Issue 7 – Failure to address pre-application concerns

Policy: NPPF 39

Issue 8 – Over-intensive development

Policy: NPPF 131, DM10

Issue 9 – Inadequate separation distances

Policy: NPPF 130, DM10

Issue 10 – Loss of privacy and outlook

Policy: DM10

Issue 11 – Density-led layout

Policy: NPPF 131

Issue 12 – Reliance on acoustic fencing

Policy: NPPF 130(c)

Issue 13 – Mitigation compensating for poor design

Policy: NPPF 135

Issue 14 – Transport Assessment free-flow assumptions
Policy: NPPF 108

Issue 15 – No incident-based modelling
Policy: NPPF 110

Issue 16 – No cumulative impact assessment
Policy: NPPF 116

Issue 17 – Shared streets used to absorb excess traffic
Policy: DM17, Highway Design Guide

Issue 18 – Rat-running risk within site
Policy: NPPF 110

Issue 19 – Bus reliability undermined by congestion
Policy: NPPF 115

Issue 20 – Increased idling traffic and emissions
Policy: NPPF 174, DM7

Issue 21 – Air quality assessment underestimates impacts
Policy: NPPF 174

Issue 22 – Fragmentation of green infrastructure
Policy: DM6

Issue 23 – Landscape harm at settlement edge
Policy: DM8

Issue 24 – Biodiversity harm not avoided
Policy: DM9

Issue 25 – Conflict with Local Nature Recovery Strategy
Policy: NPPF 182

Issue 26 – Loss of land identified for future biodiversity importance
Policy: DM9

Issue 27 – Rail corridor buffer compromised
Policy: DM6, DM9

Issue 28 – No secured healthcare provision
Policy: NPPF 92, 104, DM3

Issue 29 – No education capacity assessment
Policy: NPPF 92, 104, DM3

Issue 30 – No formal sports provision
Policy: NPPF 92

Issue 31 – No Construction Traffic Management Plan
Policy: NPPF 116, DM17

Issue 32 – Construction traffic exacerbating congestion
Policy: NPPF 116

Issue 33 – Outline application defers resolution of harm
Policy: NPPF 130

11. Additional Unresolved Issues – Raised Without Prejudice to Groby Parish Council's Objection

For the avoidance of doubt, Groby Parish Council maintains its formal objection to the proposed development.

The matters set out in this section do not indicate acceptance of the proposal and do not mitigate or outweigh the fundamental planning harms previously identified.

These issues are raised to demonstrate the extent of unresolved policy failures within the current submission and to provide further evidence as to why the proposal is not acceptable as submitted. Should the Local Planning Authority nonetheless be minded to grant permission, the matters below would require resolution. Their inclusion must not be interpreted as reducing, qualifying, or softening the Parish Council's objection.

11.1 Highway Adoption and Private Road Network

Policy: NPPF paragraphs 108 and 110; SADM Policy DM17

The proposed layout includes a substantial proportion of private driveways and non-adopted roads, estimated to comprise approximately one quarter of the internal road network. The application does not demonstrate that all roads will be constructed to adoptable standards or offered for adoption by the Highway Authority.

A fragmented network of private roads creates long-term risks relating to maintenance, safety, consistency of standards and emergency access. This fails to deliver a robust, reliable and publicly accountable highway environment.

11.2 Emergency Access and Network Failure Risk

Policy: NPPF paragraphs 108, 110 and 116

Sacheverell Way already operates with limited resilience, such that a single breakdown, collision or obstruction can significantly restrict or prevent access.

The proposal fails to demonstrate how emergency services would reliably access and egress the site during congestion or incident conditions. Given the scale of development proposed, this represents a serious and unresolved safety concern and highlights a fundamental weakness in the access strategy.

11.3 Pedestrian Crossings and Protection of Vulnerable Users

Policy: NPPF paragraphs 92 and 110; SADM Policy DM10

The development would significantly increase pedestrian movements across and along Sacheverell Way, including movements by children, elderly residents and those with limited mobility.

The application does not demonstrate the provision of safe, controlled pedestrian crossing facilities capable of addressing this increased risk. The absence of such measures undermines pedestrian safety, discourages walking and further increases reliance on private vehicles.

11.4 Parking Shortfall and On-Street Congestion

Policy: NPPF paragraphs 108 and 110; SADM Policy DM17

The level of on-site parking proposed does not adequately reflect real-world car ownership. Overspill parking onto surrounding roads, including Sacheverell Way, is therefore highly likely.

This would:

- Reduce carriageway width
- Restrict visibility
- Increase congestion
- Further compromise emergency access

The proposal fails to properly address parking demand and highway safety.

11.5 Tree Protection and Long-Term Landscape Loss

Policy: SADM Policies DM8 and DM9; NPPF paragraph 180

The proposal does not adequately secure the long-term retention of trees within residential plots. Without formal protection, future removal by householders would result in incremental and irreversible loss of landscape character and biodiversity value over time.

This represents a failure to safeguard environmental assets beyond the initial development phase.

11.6 Absence of Secured Long-Term Site Management

Policy: NPPF paragraph 104; SADM Policy DM3

The application does not clearly secure long-term maintenance and management arrangements for:

- Open space
- Landscaping and green infrastructure
- Drainage and SuDS features

The absence of robust, enforceable arrangements creates unacceptable uncertainty and risks placing future burdens on residents or Groby Parish Council.

11.7 Flood Risk and Surface Water Management

Policy: NPPF paragraphs 174 and 180(d)

The proposal does not demonstrate sufficiently robust surface water and flood management measures to address:

- Increased impermeable surfaces
- Climate change impacts
- Long-term maintenance responsibilities

Without clear and durable flood management protocols, there is a risk of future surface water flooding both on and off site.

11.8 Affordable Housing Provision and Community Balance

Policy: NPPF paragraphs 62 and 92

The proposal does not clearly secure a 40% affordable housing provision, nor does it demonstrate an appropriate tenure mix to meet identified local needs. This undermines the creation of a balanced, inclusive and sustainable community.

11.9 Health, Recreation and Community Infrastructure – Long-Standing Local Need

Policy: NPPF paragraphs 92 and 104; SADM Policy DM3

The provision of improved healthcare facilities and formal sports provision, including a football pitch with an associated clubhouse, has been the subject of ongoing discussion within Groby for a considerable period of time.

Health Centre

Local GP provision within Groby is widely recognised as constrained, with the existing surgery operating from premises that are too small to meet current demand. This is a long-standing issue within the village and not one created by this application.

The scale of development proposed presents an opportunity to help address an existing deficit in healthcare provision. However, the application:

- Demonstrates no formal engagement with local GP practices or the NHS Integrated Care Board
- Does not confirm deliverability, funding or phasing
- Provides no certainty regarding long-term operation

As such, references to healthcare provision remain aspirational and fail to demonstrate that existing pressures would be alleviated.

Football Pitch and Clubhouse

The provision of a football pitch with associated clubhouse facilities has similarly been an ongoing aspiration within Groby, reflecting demand from local clubs and pressure on existing facilities.

The application makes no firm provision for such facilities and relies instead on informal open space. This represents a missed opportunity for the development to reduce existing local pressures and support health, wellbeing and community cohesion.

11.10 Social Cohesion, Buddy Benches and Mental Wellbeing Gardens

Policy: NPPF paragraph 92

The proposal does not clearly demonstrate how social cohesion and mental wellbeing will be supported across the development.

There is no clear provision for:

- Buddy benches, which promote social interaction and help reduce isolation
- Mental wellbeing gardens or quiet communal spaces, which support mental health and foster a sense of belonging

The absence of such features undermines the creation of a healthy, inclusive and socially sustainable community.

11.11 Excessive Housing Numbers and Need for Reduction

Policy: NPPF paragraphs 130, 131 and 135; SADM Policy DM10

Many of the harms identified throughout this objection arise directly from the number of dwellings proposed.

The scale of development exceeds what the site can reasonably accommodate without harm. A reduction in housing numbers is necessary to:

- Improve spacing and residential amenity
- Reduce traffic and parking pressure
- Improve emergency access and network resilience
- Create space for meaningful green, social and wellbeing infrastructure

Without such a reduction, the proposal remains fundamentally flawed.

11.12 Overall Implication

Taken together, these additional unresolved matters demonstrate ongoing conflicts with national and local planning policy. They reinforce the conclusion that the proposal:

- Is not deliverable in a safe, inclusive or sustainable manner
- Relies on unresolved future mitigation
- Fails to address long-standing community needs

These issues add significant further weight to Groby Parish Council's objection and confirm that the proposal is not acceptable as currently proposed.

Sue Hackett
Parish Clerk

On behalf of Groby Parish Council Planning & Development Committee
Groby Parish Council
Leicester Road
Groby
Leicester
LE6 0DQ