



OCTOBER
2026

Harborough Local Plan Examination

Matter 7 Statement

Iceni Projects & Apex on behalf of
Marq Logistics (formerly GLP)

ICENI PROJECTS & APEX
ON BEHALF OF MARQ
LOGISTICS (FORMERLY
GLP)

October 2026

Iceni Projects

Birmingham: The Colmore Building, 20 Colmore Circus Queensway, Birmingham B4 6AT

London: Da Vinci House, 44 Saffron Hill, London, EC1N 8FH

Edinburgh: 11 Alva Street, Edinburgh, EH2 4PH

Glasgow: 177 West George Street, Glasgow, G2 2LB

Manchester: This is the Space, 68 Quay Street, Manchester, M3 3EJ

t: 020 3640 8508 | **w:** iceniprojects.com | **e:** mail@iceniprojects.com

linkedin: [linkedin.com/company/iceni-projects](https://www.linkedin.com/company/iceni-projects) | **twitter:** [@iceniprojects](https://twitter.com/iceniprojects)

Harborough Local Plan Examination
MATTER 7 STATEMENT

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. MATTER 7 – LOCATING DEVELOPMENT IN THE RIGHT PLACE 2

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared by Icen Projects and Apex Transport Planning & Engineering on behalf of Marq Logistics (formerly GLP) who hold commercial land interests at Magna Park, Lutterworth, including Mere Lane and south of George House, identified as allocations MP1 & MP2 in the draft Local Plan.
- 1.2 GLP submitted representations on the Harborough Local Plan, including at the Regulation 19 stage, classified under Representor ID 8357.
- 1.3 This Statement builds upon those previous representations in response to the Inspectors' Matter 7, Issue 2 questions.

2. MATTER 7 – LOCATING DEVELOPMENT IN THE RIGHT PLACE

Issue 2: Key Development Sites

Policies SA01, SA02, SA03, SA04, DS01 and DS02

1. Are the following proposed residential development/mixed use and employment allocations justified, based on up-to-date evidence, effective, and consistent with national policy?

MAGNA PARK (STRATEGIC WAREHOUSING)	Plan Policies
Site MP1: Land south of George House, Coventry Road (15.8 Ha Strategic Warehousing B8 land) Site MP2: Land at Mere Lane, Magna Park (122 Ha Strategic Warehousing B8 land)	SA01, DS02

2.1 As detailed in our Regulation 19 representations, we consider that the proposed allocations at Magna Park (Sites MP1 and MP2) are justified, based on up-to-date evidence, effective, and consistent with national policy, subject to the proposed modifications we have previously set out. The Council's evidence base strongly supports the allocation of these sites and Marq Logistics have submitted planning applications (26/00765/FUL and 26/00574/OUT)¹ to deliver these sites. It is also noted that Part of MP1 is already allocated in the adopted Local Plan.

2.2 We provide further detail below on these points, in response to the Inspectors' other questions.

3. For each individual site (housing/employment and mixed use) please answer the following questions. The Council should address any site-specific concerns raised in representations, in addition to the questions outlined in respect of individual sites.

i) What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

ii) What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

2.3 We support the proposed allocation for sites MP1 and MP2 for strategic warehousing (B8) uses, and note that the site areas of the allocations are provided in hectares within the SA01 schedule. This reflects the Council's evidence base (including the Strategic B8 Needs Sensitivity Report (EMP-NLP

¹ Planning applications 26/00765/FUL (MP1) and 26/00574/OUT (MP2), Harborough District Council:

<https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage>

<https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TE0DNLHWFH00>

4)), which assesses both sites as suitable for strategic B8 uses. As a result, both site allocations are justified.

- 2.4 We have however highlighted in our previous representations and in our Matter 4 Statement that the indicative floorspace capacity of both sites should be increased in Policy DS02, to reflect the capacity achieved in Marq's proposals as detailed in planning applications 26/00765/FUL and 26/00574/OUT.

iii) What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

- 2.5 A full planning application was submitted for MP1 in May 2026 (application 26/00765/FUL), with determination expected later this year. The application proposals include two strategic warehouse units delivering a total of 69,995 sqm (GIA).
- 2.6 A hybrid planning application was submitted for MP2 in April 2026 (application 26/00574/OUT), for up to 300,000 sqm (GIA) of strategic distribution floorspace, with other supporting uses and infrastructure. The application is currently progressing towards determination.

iv) What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

- 2.7 The proposed developments at both MP1 and MP2 would between them deliver approximately 370,000 sqm of the identified need for 387,400 sqm of strategic logistics space in Harborough district over the Plan period, thereby making a very significant contribution to identified needs and supporting economic growth.
- 2.8 In addition, as detailed in the submitted Planning Statement accompanying planning application 26/00574/OUT (summarised at paragraph 4.60), development of MP2 is expected to deliver the following benefits:
- the generation of approximately 2,595 direct and 876 indirect jobs during the construction phase, and a total of £370.2m direct and indirect GVA
 - the generation of approximately 3,470 direct jobs (full time equivalent), 3,383 indirect jobs, and a total of £306.7m GVA once operational
 - helping to address the identified need for Travelling Showpeople Plots in the District
 - the potential provision of additional community facilities for residents and workers (visitor centre and café, police facility)

- extension of Bittesby Country Park, alongside significant Biodiversity Net Gain and arboricultural enhancements
- transport benefits including the realignment of Mere Lane, a new link road to Magna Park Central and provision of shared footway/cycleway
- the incorporation of various measures to create a highly sustainable development

v) How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

2.9 The Council's assessment of MP1 (Land South of George House, Coventry Road) and MP2 (Land at Mere Lane, Magna Park) within the Strategic B8 Needs Sensitivity Report (EMP-NLP 4) considers these matters in some detail, concluding that the sites relate well to the existing Magna Park and would be suitable for strategic B8 uses having regard to potential impacts and relevant constraints. The evidence therefore justifies the allocation of these sites.

2.10 Subsequently, Marq Logistics has submitted planning applications for both sites (26/00765/FUL & 26/00574/OUT), with the submitted technical reports providing significant detail on the suitability of the proposals in terms of matters such as transport, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and heritage impacts. Together these submitted documents demonstrate that both allocations are suitable for strategic B8 development and will have an acceptable impact.

vi) How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

2.11 MP1 and MP2 are identified by the Environment Agency mapping as being within Flood Zone 1, with localised surface water flooding affecting small parts of the sites. Both sites were assessed in the Council's evidence, including the Level 1 & 2 SFRA and Sequential Test. The Flood Risk Topic Paper (TPC-NLP 3) explains how the Council have applied a sequential, risk-based approach to site selection, with the assessments informing site-specific requirements. Policy SA01 thus requires site-specific Flood Risk Assessments and drainage strategies at the application stage.

2.12 The planning applications subsequently submitted for both sites are supported by detailed Flood Risk Assessments, which identify the sites as being within Flood Zone 1 and at low risk from all sources of flooding. The assessments confirm that any localised surface water flood risk capable of being appropriately managed through site design, attenuation measures and a comprehensive SuDS strategy.

viii) How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

- 2.13 Transport Assessments have been submitted for both sites (the Transport Assessment for application 26/00765/FUL ('the MP1 TA')² and the Transport Assessment for application 26/00574/OUT ('the MP2 TA'))³. These test the local network and the Strategic Road Network (SRN) junctions using survey-based trip rates, which National Highways (NH) accepted in principle and Leicestershire County Council (LCC) agreed (MP2 TA paras 1.2.2 and 7.1.3). Around just a fifth of the traffic generated by MP1 and MP2 is forecast to travel through the Gibbet Hill roundabout, and the initial assessments conclude that the developments would not have a severe impact (MP2 TA paras 12.1.15 and 12.2.3; MP1 TA paras 12.1.9 and 12.2.3).
- 2.14 Wider network modelling is being undertaken. A Vissim model of Gibbet Hill has been built and audited on behalf of NH, which has confirmed that it is content with the model, and the 'with development' forecasting awaits the outputs of LCC's strategic transport model, as explained in our Matter 4 and Matter 10 statements. At plan level, NH has agreed with the Council that no SRN mitigation is required for the Local Plan, with any necessary mitigation identified at application stage (Statement of Common Ground between the Council and NH (SCG-NLP 25)). LCC and Warwickshire County Council (WCC) do not agree, and their concerns centre on Gibbet Hill (Statement of Common Ground between the Council, LCC and WCC relating to MP1, MP2 and the A5 (HDC15), paras 4.3, 5.2 and 6.1). The Council no longer relies on the junction schemes and costs in Section 5 of its Strategic Transport Impact Assessment (TRP-NLP 2) (Transport Topic Paper (Part 2) (HDC14), para 5.71). Our Matter 4 and Matter 6 statements address the routes to funding and delivery at the A5 junctions.

ix) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

- 2.15 The anticipated infrastructure requirements for MP1 and MP2 include transport mitigation (including walking and cycling improvements, public transport, travel planning measures and junction

² Transport Assessment submitted with application 26/00765/FUL (MP1): https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/files/8433EDF8CAD4C6A1F2126AD3863D799A/pdf/26_00765_FUL-TRANSPORT_ASSESSMENT_PART_1_OF_5-1489504.pdf

³ Transport Assessment submitted with application 26/00574/OUT (MP2): https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/files/9B8148C5BF0B78601B9043BFFAB4239A/pdf/26_00574_OUT-TRANSPORT_ASSESSMENT-1480605.pdf

improvements), utilities, drainage and site-specific environmental mitigation. These are identified in Policy SA01 and the Council's evidence base, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (INF-NLP 1 & 2), and will be delivered either directly as part of the development, through developer obligations and/or wider planned investment as appropriate.

- 2.16 As detailed in the evidence base and the submitted application documents, there are no physical or other constraints to development, and the submitted applications seek to deliver all relevant infrastructure to support the development of these sites.

x) Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

- 2.17 As detailed within the Council's site assessments (EMP-NLP 4) MP1 and MP2 are available and deliverable. They are controlled by Marq Logistics, who have submitted planning applications for the development of the sites in accordance with the draft Local Plan allocations.

- 2.18 Subject to obtaining planning permission, it is anticipated that the sites will be delivered to broadly the below timescales:

- Land South of George House (MP1)
 - Unit B (26,555 sqm): March 2028
 - Unit A (43,440 sqm): April 2028
- Land at Mere Lane (MP2)
 - May 2029: Unit 1
 - February 2030: Unit 3
 - March 2030: Unit 4
 - December 2030: Unit 5A
 - January 2031: Unit 2
 - October 2031: Unit 7
 - November 2031: Unit 6
 - December 2031: Unit 5b

- 2.19 The western part of MP2 is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. The submitted planning application (26/00574/OUT) is supported by a Mineral Sterilisation Appraisal, which confirms based on site investigation work that there is limited sand and gravel present beneath the site, and would be economically unviable to extract. Leicestershire County Council has confirmed its agreement with this conclusion in its consultation response to the application dated 29/05/26. Accordingly, the Safeguarding Area will not affect the delivery of the site.

2.20 MP1 does not lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

xii) Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

2.21 As detailed within our Regulation 19 representations, we consider there are some Main Modifications required to make the policy sound.

MP1 – Land South of George House

2.22 In relation to MP1, we consider it necessary to delete the last sentence of the ‘Policy Requirement’ section, which references the sequential approach to site layout.

2.23 As discussed above, whilst a small part of the site is subject to surface water flood risk, this is a function of the existing topography, which will be altered by the proposed development. The proposed development incorporates a sustainable drainage strategy which ensures that water will be appropriately dealt with within the site and will not increase flood risk.

2.24 Accordingly, it is unclear what is meant by this part of the policy and we do not consider that the reference to a sequential approach is justified. It should be deleted in order to ensure the policy is sound.

MP2 – Land at Mere Lane

2.25 As detailed in our Regulation 19 representations, we consider it necessary for clarity to amend points 1 and 3 of the policy requirements to refer to external lighting; and in point 5, to refer to renewable energy generation more broadly, rather than the current narrow focus solely on PV panels, which might be a suitable option but which do not comprise the only available technology to generate renewable energy. Meanwhile we consider it necessary in point 8 to add ‘where necessary’ to the end of the final sentence regarding potential highway mitigation, to ensure mitigation is only required where necessary and appropriate. Furthermore, for the reasons discussed above in relation to MP1, we consider it necessary to delete the reference to “the sequential approach to site layout” in point 11.

2.26 In relation to the requirement for 3ha of land for Travelling Showpeople plots in point 12, we note that the Council consider this is necessary and appropriate to meet identified needs within Harborough over the Plan period.

2.27 As a result, Marq Logistics has included for the potential provision of a 3ha plot for Travelling Showpeople plots within the submitted planning application (26/00574/OUT). This is included in the submitted parameter plan and the illustrative masterplan that supports the application shows how this element could be delivered as part of the wider development.

-
- 2.28 However, as discussed in our Regulation 19 representations, Marq's preference would be to not provide this on-site, in order to maximise the developable area available for strategic logistics uses and having regard to the practical considerations of delivering TSP plots on this site.
- 2.29 Accordingly, following discussions with Harborough District Council, the planning application also includes a scenario (as detailed in the parameter plan and illustrative masterplans) which would involve the provision of the TSP requirement off-site. Marq has subsequently identified a suitable site in the local area that could accommodate the 3ha requirement, and has provided details to the Council to inform their assessment. Pre-application discussions are ongoing, and it is anticipated that a planning application could be submitted in due course to deliver this site.
- 2.30 On this basis, we anticipate that the Council may identify the alternative site as a separate allocation for TSP development through a Main Modification to the submitted plan. In these circumstances, point 12 of the policy requirements schedule in SA01 would need to be deleted to reflect the fact that this need is being accommodated elsewhere. Should the alternative site not be identified as a specific allocation in the Plan, it will be necessary to amend the wording of point 12 to clarify that this provision can be made off-site, on a suitable alternative site within the district. This would then provide the policy basis for a planning application to come forward on the alternative site to deliver the TSP plots.
- 2.31 These amendments are considered necessary in terms of soundness, as it would not be justified to exclusively require on-site provision when a suitable alternative site is available to meet the identified requirement.

Magna Park (Strategic Warehousing)

Site MP1: Land south of George House, Coventry Road (15.8 Ha Strategic Warehousing B8 land) and Site MP2: Land at Mere Lane, Magna Park

1. Are the allocations of the sites for strategic warehousing appropriate in the context of a risk of surface water flooding? How do the site-specific policies relate to policy DM07: Managing Flood Risk?

- 2.32 As discussed above, small parts of the site are subject to localised areas of surface water flooding, reflecting the existing topography. This can be appropriately dealt with through the development management process, with the assessments submitted in support of planning applications 26/00765/FUL and 26/00574/OUT confirming that any localised surface water flood risk is capable of being appropriately managed through site design, attenuation measures and a comprehensive SuDS strategy.

-
- 2.33 The site-specific requirements in SA01 for flood risk assessments and appropriate surface water drainage strategies are consistent with DM07, and will ensure that localised surface water flood risk is appropriately managed.

2. With reference to site MP2, what is the rationale for the requirement for the provision of a 3 Ha site for travelling show people and is this consistent with any flood risk issues?

- 2.34 As discussed above, Marq has allowed for on-site provision in the proposals submitted under application 26/00574/OUT, although the strong preference would be for any required provision to be off-site, with an appropriate Main Modification to reflect this in Policy SA01.
- 2.35 The Flood Risk Assessment submitted in support of the application explains how flood risk from all sources, including surface water flooding, is low and consequently flood risk can be appropriately dealt with through site design and a suitable drainage strategy.

4. How has the potential impact on designated heritage assets been taken into account in the site selection process, and is the wording of criterion 10 suitably robust?

- 2.36 Relevant heritage assets in proximity to MP1 and MP2 have been considered in the Heritage Analysis of Local Plan Sites (2024) document (HFC-NLP 1). This identifies relevant heritage assets and considers the potential impact of development on the sites, concluding that MP1 would be unlikely to affect the Lutterworth Conservation Area, and that the scale of the MP2 allocation allows for development to be located and screened so as to limit potential visibility to identified heritage assets. These heritage considerations then fed into the site assessments undertaken in EMP-NLP 4.
- 2.37 Accordingly, the allocations are justified by a robust evidence base relating to heritage, and criterion 10 is effective in terms of requiring appropriate heritage assessment in support of development proposals for MP2.
- 2.38 The planning applications for both sites are thus supported by detailed heritage impact assessments, which assess all relevant heritage assets. These do not identify any fundamental constraints to development.

5. How would development of this site reinforce the Area of Separation between Ullesthorpe and Magna Park and how has the topography of the site been taken into account in the delineation of the allocation boundary?

- 2.39 As discussed in our Matter 5 Statement, the Area of Separation has been carefully factored into Marq's proposals for the MP2 allocation, and the submitted application proposals include a 23ha extension to Bittesby Country Park, as well as significant structural landscaping, which aligns with

the part of MP2 affected by the Area of Separation. Accordingly, no built development is proposed within the Area of Separation, and the proposed country park and landscape uses will reinforce and complement the sense of separation between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe, providing a long term defensible northern boundary to the employment area.

6. Can the issue of congestion on the A5 be resolved within the lifetime of the Plan?

- 2.40 Yes. Congestion on the A5 is an existing issue that is capable of resolution within the Plan period. £5.17 million has been secured and pooled for the Gibbet Hill roundabout (MP2 TA Table 8-6), including £2.75 million secured under permission 15/00865/OUT,⁴ where Condition 27 required an improvement approved by Highways England and WCC. Road Investment Strategy 3 (RIS3) names it as a pipeline scheme to start construction early in the fourth road period, NH is consulting on options until 3 November 2026,⁵ and its programme currently assumes that the improvement would open to traffic in 2033, subject to approval and funding (RIS3, pages 60 and 74; NH, A5 Gibbet Hill Environmental Assessment Non-Technical Summary, August 2026, para 2.2.1)⁶. At Cross in Hand, a modest improvement within highway land has been designed (MP2 TA para 8.3.17). LCC and WCC do not share NH's view of the prospects of delivery at Gibbet Hill (HDC15). We consider that the test of a reasonable prospect of delivery is met, as addressed in our Matter 4 and Matter 6 statements.

⁴ Decision notice, application 15/00865/OUT (Symmetry Park), 5 July 2018 (Conditions 27 and 28):

https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/files/B9173B5864668F16FB134626AEC34758/pdf/15_00865_OUT--809539.pdf

⁵ National Highways, A5 Gibbet Hill Options Consultation (September 2026):

<https://nationalhighways.citizenspace.com/he/a5-gibbet-hill-consultation/>

⁶ Department for Transport, Road Investment Strategy 3: 2026 to 2031 (pages 60 and 74):

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/road-investment-strategy-3-ris3-2026-to-2031>; and National Highways, A5 Gibbet Hill Environmental Assessment Non-Technical Summary (August 2026), para 2.2.1: <https://nationalhighways.citizenspace.com/he/a5-gibbet-hill-consultation/>