



OCTOBER
2026

Harborough Local Plan Examination

Matter 10 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 10 STATEMENT

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. MATTER 10 – DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENTS AND MANAGEMENT OF
IMPACTS 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 Marq Logistics is one of the UK's leading industrial and logistics providers and have a long history of delivering successful employment schemes in the Midlands. Magna Park in Harborough is their flagship scheme and is considered to be one of the most successful employment schemes in Europe, accommodating strategic warehousing developments which are occupied by some of the world's leading distribution operators, providing significant local employment and economic benefits.
- 1.3 GLP submitted representations on the Harborough Local Plan, including at the Regulation 19 stage, classified under Representor ID 8357.
- 1.4 This Statement builds upon those previous representations in response to the Inspectors' Matter 10, Issue 1 questions.

2. MATTER 10 – DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENTS AND MANAGEMENT OF IMPACTS

Issue 1: Development Standards

Policy DM06 Transport and Accessibility

6. Is it appropriate to defer transport impacts such as consideration of the impact of developments on the SRN to planning application stage? For example, with reference to allocations MP1 and MP2, there is a clear issue of existing congestion on the A5 with the Gibbet Road Roundabout working at 98% capacity [INF-NLP2].

- 2.1 Plan-level evidence has not left transport impacts, whether on the local highway network or the Strategic Road Network (SRN), to the application stage alone. The Council's Strategic Transport Impact Assessment ('the STIA') (TRP-NLP 2) identifies the Gibbet Hill and Cross in Hand constraints, although the Council no longer relies on its junction schemes and costs (Transport Topic Paper (Part 2) (HDC14), para 5.71). National Highways (NH) has agreed with the Council that no SRN mitigation is required for the Local Plan, with any necessary mitigation identified at application stage (SCG-NLP 25). Leicestershire County Council (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).
- 2.2 For the local highway network, the Council's Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) report (September 2026) (HDC13) takes a two-stage approach of strategic identification followed by detailed junction testing. It identifies eleven local road schemes, with an upper estimate of about £8.2 million, finds that several junctions flagged by the strategic model need no mitigation, and concludes that the Plan's impacts can be addressed through feasible junction improvements (HDC13, paras 1.1.4 to 1.1.6 and 1.1.8 and Appendix C; HDC14, paras 5.85 and 5.86). On the A4303 in Lutterworth, a deliverable minor mitigation scheme is identified at Coventry Road / Hunter Boulevard, and no mitigation is required at the A4303 / Coventry Road / Fairacres Coventry Road or A4303 Lutterworth Road / A426 Rugby Road roundabouts (HDC13, paras 1.1.7, 4.4.5 and 4.5.8).
- 2.3 The congestion at the Gibbet Hill roundabout is an existing constraint and is not a result of MP1 and MP2 coming forward. The Council's own strategic modelling shows the roundabout over capacity in the 2041 Core scenario, which excludes the Plan's development (STIA paras 3.5.7 and 3.5.8), and the Council's evidence records it at 98% capacity (INF-NLP 2). The relevant question is therefore whether the traffic that the allocations add can be mitigated and would not be severe, and the evidence indicates that it can and would not.
- 2.4 For MP1 and MP2 the position is not one of deferral. Full Transport Assessments have already been submitted for both sites, with junction modelling at the A5 and A4303 junctions and an initial

conclusion that the impact is not severe (Transport Assessment for application 26/00574/OUT ('the MP2 TA')¹ paras 12.1.15 and 12.2.3; Transport Assessment for application 26/00765/FUL ('the MP1 TA')² paras 12.1.9 and 12.2.3). Around just a fifth of the traffic generated by MP1 and MP2 is forecast to travel through the Gibbet Hill roundabout, so the significant majority of site traffic uses alternative routes (MP2 TA Table 7-3; MP1 TA Table 7-3). The increase in flows at the junction is under 3%, against 2025 flows that are lower than those assessed and accepted for historic approved applications (MP2 TA Tables 8-4 and 8-5 and paras 8.3.24 to 8.3.28). HGV routing controls and traffic regulation order contributions, which WCC has asked for (HDC15, Appendix B, paras 2.5, 2.6 and 2.14), are secured at application stage by condition and planning obligation, as they were for Symmetry Park³ and the Magna Park Extension.⁴

- 2.5 In response to the MP2 application, NH has asked for further modelling at Gibbet Hill.⁵ A Vissim model of the Gibbet Hill roundabout has been built from April 2025 survey data, as part of the ongoing MP1 and MP2 application process, and has been calibrated and validated. It was audited by AECOM on behalf of NH, which confirmed on 16 July 2026 that, following independent checks, it is content with the updated model (Vissim Modelling Impact Assessment Report MG0406, paras 1.1.3 and 1.3, submitted to Rugby Borough Council in relation to the emerging local plan). The model is therefore suitable for consideration of future year scenarios.
- 2.6 The 'with development' future year modelling awaits the outputs of LCC's strategic transport model ('PRTM'), which LCC is running for the MP1 and MP2 applications. The work commenced on 1 June 2026 and LCC's latest programme is for 'with development' modelling completed by 23 October 2026 and the forecasting report issued by 13 November 2026. We are awaiting that information to consider the wider network implications. In the meantime, the interim assessments undertaken within the MP2 TA and MP1 TA demonstrate 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).
- 2.7 NH is also progressing work at Gibbet Hill outside the planning application process. It is consulting (23 September to 3 November 2026) on three shortlisted options for an improvement, Options 5, 6 and 11, has carried out traffic modelling of them, and describes all three as designed to improve

¹ 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

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 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

⁴ Appeal decision APP/F2415/W/18/3206289 (Magna Park Extension), 18 April 2019: <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?Caseid=3206289&CoID=0>.

⁵ National Highways consultation response on application 26/00574/OUT: https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/files/44DBF18D9A14EF0B89F8D09F77E16D0D/pdf/26_00574_OUT-NATIONAL_HIGHWAYS-1516943.pdf

traffic flow and reduce congestion (NH, A5 Gibbet Hill Options Consultation Brochure, September 2026)⁶. The LCC and WCC Statement of Common Ground records that NH is progressing optioneering and consultation on the business case for a major improvement in partnership with them (HDC15, para 6.1). £5.17 million has been secured and pooled for the junction (MP2 TA Table 8-6), and Road Investment Strategy 3 (RIS3) names the A5 Gibbet Hill scheme as one of nine pipeline schemes to be developed during the current road period with a view to starting construction early in the fourth road period, subject to business cases (RIS3, pages 60 and 74)⁷. NH's programme currently assumes that construction would start in 2031 and the improvement would open to traffic in 2033, subject to approval and funding (NH, A5 Gibbet Hill Environmental Assessment Non-Technical Summary, August 2026, para 2.2.1)⁸.

- 2.8 Paragraph 114 of the December 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)⁹ applies at both plan-making and application stage, and the evidence indicates that it can be met. Paragraph 115 sets the threshold for refusal as an unacceptable impact on highway safety or residual cumulative impacts on the road network that would be severe, and both tests are directed at the impact of the proposed development, which here is an increase in flows of under 3% at Gibbet Hill.

7. Notwithstanding, its robust representation objecting to the allocations at Magna Park, our understanding from [SCG-NLP25], National Highways now agrees in principle the allocations should move forward. Is it appropriate where the allocation is a 'potential concern' to rely on further assessment at the planning application stage? Is there a realistic prospect of the requisite highway improvements coming forward over the Plan period and is the construction of the warehousing dependent on the highway improvements?

- 2.9 There is a reasonable prospect of the requisite improvements within the Plan period at Gibbet Hill and Cross in Hand, and a 'reasonable prospect' rather than certainty is the test. At Gibbet Hill, £5.17 million has been secured and pooled (MP2 TA Table 8-6), and NH's programme provides a route to delivery.
- 2.10 An improvement at Gibbet Hill has also previously been agreed. Condition 27 of the Symmetry Park permission (15/00865/OUT, 5 July 2018) required a signalised improvement of the roundabout, with widened and flared entries, to be in place before first occupation. A financial contribution of £2.75 million towards improvements at the junction has since been secured under that permission, and forms part of the £5.17 million pooled for the junction (MP2 TA Table 8-6). NH's more recent options assessment has discounted signalisation of the existing layout, because its modelling showed that

⁶ National Highways, A5 Gibbet Hill Options Consultation (September 2026):

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

⁷ 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>.

⁸ 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/>

⁹ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023):

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20231228093504/https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

this did not perform well under future traffic conditions, and its consultation options are more significant roundabout improvements. The earlier agreement nonetheless shows that NH and the local highway authorities have accepted that this junction can be improved and that funding for it has been secured.

- 2.11 The RIS3 pipeline position and NH's programme for the Gibbet Hill scheme are set out in our response to Question 6. At Cross in Hand, a modest improvement within highway land has been designed (MP2 TA para 8.3.17), and the Council no longer relies on the STIA's earlier signalisation scheme at that junction (HDC14, para 5.71).
- 2.12 LCC and WCC consider that a strategic scale improvement is required at Gibbet Hill, that it is beyond what a developer could deliver, that NH has made no funding commitment, that no small scale interim solution is tenable, and that timely delivery is extremely unlikely (HDC15, paras 3.1 and 6.1 and Appendix B, paras 2.12 and 2.13). We agree that the strategic scheme is for NH and that no funding commitment exists, but we do not agree that no improvement is achievable, as the earlier agreement above shows. For the strategic scheme, the test is a reasonable prospect of delivery, supported by the RIS3 pipeline, NH's three modelled options and its programme, and by the LCC and WCC acknowledgement that NH is progressing the business case in partnership with them (HDC15, para 6.1). Further detail is set out in our Matter 4 and Matter 6 statements.
- 2.13 On dependency, the construction of the warehousing does not depend on the strategic improvement at Gibbet Hill. The congestion there is an existing constraint that arises without the Plan's development (STIA paras 3.5.7 and 3.5.8), and the improvement is needed whether or not MP1 and MP2 are developed. The initial conclusions of the Transport Assessments are that the developments would not have a severe residual cumulative impact or an unacceptable impact on highway safety (MP2 TA paras 12.1.15, 12.2.2 and 12.2.3; MP1 TA paras 12.1.9 and 12.2.3). Only around a fifth of the traffic generated by MP1 and MP2 is forecast to travel through the Gibbet Hill roundabout (about 19% of development trips in the peak hours; MP2 TA Tables 7-4 and 8-1; MP1 TA Table 8-1).
- 2.14 The MP2 proposals include a new link road through Magna Park Central, connecting to Harrier Parkway and Shackleton Way, which reduces development movements on the A5, particularly at the Mere Lane roundabout (MP2 TA paras 7.4.6 and 7.4.7). Most traffic is forecast to use the M1 corridor, with 27% of light vehicles and 32% of HGVs travelling to the M1 north and south via Junction 20, and a further 8% and 9% travelling east of the M1 (MP2 TA Table 7-3). Traffic heading north and north-east uses the A5 northbound to connect with Junction 12 of the M6 (and the M69 Junction 1), rather than travelling south through the Gibbet Hill roundabout to Junction 1 of the M6; 16% of light vehicles and 14% of HGVs are forecast to travel north on the A5 (MP2 TA Table 7-3 and para 7.4.8). The increase in background flows at the Gibbet Hill roundabout is under 3% (MP2 TA Tables 8-4 and 8-5 and paras 8.3.24 to 8.3.28). Paragraphs 114 and 115 of the December 2023 NPPF are directed at

the impact of the proposed development, and on that measure the evidence does not show a dependency.

- 2.15 At Cross in Hand, the assessments use the junction model from the approved HGV parking facility application (22/02002/OUT)¹⁰, which assumes the modest improvement. They show the roundabout operating well within capacity with MP1 and MP2 in 2031, with a maximum ratio of flow to capacity of 0.70, against the 0.85 level generally taken as the threshold for satisfactory operation (MP2 TA paras 8.3.15 to 8.3.20 and 10.5.10 to 10.5.14; MP1 TA paras 10.5.18 to 10.5.21). That improvement lies within highway land and does not require third-party land (MP2 TA para 8.3.17), so it can be delivered alongside the developments.
- 2.16 The infrastructure that arises directly from the allocations, namely the site access, link road, footways and active travel connections, is deliverable with the development (MP2 TA paras 12.1.17 and 12.2.2; MP1 TA paras 6.2.1 to 6.2.7 and 11.1.1 to 11.1.3). On the local highway network, the Council's Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) report finds no mitigation is required at the A4303 / Coventry Road / Fairacres Coventry Road and A4303 Lutterworth Road / A426 Rugby Road junctions, and only a minor scheme at Coventry Road / Hunter Boulevard (HDC13, paras 1.1.7, 4.4.5 and 4.5.8).
- 2.17 Further assessment at application stage is the appropriate route for confirming any remaining impacts and mitigation, as NH has agreed with the Council (SCG-NLP 25, as summarised in HDC15, para 5.4), and it is already under way. NH has accepted the trip rates in principle (MP2 TA para 1.2.2) and is content with the Vissim model of the Gibbet Hill roundabout (as set out above), and the PRTM outputs, due by 13 November 2026, will test the position further. NH has recorded no soundness concern in the Statement of Common Ground (SCG-NLP 25). If the Inspectors consider it necessary, or if the modelling were to show that a threshold would be reached, a trigger linking occupation to the delivery or funding of the Cross in Hand improvement would be a proportionate mechanism.

¹⁰ Application 22/02002/OUT (HGV parking facility), Harborough District Council: <https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=RLPGKBHWIG800>