

Matter 2: Local Plan Vision, District Portrait and Development Objectives

Issue 1: Plan Vision

Question 1: Consistency of the Vision with national policy and housing needs

- 1.1.1. The Vision broadly addresses the themes in [NPPF paragraph 15, p.8](#), but should expressly identify both Harborough's housing needs and its contribution towards Leicester's unmet need. The [Vision, p.4](#), promises housing choice, services, sustainable travel, retained settlement identity and community influence; [paragraphs 4.5-4.7, p.22](#), explain the cross-boundary housing contribution. Bringing those purposes into the Vision would clarify what growth is intended to achieve, without prejudging the disputed amount or distribution considered under Matter 3.
- 1.1.2. The more important issue is whether those objectives can be delivered together. [Proposed MM4.1, pp.4-5](#), usefully adds funding and services to the infrastructure objective. It does not demonstrate that infrastructure will be available when the housing trajectory requires it. Question 3 identifies the remaining wastewater evidence required. Nor does the Vision's promise to preserve settlement identity establish that the allocation strategy achieves it.
- 1.1.3. The Panel should require the housing purpose to be explicit and test the allocations against the Vision's environmental, infrastructure and community outcomes, not treat those aspirations as evidence of compliance. The distinction matters under [NPPF paragraphs 16\(b\) and 35\(b\)-\(c\), pp.8 and 12](#): a positive Vision cannot validate an inadequately justified or ineffective allocation. STNT's detailed SA02 case remains in its related Matter statements.
- 1.1.4. Reg19 basis: [section 3.2, pp.13-16/PDF pp.17-20](#), on the spatial strategy's infrastructure assumptions; [section 8.1.2, pp.31-32/PDF pp.35-36](#), on settlement identity and consistency with the Vision.

Question 2: Identification of strategic allocation policies

- 1.1.5. The allocation policies are identifiable as strategic, but the scope of that classification needs clearer explanation. [Paragraph 1.15, p.9](#), expressly identifies Parts 1 and 3 as strategic; Chapter 5, containing SA01-SA04, sits within Part 1. It would therefore be incorrect to say that SA02 has not been identified as strategic. However, [paragraph 5.2, p.45](#), describes site-specific requirements and the more detailed provisions for the largest sites, without distinguishing which details are essential to the strategic policy.
- 1.1.6. [NPPF paragraph 21, p.9](#), limits strategic policies to what is necessary for strategic priorities; [PPG 61-002-20190315](#) requires a clear distinction from non-strategic policies. The Council should provide a policy-level identification and explain the strategic necessity of the detailed allocation requirements. This should remove ambiguity about the scope left for neighbourhood planning, without weakening necessary infrastructure, environmental or design safeguards.
- 1.1.7. Classification is not justification: identifying SA02 as strategic cannot establish that the allocation is sound or that it delivers the spatial strategy. STNT's substantive objection is preserved, not answered by a label.
- 1.1.8. Reg19 basis: [section 3.1, p.13/PDF p.17](#), on justification of the allocation strategy; [section 8.1.2, p.31/PDF p.35](#), on settlement identity and the effectiveness of spatial protections.

Question 3: Sewerage capacity and pollution risk

- 1.1.9. The Plan responds through a pre-occupation capacity safeguard and provider engagement, but those measures must be supported by credible delivery timing for the remaining constrained catchments. [DS05, first criterion 4\(c\), p.41](#), requires adequate foul-water treatment and disposal before occupation, with phasing agreed with the relevant bodies. Anglian Water expressly supports that mechanism in its [Reg19 comments on DS05](#).
- 1.1.10. The evidence has changed. Anglian Water's consultation response dated [20 July 2026 to the recently submitted outline planning application for the site](#) (HDC ref: 26/00470/OUT confirms treatment and sewer-network capacity for the proposed Husbands Bosworth

development, including consideration of consented flows. STNT therefore does not rely on its earlier no-capacity warning as a continuing objection to that scheme. However, [HDC16, pp.10-11](#), still identifies Great Easton and Hallaton as red-rated pending 2030-2035 investment, and seeks clarification of the revised Husbands Bosworth advice for Local Plan purposes. The Panel needs the completed catchment-level reconciliation, not an assumption that the favourable site response resolves every allocation or cumulative demand.

- 1.1.11. [HDC16, pp.1 and 5](#), confirms that no separate Stage 2 Water Cycle Study has been completed and acknowledges unresolved network-improvement detail. A separate study is not indispensable if other proportionate evidence supplies the answer. But a condition preventing occupation cannot establish when occupation will be possible. For unresolved catchments, the evidence must connect capacity, necessary works, funding route and commissioning dates to the housing phases, allowing for cumulative commitments. Water-company investment must not be misrepresented as an unfunded developer contribution: [HDC11, section 1.6, PDF p.7](#).
- 1.1.12. The Panel should require that reconciliation before accepting the affected trajectory, retaining effective pre-occupation safeguards and excluding unsupported delivery assumptions. This is a Plan-wide test. SA02's separate Severn Trent position must be assessed on its own evidence; Anglian's warning is not an objection to SA02. [INF-NLP2, section 3.6.3, Table 6, pp.28-29](#), identifies OA1's sewerage network as likely to require capacity improvements. The distinct SA02 phasing evidence is addressed in STNT's Matter 6 draft.
- 1.1.13. Reg19 basis: [section 4.2, pp.22-23/PDF pp.26-27](#), on sewage capacity, infrastructure funding and phased delivery.

Question 4: Made neighbourhood plans and their relationship to this Plan

- 1.1.14. The Council's [published January 2026 status schedule, PDF pp.1-6](#), records made plans for Arnesby; Billesdon; Broughton Astley; Burton Overy; Dunton Bassett; East Langton; Fleckney; Foxton; Gilmorton; Great Bowden; Great Easton; Great Glen; Hallaton; High Leicestershire; Houghton on the Hill; Hungarton; Husbands Bosworth; the Kibworths; Leire;

Lubenham; Medbourne; Misterton with Walcote; North Kilworth; Saddington; Scraptoft; Shearsby; South Kilworth; Swinford; Tugby and Keythorpe; and Tur Langton. This is a dated list, not confirmation of each current version: the [Great Bowden review record](#), for example, now records a successful referendum on 8 October 2026. The Council should supply an updated schedule distinguishing made plans, referendum-approved plans and reviews still in progress.

- 1.1.15. Made neighbourhood plans remain part of the statutory development plan; adoption of this Local Plan would not automatically erase all their policies. Where development-plan policies conflict, [section 38\(5\) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004](#) gives priority to the policy in the document that became part of the development plan last. [NPPF paragraphs 29-30, p.10](#), explain neighbourhood planning's role and the relationship with strategic and subsequently adopted policies.
- 1.1.16. For STNT, the relevant connection is protection of heritage, landscape and settlement identity, including the [made Great Glen plan](#). The Council should identify which relevant neighbourhood-plan policies would actually conflict with its allocations and explain the proposed treatment; compatible local protections remain applicable. A later allocation's potential priority does not establish its soundness, while an existing neighbourhood plan is not an automatic veto. STNT advances no separate objection to the making of these plans.
- 1.1.17. Reg19 basis: [section 5, pp.24-25/PDF pp.28-29](#), including the express Great Glen neighbourhood-plan evidence reference; [section 8.1.2, p.31/PDF p.35](#), on settlement identity and spatial protections.