

Matter 3 Amount and distribution of development

Cllr Phil King | Respondent 2511 | 15 October 2026

I submit these comments in my individual capacity as District Councillor for Kibworths Ward and Leicestershire County Councillor for Gartree Division. I am not acting as an official representative of either Harborough District Council or Leicestershire County Council; these are my own representations.

Original representations 13333, 13372 and 13369

Questions addressed in ID9

Issue 1 Questions 1 to 3; Issue 2 Questions 1 to 4; Issue 3 Questions 1 and 2; Issue 5 Questions 2 and 9

1. I maintain my objection to DS01 and the justification for the distribution of growth. My original representation also challenged the housing requirement. The Council must demonstrate a transparent relationship between assessed need, any contribution to Leicester's unmet need, the distribution selected and realistic delivery.
2. I accept the Panel's decision to examine the plan under the December 2023 NPPF. That decision does not establish that the housing strategy or allocations are sound. My comments concern their substantive justification and delivery.
3. Concentrating further development along the A6 requires an adequate assessment of cumulative effects. The Council should show why this distribution is preferable to reasonable alternatives in the absence of the previously envisaged strategic expressway.
4. The hierarchy must reflect actual accessibility and infrastructure capacity. Kibworth Beauchamp and Kibworth Harcourt retain separate identities. Their combined assessment should not obscure constraints or assume that facilities are equally accessible from every development location. The comparative treatment of Broughton Astley and Lutterworth and the classification of land south of Gartree Road also need a clear explanation.
5. Housing delivery assumptions must match infrastructure timing. Where a site depends on access works, schools or cumulative highway mitigation, the trajectory should demonstrate those dependencies. A later intervention date cannot be reconciled with earlier housing delivery simply by assuming the matter will be resolved through an application. [HDC11A, entries TR8, TR20, TR22 and TR23; HDC18, Tables 9 and 13.]
6. I seek evidence of realistic lead-in times, occupation rates and infrastructure dependencies for principal allocations, with sensitivity testing for delay. Any resulting shortfall should prompt reconsideration of the strategy, rather than unsupported optimism in the trajectory.
7. The supplementary report considered by Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet on 13 October 2026, paragraphs 43 to 47 and 59, identifies outstanding education delivery arrangements, an incomplete viability review and the need to establish realistic funding before substantially redrafting the transport strategy. The trajectory and distribution cannot be justified independently of those dependencies. Any revised delivery assumptions must be reflected consistently in DS01 and the supporting supply calculations.
8. Changes sought: an evidence-led reassessment of the hierarchy and distribution where necessary, a transparent housing requirement calculation, and a trajectory consistent with essential infrastructure delivery. I do not rely on the transitional threshold decision as proof that the housing requirement is either excessive or sufficient.

Evidence references

ID9 Stage 2 Matters Issues and Questions, 21 September 2026. Supplementary report on Harborough District Local Plan considered by Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet on 13 October 2026, paragraphs and appendices cited above. HDC11 and HDC11A infrastructure update and schedule; HDC14 Transport Topic Paper Part Two; HDC18 Education Delivery Strategy.

[Examination library index](#) | [HDC14 — examination evidence](#) | [HDC11A — examination evidence](#) | [HDC18 — examination evidence](#)