

MATTER 6: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the timely provision of Strategic Infrastructure?

Policy DS05: Development Strategy: Supporting Strategic Infrastructure

Issue 1: Supporting Strategic Infrastructure

Q8. Is reference to collaborative working between various local authorities, highway authorities and National Highways relevant to a policy?

The city council considers that this policy should reference collaborative working between local authorities and National Highways as it is dealing with strategic cross boundary infrastructure and growth. Given the scale of planned growth and the potential for impacts on the city's highway and transport network, cross-boundary collaboration is deemed essential to identify and deliver the required mitigation measures and funding mechanisms.

As well as the Local Planning Authority, the proposed developments would also need to engage with the local highway authorities, including National Highways, where there is thought to be cross-boundary and cumulative transport impacts.

Q14. The NPPF paragraph 114 is clear that when assessing sites, the cost-effective mitigation of significant impacts on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion, or on highway safety, should be ensured whether at the plan making or planning application stage. Is the Plan supported by an adequate, easily accessible costed evidence base which demonstrates that this is the case and which sets out clearly how the Council has approached the issue of costings and need, with particular reference to its objective of reducing reliance on the private car. Is this presented in a manner which would avoid a 'paper chase' exercise and has it been agreed with the relevant highway authorities?

The Plan has identified a need for collaborative working to address the cross-boundary strategic transport matters.

HDC11 and HDC11a have identified a package of transport interventions required to mitigate transport impacts of the proposed growth. HDC11a presents an updated infrastructure schedule that presents infrastructure costs as well as more detailed categories to improve its clarity. This includes the costs, timescales, responsibilities, funding mechanisms of proposed infrastructure measures.

HDC11a also presents the intervention measures that will reduce private car dependency such as walking and cycling measures and wider transport corridor schemes. Further transport interventions may be identified following the specific site transport assessments as they come forward.

However, Leicester City Council has not been involved in the finalisation of the costed evidence base and has not formally agreed the proposed transport mitigation package.

Q15. Given the Council's vision-based approach to accessibility and potential impacts on transport infrastructure, what confidence is there that the impacts can be mitigated? How has the costing of highway mitigation measures following the submission of the Plan impacted on the potential viability of the Plan? What, if any, is the significance to the strategy of the Plan given that a sizable body of the detailed transport costings postdate the Reg 19 version of the Plan and the submission version?

The supporting evidence submitted demonstrates the indicative scale and costs of the required transport interventions that are likely to be required to support the proposed growth that intend to support the Council's vision-led approach to transport planning.

The interventions include walking and cycling infrastructure, public transport improvements, travel planning measures, mobility hubs and highway interventions. The updated infrastructure schedule has stated that there is no fundamental infrastructure constraint that would prevent the delivery of the proposed mitigation measures. The September 2026 Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a) has reduced infrastructure costs to £319m from £339m identified in March 2026. Therefore, the evidence has provided some confidence that a mitigation strategy can be identified. This is, however, dependent on the sites coming forward at the planning application stage, as further detailed assessment will be required that will consider the effectiveness of the deliverability of such schemes.

As the transport infrastructure mitigation has continued to evolve since the Regulation 19 consultation stage, this perhaps indicates that the mitigation strategy was not as fully developed at the point of submission.

The city council was not involved in finalising the updated transport mitigation package and has not formally agreed the mitigation measures, cost assumptions, or delivery arrangements. Whilst the additional evidence provides greater confidence that was available at the Regulation 19 stage, there remains the requirement for ongoing collaboration and agreement between the highway authorities to provide assurance regarding the mitigation of cross boundary impacts.