

Matter 6 Strategic infrastructure

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 and 13372 with related allocation representations

Questions addressed in ID9

Issue 1 Questions 3 to 6, 10 to 16; Issue 2 Questions 1 to 9

Late provision of critical evidence

1. My objection concerns the timing and substance of the evidence. Transport capacity, school provision, infrastructure costs and funding should inform allocation choices. The September updates came almost five months after submission. The Council should explain what evidence supported its decisions at submission, how the later findings change those assumptions and whether the strategy, allocations or phasing consequently require revision.

2. Changes in scheme requirements and costs must be traced through the viability assessment and housing trajectory. An overall reduction in estimated costs does not establish that the selected locations remain appropriate. Representors at Regulation 19 could not assess evidence not then available; the Panel should determine whether material changes require further appraisal or consultation. I do not suggest that late publication alone establishes a procedural breach.

October evidence on the unresolved transport strategy

3. The supplementary report considered by Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet on 13 October 2026, paragraphs 36 to 39 and Appendix A, concludes that HDC's recent work has not satisfactorily resolved the County Council's Regulation 19 transport concerns. Appendix A says Part Two of the Transport Topic Paper was prepared without the Local Transport Authority's involvement, fails to provide a coherent strategy, does not satisfactorily reconcile the Strategic Transport Impact Assessment with the Preliminary Scheme Design work, and contains costs not agreed by the authority.

4. Appendix A also records that a further draft junction report was received on 21 September after County Council comments on 3 and 7 September. Technical modelling matters still appeared unresolved, and the version on the examination website appeared only to incorporate the comments of 3 September. The Panel should establish which version is relied upon and require a clear, accessible reconciliation of assumptions, modelling, mitigation and agreed costs.

5. Paragraph 59 calls for further viability work to identify realistic funding and, subject to that, significant redrafting of both parts of the Transport Topic Paper to provide a coherent funded strategy for the A6 and A5 corridors. Paragraph 60 says it is unclear whether any further work could be completed within the normal six-month examination pause. This is a material question about strategy and delivery, rather than a request for every engineering detail at allocation stage.

Kibworth bypass and cumulative transport impacts

6. My position remains that Kibworth needs a bypass. Strategic through traffic passes through the villages alongside local journeys. The plan must address the underlying problem before relying on further substantial corridor growth.

7. HDC14 paragraphs 6.12–6.19 acknowledge forecast increases in flow and delay on the A6 and on alternative routes used to avoid congestion. I welcome coordinated assessment, but the evidence must demonstrate acceptable outcomes and deliverable mitigation.

8. The Council should assess a bypass as a reasonable strategic transport option, comparing congestion, air quality, safety and community connectivity outcomes with the proposed package. I recognise the need to investigate feasibility, cost, environmental effects and funding. Complexity should not replace a proportionate assessment.

9. The evidence should distinguish through traffic from local and development traffic. It should explain how far proposed bus, walking and cycling measures can address each. Sensitivity testing is needed if anticipated changes in travel behaviour fall short. A vision-led approach must still provide a robust basis for understanding likely outcomes.

10. Assessment should include displaced traffic on surrounding village and rural routes. Junction improvements may redistribute pressures; the Council should demonstrate their corridor-wide effects, rather than assume an isolated capacity improvement resolves the wider problem.

Phasing and integral junction works

11. HDC11A records K1 access and transport requirements at TR8 with costs subject to scope and scale. TR20, TR22 and TR23 identify integral A6 junction works in Kibworth during 2035–2041; TR24 records integral works at Archers Roundabout in Great Glen in the same period.

12. These entries require reconciliation with projected occupations. They do not alone prove that mitigation will be late. The Council should establish when each intervention becomes necessary and how development is prevented from exceeding acceptable network conditions before works are delivered.

13. Policies should identify delivery triggers based on evidenced impacts, responsibilities and dependencies. The railway bridge constraint for K1 requires particular attention.

Funding and viability

14. The reduced aggregate infrastructure estimate in HDC11 and HDC12 does not demonstrate every allocation's viability. Some costs remain undefined; infrastructure in the schedule and costs tested for development viability are not identical. [HDC11, section 1.6; HDC12, Table 1.1 and Summary and Conclusions.]

15. ID9 Matter 6 Issue 2 Question 5 records that the detailed assessment requested by the Panel, linking costs to individual policy requirements, has not been provided notwithstanding HDC12. I seek that reconciliation, including allocation-specific obligations, cumulative mitigation, affordable housing and sensitivity to changed costs.

16. Essential infrastructure must have a credible funding and delivery route. References to section 106, section 278, CIL or external funding identify possible mechanisms, not necessarily sufficient funding. The Council should distinguish secured resources from assumptions and explain the fallback where prospective income is unavailable.

17. Where a measure classified as beneficial is relied upon to achieve traffic reduction, the Council should explain why its omission would not undermine the mitigation strategy. Equally, costs should not be double-counted where infrastructure is genuinely funded by a utility or another body.

18. The supplementary report considered by Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet on 13 October 2026, paragraphs 45 to 47, says its viability review is incomplete and it cannot yet confirm whether sufficient infrastructure funding is available. It also maintains that, where viability is limited, education contributions take priority over highway and transport contributions. Paragraph 59 expressly requires further transport funding work to reflect that priority. The Council must demonstrate what transport mitigation remains funded after education obligations are met; it cannot count the same development value twice.

19. Paragraphs 52 to 54 describe CIL consultation later in 2026 and possible adoption in early 2027, subject to examination. This is an indicative future programme, not secured income. The Panel should require clarity about strategic sites excluded from CIL, how cumulative off-site needs would be funded, and the fallback if levy receipts or external grants fall short.

Education and linked development

20. The supplementary report considered by Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet on 13 October 2026, paragraphs 40 to 44 and Appendix B, accepts that the submitted Education Delivery Strategy identifies infrastructure to accommodate allocated development, but says it omits delivery mechanisms, land equalisation and approaches to heads of terms from the wider commissioned work. Paragraph 44 states that there is no prospect of reaching a satisfactory conclusion on an updated strategy or addendum before 16 October. I therefore distinguish identifying school capacity from demonstrating its deliverable provision.

21. Paragraph 42 records that the submitted strategy discounts unplanned development not consented before September 2026. The Council should explain the treatment of windfalls and other foreseeable growth, avoid double-counting capacity, and test whether later permissions could undermine the proposed provision for allocated sites.

22. HDC18 identifies additional primary capacity requirements in Great Glen and Kibworth. Table 13 identifies constraints on expanding Kibworth Mead and expresses a preference for meeting additional secondary demand through a Market Harborough North solution. Providing sufficient places elsewhere does not, by itself, demonstrate that new housing in Kibworth is sustainably located.

23. HDC18 Table 13 identifies a possible additional half form of entry at Kibworth Mead by 2035, but says physical expansion may not be possible and prefers a solution with Market Harborough North. Table 9 also identifies an additional half form of primary entry by 2034 and suggests that demand could be accommodated at the proposed Market Harborough primary school. Both raise accessibility questions under Matter 6 Issue 1 Question 12. The primary requirement is shown for 2034 while the new Market Harborough North primary provision is shown for 2035; the Council should reconcile that timing and any interim arrangements.

24. Meeting Kibworth's additional demand in Market Harborough would create journeys between separate settlements. The precise school location, journey distances and times, admissions arrangements and transport provision require confirmation. It risks children from the same community, and potentially siblings, attending different schools. I am not asserting that an agreed bussing arrangement or a split-site school has been established.

25. The education and transport consequences must be examined together. The Council should demonstrate journey times, safe and realistic travel options, access to extracurricular activities and children's ability to travel independently. Additional parent-driven journeys could increase A6 congestion; bus provision also requires a credible route and operating arrangements.

26. The costs of getting children to and from school must be identified. Depending on eligibility and the arrangements provided, costs could fall on the County Council, families or both. The assessment should include ongoing transport costs, not simply the capital cost of providing school places, and explain whether any necessary funding is secured or assumed.

27. If the preferred Market Harborough provision is delayed, the Council must demonstrate how pupils from homes already occupied in Kibworth would be accommodated. School land, delivery responsibility, interim capacity and funding should be aligned with the housing trajectory.

28. Without a meaningful solution to daily A6 congestion, this risks becoming a travesty of sustainable planning. I maintain that Kibworth needs a bypass. The Council cannot credibly promote sustainable communities while leaving the educational, transport and financial dependencies unresolved.

29. These foreseeable problems could have been identified and addressed had detailed, integrated analysis been completed before submission. School capacity and accessible provision should help determine the housing strategy. If they cannot be delivered alongside the housing, the allocation's scale, location or timing should be reconsidered.

Changes sought

30. Require a proportionate bypass comparison, robust cumulative and sensitivity assessments, transparent site and policy viability reconciliation, credible funding fallbacks and enforceable infrastructure phasing. Where essential mitigation cannot be demonstrated, revise the scale, location or timing of development. These concerns relate principally to justification and effectiveness; final engineering detail is not demanded for every scheme at plan stage.

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 Updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan; HDC11A September 2026 Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, TR8, TR20, TR22, TR23 and TR24; HDC12 Updated Local Plan Viability; HDC14 paragraphs 6.12 to 6.19; HDC18 Tables 9 and 13 and summary tables.

[Examination library index](#)

[HDC11 — examination evidence](#)

[HDC11A — examination evidence](#)

[HDC12 — examination evidence](#)

[HDC14 — examination evidence](#)

[HDC18 — examination evidence](#)