

Examination of the Harborough Local Plan 2020-2041

Stage 2 Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

Written Statement by Harborough District Council

MATTER 7: Locating Development in the Right Place

Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to Locating Development in the Right Place?

Policies AP01, AP03, AP04, SA01, SA02, SA03, SA04, DS01 and DS02

Matter 7, Issue 1: Directing Development to the Right Place

Policy AP01: Development in Settlements

The Council's response:

Matter 7, Issue 1, Question 1

Q1. Policy AP01 sets out that in addition to sites allocated in Plan policy SA01, development will be permitted within the existing built-up area or settlement limits (Policy AP01 criterion 2), and on land adjoining the existing built-up area settlement limits (Policy AP01 criterion 3), subject to certain criteria. However, does the Plan define these terms in relation to each settlement in the settlement hierarchy? In this regard would the policy be effective in its application?

1. While the Plan does not define these terms in relation to each settlement, it allows the decision maker to make an up-to-date assessment of what constitutes 'adjoining the existing built-up area' at the time of a planning application. It does not define limits for all settlements but acknowledges that these have been established, and will continue to be defined, through made neighbourhood plans (NP) for many settlements.
2. Yes. The Council considers that the policy wording will be effective insofar as it gives the decision maker the appropriate detail to establish what constitutes the 'existing built up area' and 'land adjoining the existing built-up area' thus

enabling the assessment of development proposals under criteria 2 and 3. This is a pragmatic approach which allows the decision maker to make an up-to-date assessment of the existing built up area, or take account of settlement limits in Made Neighbourhood Plans where they exist, in the determination of a planning application.

3. Part 4 makes it clear that, along with Areas of Separation and Green Wedges, the Plan's site allocations and land subject to planning permission but not yet completed should be excluded from the existing built up area.

Matter 7, Issue 1, Question 2

Q2. Given the above, how would policy AP01 interact with policy AP03 and AP04 in relation to development in the countryside?

4. Development in the Countryside policies (AP03 and AP04) will apply to the countryside outside settlements, including Areas of Separation and Green Wedges, unless the proposal land is assessed as adjoining the existing built-up form of a settlement.
5. For proposals on land adjoining the existing settlement, policy AP01.3 will apply unless it lies within an Area of Separation or a Green Wedge. For proposals within an Area of Separation AP03.2 and AP04.2 will apply and for those within a Green Wedge AP03.3 and AP4.4 will apply.

Matter 7, Issue 1, Question 3

Q3. Are the criteria in policy AP01 criterion 2 clear and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals, and thereby accord with NPPF paragraph 16d?

6. Yes. The Council considers that the criteria in AP01.2 are unambiguous and clear. They set out a positive framework which allows for development proposals delivering benefits to be approved within existing settlements.
7. However, as the Plan should be read as a whole, proposals will also need to comply with other policies in the Plan including DM01 (High Quality Inclusive Design), DM03 (Heritage Asset Conservation), DM05 (Green and Blue Infrastructure and Open Space), DM07 (Managing Flood Risk) and DM10 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity Protection and Enhancement) and DM12 (Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities).

Matter 7, Issue 1, Question 4

Q4. Would policy AP01 criterion 3f provide the necessary clarity for decision makers and applicants through the development management process? Would it be necessary, in the interests of soundness, to include within policy AP01 3f for circumstances where Plan policies most important for determining the application are out of date due to the lack of the five-year housing land supply?

8. At the time of writing, this criterion was considered appropriate. However, it is acknowledged that with the introduction of NPPF26, there is inconsistency between policy AP01 criterion 3f and national policy S5.1 criterion j. The Council would be open to a modification to the policy to address this matter.

Matter 7, Issue 1, Question 5

Q5. Policy AP01 criterion 4 excludes Green Wedges and Areas of Separation site allocations and existing commitments from the definition of land adjoining the existing built-up area/settlement limits. Is this approach justified by the evidence and consistent with national policy?

9. Yes. The Council considers the approach set out in AP01.4 is justified and consistent with national policy.
10. Given their specific strategic roles and functions as set out in DS04, the exclusion of Green Wedges and Areas of Separation from the definition of land adjoining the existing built-up area or settlement limits is justified. The maintenance of their predominantly open and undeveloped character is fundamental to their stated aims of preventing the merging of settlements and additionally, in the case of Green Wedges, guiding development, providing access for urban areas into green space and countryside, and providing recreational opportunities. The approach to development in these designations is set out in AP03 and AP04. While development is not precluded, its compatibility with and impact on the designations will need to be considered in development proposals.
11. The exclusion of undeveloped site allocations and commitments from the definition of land adjoining the existing built-up area is justified as they will only form part of the built-up area once development is completed. Proposals on land adjoining undeveloped allocations and commitments would risk

isolated and potentially poorly connected development coming forward that is not well related to the existing built-up area of settlements.

Matter 7, Issue 1, Question 6

Q6. Would Plan policies support development to achieve Made Neighbourhood Plan housing needs?

12. Yes. By allowing for development of an appropriate use, scale and form within the existing built-up area of settlements (criterion 2) and specifically allowing for housing developments that meet local housing need, as evidenced through a Neighbourhood Plan, on land adjoining the existing built-up area of settlements or settlement limits (criterion 3.a), the Plan supports development to meet Made Neighbourhood Plan housing needs.

Matter 7, Issue 2: Key Development Sites

Policies SA01, SA02, SA03, SA04, DS01 and DS02

The Council's response:

Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 1

Q1. Are the following proposed residential development/mixed use and employment allocations justified, based on up-to-date evidence, effective, and consistent with national policy?

13. Yes. The site allocations have been identified through a comprehensive and proportionate evidence base. This included rigorous assessment against constraints and reasonable alternatives together with continuous refinement throughout the plan-making process based on consultation responses and updated technical evidence.

14. The detailed responses to the site-specific questions under Matter 7, Issue 2 demonstrate that each allocation has been tested for suitability, availability, viability, deliverability and constraints. Where constraints have been identified, the Plan contains site-specific requirements and mitigation measures to ensure they are appropriately addressed through the development management process.

15. Collectively, the evidence demonstrates that the allocations provide an appropriate and effective strategy for meeting identified housing, employment,

retail and infrastructure needs in sustainable locations. The policy framework provides a clear mechanism for securing infrastructure and mitigation necessary to support development.

16. Accordingly, and for the reasons set out in the individual site-specific responses below, the Council considers that the proposed allocations are fully justified, based on up-to-date evidence and consistent with national policy.

LEICESTER URBAN AREA	Plan Policies
<u>Land South of Gartree Road Strategic Development Area</u>	
Site OA1: Land South of Gartree Road (mixed use new neighbourhood inc.1200 homes and 5Ha employment land in Plan period)	SA01, SA02, DS01,DS02
<u>Thurnby and Bushby</u>	
Site TB1: Land South of A47 and east of Zouche Way (125 homes)	SA01, DS01
<u>Scraptoft</u>	
Site S1: Scraptoft East, Land between Scraptoft and Bushby (950 homes)	SA01, SA04, DS01
Site S2: Land at Beeby Road (175 homes)	SA01, DS01
MARKET TOWNS	Plan Policies
<u>Market Harborough</u>	
Site MH1: Land east of Leicester Road and south of Grand Union canal (250 homes)	SA01, SA03, DS01
Site MH2: East of Market Harborough Road (850 homes)	
Site MH3: Land south of Gallow Field Road (600 homes)	
Site MH5: Land OS370, Leicester Road (0.6 Ha employment land)	SA01, DS02
Site MH6: Compass Point Business Park (4.3 Ha employment land)	
Site MH7: St Marys Road (3,000 sqm gross employment land)	
Site MH8: Commons Car Park (1,000 sqm gross employment land)	
<u>Lutterworth</u>	
Site L1: Land off Leicester Road (230 homes)	SA01, DS01
Site L2: Land at M1 Junction 20/Swinford Road (90 homes)	
Site L3: Land south of Lutterworth Road/Coventry Road (3.4 Ha employment land)	SA01, DS02
LARGE VILLAGES	Plan Policies
<u>Broughton Astley</u>	
Site BA1: Land off Frolesworth Road (475 homes)	SA01, DS01

<u>Fleckney</u> Site F1: Land north of Kilby Road and land west of Longgreys (150 homes)	SA01, DS01
<u>Great Glen</u> Site GG1: Land north of London Road and east of Leicester Grammar School (400 homes)	SA01, DS01
<u>Kibworth</u> Site K1: Land west of Warwick Road and south of Priory Business Park (475 homes)	SA01, DS01
Site K2: Land south and west of Priory Business Park (3.1 Ha emp land)	SA01, DS02
MEDIUM VILLAGES	Plan Policies
<u>Billesdon</u> Site B1: Land at Gaulby Road (48 homes) Site B2: Billesdon Depot, south of Gaulby Road (10 homes) Site B3: Land north of Dingley Road (5 homes)	SA01, DS01
<u>Great Bowden</u> Site GB1: Land north of Dingley Road (15 homes) Site GB2: Land off Dingley Road and Nether Green (85 homes)	SA01, DS01
<u>Houghton on the Hill</u> Site HH1: Land north of Uppingham Road (80 homes) Site HH2: Land north of Stretton Lane (24 homes)	SA01, DS01
<u>Husbands Bosworth</u> Site HB1: Land east of Welford Road (105 homes)	SA01, DS01
<u>Ullesthorpe</u> Site U1: Land south of Ashby Road (30 homes) Site U2: Land north of Ashby Road (50 homes)	SA01, DS01
MAGNA PARK (STRATEGIC WAREHOUSING)	Plan Policies
Site MP1: Land south of George House, Coventry Road (15.8 Ha Strategic Warehousing B8 land) Site MP2: Land at Mere Lane, Magna Park (122 Ha Strategic Warehousing B8 land)	SA01, DS02

The Council's response:

2. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 2

Q2. To ensure that this session is able to take place as efficiently as possible, for sites which include housing, as a minimum, the Council should provide an A3 landscape document, with numbered pages, headings repeated on each page, and each subcategory of dwellings aggregated for each year of the Plan, and for the Plan period as a whole. Projected completions for each individual site should be included for each year of the Plan period.

This should include sites with planning permission and all housing and mixed use allocations which have been identified as contributing to the housing supply set out in Table 2 of the Plan as submitted. Please group allocations by sub areas. All planning permissions should also be presented in the same manner. For ease, these should also be sorted by detailed and outline permissions.

If SHLAA sites are expected to contribute to the housing supply over the Plan period, but have not been allocated, please also include these within the table. Similarly, other contributions such as windfall should also be set out clearly.

Other than the address, and planning reference, whether outline or full planning permission, and site area, please also include whether the site is considered viable or not. This is to ensure that each site can be rigorously interrogated if necessary.

Please see Appendix 1

Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Questions:

Q3. For each individual site (housing/employment and mixed use) please answer the following questions. The Council should address any site-specific concerns raised in representations, in addition to the questions outlined in respect of individual sites.

- i) What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?
- ii) What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?
- iii) What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?
- iv) What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?
- v) How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?
- vi) How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?
- viii) How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?
- ix) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?
- x) Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?
- xi) Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?
- xii) Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

The Council's response:

Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites

Site OA1: Land South of Gartree Road (mixed use new neighbourhood inc.1200 homes and 5Ha employment land in Plan period)

3.i) Site OA1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

17. Policy SA01 clearly proposes the following: 3,150 homes (including older persons housing, affordable housing and an appropriate mix of types, sizes and tenures); 5ha of general employment land; 5ha of land to meet the needs of travelling showpeople; 3ha of land for cemetery provision; a Local Centre Primary Health Centre; community hall and leisure facilities; sports pitches, children's equipped play areas and other outdoor recreational facilities; education facilities; public open spaces; green spaces and ecological corridors; Area of Separation; Green and Blue Infrastructure Networks; managed high quality sustainable methods of movement; vehicular access points from the A6 and Gartree Road with a connection across the site; and bus stops and associated infrastructure.

3.ii) Site OA1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

18. The scale of housing development proposed is justified on the basis of the location of the site, adjacent to the Leicester Urban Area and therefore identified as the most sustainable tier in the district's Settlement Hierarchy.

19. The mix of uses proposed is justified as those required in order to create a sustainable community in accordance with NPPF paragraph 74.

3.iii) Site OA1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

20. An outline planning application (reference 26/01350/OUT) has been submitted for the site. It has recently been validated and is therefore pending consideration.

3.iv) OA1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

21. The key benefit of the development is delivery of a large number of homes (3,150 within Harborough in total, with 1,200 expected to be delivered in the plan period) within a sustainable residential-led development.
22. In addition, the site will: provide jobs through delivery of 5ha of employment land; provide land for travelling showpeople; provide 3ha of land for cemetery provision; provide a local centre with shopping facilities; provide a Primary Health Centre; provide sports pitches, children's equipped play areas and other outdoor recreational facilities; provide both primary schools and a new secondary school; provide an extensive, integrated and well-connected network of managed public open spaces, green spaces and ecological corridors and enhancement of the River Sence and Wash Brook corridors; provide an extensive, integrated and well connected network of managed high quality sustainable methods of movement; and make a significant contribution to the delivery of affordable homes and older persons homes.
23. Finally, the site will safeguard the visual and physical separation between the site and Great Glen, preventing coalescence and safeguarding the identity and distinctive character of Great Glen.

3.v) OA1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

24. The site lies to the south east of Oadby and adjacent to the wider Leicester urban area. It is immediately adjacent to residential development in Oadby and is bounded to the north east by Gartree Road and the south west by London Road, both forming natural boundaries. The village of Great Glen lies to the south east of the site with Station Road forming the eastern boundary. The site surrounds the existing residential development at Stretton Hall. To the north east of Gartree Road is Leicestershire Aero Club and the village of Stoughton with agricultural land beyond. Leicester Grammar School lies to the east of the southern tip of the site.

25. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, ecology, landscape, heritage, archaeology and flood risk.
26. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA02 which requires sustainable residential-led development, a Transport Assessment and mitigation of transport impacts, restoration of natural vegetation and the creation of wetlands, retention and enhancement of existing woodland, spinneys and hedgerows, landscaping to screen potential views to the development; a contaminated land and unexploded ordnance assessment; a noise impact assessment; a Heritage Impact Assessment; a buffer for the protection and enhancement of the Stretton Magna Deserted Medieval Village; a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy, and protection of both the sewage treatment works and future occupiers. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework. Detailed mitigation has been tested through the Development Management process.

3.vi) OA1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

27. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [[EN-NLP 10](#)] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.
28. The site contains some areas of high surface water flood risk associated with the Wash Brook and its tributaries. The LLFA have advised that a sequential approach to site layout should be adopted avoiding all areas of flood risk and the River Sence and to the Wash Brook catchment.
29. Due to these constraints, the site was subject to detailed assessment through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (site ref: 8631), including the preparation

of a [Site Table](#), and Sequential and Exception Test [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#). The site was found capable of passing both parts of the Exception Test, subject to appropriate mitigation, which has been incorporated into Policy SA02.

30. The Council therefore considers that flood risk has been fully taken into account in allocating the site and that the policy requirements provide an appropriate and effective framework for ensuring that development can be delivered safely and in accordance with national policy.

3.viii) OA1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

31. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [\[TRP-NLP2\]](#) considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [\[HDC11A\]](#) as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [\[TRP-NLP5\]](#). The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [\[HDC13\]](#) builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) OA1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

32. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule ([HDC11A](#)). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

33. The infrastructure identified within HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is fully satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

34. HDC11A provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach to be consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15th July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) OA1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

35. Policy SA02 proposes residential development of approximately 3,150 dwellings, of which 1,200 are expected to be deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2033/4 with development progressing throughout the remainder of the plan period.

36. The site does not lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) OA1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

37. Main Modifications (MM13.3 and PM4) are proposed to remove the Stretton Magna Deserted Medieval Village scheduled monument from Policy SA02 site boundary following advice from Historic England.

38. The remainder of the boundary remains appropriate, and no further amendments are required.

3.xii) OA1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

39. Main Modifications (MM13.3 and PM4) are proposed to remove the Stretton Magna Deserted Medieval Village schedule monument from Policy SA02 site boundary following advice from Historic England.

Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites

Site TB1: Land South of A47 and east of Zouche Way (125 homes)

3.i) TB1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

40. Policy SA01 and the associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly identify Land South of A47 and east of Zouche Way (TB1) for 125 homes, alongside open space, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, access and supporting infrastructure necessary to serve the development. The principal proposed use is residential.

3.ii) TB1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

41. The justification for the mix is the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] (under site reference 8241), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically,

Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment identified the site as a logical extension of the existing built form and an appropriate location for development when compared to other sites within the Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby area. Given its sustainable location adjoining Leicester Urban Area, a predominantly residential allocation is proportionate to a site of this scale.

3.iii) TB1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

42. The site is divided into two distinct parcels, both of which benefit from extant planning permissions that demonstrate the site's capability to deliver its full housing requirement alongside the retail use. The south-west parcel of the site benefits from planning permission for the erection of a discount food store (25/00219/FUL), while the remainder of the site benefits from outline planning permission, subject to S106, for up to 130 dwellings including public open space, sustainable drainage system and associated infrastructure (25/01615/OUT). Because the planning consent on the main portion of the site accommodates up to 130 dwellings, the Council can confirm that the site remains entirely capable of delivering the 125 dwellings planned under Policy SA01/TB1.

3.iv) TB1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

43. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of approximately 125 dwellings contributing materially to the district housing requirement, including affordable housing, public open space, green infrastructure, biodiversity enhancements, sustainable drainage measures, potential local economic stimulus, and efficient use of a sustainable location adjoining Leicester with existing jobs, services, facilities and public transport opportunities.
44. As a result, the site would make a positive contribution to housing delivery in a sustainable location.

3.v) TB1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

45. The site lies on the eastern edge of the built-up area, adjacent to recent housing development to the west, agricultural land to the north and east, and the A47 which forms a strong physical boundary to the south. A discount food store is permitted within the south-western part of the site.
46. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.
47. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/TB1 that requires integration and connectivity with the existing community, assessment and mitigation of transport impacts, retention and reinforcement of boundary hedgerows and trees, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy, and protection of both the sewage treatment works and future occupiers. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework. Detailed mitigation has been tested through the Development Management process.

3.vi) TB1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

48. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [[EN-NLP 10](#)] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

49. TB1: Land south of A47 and east of Zouche Way (Site 8241) lies within Flood Zone 1 but is affected by significant surface water flood risk associated with Thurnby Brook and surface water flow routes affecting the northern part of the site. Appendix 4 identifies high surface water flood risk along the northern boundary adjoining Thurnby Brook and additional surface water flow paths crossing parts of the site.
50. Due to these constraints, the site was subject to detailed assessment through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential and Exception Test [EN-NLP 9]. The site was found capable of passing both parts of the Exception Test, subject to appropriate mitigation, which has been incorporated into Policy SA01/TB1.
51. The Council therefore considers that flood risk has been fully taken into account in allocating the site and that the policy requirements provide an appropriate and effective framework for ensuring that development can be delivered safely and in accordance with national policy.

3.viii) TB1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

52. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) TB1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

53. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule ([HDC11A](#)). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.
54. The infrastructure identified within HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is fully satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
55. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach to be consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15th July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) TB1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

56. Policy SA01/TB1 proposes residential development of approximately 125 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#)

[HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of three years until 2030/31.

57. The site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, but this is not considered to impact on the site's overall deliverability. A proposed Main Modification within [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2] (MM12.4) introduces a requirement for a Minerals Assessment to accompany future planning applications.

3.xi) TB1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

58. Yes. The Council considers that the allocation boundary remains appropriate and reflects site 8241 as assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#). The boundary follows clear and defensible physical features including the A47, existing residential development and established field boundaries, and contains sufficient land to accommodate approximately 125 dwellings together with supporting infrastructure required by the Plan, including access, green infrastructure and public open space, biodiversity enhancements, and sustainable drainage measures.

3.xii) TB1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

59. [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2] contains MM12.4, which introduces the requirement for a Minerals Assessment to directly address the minerals safeguarding issue. Additionally, MM12.2 clarifies the relationship between TB1 and the S1 and S2 cluster. No further Main Modifications are considered necessary.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites

Site S1: Scraftoft East, Land between Scraftoft and Bushby (950 homes)

3.i) S1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

60. Policy SA04 and the Site Allocation Schedule associated with Policy SA01 clearly identify Scraftoft East for approximately 950 homes together with essential infrastructure. Policy SA04 specifies approximately 950 homes, affordable housing and supported and specialist forms of accommodation, a site for a two-form primary school with early years provision, retention of the Green Wedge shown on the Policies Map, public open space, green infrastructure and biodiversity, associated infrastructure including sustainable drainage systems and walking and cycling infrastructure. The housing mix would be determined in accordance with Policies HN01 to HN04 and the latest relevant evidence. The strategic scale, principal uses and essential infrastructure are therefore clear. The detailed disposition and phasing of those uses would be established through the comprehensive masterplan in accordance with Appendix 6.

3.ii) S1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

61. The proposed mix on Scraftoft East is justified by the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, infrastructure evidence, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] (under site reference 8227), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment identified the site as a logical extension of the existing built form and well placed to deliver the majority of the housing growth for the Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby area when compared to alternative deliverable sites of a similar scale within that area. The mix of residential and essential infrastructure, including a two-form primary school, is justified by identified housing and infrastructure needs and the site's scale and sustainable location adjoining Leicester Urban Area.

3.iii) S1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

62. An outline planning application for up to 950 dwellings, including Later Living Accommodation, 2FE primary school with early years provision, public open space, drainage, landscaping, habitat creation, internal roads/routes, and associated infrastructure (26/00289/OUT) has been submitted and is under consideration. The application is supported by a suite of technical material and consultation responses. It demonstrates active developer involvement and the intention of the two housebuilders controlling the site to pursue development.

3.iv) S1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

63. Benefits of development in accordance with the Plan would deliver approximately 950 dwellings towards the District housing requirement, including affordable housing and supported and specialist forms of accommodation, a two-form entry primary school with early years provision addressing education need, multifunctional green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity net gain and habitat creation, public open space and recreational opportunities, sustainable drainage and opportunities to reduce downstream flood risk, improved walking and cycling links, financial or direct provision towards necessary transport and community infrastructure, potential local economic stimulus, and efficient use of a sustainable location adjoining Leicester with existing jobs, services, facilities and public transport opportunities.

3.v) S1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

64. The site lies between Scraptoft and Thurnby/Bushby and adjoins existing residential development and agricultural land.

65. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.
66. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA04, which requires a comprehensive masterplan, assessment and mitigation of cumulative transport impacts, a Heritage Impact Assessment, retention of the Green Wedge, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and sustainable drainage measures. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the masterplanning and development management processes.

3.vi) S1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

67. S1: Scraftoft East (Site 8227) lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore a low risk of fluvial flooding. Nevertheless, a tributary of Thurnby Brook crosses the site and is associated with a significant surface water flow path which represents the principal flooding constraint affecting the allocation.
68. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [[EN-NLP 10](#)] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.
69. Given that the site lies within Flood Zone 1, and the flooding constraints principally relate to surface water flow routes which are capable of being addressed through layout and mitigation measures, the site passed the Sequential Test and did not require the application of the Exception Test.

3.viii) S1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

70. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) S1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

71. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule ([HDC11A](#)). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

72. The infrastructure identified within HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is fully satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

73. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach to be consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15th July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) S1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

74. Policies SA01/S1 and SA04 propose residential development of approximately 950 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2030/31 with development progressing over a period of ten years until 2040/41.

75. Part of the site is in a Mineral Safeguarding Area. While a site-specific Minerals Assessment is explicitly required by Policy SA04(1)(f) to ensure compliance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, this standard assessment will not impact on the overall delivery of the allocation.

3.xi) S1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

76. The Council considers that the site boundary for Site S1 is appropriate, and there is no evidence or justification to suggest that an amendment is required.

77. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features on the ground and precisely reflects the footprint of the parcel comprehensively evaluated as site 8227 through the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)]. This defined area contains sufficient land to sustainably accommodate approximately 950 dwellings while providing necessary space for a primary

school, site access, public open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure including sustainable drainage systems and walking and cycling infrastructure.

3.xii) S1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

78. Beyond the proposed modifications set out in [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2], no further Main Modifications are considered necessary.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites

Site S2: Land at Beeby Road (175 homes)

3.i) S2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

79. Policy SA01 and the associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly identify Land at Beeby Road (S2), for 175 dwellings. The principal proposed use is residential, together with the open space, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, access, active-travel connections and other supporting infrastructure necessary to serve the development. The site would also contribute, where necessary, towards the reasonable costs of the two-form-entry primary school proposed at S1 and towards other infrastructure required to mitigate the cumulative effects of the S1, S2 and TB1 cluster. While the allocation is for 175 homes, the proposed scale has evolved through the development management process, with the site benefitting from extant planning permission for up to 200 dwellings ([25/00767/OUT](#)). That modest variation does not undermine the clarity, effectiveness or strategic purpose of the allocation.

3.ii) S2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

80. The justification for the mix is the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (under site reference 12235), the

allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process.

Specifically, Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment identified the site as a logical extension of the existing built form and an appropriate location for development when compared to other sites within the Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby area. Given its sustainable location adjoining Leicester Urban Area, a predominantly residential allocation is proportionate to a site of this scale.

3.iii) S2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

81. The site benefits from outline planning permission, subject to conditions and S106, for up to 200 dwellings including open space, landscape, drainage and associated infrastructure and works (access to be considered) ([25/00767/OUT](#)). This demonstrates that the principle of residential development has been thoroughly assessed through the development management process.

3.iv) S2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

82. Benefits of development in accordance with the Plan would deliver approximately 175 dwellings towards the District housing requirement, including affordable housing and an appropriate mix of homes, public open space and green infrastructure, biodiversity net gain and landscape, sustainable drainage and flood risk mitigation, improved walking and cycling links, transport improvements, financial or direct provision towards necessary transport and community infrastructure, potential local economic stimulus, and efficient use of a sustainable location adjoining Leicester with existing jobs, services, facilities and public transport opportunities. The extant planning permission indicates that the site is capable of accommodating up to 200 dwellings.

3.v) S2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

83. The site lies on the northern edge of Scraptoft adjoining existing residential development to the south and west, with agricultural land beyond. The site is adjacent to a committed crematorium, lies in proximity to Keyham Sewage Treatment Works and contains a protected tree belt and wildlife corridor along part of its boundary.
84. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.
85. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/S2, including assessment and mitigation of transport impacts, a Minerals Assessment, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy, a contaminated land report, and protection of the sewage treatment works and committed crematorium whilst safeguarding residential amenity. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework. Detailed mitigation has been tested through the Development Management process.

3.vi) S2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

86. S2: Land at Beeby Road (Site 12235) lies wholly within Flood Zone 1. The [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identifies only a small area of low surface water flood risk within the north-eastern part of the site. No significant flooding constraints were identified by the Lead Local Flood Authority.
87. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [[EN-NLP 10](#)] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered

flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

88. Given that the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and the identified surface water constraints are capable of being addressed through layout and mitigation measures, the site passed the Sequential Test and was not identified as requiring the Exception Test.

3.viii) S2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

89. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) S2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

90. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule ([HDC11A](#)). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the

infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

91. The infrastructure identified within HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is fully satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
92. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach to be consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15th July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) S2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

93. Policy SA01/S2 proposes residential development of approximately 175 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of four years until 2031/32.
94. Part of the site is in a Mineral Safeguarding Area. While a site-specific Minerals Assessment is explicitly required by criterion 4 in Policy SA01/S2 to ensure compliance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, this standard assessment will not impact on the overall delivery of the allocation.

3.xi) S2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

95. The Council considers the site boundary appropriate and that there is no justification for amendment. The allocation boundary reflects site 12235, which was assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5]. It follows clear and defensible physical features, including Beeby Road, Keyham Lane East, established field boundaries, and existing developments. This defined area contains sufficient land to accommodate approximately 175 dwellings together with the supporting infrastructure required by the Plan, including access, public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage, and ecological mitigation measures. The boundary was assessed through the site selection process and represents the extent of land considered suitable, available and developable for the proposed allocation. Retaining the boundary in its current form allows the proposed development to integrate logically with the existing built-up form of the settlement whilst providing an appropriate and landscaped transition into the countryside. For these reasons, the Council considers the allocation boundary to be justified, effective and appropriate.

3.xii) S2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

96. Beyond the proposed modifications set out in [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2], no further Main Modifications are considered necessary.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site MH1: Land east of Leicester Road and south of Grand Union Canal (250 homes)

3.i) MH1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

97. Policy SA03 sets the broad policy framework for the whole Market Harborough North allocation and clearly sets out the mix of uses for the cluster of sites (MH1, MH2 & MH3). This is for 1700 homes (250 for MH1); a new three-form entry primary school; a new secondary school; retail, health

and community, infrastructure, including a replacement showground; green and blue infrastructure networks; safe highway, foot and cycle connections; on and off site transport measures to mitigate impacts informed by Transport Assessment; health care contribution (as extension to existing, or new), open spaces including sports pitches and other outdoor recreational facilities.

98. The North of Market Harborough SoCG [[HDC 4D](#)] proposes a modification in respect of the replacement showground.

3.ii) MH1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

99. The scale of housing development proposed is justified on the basis of the location of the site adjacent to the edge of Market Harborough and therefore identified as the most sustainable tier in the district's Settlement Hierarchy [[PPL-NLP1](#)] and also in line with the spatial development strategy [[PRE-NLP4](#)].

100. The mix of uses proposed is justified as those required in order to create a sustainable community in accordance with [NPPF23](#) paragraph 74.

3.iii) MH1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

101. There is currently no planning application for the site.

3.iv) MH1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

102. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of approximately 250 dwellings contributing materially to the district housing requirement, including affordable housing, public open space, green infrastructure, biodiversity enhancements, sustainable drainage measures, potential local economic stimulus, and efficient use of a sustainable location adjoining Market Harborough with existing jobs, services, facilities and public transport opportunities.

103. As a result, the site would make a positive contribution to housing delivery in a sustainable location.

3.v) MH1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

104. The site lies on the northern edge of the built-up area, with housing development currently under construction to the west, existing residential use to the south and in part, east. To the north is the Grand Union Canal which forms a strong physical boundary.

105. The Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#) considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage and flood risk.

106. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy MH1 and SA03 that require development to recognize and enhance the site's location as an important gateway to Market Harborough. Policy MH1 requires development to avoid breaching the ridgeline and steepest scarp slopes to mitigate landscape and visual impact; be informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment to respect the setting of the Grand Union Canal conservation area; appropriately mitigate impact on the Grand Union Canal wildlife site; and provide a contaminated land assessment to address potential risk and mitigation from Burnmill Farm. Further to this, Policy SA03 requires visual separation of the cluster of sites with Great Bowden to prevent coalescence, sensitive consideration to the impact of the development within the Lubenham and Foxton Areas of Separation, protection of areas of historic ridge and furrow; provision of safe highway, footway and cycleway connections that are permeable through the cluster; provision of on and off-site transport measures to mitigate impacts informed by a Transport Assessment; and a flood risk assessment to assess the risk of surface water flooding and site specific surface water drainage strategy. These site-specific requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process

3.vi) MH1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

107. MH1 lies wholly within Flood Zone 1. [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) of the Site Selection Methodology notes concerns with regard to surface water flood risk (Site Ref: 8143).
108. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#), including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#) - alongside its subsequent Addendum [\[EN-NLP 10\]](#) - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [\[HSG-NLP 4\]](#), Sustainability Appraisal [\[S-NLP 3\]](#), and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.
109. MH1 (Site 8143) lies within Flood Zone 1 but is affected by significant surface water flood risk. Appendix 4 identifies surface water flood risk along the western boundary and requires understanding on potential flood risk from the canal.
110. Due to these constraints, the site was subject to detailed assessment through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential and Exception Test [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#). The site was found capable of passing both parts of the Exception Test, subject to appropriate mitigation, which has been incorporated into Policy SA03 and MH1.
111. The Council therefore considers that flood risk has been fully taken into account in allocating the site and that the policy requirements provide an appropriate and effective framework for ensuring that development can be delivered safely and in accordance with national policy.

3.viii) MH1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

112. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MH1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

113. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule [[HDC11A](#)]. The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

114. The infrastructure identified in [HDC 11A](#) is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

115. [HDC11A](#) provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the [Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026](#), which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

116. Physical constraints to the site are its topography and steep scarp slopes as set out in [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) of the Site Selection Methodology.

3.x) MH1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

117. Policy MH1 proposes residential development of 250 homes which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC2] and lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of five years until 2032/33.

118. The site is not located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) MH1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

119. Yes. The Council considers that the allocation boundary remains appropriate and reflects site 8143 as assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#). The boundary follows clear and defensible physical features including the Grand Union Canal, existing residential development, the Leicester Road and established field boundaries.

3.xii) MH1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

120. [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2] contains MM14.1, which introduces additional requirements for the transport assessment of the site.

121. The North of Market Harborough SoCG [[HDC 4D](#)] proposes some modifications to SA03 related to the replacement showground. Further details are set out in North of Market Harborough section below.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site MH2: East of Market Harborough Road (850 homes)

3.i) MH2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

122. Policy SA03 sets the broad policy framework for the whole Market Harborough North allocation and clearly sets out the mix of uses for the cluster of sites (MH1, MH2 & MH3). This is for 1700 homes (850 for MH2); a new three-form entry primary school; a new secondary school; retail, health and community, infrastructure, including a replacement showground; green and blue infrastructure networks; safe highway, foot and cycle connections; on and off site transport measures to mitigate impacts informed by Transport Assessment; health care contribution (as extension to existing, or new), open spaces including sports pitches and other outdoor recreational facilities.

123. Further to this, policy MH2 specifically requires the site to facilitate the temporary relocation of the agricultural showground, land for a secondary school and a new 3FE primary school with early years provision, at least 2 ha of cemetery provision, and provision for older persons housing.

124. The North of Market Harborough SoCG [[HDC 4D](#)] proposes a modification in respect of the replacement showground and secondary school.

3.ii) MH2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

125. The scale of housing development proposed is justified on the basis of the location of the site, adjacent to the edge of Market Harborough and therefore identified as the most sustainable tier in the district's Settlement Hierarchy [[PPL-NLP1](#)] and also in line with the spatial development strategy [[PRE-NLP4](#)].

126. The mix of uses proposed is justified as those required in order to create a sustainable community in accordance with [NPPF23](#) paragraph 74

3.iii) MH2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

127. There is currently no planning application for the site.

3.iv) MH2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

128. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of approximately 850 dwellings contributing materially to the district housing requirement, including affordable housing, a new secondary school, new primary school, cemetery provision, public open space, green infrastructure, biodiversity enhancements, sustainable drainage measures, potential local economic stimulus, and efficient use of a sustainable location adjoining Market Harborough with existing jobs, services, facilities and public transport opportunities.

129. As a result, the site would make a positive contribution to housing delivery in a sustainable location.

3.v) MH2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

130. The site lies to the north of the built-up area, with an employment area and Traveller site to the west on the other side of Harborough Road, the Grand Union Canal forms a strong physical boundary to the north, south and east with Leicester Lane running through the middle. South of the Grand Union Canal are agricultural fields allocated as MH1 (part of the SA03 cluster).
131. The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage and flood risk.
132. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy MH2 and SA03 that require development to recognise and enhance the site's location as an important gateway to Market Harborough. Policy MH2 requires development to be informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment to respect the setting of the Grand Union Canal conservation area; and provide a Flood Risk Assessment that takes account of surface water flood risk flow paths and demonstrate an understanding of the flood risk posed by the Grand Union Canal. Noise, odour and lighting assessments will also be required to address potential impacts from the animal rendering plant located to the north east of the site.
133. Further to this, Policy SA03 requires visual separation of the cluster of sites with Great Bowden to prevent coalescence, sensitive consideration to the impact of the development within the Lubenham and Foxton Areas of Separation, protection of areas of historic ridge and furrow; provision of safe highway, footway and cycleway connections that are permeable through the cluster; provision of on and off-site transport measures to mitigate impacts informed by a Transport Assessment; and a flood risk assessment to assess the risk of surface water flooding and site specific surface water drainage strategy. These site specific requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) MH2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

134. MH2 lies wholly within Flood Zone 1. [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) of the Site Selection Methodology notes concerns with regard to surface water flood risk (Site Ref: 8122).
135. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#), including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#) - alongside its subsequent Addendum [\[EN-NLP 10\]](#) - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [\[HSG-NLP 4\]](#), Sustainability Appraisal [\[S-NLP 3\]](#), and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.
136. MH2 (Site 8122) lies within Flood Zone 1 but is affected by surface water flood risk. Appendix 4 identifies a high risk surface water flood path extending from Leicester Lane to Leicester Road and requires understanding on potential flood risk from the canal.
137. Due to these constraints, the site was screened at a site level as part of [Level 2 SFRA for Sequential and Exception Test](#) and found not to require further assessment.
138. The Council therefore considers that flood risk has been fully taken into account in allocating the site and that the policy requirements provide an appropriate and effective framework for ensuring that development can be delivered safely and in accordance with national policy.

3.viii) MH2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

139. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MH2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

140. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule [[HDC11A](#)]. The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

141. The infrastructure identified in [HDC 11A](#) is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

142. [HDC11A](#) provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the [Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026](#), which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

143. Physical constraints to the site are the high pressure gas pipeline and buffer through the middle of the site as set out in [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) of the Site Selection Methodology.

3.x) MH2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

144. Policy MH2 proposes residential development of 850 homes. The total residential development for SA03 is 1700 homes (of which 1350 are to be delivered in the plan period). The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC2] and lists the site as commencing development from 2032/33 with development progressing over a period of eight years until 2039/40.

145. The site is not located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) MH2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

146. Yes. The Council considers that the allocation boundary remains appropriate and reflects site 8122 as assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#). The boundary follows clear and defensible physical features including the Grand Union Canal, and Harborough Road.

3.xii) MH2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

147. [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2] contains MM14.1, which introduces additional requirements for the transport assessment of the site.

148. The North of Market Harborough SoCG [[HDC 4D](#)] proposes some modifications to SA03 and MH2 related to the replacement showground and location of the secondary school. Further details are set out in North of Market Harborough section below.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site MH3: Land south of Gallow Field Road (600 homes)

3.i) MH3 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

149. Policy SA03 sets the broad policy framework for the whole Market Harborough North allocation and clearly sets out the mix of uses for the cluster of sites (MH1, MH2 & MH3). This is 1700 homes (600 for MH3); a new three-form entry primary school; a new secondary school; retail, health and community, infrastructure, including a replacement showground; green and blue infrastructure networks; safe highway, foot and cycle connections; on and off site transport measures to mitigate impacts informed by Transport Assessment; health care contribution (as extension to existing, or new), open spaces including sports pitches and other outdoor recreational facilities.

150. The North of Market Harborough SoCG [[HDC 4D](#)] proposes a modification in respect of the replacement showground and secondary school.

3.ii) MH3 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

151. The scale of housing development proposed is justified on the basis of the location of the site, adjacent to the edge of Market Harborough and therefore

identified as the most sustainable tier in the district's Settlement Hierarchy [PPL-NLP1] and also in line with the spatial development strategy [PRE-NLP4].

152. The mix of uses proposed is justified as those required in order to create a sustainable community in accordance with NPPF23 paragraph 74

3.iii) MH3 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

153. There is currently no planning application for the site.

3.iv) MH3 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

154. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of approximately 600 dwellings contributing materially to the district housing requirement, including affordable housing, public open space, green infrastructure, biodiversity enhancements, sustainable drainage measures, potential local economic stimulus, and efficient use of a sustainable location adjoining Market Harborough with existing jobs, services, facilities and public transport opportunities.

155. As a result, the site would make a positive contribution to housing delivery in a sustainable location.

3.v) MH3 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

156. The site lies to the north of the built-up area, with residential development currently under construction to the south, Gallow Field Road to the north, and agricultural land to the west and east.

157. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage and flood risk.
158. Policy MH3 requires development to be informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment to respect the setting of the Grand Union Canal conservation area; to provide a Flood Risk Assessment that takes account of surface water flood risk; and requires a contaminated land assessment and ordnance risk assessment as the site is former Ministry of Defence land. Noise, odour and lighting assessment will also be required to address potential impacts from the animal rendering plant located to the north east of the site.
159. Further to this, Policy SA03 requires development to recognise and enhance the site's location as an important gateway to Market Harborough; respect and maintain visual separation of the cluster of sites with Great Bowden to prevent coalescence, sensitive consideration to the impact of the development within the Lubenham and Foxton Areas of Separation, protection of areas of historic ridge and furrow; provision of safe highway, footway and cycleway connections that are permeable through the cluster; provision of on and off-site transport measures to mitigate impacts informed by a Transport Assessment; and a flood risk assessment to assess the risk of surface water flooding and site specific surface water drainage strategy. These site-specific requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process

3.vi) MH3 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

160. MH3 lies wholly within Flood Zone 1. [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) of the Site Selection Methodology notes sporadic areas of low surface water flood risk that is generally of little concern (Site Ref: 8234/10597).
161. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [[EN-NLP 10](#)] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

162. The SFRA Level 2 found that MH3 (Site 8234/10597) lies within Flood Zone 1 but is affected by surface water flood risk. Due to these constraints, the site was subject to detailed assessment through the preparation of a [Site Table](#), and Sequential and Exception Test [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#). The site was found capable of passing both parts of the Exception Test, subject to appropriate mitigation, which has been incorporated into Policy SA03 and MH3.

163. The Council therefore considers that flood risk has been fully taken into account in allocating the site and that the policy requirements provide an appropriate and effective framework for ensuring that development can be delivered safely and in accordance with national policy.

3.viii) MH3 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

164. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [\[TRP-NLP2\]](#) considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [\[HDC11A\]](#) as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [\[TRP-NLP5\]](#). The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [\[HDC13\]](#) builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MH3 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

165. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule [\[HDC11A\]](#). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.
166. The infrastructure identified in [HDC 11a](#) is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
167. [HDC11A](#) provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the [Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026](#), which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.
168. Physical constraints to the site are the high pressure gas pipeline and buffer through the middle of the site, and potential for Unexploded Ordnance on the former Ministry of Defence land as set out in [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) of the Site Selection Methodology.

3.x) MH3 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

169. Policy MH3 proposes residential development of 600 homes. The total residential development for SA03 is 1700 homes (of which 1350 are to be delivered in the plan period). The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC2] and lists the site as commencing development from 2031/32 with development progressing over a period of nine years until 2039/40.

170. The site is not located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) MH3 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

171. Yes. The Council considers that the allocation boundary remains appropriate. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features on the ground and precisely reflects the footprint of the parcel comprehensively evaluated as site 10597 through the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)].

3.xii) MH3 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

172. [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2] contains MM14.1, which introduces additional requirements for the transport assessment of the site.

173. The North of Market Harborough SoCG [[HDC 4D](#)] proposes some modifications to SA03 and MH3 related to the replacement showground and location of the secondary school. Further details are set out in North of Market Harborough section below.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site MH5: Land OS370, Leicester Road (0.6 Ha employment land)

3.i) MH5 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear? Please confirm that the description of use set out in the policy corresponds to the Use Class reference?

174. Policy SA01 and the associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly identify the site MH5 for 0.6 hectares of employment use. Criterion 1 is not prescriptive and sets out the mix of uses appropriate for the site including Use class E(g), B2 and non-strategic B8.

175. SA01/MH5 Criterion 1 could be more clearly worded to reflect Use Class E (g)(i), E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii) – Office/ Research and development / Industrial processes, Use Class B2 – General Industrial, and Use Class B8 (in units <9,000sqm) – non-strategic Storage and distribution and to correspond to Use Class references in Policy DS02 criterion 2. To remove any ambiguity and ensure consistency the Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification on this basis.

3.ii) MH5 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

176. The justification for the mix is the spatial development strategy and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5](#) (under site reference 8737) the allocation is a direct result of a robust and iterative process. Specifically, Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment to [PRE-NLP 5](#) which identified the site as an infill opportunity, well related to the cluster of sites North of Market Harborough and employment space along the B4067, and an appropriate location for development (small employment units) when compared to other sites within Market Harborough.

177. The Use Class mix is informed by [Appendix B Assessment of Commercial Attractiveness of Candidate Employment Sites](#) (EMP-NLP 5) (under site reference 8737) and is flexible to enable development to include one or more of the identified uses to reflect market demand.

3.iii) MH5 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

178. An Application for Permission in Principle (PIP-Stage 1) (25/01154/PIP) for 5-9 dwellings was refused. Appeal allowed (Appeal Ref: 6008177) on 24th September 2026.

3.iv) MH5 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

179. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of small employment units and associated job creation contributing to the district's employment requirement.

180. The site would make a small and positive contribution to employment delivery in a sustainable location and widen choice within Market Harborough.

3.v) MH5 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

181. The site lies on the edge of the built-up area, adjacent to the canal, two residential properties, Greenacres Gypsy and Traveller site and a commercial garage.

182. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.

183. The potential adverse impacts of developing the site are on the setting of the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area and the amenity of neighbouring residents, in respect of noise. Potential adverse effects can be addressed through requirements of Policy SA01/MH5 that require a Heritage Impact

Assessment and noise attenuation mitigation measures. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan.

3.vi) MH5 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

184. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#) including the detailed assessment in Appendix 4 was informed by evidence contained in the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [\[HSG-NLP 4\]](#), Sustainability Appraisal [\[S-NLP 3\]](#), and SFRA Level 2 [\[EN-NLP 7\]](#). These assessments considered risk from all sources, including surface water, together with safe access and egress.
185. The Level 2 SFRA found MH5: Land OS370 Leicester Road (site ref: 8737) to lie entirely within Flood Zone 1. However, it identified surface water risk due to ponding on site concluding this likely to be manageable at the site. The site passed the sequential test.
186. The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [\[EN-NLP 8\]](#), which took into account EA updated modelling, found the risk of surface water flooding to have increased with the overall conclusion *‘Significant increase in surface water flood extents in all modelled events, which should be considered in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment if the site is brought forwards. The site is proposed as an employment allocation in the Draft Local Plan and a Site Table has been prepared accordingly’* (page 20). The [New 8737 Site Table](#) sets out a more detailed analysis of flood risk across the site. While the Site Table does not require the Exceptions Test to be applied, due to Employment being classed as ‘less vulnerable’, the site was included in the Sequential and Exception Tests Update [\[EN-NLP10\]](#) for comprehensiveness. The site passed the Exception Test.
187. Criterion 4 of SA01/MH5 addressed surface water flood risk issues on the site and requires a site-specific flood risk assessment/surface water drainage strategy, along with a sequential approach to site layout.

3.viii) MH5 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

188. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MH5 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

189. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

190. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

191.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) MH5 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

192.Yes. The Harborough Local Housing and Employment Land Evidence Report ([EMP-NLP 5 Appendix B](#)) assessed the site as deliverable, potentially in the short / medium term.

193.Mineral Safeguarding Area: no known constraint

3.xi) MH5 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

194.The site boundary is appropriate.

3.xii) MH5 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

195.No modifications are proposed or required.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site MH6: Compass Point Business Park (4.3 Ha employment land)

3.i) MH6 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear? Please confirm that the description of use set out in the policy corresponds to the Use Class reference?

The Council's response:

196. Policy SA01 and the associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly identify the site MH6 for 4.3Ha of employment use. Criterion 1 states the appropriate mix of uses as E(g).

197. SA01/MH6 criterion 1 could be more clearly worded to reflect Use Class E (g)(i), E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii) – Office/ Research and development / Industrial processes, and to correspond to Use Class references in Policy DS02 criterion 2. To remove any ambiguity and ensure consistency the Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification on this basis.

3.ii) MH6 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

198. The site is an extant allocation in the current Local Plan. The basis for the mix is Policy MH6 of the adopted Local Plan. The site was reviewed within the Harborough Local Housing and Employment Land Evidence Report [[EMP-NLP 5 Appendix A](#)] (under Compass Point Business Park), the mix corresponds with its recommendation.

3.iii) MH6 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

199. No extant planning consent. Planning application 26/01234/FUL submitted August 2026 for 23 units for storage and distribution and light industrial purposes falling within Use Class B8 and Use class E(g)(iii). Under consideration.

3.iv) MH6 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

200. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of small employment units and associated job creation contributing to the district's employment requirement.

201. The site would make a positive contribution to employment delivery in a sustainable location within Market Harborough.

3.v) MH6 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

202. The site is located on the southern edge of the town, within the built-up area, and extends to the administrative boundary of the district. It lies wholly within Compass Point Business Park an extant employment allocation in the current Local Plan. Adjacent uses include office buildings notably the Harborough Enterprise Centre, residential properties to the east and community use / playing fields to the west beyond the A508.

203. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk. The potential adverse impact of developing the site relates to flood risk. Policy SA01/MH6 requires a site-specific flood risk assessment. This requirement operates alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan.

3.vi) MH6 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

204. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] including the detailed assessment in Appendix 4 was informed by evidence contained in the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and SFRA Level 2 [[EN-NLP 7](#)]. These

assessments considered risk from all sources, including surface water, together with safe access and egress.

205. The Level 2 SFRA found MH6: Compass Point Business Park (comprising Land east of Northampton Road, north of Harborough Enterprise centre and Land east of Compass Way/Enterprise Centre) to lie entirely within Flood Zone 1. However, it identified significant surface water flood risk on the site. Due to this risk [Site Table - 10248](#) and [Site Table - 10253](#) for the 2 component parts of the site were prepared giving an in-depth analysis of flood risk on the site. It highlighted the need for the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests as part of any allocation of the site [[EN-NLP 9](#)].
206. The site was subject to the application of the Sequential Test and needed to undergo the Exception Test also after the preparation of the SFRA Level 2. It passed the Exception Test.
207. The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [[EN-NLP 8](#)], which took into account EA updated modelling, found the risk of surface water flooding to have increased on the 10248 part of the site with the overall conclusion: *‘Significant increase in surface water flood extents in all modelled events, which should be considered in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment if the site is brought forwards. The site is included in the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) and the Site Table has been updated accordingly’* (page 21). The [Updated 10248 Site Table](#) sets out a more detailed analysis of flood risk across that part of the site. Subsequently, the site was included in the Sequential and Exception Tests Update [[EN-NLP10](#)]. The site passed the Exception Test.
208. In relation to the other part of the site (site ref: 10253), the SFRA Level 2 Addendum [[EN-NLP 8](#)] concluded *‘Significant decrease in flood extents in the 0.1% AEP event, although the site remains at high risk* (page 22). No update to the Site Table was required.
209. In light of these findings, surface and groundwater flood risk is acknowledged and addressed in criterion 4 of Policy SA01/MH6 which requires a site-specific flood risk assessment, a surface water drainage strategy and a sequential approach to site layout.

3.viii) MH6 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

210. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MH6 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

211. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

212. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

213.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) MH6 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

214.Yes. The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5 Appendix 4] identifies this is a good quality site with good amenity in a sustainable location. The Harborough Local Housing and Employment Land Evidence Report [[EMP-NLP 5 Appendix A](#)] reviewed the site, and whilst noting delivery has stalled, recommends the site for allocation.

215.Mineral Safeguarding Area: no known constraint

3.xi) MH6 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

216.The site boundary is appropriate.

3.xii) MH6 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

217.No modifications are proposed in HDC 2 Appendix 1 Schedule of Proposed Modifications amended following Panel Note 2 (ID2).

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site MH7: St Marys Road (3,000sqm gross employment land)

3.i) MH7 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

218.The site is allocated for 3000 square metres of Retail and Other Main Town Centre Uses. Please refer to the Council's response to Matter 4 Issue 5 Question 7 in respect of this site.

3.ii) MH7 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

219.The justification for the mix is the spatial development strategy and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5](#) (under site reference 8737) the allocation is a direct result of a robust and iterative process. Specifically, Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment to [PRE-NLP 5](#) which identifies the site as lying within the Market Harborough town centre boundary and a sequentially preferable site for retail and main town centre uses.

220.The basis for the mix is the assessment of the site undertaken as part of the Retail and Town Centre Study [\[RTL-NLP 3\]](#), Appendix 7. The mix of uses is not prescribed in the policy to enable proposals to be market led.

3.iii) MH7 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

221.No extant consent. No planning applications for redevelopment.

3.iv) MH7 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

222.The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of floorspace for retail and main town centres making a positive contribution to meeting the district's retail and food/beverage floorspace need in a

sequentially preferable location. Development would enhance the vitality of the town centre and regenerate a lower quality area of the centre.

3.v) MH7 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

223. The site lies within the Market Harborough Town Centre boundary, c100m west of the Primary Shopping Area boundary. The site and adjacent area include a mix of retail, food/beverage, commercial and service uses, with private car parks and service yards. Existing occupiers include businesses Kwik Fit, the Eco Village and the Freemasons Arms.

224. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.

225. The potential adverse impacts of developing the site are on heritage and flood risk. A heritage appraisal of the site [[HFC-NLP2 Addendum](#)] identifies it as sensitive. Potential adverse effects can be addressed through requirements of Policy SA01/MH7 that requires a Heritage Impact Assessment and site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan.

3.vi) MH7 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

226. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] including the detailed assessment in Appendix 4 was informed by evidence contained in the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and SFRA Level 2 [[EN-NLP 7](#)]. These assessments considered risk from all sources, including surface water, together with safe access and egress.

227. The Level 2 SFRA found MH7: St Marys Road to lie entirely within Flood Zone 1. However, a risk of surface water flooding was identified. Due to this

risk a [Site Table](#) was prepared giving an in-depth analysis of flood risk on the site. It highlighted the need for the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests as part of any allocation of the site [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#).

228. The site was subject to the application of the Sequential Test and needed to undergo the Exception Test also after the preparation of the SFRA Level 2. It passed the Exception Test.

229. The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [\[EN-NLP 8\]](#), which took into account EA updated modelling, found the risk of surface water flooding to have increased with the overall conclusion '*Significant increase in surface water flood extents in all modelled events, which should be considered in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment if the site is brought forwards. The site is included in the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) and the Site Table has been updated accordingly*' (page 21). The [Updated 10240 Site Table](#) sets out a more detailed analysis of flood risk across the site. Subsequently, the site was included in the Sequential and Exception Tests Update [\[EN-NLP10\]](#). The site passed the Exception Test.

230. However, surface flood risk is acknowledged and addressed in criterion 5 of Policy SA01/MH7 which requires a site-specific flood risk assessment, a surface water drainage strategy and a sequential approach to site layout.

3.viii) MH7 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

231. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [\[TRP-NLP2\]](#) considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [\[HDC11A\]](#) as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [\[TRP-NLP5\]](#). The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [\[HDC13\]](#) builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MH7 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

232. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

233. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

234. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) MH7 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

235. Yes. The Harborough Retail and Town Centre Study [[RTL-NLP 3](#)] Appendix 7 assesses the site to have a reasonable prospect of delivery. In the short-term

small-scale infill, is most realistic, whilst comprehensive development is more realistic in the longer-term.

236. Mineral Safeguarding Area: no known constraint

3.xi) MH7 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

237. The site boundary is appropriate. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable property boundaries and physical features on the ground and to the north largely reflects the defined Town Centre boundary. The allocation encompasses under-utilised land and buildings in a secondary area of the centre. The boundary precisely reflects the footprint of the parcel evaluated as site 10240 through the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5].

3.xii) MH7 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

238. There are no modifications proposed in HDC 2 Appendix 1 Schedule of Proposed Modifications amended following Panel Note 2 (ID2). However, please refer to Matter 4, Issue 5, question 10 and 7 for the Council's response on new modifications in respect of SA01/MH7.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site MH8: Commons Car Park (1,000 sqm gross employment land)

3.i) MH8 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

239. The site is allocated for at least 1,000sqm of retail and Other Main Town Centre Uses. Please refer to the Council's response to Matter 4, Issue 5 Question 8 in respect of this site.

3.ii) MH8 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

240. The justification for the mix is the spatial development strategy and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5](#) (under site reference 12231) the allocation is a direct result of a robust and iterative process. Specifically, Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment to [PRE-NLP 5](#) identifies the site as lying within the Market Harborough town centre boundary, partially in the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) and as a sequentially preferable site for retail and main town centre uses to support the vitality and viability of the town at the top of the districts retail hierarchy.

241. The basis for the mix is the assessment of the site undertaken as part of the Retail and Town Centre Study [[RTL-NLP 3](#)], Appendix 7. The mix of uses is not prescribed in the policy to enable proposals to be market led.

3.iii) MH8 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

242. No extant consent.

3.iv) MH8 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

243. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of floorspace for retail and main town centres making a positive contribution to meeting the districts projected retail and food/beverage floorspace need, in a sequentially preferable location.

244. The site presents a brownfield development opportunity in a viable and attractive trading position with good links to the Square. Development would enhance the vitality and viability of the town.

3.v) MH8 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

245. The site is adjacent to retail stores and the River Welland, there is residential development, parks and open space to the south of the site. The site is also a public car park, containing below ground attenuation tanks and providing access to flood defence and monitoring infrastructure along the river.

246. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.

247. The potential adverse impacts of developing the site are on heritage, flood risk and public parking provision. A heritage appraisal of the site [[HFC-NLP2 Addendum](#)] identifies it as sensitive. Potential adverse effects can be addressed through requirements of Policy SA01/MH8 that requires a Heritage Impact Assessment and site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan.

3.vi) MH8 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

248. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] including the detailed assessment in Appendix 4 was informed by evidence contained in the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and SFRA Level 2 [[EN-NLP 7](#)]. These assessments considered risk from all sources, including surface water, together with safe access and egress.

249. The Level 2 SFRA found MH8: Commons Car Park to lie predominantly within Flood Zone 2. However, a significant risk of surface water flooding is identified due to the site's location proximity to the lowest point in the town, the River Welland. Due to this risk a [Site Table](#) was prepared giving an in-depth analysis of flood risk on the site. It highlighted the need for the

application of the Sequential and Exception Tests as part of any allocation of the site [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#). The LLFA also identified that the significant presence of flood infrastructure creates constraints to development.

250. The site was subject to the application of the Sequential Test and needed to undergo the Exception Test also after the preparation of the SFRA Level 2. It passed the Exception Test. However, surface flood risk is acknowledged and addressed in criterion 6 of Policy SA01/MH8 which requires a site-specific flood risk assessment, a surface water drainage strategy and a sequential approach to site layout.

3.viii) MH8 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

251. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [\[TRP-NLP2\]](#) considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [\[HDC11A\]](#) as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [\[TRP-NLP5\]](#). The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [\[HDC13\]](#) builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MH8 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

252. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment

of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

253. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

254. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) MH8 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

255. Yes. The Harborough Retail and Town Centre Study [RTL-NLP 3] Appendix 7 assesses the site (southwestern part) to have a good prospect of delivery in the short to medium term 5-10 years.

256. Mineral Safeguarding Area: no known constraint

3.xi) MH8 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

257. The site boundary is appropriate. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable property boundaries and physical features on the ground and to the south and west reflects the defined Town Centre boundary. The boundary precisely reflects the footprint of the parcel evaluated as site 12231 through the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5].

3.xii) MH8 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

258.A Main Modification MM12.8 is proposed in HDC 2 Appendix 1 Schedule of Proposed Modifications amended following Panel Note 2 (ID2) to respond to the representation of the Environment Agency.

259.Please also refer to Matter 4, Issue 5, question 8 for the Council's response on new modifications in respect of Policy SA01/MH8.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site L1: Land off Leicester Road (230 homes)

3.i) L1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

260.The site is allocated for housing (230 homes) under SA01/L1. The mix of housing and affordable housing on the site will be in line with Plan policies as will other supporting infrastructure including open space, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems and sustainable transport provision.

261.Yes. The proposed scale and use are clear.

3.ii) L1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

262.The justification for the mix is the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (under site reference 8167), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) found the site to be well related to the settlement form and in keeping with the scale identified within the Development Strategy for Lutterworth, which takes into account the committed Lutterworth East Strategic Development Area. It identified the site an appropriate allocation when considered against alternative sites in Lutterworth to deliver the identified housing needs for the settlement.

3.iii) L1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

263. A full planning application has been submitted and is pending consideration for residential development of 230 dwellings, with access from Leicester Road (A426), landscaping, drainage, open space and associated works (26/00447/FUL).

3.iv) L1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

264. The site would provide 230 dwellings towards the District's housing requirement, including affordable housing and an appropriate mix of housing, and open space provision. As a result, the site would make a positive contribution to housing delivery in one of the District's most sustainable settlements.

3.v) L1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

265. The site is adjacent to housing development at its southern boundary, with the brook forming the western boundary, beyond which is agricultural land. Agricultural land also lies to the north and the A426 forms the eastern boundary.

266. Policy SA01/L1 (and proposed modification MM12.9 [[HDC 2 Appendix 1](#)]) seek to address the following constraints:

- Area of Separation designation on the south-western part
- Nearby intensive poultry installation (pig and poultry site) (see MM12.9)
- Surface water flood risk
- Access arrangements for the committed Lutterworth East SDA
- Heritage assets in the vicinity and their setting
- Bittesby Brook corridor/Local Wildlife Site/PRoW

267. These site-specific requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) L1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

268. The Level 2 SFRA found that L1 lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 with some risk of surface water flooding, but no significant concerns were raised. The [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) notes that the Lead Local Flood Authority identified significant surface water flooding risk on part of the site and the western part of the site should remain undeveloped and be incorporated into the site's open space (Site Ref: 8167).

269. The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [\[EN-NLP 8\]](#), which took into account EA updated modelling, found the risk of surface water flooding to have stayed broadly the same and the overall conclusion for the site was '*no significant change in surface water flood extents*' (page 18).

270. Given that the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and the flooding constraints principally related to surface water flow routes are capable of being addressed through layout and mitigation measures, the site passed the Sequential Test and did not require the application of the Exception Test.

3.viii) L1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

271. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [\[TRP-NLP2\]](#) considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [\[HDC11A\]](#) as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [\[TRP-NLP5\]](#). The Local Highway

(Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) L1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

272. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.
273. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
274. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) L1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

275. Policy SA01/L1 proposes residential development of 230 homes which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [HDC 2 Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) and lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of five years until 2032/33.

276. The site does not fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) L1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

277. The site's boundary is appropriate and there is no evidence or justification to suggest any amendment is required.

278. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features and reflects the footprint of the parcel comprehensively evaluated as site 8167 through the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)].

3.xii) L1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

279. No main modifications are required in addition to proposed MM12.9 set out in [HDC 2 Appendix 1](#).

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site L2: Land at M1 Junction 20/Swinford Road (90 homes)

3.i) L2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

280. The site is allocated for housing (90 homes) under SA01/L2. The mix of housing and affordable housing on the site will be in line with Plan policies as will other supporting infrastructure including open space, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems and sustainable transport provision.

281. Yes. The proposed scale and use are clear.

3.ii) L2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

282. The justification for the mix is the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (under site reference 8104), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) found the site to be connected to the settlement form and will contribute to the housing needs identified for Lutterworth in the development strategy. It identified the site an appropriate allocation when considered against alternative sites in Lutterworth to deliver the identified housing needs for the settlement.

3.iii) L2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

283. The site received outline planning permission with Section 106 agreement on 24th August 2026.

284. The planning reference is 25/00746/OUT. The description of development is “Outline application for the erection of up to 90 dwellings, public open space, access onto Swinford Road, landscaping, balancing ponds, acoustic barrier, and some other associated infrastructure (access to be considered)”

3.iv) L2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

285. The site would provide 90 dwellings towards the District's housing requirement, including affordable housing and an appropriate mix of housing, and open space provision. As a result, the site would make a positive contribution to housing delivery in one of the District's most sustainable settlements.

3.v) L2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

286. The site is bounded to the east by the M1 motorway, Lutterworth Road to the north and Swinford Road to the south. To the west is mixed residential, office and nursery uses.

287. The Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#) considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage and flood risk.

288. Policy SA01/L2 requires development to assess and appropriately mitigate noise and vibration from the adjacent M1 motorway, enhance the Local Wildlife Site on the western boundary, complete a contaminated land assessment to assess risks arising from the former railway line, and also requires a site-specific flood risk assessment and drainage strategy.

289. These site-specific requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process

3.vi) L2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

290. The Level 2 SFRA found that L2 lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 and no significant concerns were raised. The [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) notes that the Lead Local Flood Authority also identified no concerns (Site Ref: 8104).

291. The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [\[EN-NLP 8\]](#), which took into account EA updated modelling, found the risk of surface water flooding to have stayed broadly the same and the overall conclusion for the site was '*no significant change in surface water flood extents*' (page 17).

292. Given that the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and there are no concerns regarding surface water flooding, the site passed the Sequential Test and did not require the application of the Exception Test.

3.viii) L2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

293. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [\[TRP-NLP2\]](#) considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [\[HDC11A\]](#) as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [\[TRP-NLP5\]](#). The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [\[HDC13\]](#) builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) L2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

294. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule [[HDC11A](#)]. The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

295. The identified infrastructure in [HDC 11A](#) is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

296. [HDC11A](#) provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the [Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026](#), which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

297. Other constraints are potential noise and vibration impacts, and air quality from the M1 and A4303.

3.x) L2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

298. Policy SA01/L2 proposes residential development of 90 homes which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [HDC 2 Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) and lists the site as commencing development from 2026/27 with development progressing over a period of 2 years until 2027/8.

299. The site does fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. A proposed modification is set out to address this as detailed below. In response to the planning application consultation, the Mineral Planning Authority stated they had no objections to the proposal. *"The Mineral Planning Authority notes the scale and nature of the proposed development, and existing public highway infrastructure which surrounds the site on 3 sides, with the M1 motorway to the east, the A4303 to the north, and existing residential development to the west on Swinford Road, in this instance, the MPA does not consider that prior extraction of minerals would be either practicable or viable. Under those circumstances, the Mineral Planning Authority has no objections to the proposals in respect of Policy M11 of the LMWLP"*

3.xi) L2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

300. The site's boundary is appropriate and there is no evidence or justification to suggest an amendment is required.

301. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features on the ground and precisely reflects the footprint of the parcel comprehensively evaluated as site 8104 through the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)].

3.xii) L2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

302. A main modification has been proposed in the [Appendix 1-Schedule of Proposed Modifications](#) [HDC2] at MM12.10 to add a criterion to policy requirements requiring a minerals assessment to accompany the proposal. This is in response to a representation from Leicestershire County Council. No further modifications are proposed.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Market Towns

Site L3: Land south of Lutterworth Road/Coventry Road (3.4 Ha employment land)

3.i) L3 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear? Please confirm that the description of use set out in the policy corresponds to the Use Class reference?

303. The scale and type of uses are explicitly defined by Policy SA01 and its associated Site Allocation Schedule, which allocates Land south of Lutterworth Road/Coventry Road (Site L3) for employment development. The policy requirements specify that the development must be restricted to employment uses falling within Use Classes E(g)(iii), ensuring absolute clarity and direct correspondence with the statutory Use Class reference.

3.ii) L3 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

304. The site is an extant allocation in the current Local Plan. The basis for the mix is policy MH6 of the adopted Local Plan. However, the site was reviewed within the Harborough Local Housing and Employment Land Evidence Report [[EMP-NLP 5 Appendix A](#)] (Land South of Lutterworth Road / Coventry Road), the mix corresponds with its recommendation. Based on the evidence, including the proximity of adjacent residential properties, widening the mix of Use Classes to include B2 and B8 is not justified as unlike Use Class E(g) these are not uses which can be carried out in a residential area.

3.iii) L3 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

305. Application 22/01318/FUL approved for a restaurant and drive through Use Class E(b) in November 2023 on 0.7Ha of the site nearest to the roundabout. Construction completed Summer 2026. No extant consent or application on the rest of the site.

3.iv) L3 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

306. The benefits for development in accordance with the Plan include the provision of employment units and associated job creation, contributing directly toward the district's employment land requirement. The allocation will make a positive contribution to employment delivery in a sustainable location. Furthermore, the development will secure site-specific landscape and noise mitigation to protect neighbouring residential amenity, retain green corridors, and implement a carefully considered and integrated flood resilient sustainable drainage design.

3.v) L3 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

307. The site is bounded by the A4303 to the north and adjoins the Fairacres Travelling Showpeople yard to the immediate south, with agricultural land to the western boundary.

308. The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage and flood risk.

309. Potential adverse impacts can be successfully addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/L3. This policy requires the provision of access from the existing Fairacres Road, adequate and appropriate landscaping,

including noise attenuation to protect the residential amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent Fairacres Travelling Showpeople yard, green corridors throughout and a buffer between the development and the Bitteswell Brook; a carefully considered, integrated, flood resilient sustainable drainage design and submission of a Minerals Assessment. These criteria operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and national development management policies to provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) L3 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

310.L3: Land south of Lutterworth Road/Coventry Road (SFRA Site 8179) lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of fluvial flooding. The Local Lead Flood Authority has raised no significant concerns regarding development in this location.

311.Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [EN-NLP 9] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [EN-NLP 10] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [HSG-NLP 4], Sustainability Appraisal [S-NLP 3], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

312.Given that the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and exhibits no significant surface water constraints, the site passed the Sequential Test and did not require the application of the Exception Test.

3.viii) L3 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

313. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) L3 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

314. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

315. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

316.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) L3 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

317.Policy SA03/L3 proposes employment development, which is deliverable within the plan period. The site is owned by Leicestershire County Council and is identified in [Appendix A: Review of Existing Employment Areas and Extant Allocations](#) of the Harborough Local Housing and Employment Evidence [EMP-NLP 5] as one of the limited employment sites in Lutterworth capable of delivering development in the short term. Planning permissions have previously been granted for employment development and a spine road has already been delivered to facilitate future development. Potential for delivery is assessed as short-term (EMP-NLP 5).

318.The site is not affected by a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) L3 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

319.There may be some merit in amending the site boundary to exclude the 0.7Ha part of the site recently constructed for Use Class E(b) purposes, which are not an employment Use Class.

3.xii) L3 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

320.A Main Modification MM12.11 is proposed in HDC 2 Appendix 1 Schedule of Proposed Modifications amended following Panel Note 2 (ID2).

321. For factual accuracy, the Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification to the policies map based the response to question 3xi).

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Large Villages

Site BA1: Land off Frolesworth Road (475 homes)

3.i) BA1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

322. Policy SA01 Site Allocation Schedule BA1 clearly allocates BA1: Land off Frolesworth Road for 475 dwellings. The mix of housing, including affordable housing provision and an appropriate mix of homes, will be in line with Plan policies as will other supporting infrastructure including open space, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems and sustainable transport provision. A comprehensive masterplan for the site is required under SA01/BA1 criterion 1.

3.ii) BA1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

323. The scale of BA1 reflects the sustainability of Broughton Astley as one of four Large Villages (tier 3 in the Settlement Hierarchy), strategic housing needs and the level of existing commitments. It also reflects site constraints and opportunities.

324. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (see site reference 10554), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified the site to be in keeping with the scale of development identified within the Development Strategy for Broughton Astley and in keeping with the character and landscape setting of the existing settlement. The site was identified as having a low impact on the edge of the settlement and considered an appropriate location for development. The site is adjacent to the recreation space and primary school and would enable land to be provided to expand the school.

3.iii) BA1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

325. An outline planning application has been submitted and is pending consideration for residential development of up to 550 dwellings, with all matters reserved except means of site access; land for a primary school expansion; land for a Community Facility; Cemetery expansion and car parking; land for Recreational Ground expansion; public open space; associated ancillary earthworks and enabling works; and demolition of existing structures. All other matters (layout, appearance, scale and landscaping) reserved for subsequent approval (26/00480/OUT).

3.iv) BA1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

326. The site would provide approximately 475 dwellings (the current application is for up to 550 dwellings) towards the District's housing requirement, including affordable housing and an appropriate mix of housing. Other benefits include land for a primary school expansion, land for a community facility, cemetery expansion and car parking, land for recreational ground expansion and public open space.

3.v) BA1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

327. The site is adjacent to housing development, primary school and recreation ground along its north-eastern boundary, with agricultural land to the north-west and southern boundaries. The cemetery lies adjacent to the southern corner of the site.

328. Policy SA01/BA1 (and proposed modification MM12.13 [[HDC 2 Appendix 1](#)]) seek to address the following specific constraints:

- Surface water flood risk
- Heritage assets in the vicinity and their setting
- High voltage power line across the site

- Two PRowS cross the site
- Potential contamination from agricultural use
- Local transport impacts
- Nearby consented Anaerobic Digester (see proposed modification MM12.13 [\[HDC 2 Appendix 1\]](#))

329. These site-specific requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) BA1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

330. BA1: Land off Frolesworth Road lies (Site 10554) lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 but some risk of surface water flood risk, including potential access/egress issues, has been identified through the SFRA Level 2. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) also highlighted isolated areas of generally low surface water flood risk and recommended a sequential approach to site layout should be taken. The need for an assessment of access/egress from Frolesworth Road due to a high surface water flood risk was also raised by the LLFA during informal consultation on the emerging Regulation 19 Plan (see [Site Selection Methodology – Appendix 4](#) for site 10554).

331. While surface water flood risk was found to have increased slightly in the SFRA Level 2 Addendum [\[EN-NLP 8\]](#), which took into account EA updated modelling, the overall conclusion for the site was '*no significant change in surface water flood extents*' (page 22).

332. As the site passed the Sequential Test, the Exception Test was not carried out. However, criterion 7 of SA01/BA1 highlights the flood related issues and the need for these to be addressed through a Flood Risk Assessment/Surface Water Drainage Strategy and recommends that a sequential approach to site layout is taken.

3.viii) BA1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

333. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) BA1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

334. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC11A). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

335. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

336.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) BA1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

337.Policy SA01/BA1 proposes residential development of approximately 475 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2030/31 with development progressing over a period of seven years until 2036/37.

338.The site does not fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) BA1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

339.The Council considers that the allocation boundary remains appropriate and reflects site 10554 as assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#). The boundary follows clear and defensible physical features including Frolesworth Road, residential development, primary school, recreation area, cemetery and field boundaries.

3.xii) BA1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

340.[Appendix 1](#) Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2] contains MM12.12 (adding additional clarity to criterion 2: NGET Overhead Cable Route) and

MM12.13 (additional criterion relating to the consented Anaerobic Digester). No additional Main Modifications are considered necessary.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Large Villages

Site F1: Land north of Kilby road and land west of Longgrey (150 homes)

3.i) F1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

341. Policy SA01 clearly allocates Site F1 for 150 dwellings.

3.ii) F1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

342. The allocation is based on the Council's housing requirement and its assessment of suitable sites through the SHELAA 2024 and Site Selection Methodology 2025. The SHELAA 2024 Site Companion Guide (HSG-NLP 6) identifies site 8087 Land North of Kilby Road and site 8055 Land to the West of the Longgrey as available and developable for housing. The subsequent site-selection process assessed the component sites that form F1 and identified them as suitable locations to contribute to Fleckney's housing requirement.

343. The scale of 150 dwellings is therefore based on the Council's housing and site-selection evidence rather than the higher indicative SHELAA capacity. The detailed housing mix is appropriately addressed through the Local Plan's housing policies, informed by the Harborough Local Housing and Employment Land Evidence (February 2025) and wider housing-need evidence.

3.iii) F1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

344. Outline planning application 25/00515/OUT proposes up to 170 dwellings, with access from Longgrey and Garner Way, public open space and associated infrastructure. A draft S106 has been submitted and is currently progressing towards conclusion.

3.iv) F1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

345. The principal benefit is the delivery of 150 homes towards the Council's housing requirement, including affordable housing. The site is well related to the existing built-up area of Fleckney and provides an opportunity for sustainable settlement growth.

3.v) F1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

346. F1 is well related to the existing settlement, being located on the northern and western edges of Fleckney and adjoining existing residential development.

347. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/F1, including a Heritage Impact Assessment in relation to the Grade II* Church of St Nicholas, structural planting to mitigate impacts on the wider countryside setting, integration of pedestrian and cycling access via Longgreys, and a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy, including SuDS maintenance and management and application of the sequential approach to site layout. These requirements, together with the wider Local Plan policies, provide an appropriate framework for mitigating the potential landscape, heritage, transport, accessibility and flood-risk impacts of development.

3.vi) F1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

348. The Site Selection Methodology Appendix 4 and Sustainability Appraisal identifies F1 lies within Flood Zone 1 and raises no significant concerns. Policy SA01 requires a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and appropriate sustainable drainage. Given the Flood Zone 1 location, there is no identified need for the Exception Test.

3.viii) F1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

349. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) F1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

350. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

351. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

352.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) F1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

353.HDC 2 Appendix 3 – Local Plan Allocations: Housing Land Supply Templates identifies F1 as a 150-dwelling allocation, with delivery anticipated within the first five years of the Plan.

354.The site is identified as available and developable, with active developer interest. Appendix 3 also records planning application 25/00515/OUT for up to 170 dwellings as approved subject to completion of the Section 106 agreement.

3.xi) F1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

355.The F1 allocation combines the Land north of Kilby Road and Land west of Longgrey sites. The Council's Site Selection Methodology assessed both as preferred locations for housing. The boundary is therefore consistent with the Council's site-selection evidence, and no compelling evidence has been identified requiring amendment.

3.xii) F1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

356.No specific Main Modification has been identified.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Large Villages

Site GG1: Land north of London Road and east of Leicester Grammar School
(400 homes)

3.i) GG1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

357. Policy SA01 and the associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly identify Land north of London Road and east of Leicester Grammar School (GG1) for 400 homes together with associated infrastructure including sustainable drainage and flood risk mitigation, walking and cycling infrastructure, potential improvements to local highways and parking at Leicester Grammar School, open space and preservation of woodland, and new sports / community hub and associated pitches.

3.ii) GG1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

358. The basis and justification for the proposed mix on Land north of London Road and east of Leicester Grammar School (GG1) is the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, infrastructure evidence, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] (under site reference 8230), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment identified the site as a sustainable location for growth which, when compared against alternatives, relates logically to Great Glen and is appropriate in terms of the identified scale of development for the village.

3.iii) GG1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

359. Outline planning application for up to 450 dwellings, new accesses, new car park serving Leicester Grammar School, sports/recreation/community hub and associated facilities, and ancillary infrastructure (25/01467/OUT) pending determination.

3.iv) GG1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

360. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan would deliver 400 dwellings towards the District housing requirement, including affordable housing, together with a new sports and community hub and associated pitches, sustainable drainage and flood risk mitigation, improved walking and cycling infrastructure, potential improvements to local highways and parking at Leicester Grammar School, open space and preservation of woodland, and provision of new sports / community hub and associated pitches.

3.v) GG1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

361. The site lies adjacent to Leicester Grammar School and existing residential development on the edge of Great Glen.

362. The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.

363. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/GG1, including a comprehensive masterplan, Heritage Impact Assessment, Transport Assessment, integration of active travel routes, protection of important habitats, integration of active travel routes, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy, and assessment of impacts on safeguarded waste facilities.

364. The policy also requires coordination with Policy OA1 to ensure a comprehensive approach to infrastructure, transport and settlement separation. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the masterplanning and development management processes.

3.vi) GG1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

365.GG1: Land north of London Road and east of Leicester Grammar School (Site 8230) lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore a low risk of fluvial flooding. The principal flood risk issue affecting the site relates to surface water flooding and associated access and egress arrangements. The site also occupies an upstream location relative to Great Glen, meaning that management of surface water runoff is particularly important.

366.Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5], including the detailed site assessments in [Appendix 4](#), and the Sequential and Exception Test [EN-NLP 9] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [EN-NLP 10] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [HSG-NLP 4], Sustainability Appraisal [S-NLP 3], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

367.Given that the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and the identified surface water constraints are capable of being addressed through layout, drainage design and sustainable drainage measures, the site passed the Sequential Test and did not require the application of the Exception Test.

3.viii) GG1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

368.The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [TRP-NLP2] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road

safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) GG1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

369. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule ([HDC11A](#)). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

370. The infrastructure identified within HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is fully satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

371. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach to be consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15th July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

372. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in [Appendix 4](#), demonstrates that there are no insurmountable barriers to delivery. Identified constraints, including the proximity to the A6 transport corridor, the boundary interface with Leicester Grammar School,

surface water flow paths, and nearby designated heritage assets, have been comprehensively assessed through the preparation of the Plan and addressed within the policy requirements of Policy SA01/GG1 and the wider policy framework.

3.x) GG1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

373. Policy SA01/GG1 proposes residential development of 400 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2030/31 with development progressing over a period of six years until 2035/36.

374. Site GG1 is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) GG1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

375. The Council considers that the site boundary for Site GG1 is appropriate, and there is no evidence or justification for amendment. The allocation boundary reflects site 8230, which was assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5]. The boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features including London Road, Leicester Grammar School, existing residential development, and field boundaries.

376. This defined area contains sufficient land to sustainably accommodate approximately 400 dwellings together with the supporting infrastructure required by the Plan, including access, walking and cycling routes, sustainable drainage and potential parking improvements.

377. Retaining the boundary in its current form enables a comprehensive master planned development that integrates with the existing settlement and responds appropriately to neighbouring uses. The Council is not aware of any evidence that would justify either extending or reducing the allocation boundary and therefore considers it to be justified effective and appropriate.

3.xii) GG1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

378. Beyond the proposed modifications set out in [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2], no further Main Modifications are considered necessary.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Large Villages

Site K1: Land west of Warwick Road and south of Priory Business Park (475 homes)

3.i) K1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

379. Policy SA01 and the associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly identify Land west of Warwick Road and south of Priory Business Park (K1) for 475 homes.

3.ii) K1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

380. The justification for the proposed mix on Land west of Warwick Road and south of Priory Business Park (K1) is the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, infrastructure evidence, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (under site reference 8247), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified the site as an appropriate location in terms of the scale and next to recent residential development to contribute to delivering the identified housing growth in Kibworth.

3.iii) K1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

381.A planning application has not been submitted to date.

3.iv) K1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

382.The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of 475 dwellings toward the District housing requirement, including a substantial contribution to affordable housing in a settlement that has a good range of important and supporting services and facilities. Furthermore, the development will secure a comprehensive masterplan to coordinate transport impacts along the A6 corridor and support primary and secondary education expansion.

3.v) K1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

383.Adjacent uses include agriculture, residential, employment and a railway line.

384.The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.

385.Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/K1, operating alongside the wider policy framework. Specifically, the policy requires a comprehensive masterplan and a Transport Assessment to mitigate cumulative impacts along the A6 corridor and the Warwick Road railway bridge; contributions toward local primary and secondary education expansion; and an environmental assessment alongside robust drainage evidence to safeguard the Kilby-Foxton Canals SSSI. Furthermore, the policy mandates a full archaeological evaluation of the site's historic remains; a sequential approach to site layout to steer development away from identified surface water flood risk; and a comprehensive noise, overheating, and ventilation assessment to protect

future residential amenity while explicitly protecting ongoing operational railway safety.

3.vi) K1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

386. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5], including the detailed site assessments in [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessments](#), and the Sequential and Exception Test [EN-NLP 9] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [EN-NLP 10] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [HSG-NLP 4], Sustainability Appraisal [S-NLP 3], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

387. K1: Land west of Warwick Road and south of Priory Business Park (Site 8247) lies within Flood Zone 1 but is affected by extensive areas of high surface water flood risk associated with the tributary of the Burton Brook.

388. Due to these constraints, the site was subject to detailed assessment through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, including the preparation of a [Site Table](#), and Sequential and Exception Test [EN-NLP 9]. The site was found capable of passing both parts of the Exception Test, subject to appropriate mitigation, which has been incorporated into Policy SA01/K1

389. The Council therefore considers that flood risk has been fully taken into account in allocating the site and that the policy requirements provide an appropriate and effective framework for ensuring that development can be delivered safely and in accordance with national policy.

3.viii) K1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

390. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [TRP-NLP2] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that

considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [HDC11A] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [TRP-NLP5]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) K1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

391. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC11A). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

392. The identified infrastructure in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

393. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) K1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

394. Policy SA01 proposes residential development of approximately 475 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of four years until 2031/32.

3.xi) K1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

395. The site boundary is appropriate in terms of the scale and its location next to residential development.

3.xii) K1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

396. Beyond the proposed modifications set out in [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2], no further Main Modifications are considered necessary.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Large Villages

Site K2: Land south and west of Priory Business Park (3.1 Ha emp land)

3.i) K2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear? Please confirm that the description of use set out in the policy corresponds to the Use Class reference?

397. Policy SA01 and the associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly allocate the site K2 for 3.1ha of employment use. Criterion 1 sets out the mix of uses appropriate for the site including business, light industrial and retail (Use Class E(g), B2 and E(a)).

398. SA01/K2 Criterion 1 could be more clearly worded to reflect Use Class E (g)(i), E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii) – Office/ Research and development / Industrial processes, Use Class B2 – General Industrial, and Use Class E(a) Retail to correspond to Use Class references in Policy DS02. To remove any ambiguity and ensure consistency the Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification on this basis.

3.ii) K2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

399. The site is an extant allocation in the current Local Plan. The basis for the mix is Policy K1 of the adopted Local Plan. The site was reviewed within the Harborough Local Housing and Employment Land Evidence Report [[EMP-NLP 5 Appendix A](#)] (under Compass Point Business Park), the mix corresponds with its recommendation.

3.iii) K2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

400. No extant consent. Planning application 26/00229/OUT submitted February 2026 for up to 600sqm Class E(a) and E(b) including Sui Generis (Drive-thru) - access only on part of site (c1.3Ha). Under consideration.

3.iv) K2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

401. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include the provision of a flexible mix of business, light industrial, and retail, alongside associated job creation that contributes directly toward the district's employment land requirements.
402. The allocation will make a positive contribution to employment and service delivery in a settlement that has a good range of important and supporting services and facilities. Furthermore, the development will support sustainable modes of travel from Warwick Road, deliver site-specific landscaping and noise attenuation to screen and protect the residential amenity of existing properties, provide robust drainage evidence to ensure protection of the Kilby-Foxton Canals SSSI, and implement layout measures to steer development away from areas at risk of surface water flooding.

3.v) K2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

403. The site directly adjoins the established Priory Business Park and Beauchamp Business Park (recently fully developed), forming a logical extension of the existing employment area. It is clearly bounded by Warwick Road along its eastern boundary.
404. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage and flood risk.
405. Potential adverse impacts can be successfully addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/K2. This policy requires the provision for sustainable travel modes from Warwick Road; landscaping, including noise attenuation to screen and protect the residential amenity of existing properties on 'Kibworth Meadows'; robust drainage evidence to protect the Kilby-Foxton Canals SSSI; and a sequential approach to site layout to steer development away from areas identified at flood risk. These criteria operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and national development

management policies to provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) K2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

406.K2: Land adjacent to Priory/Beauchamp Park (Site 10642) lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of fluvial flooding. However, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessments](#) identifies a small band of low surface water flood risk forming a surface water flow path across the land. The Local Lead Flood Authority confirmed that the risk is manageable for employment uses through raised floor levels and an appropriate sustainable drainage system strategy.

407.Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [[EN-NLP 10](#)] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

408.Given that the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and surface water constraints are fully capable of being managed through layout and mitigation, the site passed the Sequential Test and did not require the application of the Exceptions Test.

3.viii) K2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

409.The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that

considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [HDC11A] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [TRP-NLP5]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) K2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

410. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.
411. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
412. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) K2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

413. Policy SA01/K2 proposes a mix of business, light industrial, and retail development, which is deliverable within the plan period. The site forms the remaining undeveloped phase of the wider Beauchamp Business Park, where earlier phases have been completed or brought forward successfully. Potential for delivery is assessed as medium-term (EMP-NLP 5).

414. The site is not affected by a Mineral Safeguarding Area

3.xi) K2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

415. The site boundary is appropriate.

3.xii) K2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

416. Beyond the proposed modifications set out in [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2], no further Main Modifications are considered necessary.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site B1: Land at Gaulby Road (48 homes)

3.i) B1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

417. Policy SA01 and associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly allocate B1 for 48 homes, comprising 30 self-build or custom house build plots and 18 affordable First Homes with school drop off area and associated parking.

3.ii) B1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

418. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (under site reference 8155), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified that the site is in keeping with the scale of development set out within the Development Strategy for Billesdon, displaying a strong relationship to the existing settlement form and providing the potential to deliver additional primary school drop-off and parking provision.

3.iii) B1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

419. Outline application approved for up to 48 dwellings, including 30 custom house build plots and 18 affordable First Homes, with associated vehicular access, school drop off area with 40 spaces, landscaping, and drainage infrastructure (access only to be considered) APP/F241/W/24/3346350 (23/01104/OUT).

420. Pending outline application for up to 62 dwellings, comprising 36 custom housebuilding plots and 26 affordable homes (25/01548/OUT).

4.iv) B1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

421. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of 48 dwellings contributing to the district's housing requirement, comprising 30 self-build or custom housebuilding plots and 18 affordable First Homes. The development would also provide a school drop-off area and associated parking, retain connectivity between the village and the wider countryside through integration of an existing Public Right of Way, foster links to and between adjoining Local Green Spaces, and deliver structural landscaping and sustainable drainage measures.

4.v) B1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

422.Adjacent Land uses: Residential, school playing fields, agriculture, highway depot.

423.The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.

424.Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/B1.

4.vi) B1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

425.Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [EN-NLP 9] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [EN-NLP 10] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [HSG-NLP 4], Sustainability Appraisal [S-NLP 3], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

426.Land at Gaulby Road (Site 8155) lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore a low risk of fluvial flooding. The site contains extensive flood risk in the southern half of the development site associated with Burton Brook.

427.Due to these constraints, the site was subject to detailed assessment through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential and Exception

Test [EN-NLP 9]. The site was found capable of passing both parts of the Exception Test, subject to appropriate mitigation, which has been incorporated into Policy SA01/B1.

428. The Council therefore considers that flood risk has been fully taken into account in allocating the site and that the policy requirements provide an appropriate and effective framework for ensuring that development can be delivered safely and in accordance with national policy.

4.viii) B1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

429. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [TRP-NLP2] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [HDC11A] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [TRP-NLP5]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

4.ix) B1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

430. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

431. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

432. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

433. As detailed in [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) that forms part of the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] (under site reference 8155), there are no insurmountable barriers to the delivery of Site B1.

4.x) B1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

434. Policy SA01 proposes residential development of approximately 48 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of four years until 2031/32.

4.xi) B1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

435. The site boundary is appropriate, and there is no evidence or justification to suggest an amendment is required. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features and reflects the boundary of the site assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] (reference 8155).

4.xii) B1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

436.No modification proposed in HDC 2 Appendix 1 Schedule of Proposed Modifications amended following Panel Note 2 (ID2).

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site B2: Billesdon Depot, south of Gaulby Road (10 homes)

3.i) B2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

437.Policy SA01 and associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly allocate B2 for a maximum of 10 homes on up to 0.5 hectares at the site frontage with arrangements suitable for self and custom house builders.

3.ii) B2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

438.The basis for residential in site B2 is the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (see site reference 8190), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified that a residential development is in keeping with the scale of housing growth identified within the Development Strategy for Billesdon. The principle of residential use reflects the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan.

439.Since that assessment, planning permission has been granted for an alternative use.

3.iii) B2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

440.Planning permission granted in September 2026 for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a two-storey Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Training Facility, with new workshops for 6No of fire appliance, maintenance and hard standing area, new retained fire station with ancillary accommodation to replace existing facility on Rolleston Road, Billesdon (24/01643/FUL).

3.iv) B2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

441.The residential allocation would provide up to 10 dwellings contributing to the district's housing requirement, with servicing and site arrangements designed to make the site suitable and attractive for self and custom builders. Development would also secure the beneficial reuse of previously developed land, subject to appropriate investigation and remediation of any contamination, together with landscape mitigation and sustainable drainage measures.

3.v) B2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

442.Adjacent Land uses: Agriculture, woodland Lake.

443.The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.

444.Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/B2.

3.vi) B2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

445. The site lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore a low risk of fluvial flooding.

446. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#), including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#) - alongside its subsequent Addendum [\[EN-NLP 10\]](#) - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [\[HSG-NLP 4\]](#), Sustainability Appraisal [\[S-NLP 3\]](#), and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together, these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

447. The site passed the Sequential Test and did not require the application of the Exception Test.

3.viii) B2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

448. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [\[TRP-NLP2\]](#) considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [\[HDC11A\]](#) as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [\[TRP-NLP5\]](#). The Local Highway

(Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) B2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

449. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.
450. The identified infrastructure in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
451. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) B2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

452. Policy SA01 proposes residential development of approximately 10 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of four years until 2031/32. Since then, planning permission has been granted for an alternative development. This permission has not been implemented to date.

3.xi) B2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

453. The site boundary is appropriate, and there is no evidence or justification to suggest an amendment is required. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features and reflects the boundary of the site assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#) (reference 8190).

3.xii) B2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

454. Should the alternative permission be implemented, further review will need to be undertaken of the availability and deliverability of the allocation.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site B3: Former Lorry Park, Gaulby Road (5 homes)

3.i) B3 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

455. Policy SA01 and associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly allocates site B3 for 5 homes.

3.ii) B3 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

456. The principle of residential use reflects the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (see site reference 8202), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified that a residential development is in keeping with the scale of housing growth identified within the Development Strategy for Billesdon.

3.iii) B3 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

457. There are no current planning applications.

3.iv) B3 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

458. The benefits of development in accordance with the Plan include provision of additional dwellings contributing to the district's housing requirement and beneficial reuse of previously developed land, subject to appropriate investigation and remediation of any contamination. Development would also retain important boundary trees and hedges, reinforce the site's landscaping with native trees, and provide mitigation that responds to the adjoining Billesdon Woodland Pool Local Green Space.

3.v) B3 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

459. Adjacent Land uses: Agriculture, woodland.

460. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk.

461. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/B3 that require integration and connectivity with the existing community, assessment and mitigation of transport impacts, retention and reinforcement of boundary hedgerows and trees, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy, and protection of both the sewage treatment works and future occupiers. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework. Detailed mitigation has been tested through the Development Management process.

3.vi) B3 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

462. B3 lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore a low risk of fluvial flooding.

463. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [[EN-NLP 10](#)] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

464. The site passed the Sequential Test and did not require the application of the Exception Test.

3.viii) B3 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

465. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) B3 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

466. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

467. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make

it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

468.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

469.As detailed in [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) that forms part of the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] (under site reference 8202), there are no insurmountable barriers to the delivery of Site B3.

3.x) B3 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

470.Policy SA01 proposes residential development of approximately 5 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of four years until 2031/32.

3.xi) B3 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

471.The site boundary is appropriate, and there is no evidence or justification to suggest an amendment is required. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features and reflects the boundary of the site assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] (reference 8202).

3.xii) B3 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

472.No.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site GB1: Land north of Dingley Road (15 homes)

3.i) GB1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

473.Policy SA01 Site Allocation Schedule GB1 clearly allocates site GB1 for 15 homes. Other Plan policies require affordable housing and an appropriate mix of homes, alongside open space, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, access and supporting infrastructure necessary to serve the development.

3.ii) GB1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

474.The scale of GB1 reflects the sustainability of Great Bowden, one of five Medium Villages (tier 4 in the Settlement Hierarchy), strategic housing needs and the level of existing commitments. It also reflects site constraints and opportunities.

475.As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (see site reference 8151), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified the site to be in keeping with the scale of development identified within the Development Strategy for Great Bowden, well related to the village's built form and village centre, lying adjacent to recent housing development. It identified the site as a preferred location for housing development when compared to other locations and sites around the village.

3.iii) GB1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

476.A planning application has been approved for the erection of 11 dwellings, including two affordable bungalows (25/00608/FUL). The decision notice was issued on 24/08/2026.

3.iv) GB1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

477.The development will deliver residential development, including affordable dwellings and an appropriate mix of housing.

3.v) GB1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

478.The site is adjacent to the existing settlement built form to the west and agricultural land, primary school, and recreation ground along its north-eastern boundary, with agricultural land to the north-west and southern boundaries. The cemetery lies adjacent to the southern corner of the site.

479.Policy SA01/GB1 (and proposed modification MM12.21 [HDC 2 Appendix 1]) seeks to address the following specific constraints:

- Surface water flood risk
- Heritage assets (designated and non-designated) in the vicinity and their setting requiring a Heritage Impact Assessment
- Proximity of 3 three waste sites (see proposed modification MM12.21 [HDC 2 Appendix 1])

480.These site-specific requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) GB1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

481. The Level 2 SFRA found that GB1: Land north of Dingley Road (Site 8151) lies entirely within Flood Zone 1. While the assessment found some risk of surface water flood risk and concluded that site itself to be at low risk of flooding, it highlights potential access/egress issues.

482. The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [EN-NLP 8], which took into account EA updated modelling, found the risk of surface water flooding to have fallen slightly and the overall conclusion for the site was '*no significant change in surface water flood extents*' (page 18).

483. As the site passed the Sequential Test, the application of the Exception Test was not required. However, criterion 3 of SA01/GB1 highlights that site access/egress arrangements will need to take account of surface water flood risk and be addressed in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment/Surface Water Drainage Strategy.

3.viii) GB1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

484. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [TRP-NLP2] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [HDC11A] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [TRP-NLP5]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) GB1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

485.The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

486.The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

487.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) GB1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

488.Policy SA01/GB1 proposes residential development of approximately 15 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. However, the site has extant permission for 11 dwellings. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 -](#)

[Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of two years.

489. The site falls within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. However, due to its modest scale and context the Minerals Planning Authority did not require a Minerals Assessment at the time of the planning application.

3.xi) GB1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

490. The boundary of the site is considered appropriate and there is no evidence or justification to suggest an amendment is required. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features and reflects the boundary of the site assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#) (reference 8151). Furthermore, the site has extant permission for 11 dwellings.

3.xii) GB1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

491. Other than MM12.20 already set out in HDC 2 Appendix 1, no other MMs are required.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site GB2: Land off Dingley Road and Nether Green (85 homes)

3.i) GB2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

492. Policy SA01 Site Allocation Schedule GB2 clearly allocates GB2 for 85 homes. Other Plan policies require affordable housing and an appropriate mix of homes, alongside open space, green infrastructure, sustainable

drainage, access and supporting infrastructure necessary to serve the development.

3.ii) GB2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

493. The scale of GB2 reflects the sustainability of Great Bowden, one of five Medium Villages (tier 4 in the Settlement Hierarchy), strategic housing needs and the level of existing commitments. It also reflects site constraints and opportunities.

494. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (see site reference 8054), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified the site to be in keeping with the scale of development identified within the Development Strategy for Great Bowden, well related to the village's built form and village centre, representing rounding off the village up to the A6. It identified the site as preferred location for housing development when compared to other locations and sites around the village.

3.iii) GB2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

495. No planning application has been submitted.

3.iv) GB2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

496. The site would deliver an appropriate mix of housing, including affordable housing, within a sustainable village and close to Market Harborough's wider range of services and facilities.

3.v) GB2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

497. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement built form and adjoins allocation GB1 (now a commitment). The A6 runs along the eastern boundary. The River Welland runs to the south east of the site. Agricultural land lies to the south and is now part of the James Adler Nature Reserve.

498. Constraints relating to SA01/GB2 include:

- Fluvial and surface water flood risk
- Proximity to heritage assets (designated and non-designated) requiring a Heritage Impact Assessment
- Mineral Safeguarding Area
- Potential impact of proximity to A6 – Noise impact assessment required
- Biodiversity/green and blue infrastructure connections/SSSI impact zone
- Proximity of 3 three waste sites
- Site access on to Dingley Road

499. Site specific requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) GB2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

500. The Level 2 SFRA found GB2: Land off Dingley Road and Nether Green (Site 8054) to be 84% within Flood Zone 1, 5.3% within Flood Zone 2 and 1.2% within Flood Zone 3 and at risk of significant surface water flooding. Due to the identified risks, a [Site Table](#) for 8054 was prepared giving an in depth analysis of flood risk on the site. It highlighted the need for the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests as part of any allocation of the site [\[EN-NLP 9\]](#). Informal consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority also highlighted significant surface water flooding associated with the River Welland in the east of the site, stating that development in this part of the site should be avoided.

501. The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [EN-NLP 8], which took into account EA updated modelling, found ‘*significant increase in Flood Zone 2/3 extents and a significant decrease in surface water flood extents*’ (section 3). As a result, an [Updated Site Table](#) for the site was prepared. A Sequential and Exception Test Addendum [EN-NLP 10] also carried out.

502. Given that GB2 did not pass the Sequential Test, the site needed to go through the Exception Test at the Level 2 SFRA and Level 2 SFRA Addendum stages. The site was found capable of passing both parts of the Exception Test, subject to appropriate mitigation.

503. Flood risk on the site is acknowledged and addressed in criterion 10 of Policy SA01/GB2 which requires a site-specific flood risk assessment, a surface water drainage strategy, a sequential approach to site layout, appropriate raising of floor levels and a flood warning and evacuation plan.

3.viii) GB2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

504. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [TRP-NLP2] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [HDC11A] as ‘integral’ to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [TRP-NLP5]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) GB2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

505. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

506. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

507. HDC 11A provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) GB2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

508. Policy SA01/GB2 proposes residential development of approximately 85 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply](#)

[Template](#)) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of four years.

509. The southern part of the site now lies within the Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust James Adler Nature Reserve.

510. The site falls within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. A Minerals Assessment may be required by the Minerals Planning Authority at the time of any planning application. They will consider the size and context of the site in deciding if a Minerals Assessment needs to be provided.

3.xi) GB2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

511. The boundary of the site is considered appropriate. There is no evidence or justification to suggest an amendment is required. The allocation boundary follows clear, identifiable physical features and reflects the boundary of the site assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#) (reference 8054).

3.xii) GB2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

512. No MMs are required.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site HH1: Land north of Uppingham Road (80 homes)

3.i) HH1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

513. Policy SA01 clearly allocates Site HH1 for 80 dwellings.

3.ii) HH1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

514. The allocation is based on the Council's housing requirement and its assessment of suitable sites through the SHELAA 2024 and Site Selection Methodology 2025. The SHELAA 2024 Site Companion Guide identifies site 21/8206 as available and developable for housing, while the subsequent site-selection process assessed the site as suitable for allocation and identified capacity for residential development at Houghton on the Hill.

515. The scale of development at HH1 is therefore based on the Council's housing and site-selection evidence rather than simply relying on the indicative SHELAA capacity. The detailed housing mix is appropriately addressed through the Local Plan's housing policies, informed by the Harborough Local Housing and Employment Land Evidence (February 2025) and wider housing-need evidence. This provides an appropriate basis for determining the mix at the planning application stage, having regard to the latest evidence and the characteristics of the site and settlement.

3.iii) HH1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

516. An outline planning application, 25/00599/OUT, has been submitted for the erection of up to 90 dwellings, with access to be considered. A draft S106 has been submitted and is currently progressing towards conclusion.

3.iv) HH1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

517. The proposed development would make a positive contribution to the Council's housing requirement by providing up to 90 dwellings, including affordable housing in accordance with Local Plan requirements.

518. The development would also provide green and recreational space, SuDS, and pedestrian and cycle connections, helping to integrate the site with the existing settlement and support sustainable travel.

3.v) HH1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

519. The HH1 site is well related to the existing settlement, with the eastern part of the site adjoining existing development.

520. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01 HH1, including a Mineral Assessment, an appropriate gas pipeline buffer, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy, Noise Impact Assessment, retention and integration of the existing Public Right of Way, and appropriate landscaping and ecological measures. The eastern part of the site should be the focus of development to minimise landscape impacts and ensure a strong relationship with the existing settlement.

3.vi) HH1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

521. HH1 is entirely within Flood Zone 1, with approximately 6% of the site affected by surface-water flood risk. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 (site ref: 8206) identifies no access or egress issues and records no significant concerns at the initial screening stage.

522. The flood risk has nevertheless been appropriately taken into account in the allocation. Policy SA01 HH1 requires a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, Surface Water Drainage Strategy and SuDS management plan. It also requires the development layout to use a sequential approach to avoid areas of surface-water risk where possible, or otherwise formalise flow routes and provide compensatory storage.

523. The Council's Sequential and Exception Test (January 2025) explains that flood risk was considered through the site-selection process, with sites assessed against flood zones and higher-risk sites excluded or having their developable area reduced where appropriate. Given that HH1 is wholly within Flood Zone 1 and only a small proportion is affected by surface-water risk, the site is not subject to the level of fluvial flood risk that would require the Exception Test.

3.viii) HH1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

524. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) HH1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

525. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

526. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

527.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) HH1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

528.HDC 2 Appendix 3 – Local Plan Allocations: Housing Land Supply Templates identifies HH1 as an 80-dwelling allocation, with delivery anticipated within the first five years of the Plan.

529.The site is identified as available and developable, with active developer interest. Appendix 3 also records planning application 25/00599/OUT for up to 170 dwellings as approved subject to completion of the Section 106 agreement.

530.The site partly falls within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. Policy SA01 HH1 therefore requires a Mineral Assessment in accordance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This is a requirement to ensure that the mineral resource is appropriately considered; it does not impact the sites deliverability.

3.xi) HH1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

531.The proposed HH1 boundary is considered appropriate and is consistent with the site-selection evidence. Site 8206 was assessed as suitable for allocation, with the eastern part of the site identified as being well related to the existing settlement. It was concluded that development should be focused on this part of the site to avoid impacts on more sensitive landscape.

532.The boundary therefore provides an appropriate basis for accommodating the allocation while allowing the detailed layout to respond to the site's landscape, flood risk, gas pipeline and other constraints.

533.The boundary is therefore consistent with the Council's site-selection evidence and no compelling evidence has been identified requiring amendment.

3.xii) HH1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

534.No specific Main Modification has been identified.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site HH2: Land north of Stretton Lane (24 homes)

3.i) HH2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

535.Policy SA01 clearly allocates Site HH2 for 24 dwellings comprising 100% affordable housing.

3.ii) HH2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

536.The basis for HH2 is the Council's housing and affordable housing evidence, including the Housing Mix and Type Topic Paper and the updated Leicester and Leicestershire housing mix evidence.

537.The requirement is justified by the identified local need for smaller and more affordable homes within Houghton on the Hill. The AECOM Housing Needs Assessment identifies a gap in smaller, more affordable housing. HH2 therefore provides a site-specific response to local housing need and an opportunity to address the imbalance in the existing housing stock, which has a relatively high proportion of larger homes.

3.iii) HH2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

538. A planning application for up to 24 dwellings with associated access, landscaping, and open space (24/00359/FUL), was refused by the Planning Committee in April 2026, contrary to the officer's recommendation. The stated reasons for refusal were that the proposal conflicted with Policies L1 and L2 of the Houghton on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan and would result in harm to the landscape and the Houghton on the Hill Conservation Area. No planning appeal has been lodged to date, and the site remains available for development.

3.iv) HH2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

539. The principal benefit of HH2 is the delivery of 24 affordable homes, directly addressing the identified local need for smaller and more affordable housing. Policy HH2 requires 100% affordable housing provision.

540. The development would also provide wider benefits through improved connectivity by retaining and integrating the existing Public Right of Way, retention of mature hedgerows and trees, and the provision of recreational and wildlife areas.

3.v) HH2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

541. The HH2 site is well related to the existing settlement, being located adjacent to the village and existing residential development.

542. Potential adverse impacts can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01 HH2, including a Mineral Assessment, an appropriate buffer to the gas pipeline, a Heritage Impact Assessment, integration of the existing Public Right of Way D11, and retention of existing mature hedgerows, trees and the Tree Preservation Order along the southern boundary. Development must also respect the character and setting of the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings.

3.vi) HH2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

543.HH2 is located entirely within Flood Zone 1, with no identified surface-water flood risk in the Level 2 SFRA screening (site ref: 8135). The site was therefore identified as having no significant flood-risk concerns.

3.viii) HH2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

544.The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) HH2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

545.The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment

of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

546. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

547. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) HH2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

548. [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] identifies HH2 as a 24-dwelling allocation, with delivery anticipated within the first five years of the Plan.

549. The site is identified as developable, with active developer interest. However, the planning application (24/00359/FUL) has been refused.

550. The site partly falls within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. Policy SA01 HH1 therefore requires a Mineral Assessment in accordance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This is a requirement to ensure that the mineral resource is appropriately considered; it does not impact the sites deliverability.

3.xi) HH2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

551. The proposed HH2 boundary is considered appropriate and is consistent with the site-selection evidence. Site 8135 was assessed as suitable for allocation, with the site adjoining the existing settlement and having access from Stretton Lane. The evidence identifies the need for development to be carefully located to address the gas pipeline and minimise impacts on the landscape setting of the village and Conservation Area.

552. The boundary therefore provides an appropriate basis for accommodating the allocation while allowing the detailed layout to respond to the site's gas pipeline, landscape, heritage and other constraints.

553. The boundary is therefore consistent with the Council's site-selection evidence, and no compelling evidence has been identified requiring amendment.

3.xii) HH2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

554. No specific Main Modification has been identified.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site HB1: Land east of Welford Road (105 homes)

3.i) HB1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

555. Policy SA01 clearly identifies HB1 Land east of Welford Road, Husbands Bosworth for 105 homes.

3.ii) HB1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

556. The justification for the mix is the spatial development strategy, settlement hierarchy, and the comprehensive site assessment process. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] (under site reference 8064), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment identified the site as being well related to village facilities to contribute to delivering the identified housing growth for Husbands Bosworth.

3.iii) HB1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

557. An outline planning application for the construction of up to 150 dwellings with associated landscaping, open space, drainage infrastructure and associated works (all matters reserved except access from Welford Road) has been submitted and is currently being considered (26/00470/OUT).

3.iv) HB1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

558. Benefits of the proposed development would be delivery of housing towards the District's housing requirement, landscaping, open space and affordable housing.

3.v) HB1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

559. To the north and west the site adjoins the existing built form of the village. Development of the site has been thoroughly considered through the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5] and potential impacts will be mitigated through policy requirements.

3.vi) HB1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

560. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (SFRA site ref: 8064). The Lead Local Flood Authority advised that there is a high surface water flood risk at the south-western boundary of the site and a small low-risk surface water flow path to the east. The site layout will need a sequential approach and a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required.

561. Flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], including the detailed site assessments in Appendix 4, and the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] - alongside its subsequent Addendum [[EN-NLP 10](#)] - were informed by evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment [[HSG-NLP 4](#)], Sustainability Appraisal [[S-NLP 3](#)], and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, ground water and reservoir flooding, together with issues relating to safe access and egress. The outcomes directly informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements embedded within individual policy requirements.

562. Given that the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and the identified surface water constraints are capable of being addressed through layout and mitigation measures, the site passed the Sequential Test and was not identified as requiring the Exception Test.

3.viii) HB1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

563. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the

delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [TRP-NLP5]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) HB1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

564. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

565. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

566. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) HB1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

567. Policy SA01/HB1 proposes residential development of 105 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on

site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [HDC2 Appendix 3: LP Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Templates\)](#) which lists the site as commencing development from 2029/30 with development progressing over a period of three years until 2031/32.

568. The site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and therefore a Mineral Assessment will be required in accordance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

3.xi) HB1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

569. Yes. The Council considers that the allocation boundary remains appropriate and reflects site 8064 as assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)]. The site is in keeping with the scale of growth for Husbands Bosworth and is well related and in keeping with the settlement form.

3.xii) HB1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

570. No further Main Modifications are considered necessary.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site U1: Land south of Ashby Road (30 homes)

3.i) U1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

571. Policy SA01 Site Allocation Schedule U1 clearly allocates U1 for 30 homes. Other Plan policies require affordable housing and an appropriate mix of homes, alongside open space, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, access and supporting infrastructure necessary to serve the development.

3.ii) U1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

572. The scale of U1 reflects the sustainability of Ullesthorpe, one of five Medium Villages (tier 4 in the Settlement Hierarchy), strategic housing needs and the level of existing commitments. It also reflects site constraints and opportunities.

573. As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (see site reference 10649), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified the site to be in keeping with the scale of development identified within the Development Strategy for Ullesthorpe, well related to the village's built form, being adjacent to established and new residential development and Ullesthorpe Playing Field. Surface water flood risk indicated that development on the eastern part of the site should not be developed. The assessment identified the site as a preferred location for housing development when compared to other locations and sites around the village.

3.iii) U1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

574. An outline planning application is pending decision and has a resolution to approve (subject to the signing of s106 agreement). The application details are as follows:

- Reference: 25/01565/OUT
- Proposal: Erection of up to 46 dwellings, including affordable housing, public open space, sustainable urban drainage system and associated infrastructure (all matters reserved except for means of access)

3.iv) U1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

575. Benefits of development in accordance with the Plan would deliver at least 30 dwellings towards the District housing requirement, including affordable housing and an appropriate mix of homes, as well as public open space and green infrastructure, biodiversity net gain and sustainable drainage, and financial contributions to community infrastructure. The approved application

(subject to the signing of a s106 agreement) indicates that the site can accommodate up to 46 dwellings.

3.v) U1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

576.U1 is adjacent to the existing built form of the village, both established and relatively new residential development, along its western and northern boundaries. It also adjoins the village's playing field along its northern edge. Agricultural land lies to the south and east. Limiting development to the western part, due to surface water flood risk, also limits its wider landscape impacts and allows for BNG and green infrastructure provision on that part of the site. A Transport Assessment, required for all major development, would identify any local transport mitigations.

577.Site specific requirements under SA01/U1 (relating to landscape impacts, potential impact on Croft Pasture SSSI, and surface water flood risk) operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) U1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

578.The Level 2 SFRA found U1: Land south of Ashby Road (Site ref: 10649) to lie entirely within Flood Zone 1. However, it identified significant surface water flood risk on the site. Due to this risk a [Site Table](#) for 10649 was prepared giving an in depth analysis of flood risk on the site. It highlighted the need for the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests as part of any allocation of the site [[EN-NLP 9](#)]. The Lead Local Flood Authority also highlighted the high surface water flood risk on the eastern third of the site in their comments on the emerging Reg 19 informal consultation.

579.The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [[EN-NLP 8](#)], which took into account EA updated modelling, found the risk of surface water flooding to have fallen and the overall conclusion for the site was '*significant decrease in surface water*

flood extents in the 0.1% AEP event' (page 23) so no update to the Site Table was required.

580. As the site did not pass the Sequential Test, it needed to undergo the Exception Test following the preparation of the SFRA Level 2. The site was found capable of passing both parts of the Exception Test, subject to appropriate mitigation.

581. However, surface water flood risk is acknowledged and addressed in criterion 3 of Policy SA01/U1 which requires development to be located on the western part of the site and a site-specific flood risk assessment, a surface water drainage strategy and a sequential approach to site layout.

3. viii) U1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

582. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) U1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

583. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment

of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

584. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

585. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) U1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

586. Policy SA01/U1 proposes residential development of 30 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of two years until 2029/30.

587. The site does not fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) U1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

588. The Council considers the site boundary appropriate and that there is no justification for amendment.

3.xii) U1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

589.No MMs are required.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Medium Villages

Site U2: Land north of Ashby Road (50 homes)

3.i) U2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

590.Policy SA01 and associated Site Allocation Schedule clearly allocates U2 for 50 homes. Other Plan policy requirements include affordable housing and an appropriate mix of homes, alongside open space, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, access and supporting infrastructure necessary to serve the development.

3.ii) U2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

591.The scale of U2 reflects the sustainability of Ullesthorpe, one of five Medium Villages (tier 4 in the Settlement Hierarchy), strategic housing needs and the level of existing commitments. It also reflects site constraints and opportunities.

592.As detailed in the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] (see site reference 8180), the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified the site to be in keeping with the scale of development identified within the Development Strategy for Ullesthorpe and well related to the village's existing built form. The assessment identified the site as a preferred location for housing development when compared to other locations and sites around the village.

3.iii) U2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

593.No planning application has been submitted.

3.iv) U2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

594.Benefits of development in accordance with the Plan would deliver around 50 dwellings towards the District housing requirement, including affordable housing and an appropriate mix of homes. Alongside housing, the site will deliver policy compliant open space provision contributing to green and blue infrastructure in the village.

3.v) U2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

595.The site lies on the north eastern edge of the village and adjoins established development. The northern third of the site extends into open countryside and its southern boundary is formed by Ashby Road. Agricultural land lies to the north and east.

596.The following constraints have been identified and may require mitigation:

- Impacts on the wider landscape to the north and east
- Location within catchment zone for Croft Pasture SSSI
- Surface water flood risk
- Partially within Mineral Safeguarding Area

597.Site specific requirements under SA01/U2 (relating to landscape impacts, potential impact on Croft Pasture SSSI, and surface water flood risk) operate alongside the wider policy framework of the Plan and provide an effective mechanism for mitigation through the development management process.

3.vi) U2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

598. The Level 2 SFRA did not raise any significant concerns relating to U2: Land north of Ashby Road (Site 8180). It lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 and only a small part of the site is at risk of surface water flooding. In comments on the informal consultation on emerging policies prior to Regulation 19 consultation, the Lead Local Flood Authority also identified only a small area of low surface water flood risk and advocated this be dealt with through a sequential approach to site layout.

599. The SFRA Level 2 Addendum [[EN-NLP 8](#)], which took into account EA updated modelling, found little change in the risk of surface water flooding and the conclusion for the site was '*no significant change in surface water flood extents*' (page 18)

600. As it passed the Sequential Test, the site was not subject to the application of the Exception Test.

601. Although relatively low risk, surface water flood risk is acknowledged and addressed in criterion 3 of Policy SA01/U2 which requires a site-specific flood risk assessment, a surface water drainage strategy and a sequential approach to site layout.

3.viii) U2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

602. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway

(Preliminary Scheme Design) [HDC13] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) U2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

603.The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

604.The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

605.HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

3.x) U2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

606. Policy SA01/U2 proposes residential development of approximately 50 dwellings which is deliverable in the plan period. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2] which lists the site as commencing development from 2028/29 with development progressing over a period of two years to 29/30.

607. Part of the site falls within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. A Minerals Assessment may be required by the Minerals Planning Authority at the time of any planning application. They will consider the size and context of the site in deciding if a Minerals Assessment needs to be provided.

3.xi) U2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

608. The Council considers the site boundary appropriate and that there is no justification for amendment. The allocation boundary reflects site 8180, which was assessed through the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)]. It follows clear and defensible physical features.

3.xii) U2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

609. No MMs are required.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Magna Park (Strategic Warehousing)

Site MP1: Land south of George House, Coventry Road (15.8 Ha Strategic Warehousing B8 land)

3.i) MP1 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

610. The site is identified to provide 55,000sqm of strategic warehousing, defined in Policy DS02 as use class B8 in units of more than 9,000sqm. The mix and type of units proposed is clear.

3.ii) MP1 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

611. The basis for this mix is the Strategic B8 Needs Sensitivity Report (EMP-NLP 4). As detailed in the appendix to EMP-NLP 4 (under site ref. 10595) the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. The allocation of this site for strategic warehousing is justified to help meet the Leicester and Leicestershire need for strategic warehousing and is in accordance with NPPF paragraph 87.

3.iii) MP1 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

612. The site has extant consent for an HGV parking facility, a driver training centre, vehicle wash / fuelling facility and rail freight shuttle terminal associated with development at Magna Park North (15/01531/OUT, Appeal Ref. APP/F2415/W/18/3206289). These facilities, in part, are being provided elsewhere on the Magna Park estate.

613. A planning application ref. 26/00765/FUL was submitted in May 2026, for development of the site for storage and distribution (Use Class B8) with ancillary office and associated works. The application is under consideration.

3.iv) MP1 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

614. The allocation is estimated to provide 55,000sqm of strategic warehousing, to help meet the Leicester and Leicestershire need for strategic warehousing and will create construction and operational jobs. As a result, the site would make a positive contribution to employment provision and the economy in a sustainable location.

3.v) MP1 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

615. The site is surrounded by warehouses (Magna Park) and agricultural land. The Assessment of Potential B8 Sites appendix to [EMP-NLP 4](#) considered the principal effects associated with development including traffic, air quality and flood risk.

616. Potential adverse effects can be addressed through the requirements of Policy MP1, including a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. This requirement operates alongside the wider policy framework. Detailed mitigation will be tested through the Development Management process.

3.vi) MP1 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

617. Site MP1 is in flood zone 1. A small proportion of the site is affected by surface water flooding. SFRA screening identified that a sequential test should be applied and a site table was prepared as part of the SFRA Level 2 Assessment (EN-NLP 7).

618. The Assessment of Potential B8 Sites an appendix to [EMP-NLP 4](#), and the Sequential and Exception Test (EN-NLP 9) were informed by evidence contained in the SHELAA (HSG-NLP 4), the Sustainability Appraisal (S-NLP 3), and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood from all sources. The outcomes informed both the selection

of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements in policy SA01/MP1.

3.viii) MP1 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

619. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MP1 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

620. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

621. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

622.HDC11A provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

623.No physical or other constraints to development requiring site-specific requirements in Policy SA01/MP1.

3.x) MP1 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

624.Policy SA01/MP1 proposes 55,000sqm of strategic warehousing which is deliverable in the plan period. The site forms a functional part of the Magna Park estate (infill), it is controlled by GLP who are promoting it for development. Potential for delivery assessed as short-term (1-5yrs) in evidence (EMP-NLP 4).

625.Site MP1 is not in a Minerals Safeguarding Area.

3.xi) MP1 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

626.The boundary of MP1 is appropriate. There is no justification for amending the boundary.

3.xii) MP1 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

627.No.

3. Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3

Individual sites – Magna Park (Strategic Warehousing)

Site MP2: Land at Mere Lane, Magna Park (122 Ha Strategic Warehousing B8 land)

3.i) MP2 What is the scale, and type/mix of uses proposed? Are they clear?

628. The site is allocated for strategic warehousing, defined in Policy DS02 as use class B8 in units of more than 9,000sqm. The mix and type of units proposed is clear.

3.ii) MP2 What is the basis for this mix, and is it justified?

629. The basis for this mix is the Strategic B8 Needs Sensitivity Report (EMP-NLP 4). As detailed in the appendix to EMP-NLP 4 (under site ref. 12227) the allocation is the direct result of a robust, iterative testing process. The allocation of this site for strategic warehousing is justified to help meet the Leicester and Leicestershire need for strategic warehousing and is in accordance with NPPF paragraph 87.

3.iii) MP2 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and construction?

630. No extant planning permission. A hybrid planning application ref. 26/00574/OUT was submitted in April 2026, for 1) Outline application for phased development of site for storage and distribution (Use Class B8) with ancillary office and other ancillary buildings and structures; extension to country park; potential Travelling Showpeople plots; potential visitor centre and café; potential police facility; supporting infrastructure and associated works. 2) Detailed application for demolition of existing structures, site-wide infrastructure including earthworks, drainage and access. The application is under consideration.

3.iv) MP2 What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

631. The allocation is estimated to provide 285,000sqm of strategic warehousing, contributing materially to meeting the Leicester and Leicestershire need for strategic warehousing and will create construction and operational jobs. As a result, the site would make a significant positive contribution to employment provision and the economy in a sustainable location.

632. Additional benefits include land (3ha) for the provision of Travelling Showpeople plots, an extension to Bittesby Country Park and potential associated facilities.

3.v) MP2 How does the site relate to nearby uses? What is the potential adverse impact of developing the site, for example in terms of transport/traffic, pollution, nature conservation, landscape and impact on heritage assets? How have these been considered and how could they be mitigated?

633. Adjacent uses to the site include warehouses (Magna Park North / Central), Mere Farm Gypsy and Travellers site, Springfield Farm and agricultural land. The Assessment of Potential B8 Sites an appendix to [EMP-NLP 4](#) considered the principal effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk. The development also has potential for adverse effects on the amenity of neighbouring residents (Springfield Farm, Mere Farm G&T and residents of Ullesthorpe), and coalescence between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe. The potential for coalescence is considered by the Area of Separation Study [LAN-NLP 3](#), a new area of separation is proposed as mitigation.

634. Potential adverse effects can be addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/MP2, including the assessment and mitigation of transport impacts, noise / light / air quality assessment and mitigation, visual / ecological / heritage impact assessment and mitigation, a site specific SFRA, Mineral assessment and the additional requirement for a comprehensive masterplan as proposed in MM12.22 of the Schedule of proposed Modifications (HDC 2 Appendix 1).

635. Mitigation for the effect of coalescence is addressed by Policy DS04 criterion 2d) through the identification of a new Area of Separation between

Ullesthorpe and Magna Park. Proposed main modification MM12.23 reflects this via a new policy requirement in Policy SA01/MP2.

636. The above requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework.

3.vi) MP2 How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

637. Site MP2 is in flood zone 1. A small proportion of the site is affected by surface water flooding. SFRA screening identified no significant issues with the site, no sequential test was applied.

638. The Assessment of Potential B8 Sites an appendix to [EMP-NLP 4](#), was informed by evidence contained in the SHELAA (HSG-NLP 4), the Sustainability Appraisal (S-NLP 3), and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Together these assessments considered flood from all sources. The outcomes informed both the selection of sites for allocation and the site-specific mitigation requirements in policy SA01/MP2.

3.viii) MP2 How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

639. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

3.ix) MP2 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development? Are there physical or other constraints to development?

640. The infrastructure requirements and estimated costs associated with each allocation are identified within the updated Infrastructure Schedule (HDC 11a). The Schedule draws together evidence from the Council's IDP, the Transport Topic Paper(s), the Education Delivery Strategy, utilities providers and other infrastructure stakeholders. It provides a proportionate assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the development strategy and identifies the anticipated delivery mechanism for each item.

641. The infrastructure identified in HDC 11a is necessary to support the proposed development and would be delivered through a combination of Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, direct provider investment and, where applicable, CIL funding. The Council is satisfied that the requirements are directly related to the development, necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

642. HDC 11a provides a proportionate plan-making summary of infrastructure needs rather than a detailed delivery programme for every site. The Council consider this approach is consistent with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning's letter of 15 July 2026, which confirms that local plan examinations should take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to deliverability and viability, assess allocations over the plan period as a whole, and recognise that plan-makers are not required to undertake detailed viability testing of every individual site.

643. No physical or other constraints to development requiring site-specific requirements in Policy SA01/MP2.

3.x) MP2 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable? What is the expected timescale, output, rate of development and is this realistic? Does the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, if so, how would this impact on the site's deliverability?

644. Policy SA01/MP2 proposes 285,000sqm of strategic warehousing which is deliverable in the plan period. The site forms an extension of the Magna Park

estate and is controlled by GLP who are promoting it for development. Potential for delivery is assessed as short-term (EMP-NLP 4).

645. The north west of the site falls within a sand and gravel Minerals Safeguarding Area. A Minerals Assessment is a requirement of SA01/MP2, this is not considered to impact on the site's delivery.

3.xi) MP2 Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary, where appropriate?

646. The boundary of MP2 is appropriate and consistent with the evidence. There is no justification for amending the boundary.

3.xii) MP2 Are there any MMs required for the Plan to be found sound?

647. Yes. Modifications MM12.22 relating to the requirement for a masterplan and MM12.23 relating to the Area of Separation between Ullesthorpe and Magna Park are proposed as necessary for the plan to be found sound in the Schedule of Proposed Modifications ([HDC 2 Appendix 1](#)).

Additional Site-Specific Questions

LEICESTER URBAN AREA

Land South of Gartree Road Strategic Development Area

Strategic Site allocation SA02 and Policy SA01 Site OA1: Land South of Gartree Road (mixed use new neighbourhood inc.1200 homes and 5Ha employment land in Plan period)

Q1. Policy SA02 allocates land for a new sustainable residential led mixed use development of 3,150 new homes forming part of a larger parcel including land in Oadby and Wigston Borough. Some of those homes are to be delivered beyond this Plan period and Policy DS01 confirms that 1,200 are planned to be delivered within this Plan period. On this basis would SA02 criterion 3 be justified and effective in allocating land for 3,150 homes and associated infrastructure?

648. Yes, SA02 criterion 3 is justified and effective in accordance with NPPF para 74 and footnote 39. It will deliver large numbers of new homes, supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities.
649. Sites of this scale are unlikely to be fully delivered within a single plan period and require significant investment in supporting infrastructure over the long term.
650. SA02 therefore allocates the entire site in order to provide the necessary certainty for delivery which extends beyond the plan period, whilst providing flexibility to allow for any future changes in anticipated delivery rates.

Q2. Policy SA02 criterion 4 refers to a masterplan, the detailed requirements of which are included at Plan Appendix 6. Does the policy clearly set out that a masterplan will be required, who should prepare it and what the timescale for its provision and approval mechanism would be?

651. Appendix 6 states that masterplans are to be prepared by developers and must involve the active participation of relevant stakeholders. Appendix 6 also provides for the scope, form and consultation arrangements relating to the masterplan to be agreed with the Council at the pre-application stage and confirms that the relationship between the masterplan and the development management process will be agreed between the developer and the Council.

Q3. Should policy SA02 set a policy requirement for a masterplan for 4,000 homes given that 890 of those would not be within the Plan area?

652. Yes, SA02 requires a masterplan covering the entirety of the cross-boundary site to ensure the site is planned comprehensively and appropriate infrastructure delivered, in accordance with NPPF para 74c).

Q4. The site includes the Stretton Deserted Medieval Village, a scheduled Monument. Given that Policy SA02 requires that no development takes place within the Village, would its inclusion within the site allocation be justified?

653. In response to Historic England's representation, Main Modifications (MM13.3 and PM4) are proposed to remove the Stretton Magna Deserted Medieval Village schedule monument from Policy SA02 site boundary.

Q5. The setting of the Stretton Deserted Medieval Village and therefore the extent of buffer required to ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment has not been defined at Plan making stage. The same is true for other designated heritage assets that could be affected by development. A heritage impact assessment has not been carried out at Plan making stage. Rather, policy criterion 8 requires a heritage impact assessment to ensure an appropriate buffer with the Stretton Deserted Medieval Village. Would this approach ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment?

654. Yes, requiring a heritage impact assessment to ensure an appropriate buffer with the Stretton Magna Deserted Medieval Village is appropriate for this site. This approach is consistent with NPPF para 200 and will ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.

Q6. Plan Appendix 6 sets out the requirements of masterplans. Policy SA02 refers to this. Policy SA02 also sets out in policy detailed requirements in relation to matters also referred to in Appendix 6, e.g. sustainable transport, design approach. In light of this how would policy SA02 interact with Appendix 6? And would it be clear and unambiguous what the requirements of development are?

655. Appendix 6 sets out the broad requirements for masterplans. In addition, each site allocation policy supplements these broad requirements with site-specific details. In relation to Land South of Gartree Road, detailed site-specific requirements to supplement Appendix 6 are set out in Policy SA02.

656. In this way, Appendix 6 and SA02 complement each other. A good example of this is in relation to sustainable transport. Appendix 6 requires masterplans to:

‘Set out a transport and movement strategy which prioritises sustainable modes of travel, including through provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways, creating a network of permeable and interconnected streets and public realm, and increase connectivity to existing settlements and between adjoining sites.’

This broad requirement is supplemented through additional detailed requirements in SA02, for example:

‘7f) Development must provide an extensive, integrated and well-connected network of managed high-quality sustainable methods of movement spaces, including LTN 1/20 footpaths and cycle ways, as well as high-quality walking and wheeling routes. The network must connect the entire new development site, as well as the existing urban areas.’

657. Yes, Policy SA02 and Appendix 6 together provide a clear and unambiguous set of requirements for development of this site.

Q7. Would the requirement for 5 hectares of land to meet the needs of travelling show people be effective? Would it be clear and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

658. Yes, the requirement for 5 hectares of land to meet the needs of travelling show people is effective in delivering this need within the district.

659. The requirement is clear and is further clarified through proposed Main Modifications (MM) 13.1 and 13.6. This proposes to move the requirement from section 4 covering masterplan requirements to section 5 to clarify that this is a

housing requirement. Section 5 starts, 'Delivery of new homes must include...' MM13.1 would therefore place the requirement within the list of housing requirements within section 5 which must be provided. The requirement is therefore unambiguous. MM13.1 also allows for provision off-site to further enhance deliverability and therefore the effectiveness of the criteria. Criterion 4 and 5 of policy HN06 provide criteria for determining an application for the development of new Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites.

Q8. How would the requirement for 5 Ha of employment land be justified given potential impacts on the viability of City centre office space?

660. The requirement for 5 ha of employment land is justified based upon Policy DS02. Criterion 11 defines a network of centres and directs town centre uses to defined centres, in line with their position in the Harborough Retail Hierarchy. Land South of Gartree Road is defined as a Local Centre, making office uses appropriate for this location, consistent with NPPF paragraph 90.
661. The approach provides flexibility to enable employment provision to be shaped as part of the place-making and masterplanning process, it also allows provision to reflect the district employment land supply / demand balance and respond to market conditions and at the time of delivery. The relative position of the centre in the hierarchy and policies DS02 and AP02 mitigate against unrestricted office uses in this location.
662. Further, proposed Main Modification 13.5 sets out the Plan's expectations for this employment allocation, to deliver one or more employment areas to accommodate a mix of employment uses to meet district need.

Q9. Should policy SA02 address the identified need for a strategic orbital connection around the south and east of Leicester in the non-statutory Strategic Growth Plan? If so, how?

663. Policy SA02 addresses the vision of a strategic orbital connection around the south and east of Leicester within the Strategic Growth Plan in a proportionate and pragmatic manner, which provides for potential delivery in the future.
664. SA02 9d) requires a connection across the site between the two access points on the A6 and Gartree Road. Proposed Main Modifications 13.7 and 29.1 (new part) clarify this requirement and explain the potential for future upgrades which could contribute to a more strategic orbital connection around the south and

east of Leicester, should this be required to support potential future development beyond that identified in this local plan.

Q10. What is the robust evidence to justify a requirement for a minimum 15 minute zero carbon bus service? Would the requirement be clear and unambiguous, and would it be effective?

665. The requirement is rooted in the draft [Leicester Transport Plan \(2021-36\)](#).

666. The requirement supports a number of ambitions within the Leicester Transport Plan, including: all buses to be zero emission vehicles by 2036; and public transport, cycling or personal e-mobility to be the first choice for longer journeys for most people.

667. Due to the proximity of the site to Leicester City and the interaction between the site and the services and facilities available within Leicester, it is considered appropriate to ensure a high degree of sustainable travel options between the site and services and facilities within Leicester City.

668. The requirement is clear and unambiguous and effective in delivering a sustainable transport solution for future residents.

Q11. What is the robust evidence to justify the community infrastructure set out in policy SA02 criterion 6e, in relation to educational provision? Would it be clear and unambiguous?

669. The evidence is robust and consequently justifies the community infrastructure set out in policy SA02 criterion 6e. The Council considers the requirement is clear and unambiguous.

Pupil Yield:

670. The education demand model has applied the pupil yield factors used by Leicestershire County Council to the housing delivery trajectory for the site allocation. These factors are set out in paragraph 5.10 of the EDS. An appropriate lag has been applied to the annual pupil yield to account for the phased build-up of pupil demand. The yield factors applied are 0.3 pupils per dwelling for primary, 0.167 per dwelling for secondary and 0.033 for post-16.

671. Total primary pupil yield for the full allocation for SA02 is 1,200 primary pupils with 750 of these pupils materialising as a result of projected completions in OA1 and AP4 over the plan period.

672. Total secondary pupil yield for the full allocation for SA02 is estimated at 668 secondary pupils with 418 of these pupils materialising as a result of projected completions in OA1 and AP4 over the plan period.
673. The projected available capacity within existing primary and secondary schools within the statutory home to school travel distances has been applied before identifying the residual pupil yield that needs to be accommodated in expansions or new schools.

Justification for Scale and Type of Education Provision

674. New primary schools should be two or three forms of entry. This size provides pupils with a wide range of facilities and results in an ongoing revenue budget that is financially sustainable. It is rare for new schools to be larger than three forms of entry, due to the large numbers of very small children that would need to be accommodated.
675. After accounting for the projected available capacity at nearby existing primary schools, the pupil yield for SA02 requires up to six forms of entry for new primary school provision to mitigate the effects of the development. This should be provided with two new primary schools sized between two and three forms of entry. The policy requirement allows for flexibility in the phasing of this new provision with the final infrastructure solution likely to be two standalone primary schools and a standalone secondary school.
676. The scale of additional secondary school place demand cannot be accommodated within existing secondary schools and there will be additional secondary place demand from other site allocations. The provision of a new secondary school that can scale in size over time is essential to be able to accommodate demand in a sustainable manner.

Land Requirements for Schools

677. The land requirements for the new school sites accord with Leicestershire County Council's school site requirements and acknowledge Building Bulletin 103 – Area Guidelines for Mainstream Schools, which is published by the Department for Education.
678. The land requirements allow for the maximum size of school expected on each of the school sites and provide flexibility in how the new education infrastructure is provided.

Delivery and Phasing Requirements

679. Section 14 of the EDS and the submitted IDP Schedule identifies the timing for new primary and secondary education provision to serve SA02. New primary and secondary place provision will be needed by 2035, which accounts for capacity forecast to be available in existing schools in the early years of the

development. The EDS sets out recommendations for when additional primary and secondary capacity should be developed across the three school sites within the site allocation. Although the EDS sets out one method for how viable primary and secondary provision could be scaled up over time with an initial all-through school being developed, there is sufficient flexibility for alternative solutions.

Funding Mechanisms and Expected Contributions

680. All new primary school infrastructure within SA02 is expected to be funded and delivered directly by the Developer for SA02. These whole new schools are required to mitigate the effects of the development and are anticipated to be secured as planning obligations through Section 106 Agreement(s).
681. The current expectation is for the developer for SA02 to deliver at least part of the new secondary school infrastructure on the site to mitigate against the effects of the development. There are two main options for securing the additional size of secondary school required and the agreements will provide the required flexibility. The County Council can serve a notice confirming to the Developer that they wish for the additional secondary school capacity and land to be provided. At this point the Council can commit to providing the additional capital funding in their capital programme for the enhanced size of the secondary school.
682. Alternatively, part of the secondary school site will remain as a safeguarded secondary school site that the Council can call on within a defined period. The County Council can fund their contribution towards the additional secondary school places through Section 106 contributions secured from other developments, from Basic Need funding allocated by the Department for Education, from additional infrastructure funding provided by Homes England and/or from other sources of capital that fund the council's overall capital programme.

Compliance with Regulation 122(2) of the CIL Regulations 2010

683. The provision of three school sites within SA02 are clearly necessary to mitigate the effects of the development. The requirement for the developer to deliver the new primary school infrastructure and the core secondary school infrastructure is necessary for the development to be acceptable in planning terms. The scale of the mitigation is fairly related in scale and kind as it applies appropriate pupil yield factors and accounts for forecasted available places at nearby existing schools.
684. The provision of a secondary school site with flexibility to expand over time is necessary and fairly related in scale and kind. The agreements will allow the flexibility for some of the secondary school site to be safeguarded for the expansion of a smaller initial secondary school development and for the County

Council to confirm capital funding for the places that exceed the yield from SA02 at an appropriate time.

685. These policy requirements are directly related to the development and fully meet the tests of Regulation 122(2).

Q12. Policy SA02 criterion 7c requires the creation of an Area of Separation. Plan paragraph 5.15 explains that is to prevent coalescence and to protect individual character and identity of each settlement Great Glen, Oadby and Stretton Hall. What is the robust evidence that this can be accommodated alongside the development proposed? What would be the appropriate interface be between this open space and proposed built development and how would this be controlled?

686. Paragraph 5.13 explains that the Area of Separation required by criterion 7c) is to provide separation to the existing village of Great Glen, to prevent coalescence and protect the individual character and identity of Great Glen.

687. At c.317 hectares, the scale of the proposed allocation is considered sufficient to accommodate both the part of the Area of Separation which falls within the allocation boundary and the proposed development required by SA02.

688. Further evidence to support this is provided by the recently submitted outline planning application for the site (planning application reference 26/1350/OUT). The Parameter Plan (September 2026) shows the site accommodating the Area of Separation (marked as Green Infrastructure) in addition to proposed development.

689. The interface between built development and green infrastructure is expected to be managed through the Design Code and controlled through subsequent reserved matters applications.

Q13. The Local Plan Viability Report, 2025 [INF-NLP3] considered this site to be marginally viable (with 40% affordable housing target)? If there any update to this position?

(Note: Travelling Showpeople Accommodation at key development sites OA1 and MP2 will also be discussed as part of Matter 8.)

690. Yes, Aspinall Verdi has prepared a further addendum report, dated October 2026, which is appended to Hearing Statement 6. This provides an updated assessment of the strategic sites previously identified as marginally viable and

considers the implications of updated infrastructure costs for the viability of the Plan, including the costs associated with individual policies and site-specific allocations. Chapter 5 of the October 2026 addendum sets out the conclusions on the overall viability of the Plan, the proposed 40% affordable housing requirement and the updated viability position of the strategic allocations.

691. In relation to Land South of Gartree Road (OA1), the January 2025 Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA) identified the site as marginally viable at 40% affordable housing. The October 2026 Addendum has updated the assessment to reflect the latest infrastructure requirements, particularly education provision, alongside updated market values and development costs. This indicates a more marginal viability position, with the revised assessment identifying the site as marginally viable at 35% affordable housing.
692. This represents a refinement of the original viability conclusion in response to updated evidence, rather than a fundamental change in the assessment of the site's viability. The revised assessment identifies 35% affordable housing as the maximum level that can currently be supported on a marginally viable basis. The Council considers that this evidence should be reflected in the policy approach to LSGR (OA1), rather than retaining a 40% requirement that the updated assessment does not demonstrate to be viable.
693. Accordingly, the Council's proposed approach is to establish a policy target of 35% affordable housing at LSGR (OA1), with a policy floor of 25%. The policy should require the development to achieve as close to the 35% target as is demonstrated to be viable through the application-stage assessment. This would provide a clear policy expectation while allowing the affordable housing provision to respond to the viability evidence available when the development proposals are brought forward. It would also maintain the objective of securing the greatest reasonable level of affordable housing without compromising the deliverability of the allocation.
694. The Council will continue to engage with the site promoter and relevant infrastructure providers as the proposals are developed. This will enable the viability position to be reviewed in the light of any further robust evidence, including updated land cost information, and provide an opportunity to maximise affordable housing and infrastructure provision where justified.

LEICESTER URBAN AREA

Thurnby and Bushby

Site TB1: Land South of A47 and east of Zouche Way (125 homes) Policy SA01

Q1. Given potential landscape, topographic and environmental constraints, what is the robust evidence that this site can accommodate 125 dwellings?

695. The overall size of the site is considered sufficient to accommodate the proposed development required by SA01/TB1.
696. This is corroborated by the planning consent for up to 130 dwellings on the main portion of the site (25/01615/OUT) and detailed planning permission for the erection of a discount food store on the south-west part of the site (25/00219/FUL).

Q2. What is the robust evidence that traffic impacts would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe, given the cluster of sites in the Plan (site allocations S1, S2 and TB1)?

697. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the transport network. Appendix F contains a Transport Assessment proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

Q3. How would the policy ensure that the rural character of the locality is reflected in the proposed development, in particular the rural approach to Bushby?

698. The protection of the rural character formed a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the relationship of sites to existing settlements, their compatibility with neighbouring uses and their effects on the character and distinctiveness of the landscape. The [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) recognises the position of the site on the settlement edge and its relationship with the existing built form. Policy SA01/TB1 requires existing hedgerows to be retained and reinforced wherever possible, particularly along the southern and eastern boundaries. It also requires a layout that supports integration and connectivity between new and existing communities. In addition, policies DS04, DM01 and DM04 require development to conserve rural character, respond positively to local character, protect natural features and respect settlement distinctiveness. Furthermore, the NPPF 2026 includes National Development Management Policies designed to help conserve and enhance the natural environment and ensure that the rural character of the locality is reflected in the proposed development.

Q4. The site is adjacent to a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. How would the policy ensure unnecessary minerals sterilisation is avoided?

699. In the Schedule of Proposed Modifications amended following Panel Note 2 (MM12.5) [[HDC 2](#)], a criterion has been added to specifically ensure minerals sterilisation is avoided. The additional criterion within Policy SA01/TB1 requires the submission of a Minerals Assessment to accompany the proposal in accordance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This provides a proportionate and effective mechanism to address mineral safeguarding considerations at the planning application stage.

Q5. The site is close to the Houghton on the Hill sewerage treatment works. Would the intervening distance be sufficient to ensure acceptable living conditions? Would any further mitigation be required given the 'agent of change principle' set out in national policy?

700. The intervening distance is considered sufficient to ensure acceptable living conditions, and the principle of residential development in this location has already been fully tested and resolved through the development management process. The site benefits from outline planning permission for up to 130 dwellings.
701. To ensure that the detailed design and layout continues to respect this relationship at the reserved matters stage, Criterion 6 of Policy SA01/TB1 (amended) explicitly requires future applications to demonstrate both that acceptable amenity can be achieved for future occupiers and that the development would not prejudice the continued operation of the safeguarded Houghton on the Hill Sewage Treatment Works. This gives effect to the agent of change principle by requiring the proposed development to demonstrate compatibility with the existing use.

Q6. How would Plan policy SA01 TB1 interact with Plan Policy DS05d, which requires a comprehensive approach to coordinating the provision, phasing and funding of necessary infrastructure, taking account of the cumulative and cross boundary impacts arising from the cluster of sites at Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby (S1, S2, TB1)?

702. Policy DS05 and Policy SA01/TB1 are intended to operate in tandem. Main Modification (MM12.5) set out within [Appendix 1](#) - Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2] clarifies that criterion 1 of Policy SA01/GG1 gives effect at site level to the strategic requirements of Policy DS05, which establishes a strategic approach to the provision, phasing and funding of infrastructure. Main Modifications have been proposed to Policy DS05 to address Regulation 19 representations from Leicestershire County Council [[ID2](#)] and to ensure that TB1 is planned and delivered as part of a wider coordinated strategy.

LEICESTER URBAN AREA

Scraptoft

Site S1: Scraptoft East, Land between Scraptoft and Bushby (950 homes)
Policies SA01 and SA04

Q1. Policy SA04 criterion 1 refers to a masterplan, the detailed requirements of which are included at Plan Appendix 6. Does the policy clearly set out that a masterplan will be required, who should prepare it and what the timescale for its provision and approval mechanism would be?

703. Criterion 1 of Policy SA04 and Policy SA01(2) clearly set out the requirement for a comprehensive masterplan to address the site-specific requirements outlined in Appendix 6. Appendix 6 states that masterplans are to be prepared by developers and must involve the active participation of relevant stakeholders. Appendix 6 also provides for the scope, form and consultation arrangements relating to the masterplan to be agreed with the Council at the pre-application stage and confirms that the relationship between the masterplan and the development management process will be agreed between the developer and the Council.

Q2. Policy SA04 requires that development maintains an area of Green Wedge between Scraptoft and development to the South including Thurnby and Bushby. Plan paragraph 5.32 explains this is to prevent merging, guide development, provide a green lung and facilitate recreational opportunities. What is the robust evidence to confirm that development would not harmfully diminish the effectiveness of the Green Wedge when assessed against its aims, and that such an approach would further the aims of Plan Policy DS04, which requires the preservation of Green Wedges? Could such an approach involve some reduction in the existing Green Wedge?

704. Yes, the approach would involve some reduction in the existing Green Wedge. The Council's detailed response to Matter 5, Issue 2, Question 8 explains why the amended Green Wedge would nevertheless continue to perform the four functions in Policy DS04 and is replied upon in response to this question.

705. The principal evidence is provided by the Green Wedge Assessment, December 2024 [[LAN-NLP 4](#)], supplemented by paragraphs 6.8 to 6.20 of the Green Wedge, Areas of Separation and Landscape Topic Paper [[TPC-NLP 11](#)]. The assessment concluded that development could be accommodated within

part of sub-area GW1B, provided that a clear area of separation is retained and the identified limits to built development and essential landscape buffers are incorporated into the layout.

706. As explained in the Council's response to Matter 5, Issue 2, Question 8, the amended Green Wedge would retain separation along Station Road and the setting of the Conservation Area north of Covert Lane; continue to guide the form of development; remain connected to the unchanged north-western and south-eastern parts of the Green Wedge and the wider countryside; and retain public rights of way while providing opportunities to improve access and recreational provision.
707. Consequently, while the allocation would reduce the geographical extent of the existing Green Wedge, the evidence indicates that the retained and amended designation would continue to perform the Policy DS04 functions overall.
708. Any future development will be required to demonstrate through a comprehensive masterplan that the Green Wedge functions are successfully preserved, and where possible, enhanced in terms of access, recreational quality and visual separation.

Q3. The Local Plan Viability Report, 2025 [INF-NLP3] considered this site to be marginally viable (with 40% affordable housing target)? Is there any update to this position?

709. The site remains viable with a 40% affordable housing requirement. Aspinall Verdi has prepared a further addendum report, dated October 2026, which is appended to Hearing Statement 6. This provides an updated assessment of the strategic sites and considers the implications of updated infrastructure costs for the viability of the Plan, including the costs associated with individual policies and site-specific allocations. Chapter 5 of the October 2026 addendum sets out the conclusions on the overall viability of the Plan, the proposed 40% affordable housing requirement and the updated viability position of the strategic allocations. The updated assessment confirms that the site remains viable at 40% affordable housing, taking account of the updated infrastructure requirements.

Q4. How would Plan Policy SA01 S1/SA04 criterion 1b interact with Plan Policy DS05 criterion 1d and criterion 2, which requires a comprehensive approach to coordinating the provision, phasing and funding of necessary infrastructure, taking account of the cumulative and cross boundary impacts arising from the cluster of sites at Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby (S1, S2, TB1)?

710. Policy DS05 criterion 1d and criterion 2 operate with SA01/S1 and SA04 criterion 1b to deliver a coordinated approach to the provision, phasing and funding of infrastructure within the cluster. This coordinated approach to planning and delivery of infrastructure and services should be fully addressed within the comprehensive masterplan. The proposed funding mechanisms would be via S106 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy.

Q5. Policy SA04 criterion 1g requires a site-specific flood risk assessment to assess the surface water flood risk and access/egress arrangements. What is the robust evidence to provide assurance that the scale and nature of development proposed has accounted for potential flood risk? Would policy requirements be effective in mitigating potential flood risk?

711. As set out in response to Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3 (vi), flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process and informed both the allocation of Site S1 and the policy requirements contained in Policy SA04(1)(g). The evidence set out in [Appendix 4](#) of the Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)], together with the Sequential and Exception Test [[EN-NLP 9](#)] and the Sequential and Exception Test Addendum Sept 2025 [[EN-NLP 10](#)], demonstrate that the principal flood risk constraint relates to the surface water flow path associated with the tributary of Thurnby Brook.

712. The site's capacity and allocation have been assessed having regard to these constraints and the evidence concludes that they are capable of being addressed through site design, layout and mitigation measures set out in Policy SA04(1)(g). These requirements are complemented by Policy DM07. The Council therefore considers that there is robust evidence that the proposed scale and nature of development has taken account of flood risk and that the policy requirements provide an effective mechanism for mitigation.

Q6. Policy SA04 criterion b requires a site for a two-form primary school. Is the requirement clear and unambiguous? Should it make provision for a monetary contribution to educational provision? Would this be justified?

713. The evidence is robust and consequently justifies the community infrastructure set out in policy SA04 1b. The Council considers the requirement is clear and unambiguous.

Pupil Yield

714. The education demand model has applied the pupil yield factors used by Leicestershire County Council to the housing delivery trajectory for the site allocation S1. These factors are set out in paragraph 5.10 of the EDS. An appropriate lag has been applied to the annual pupil yield to account for the phased build-up of pupil demand. The yield factors applied are 0.3 pupils per dwelling for primary, 0.167 per dwelling for secondary and 0.033 for early years.

Justification for the Scale and Type of Education

715. The sites S1, S2 and TB1 have been assessed as a cluster of sites in the EDS as they are geographically close together and affect primary place demand for the two existing primary schools in this pupil plan area of Scraftoft and Thurnby. However, policy SA04 refers to the site S1 which is 950 dwellings. The total primary pupil yield arising from this site is estimated at 230 pupils over the plan period. These pupils cannot be accommodated by the existing schools, after accounting for their projected available capacity. At this level a new primary school should be provided and in a location which can provide sustainable travel options for younger pupils attending primary provision.

716. The primary school should be a 1 form entry (with a 2FE core) school and should also have capacity to expand to accommodate the pupil yield derived from S2, TB1 and potentially the sites H1 and H2 which impact the primary school at nearby Houghton on the Hill. The school at this location is on a constrained site. A 1-form entry (with a 2FE core) school would allow the school to expand and support growth as other sites in this area come forward. A school of this size would provide pupils with a good range of facilities that would result in an ongoing revenue budget that is financially sustainable.

717. The policy requirement allows for flexibility in the phasing of this new provision. However, Section 14 of the EDS and the submitted IDP schedule identifies that the primary school place provision will be required by 2034, which accounts for capacity forecast available in existing schools.

Funding Mechanisms and Expected Contributions

718. A new primary school is expected to be funded and delivered by the developers. The policy states that SA04 should provide a site for a 2 form primary school with early years provision. It is considered that initially the delivery of a new one form entry (2 core) primary school with early years provision would allow for phasing and additional growth. However, additional financial contribution would be required from the other sites in this area which would create a pupil yield. These would help finance the primary school provision. These should be secured as planning obligations through Section 106 agreement(s) and CIL.

Compliance with Regulation 122(2) of the CIL regulations 2010

719. The majority of the housing is derived from S1 site providing an estimated pupil yield of 230, consequently it is necessary to mitigate the effects of the development. The requirement for the developer to deliver the new primary school infrastructure which is initially a 1 Fe (with a 2 core) is necessary for the development to be acceptable in planning terms. Additional contributions would be required from the other sites in this area to provide for the 2FE expansion. The scale of the mitigation is fairly related in scale and kind as it applies appropriate pupil yield factors and accounts for forecasted available places at nearby existing schools.

Q7. Given the size and complexity of development proposed, what is the robust evidence, having regard to the NPPF definition of deliverable, to indicate that this site will start to deliver in 2030/31?

720. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [HDC 2].

Q8. What is the robust evidence that traffic impacts would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe, given the cluster of sites in the Plan (site allocations S1, S2 and TB1)?

721. The Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP2](#)] considered the impact of the site and how it could be integrated into the

transport network. Appendix F contains a TA proforma for this site that considers: Access; The local highway network; Existing walking and cycling networks and improvements required to facilitate development; Existing and new public transport improvements to facilitate development; and Road safety. The costs associated with active travel, public transport and travel planning are reflected in the updated IDS [[HDC11A](#)] as 'integral' to the delivery of this site. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

Site S2: Land at Beeby Road (175 homes) Policy SA01

Q1. Given the size and complexity of development proposed, what is the robust evidence, having regard to the NPPF definition of deliverable, to indicate that this site will start to deliver in 2028/29?

722. The Council's latest published information on site availability, viability and deliverability is provided within [Appendix 3 - Local Plan Allocations \(Housing Land Supply Template\)](#) [[HDC 2](#)].

Q2. How would Plan Policy SA01 S2 criterion 1b interact with Plan Policy DS05 criterion 1d and criterion 2, which requires a comprehensive approach to coordinating the provision, phasing and funding of infrastructure taking account of the cumulative and cross boundary impacts arising from the cluster of sites at Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby (S1, S2, TB1)? Would it be clear on the basis of evidence to date, what this site is expected to contribute?

723. The Council assumes this question relates to criterion 2 in Policy SA01/S2 that development of the site should contribute to the reasonable costs of the provision of a new two-form primary school.

724. Policy DS05 and Policy SA01/S2 are intended to operate in tandem. Criterion 2 of Policy SA01/S2 gives effect at site level to the strategic requirements of Policy DS05, which establishes a strategic approach to the provision, phasing and funding of infrastructure. The Education Delivery Strategy [[HDC18](#)] assessed sites S1, S2 and TB1 as cluster of sites using the methodology described in the answer to Matter 6, Issue 1, Question 12, taking account of the

proposed phasing and delivery of housing as well as the cross-boundary impacts on education in this area. The Education Delivery Strategy [[HDC18](#)] concluded that a two-form primary school would be required by 2034. The proposed funding mechanisms would be via S106 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy.

Q3. Are Policy SA01 S2 criteria 7, and 8 accurate, clear and unambiguous?

725. Yes, the Council considers that criteria 7 and 8 of Policy SA01/S2 are clear, unambiguous, with factual amendments already set out within [Appendix 1](#) - Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2] to ensure absolute accuracy.
726. Regarding criterion 7, the proposed modification (MM12.7) recognises that the adjoining crematorium is now a committed site with planning permission granted for demolition of farmhouse and outbuildings, to facilitate the erection of a crematorium (24/01140/FUL); the policy is clear that the residential layout must account for potential noise and lighting impacts from this facility, which may require a noise impact assessment and potentially a building overheating and ventilation assessment to safeguard future residential amenity and ensure that the development does not prejudice the operation of the crematorium.
727. For criterion 8, a factual amendment has been proposed to correctly name the safeguarded waste site as the Keyham Sewage Treatment Works (MM12.6), ensuring the policy remains unambiguous in requiring any future planning application to demonstrate that the development will experience no adverse amenity impacts and will not prejudice ongoing waste operations.
728. Taken together with the modifications in [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2], these criteria provide users with clarity regarding the site-specific technical assessments required.

Q4. This site is close to existing development in neighbouring Leicester City. Would the Plan, including policy SA01 S2 be effective in ensuring a design approach that has regard to this existing development?

729. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the relationship of Site S2 with adjoining developments. Policy SA01/S2 requires development to recognise the role of the site as a gateway, reflecting its position at the urban edge. Furthermore, with the inclusion of the proposed Main Modification (MM12.5) within [Appendix 1](#) of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2], the policy explicitly requires consideration of the wider Scraptoft, Thurnby and

Bushby cluster and its associated infrastructure. This ensures a coordinated approach to development rather than treating the site in isolation.

730. These site-specific policy requirements operate in tandem with the Plan's design and connectivity policies. Specifically, Policy DM01 requires development to respond positively to its context, integrate with existing communities, respect local character and create well-connected places. Additionally, Policy DM06 promotes sustainable movement and connectivity, helping to ensure that pedestrian, cycle and vehicular links relate appropriately to surrounding development.

Q5. What is the evidence that justifies development of this site, given concerns regarding surface water flood risk? How would any risk be mitigated?

731. As set out in response to Matter 7, Issue 2, Question 3 (vi), flood risk was a key consideration throughout the site selection process and informed both the allocation of Site S2 and the policy requirements contained in Policy SA01/S2.

Q6. What is the evidence to ensure that development of this site in accordance with Plan requirements, can be carried out whilst protecting the sensitive rural character of the locality?

732. The protection of the rural character formed a key consideration throughout the site selection process. The Site Selection Methodology [\[PRE-NLP 5\]](#) considered the relationship of sites to existing settlements, their compatibility with neighbouring uses and their effects on the character and distinctiveness of the landscape. [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) supported the allocation of S2 subject to appropriate mitigation. To achieve this, criterion 1 of Policy SA01/S2 explicitly requires development proposals to recognise and incorporate the site's role as an extension to the gateway into Scraptoft within their design and layout, ensuring a high-quality transition that protects the sensitive rural character. In addition, policies DS04, DM01 and DM04 require development to conserve rural character, respond positively to local character, protect natural features and respect settlement distinctiveness. Furthermore, the NPPF 2026 includes National Development Management Policies designed to help conserve and enhance the natural environment and ensure that the rural character of the locality is reflected in the proposed development.

MARKET TOWNS

North of Market Harborough

Housing Sites MH1: Land east of Leicester Road and south of Grand Union Canal (250 homes), MH2: East of Market Harborough Road (850 homes) and MH3: Land south of Gallow Field Road (600 homes)/Policies SA01 and SA03

Q1. Is the planning for primary and secondary school provision, sports facilities, wastewater treatment and a showground for Market Harborough clear and effective? Does it support the housing allocations for the town?

Primary and Secondary provision

733. Yes, with regards the education provision, this has been demonstrated to be supported by the housing allocations for Market Harborough. The Education Delivery Strategy has modelled the existing and forecasted capacities and demand for all existing schools in the area. The phased yield for additional pupils has also been completed to identify the scale and timing for additional school place provision. This follows the methodology explained in Matter 6: Issue 1, Question 12.
734. Sites MH1, MH2 and MH3 have been modelled together to identify the cumulative effects on education infrastructure. This identifies some forecasted capacity likely to be available in existing primary schools and pressure on places in secondary. The EDS and [IDP \[HDC11\]](#) identify an appropriate scale for new onsite provision at MH2 that can accommodate the additional demand and the requirements for this site are set out in the [Infrastructure Delivery Schedule \(IDS\) \[HDC11A\]](#).
735. Policy SA03 (2) requires a masterplan for the cluster to show 3FE primary school and a new secondary school. And (k) requires a phasing plan for these uses. MH1 (4e) requires contributions to cross site infrastructure including schools. MH2 (5d) requires provision of land for a secondary school and a new 3fe primary school. MH3 (1e) requires contributions to cross site infrastructure including schools.
736. A [Statement of Common Ground for Market Harborough North](#) has been signed which agrees modifications to policies MH2 and MH3 to ensure an appropriate site is available to deliver a secondary school following further constraints analysis.
737. The planning for primary and secondary provisions is considered to be clear and effective.

Sports facilities

738. The IDP identifies an appropriate scale of sport facility provision for MH1, MH2 and MH3 and the requirement for this site are set out in the [Infrastructure Delivery Schedule \(IDS\)](#) [HDC11A]
739. Policy SA03 (3j) requires the masterplan for the site to provide new open spaces including sports pitches and other outdoor recreational facilities as appropriate, serving identified needs.
740. The planning for sports facilities is considered to be clear and effective.

Wastewater treatment

741. The [Infrastructure Delivery Schedule \(IDS\)](#) [HDC11A] sets out the requirements for wastewater infrastructure required over the plan period. For Market Harborough it states the improvements required and that these will be funded by and delivered by Anglian Water.

Showground

742. Policy MH3 1a) requires “...relocation of the existing agricultural showground located on this site as part of the wider development of the North of Market Harborough to MH2 or other appropriate location”. MH2 5c) states “Development must facilitate the temporary relocation of the agricultural showground located on Land South of Gallow Field Road (MH3). Further to this, a [Statement of Common Ground for Market Harborough North](#) has been signed which proposes modifications to policy MH2 and MH3 to accommodate land for a secondary school. In doing so this requires the agricultural showground to be retained in its current location until the secondary school land is required, or for a period of five years following the grant of planning permission.
743. In taking forward the proposed modifications in the Statement it would be necessary to amend the modification to MH3 a) to ensure the showground could also be provided at another appropriate location as was provided for in the policy at submission stage. The proposed change is highlighted grey below.

~~Development of the site is subject to the relocation of The existing agricultural showground~~ **shall be retained on site in an area comprising the secondary school land until the secondary school land is required or for a period of up to five years following the grant of outline planning permission for the Site, whichever is sooner;** ~~located on this site as part of the wider development of the North of Market Harborough to MH2 or another appropriate location;~~

744. It is considered that the policy wording could be more clearly worded as proposed above and highlighted grey. To remove any ambiguity and ensure

consistency, the Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification on this basis.

Q2. What are the implications of odour from the animal rendering plant to the north for housing allocation sites MH2 and MH3?

745. The animal rendering plant is located to the north of the housing allocation site MH2. A [High Level Odour Review](#) [EN-NLP 13] has been completed and made conclusions on page 17, as set out below. There are also maps within this document that show where the acceptable zones for development are. This shows the site can accommodate the number of dwellings required by the policy within the acceptable zones for development, in order to meet the housing requirements for the Plan. To address these findings, policy MH2 5j) requires noise, odour and lighting assessments to address potential impacts arising from the animal rendering plant, and criterion 5k) requires residential development to be restricted to the southern parts of the site where impacts from the animal rendering plant can be appropriately mitigated to avoid unacceptable impact on the amenity of future residents. Policy MH3g) also requires noise, odour and lighting assessments to address potential impacts arising from the animal rendering plant

MH2 ([High Level Odour Review](#) [EN-NLP 13])

- a. *“For MH2, the evidence to date suggests a high risk of adverse odour effects in the northern parcel of land (north of Leicester Lane), meaning that some of this area may be unsuitable for development for high sensitivity uses such as schools and dwellings without mitigation or subject to more robust odour assessments. In the southern part of MH2 (below Leicester Lane) odour is likely to be acceptable and impacts from the animal rendering plant can be appropriately mitigated to avoid unacceptable impact on the amenity of future residents. This parcel of MH2 is likely capable for accommodating high sensitivity uses envisaged by the emerging Local Plan.”*

MH3 ([High Level Odour Review](#) [EN-NLP 13])

- b. *“The findings suggest that there is a low likelihood of odour effects at site allocation MH3. It is recommended that MH3 would be suitable for development, including for high sensitivity uses such as schools and dwellings. This does not preclude that it may, at times, be subjected to odour under certain wind and weather conditions.”*

Employment Sites MH5: Land OS370, Leicester Road (0.6 Ha employment land), **MH6: Compass Point Business Park** (4.3 Ha employment land), **MH7: St Marys Road** (3,000 sqm gross employment land) and **MH8: Commons Car Park** (1,000 sqm gross employment land)/Policy SA01

(Note: Questions relating to the above sites are considered under Matter 4 above.)

MARKET TOWNS

Lutterworth

Housing Sites L1: Land off Leicester Road (230 homes) and **L2: Land at M1 Junction 20/Swinford Road** (90 homes)/Policy SA01

Site L1

Q1. Is the wording of the criteria within the policy effective? In particular how does the allocation relate to the Area of Separation? What is meant by 'respect'?

746. With the addition of Proposed Modification MM12.9 [[HDC 2 Appendix 1](#)], the Council considers that the criteria in L1 reflect the constraints of the site. However, it is acknowledged that the wording of criterion 3 relating to the part of the site within the Area of Separation (AoS) would benefit from additional clarity.
747. The south-eastern corner of allocation L1 lies within the existing Bitteswell, Lutterworth and Magna Park AoS, the boundary of which is being carried forward in the emerging Plan. This part of the AoS, lying adjacent to the brook, aims to maintain separation between Bitteswell and Lutterworth as growth of the latter expands northwards. In referring to 'respect', criterion 4 is expecting any proposals to reflect the need to retain the openness and undeveloped character of the Area of Separation and the role it plays in protecting the distinctiveness and separate identity of Bitteswell and Lutterworth.

Site L1

Q2. What is the significance of the risk of surface water flooding identified in criterion 5?

748. Informal consultation with Leicestershire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), prior to Regulation 19 consultation, highlighted that the western part of allocation L1 along the brook should remain undeveloped due to high surface water flood risk. They also identified a surface water flood path on the southern boundary. While the impacts of surface water are expected to be manageable within the site layout, criterion 5 makes it clear for developers that a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment/Surface Water Drainage Management Strategy is required as part of any planning application.

Site L1

Q3. Are there any nearby activities that may be impacted by the proposed housing with reference to the agent of change? If so, how is this risk to be mitigated?

749. Yes. As part of their Regulation 19 consultation response, the Environment Agency highlighted that L1 is approximately 400m away from an Intensive Poultry Installation (Pig and Poultry site) which is regulated by the Environment Agency. The response went on to say that new development within 400 metres of an existing intensive pig or poultry farm could result in the nearby community being exposed to impacts including odour, noise, dust and flies. The severity of these impacts will depend on the size of the facility, the animals it houses and prevailing weather conditions.

750. In acknowledgement of these comments and the need for mitigation to take account of the potential adverse impacts from the Intensive Poultry Installation, the proposed modification MM12.9 [[HDC 2 Appendix 1](#)] includes an additional criterion as follows: '6. *Potential mitigation due to proximity to Intensive Poultry Installation (regulated by EA) will need to be considered.*'

751. Any mitigation of the risk associated with the Intensive Poultry Installation will be determined through the planning application process. A planning application for L1 has been submitted and is currently pending consideration (Ref: 26/00447/FUL).

Site L1

Q4. How does the site relate to nearby existing commitments and allocations?

752. Criterion 2 of Policy L1 relates primarily to the Lutterworth East Strategic Development Area which was allocated in the adopted Local Plan and is now a commitment. Of the permitted 2,750 dwellings (Ref: 19/00250/OUT), it is expected to deliver 1,500 dwellings within the Plan period [HDC 2 Appendix 2]. The development includes a proposed spine road running east from the A426 to the north of Lutterworth to the A4304 to the south east of Lutterworth, incorporating a road bridge over the M1 motorway to the north of the town.
753. The access off the A426 (Leicester Road) into Lutterworth East SDA will be in the vicinity of L1. Therefore, access arrangements for the L1 will need to take account of the committed site's access arrangements and the expected traffic flows from the SDA which will affect the A426.

Site L2

Q1. The site benefits from an outline planning permission (25/00746/OUT) approved subject to a s106 agreement. The relevant site sheet proforma [HDC3-Appendix 3] states that housing is to be delivered in the two years prior to the adoption of the Plan. Is this practicable given that the site does not have full planning permission?

754. The planning application (25/00746/OUT) was approved with a signed S106 agreement on 24th August 2026. It is accepted that the trajectory for the site should be moved on a year and the Council would be happy to accept a modification on this basis.

Site L2

Q2. There is lack of clarity as to whether the site requires additional infrastructure. What is the most up to date position?

755. The [IDP \[HDC11\]](#) and [Infrastructure Delivery Schedule \(IDS\) \[HDC11A\]](#) sets out the infrastructure requirements for each site allocation. Those required as a result of allocating L2 for residential use only relate to upgrades to existing

infrastructure and therefore would be dealt with via S106 contributions and have been in the development management process in approving the application 25/00746/OUT with a signed Section 106 agreement.

Site L2

Q3. Is the wording of the criteria within the policy effective? E.g. what is meant by 'may' in the context of an overheating study.

756. The wording 'may' in an overheating study is correct as it will be dependent on the outcome of the noise assessment required by criterion 1 as it is linked to the ability to open windows. The requirement for an overheating study could be moved to the end of criterion 1 as a modification to the plan. It is considered that the policy wording could be more clearly worded in this regard. To remove any ambiguity and ensure consistency, the Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification on this basis. Subject to this, the criteria within the policy are considered effective.

Site L2

Q4. What is the significance of the risk of flooding identified in criterion 4?

757. The [SFRA Level 2 Appendix B](#) site screening identifies the site as being 100% in flood zone 1 and no significant concerns on initial screening. This is a standard criterion for site allocation policies.

Employment Site L3: Land south of Lutterworth Road/Coventry Road (3.4 Ha employment land) Policy SA01

(Note: Questions relating to the above site are considered under Matter 4 above.)

LARGE VILLAGES

Broughton Astley

Site BA1: Land off Frolesworth Road (475 homes) Policy SA01

Q1. Is there sufficient community infrastructure within Broughton Astley to support the addition of a further 475 homes? If not, how could the impact of the increase in population be mitigated?

758. Further capacity within community infrastructure will be required to support the addition of a further 475 homes on BA1. Development proposals for BA1 will be expected to contribute appropriately to community infrastructure within the village in accordance with Policy DS05 Development Strategy: Supporting Strategic Infrastructure. While any contributions will reflect the growth from BA1, they will not be expected to contribute to existing community infrastructure deficits.

759. Working with providers, the recently updated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule [[HDC 11A](#)] has identified that contributions from BA1's development will be expected for the following community infrastructure:

- Primary education
- Secondary education
- Healthcare and Emergency Services
- Libraries
- Indoor sports facilities
- Outdoor sports provision
- Cemetery and sport provision
- Public open space

760. The appropriate level of s106 contributions will be determined as part of the determination of the current planning application for BA1 which is pending consideration (Ref: 26/00480/OUT).

Q2. Would there be any impact from the development on the operation of the nearby cricket ground?

761. There is the potential for development on BA1 to impact on the operation of the adjoining cricket ground as highlighted by Sport England in their representation (ID:14075). As the site adjoins the cricket ground, development proposals would be expected to ensure that the future operation of the cricket ground is

safeguarded. This may require appropriate mitigation and will need to be set out as part of the planning application.

Q3. Could the highways impact of the proposed development be adequately alleviated?

762. Yes. The recently updated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule [[HDC 11A](#)] identifies three specific areas of Transport Infrastructure which could require s106 contributions from BA1. These are drawn from the Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP 2](#)] (see Appendix F Site Pro Forma for Site ID:10554) and represent indicative amounts for plan making purposes only at this stage for:

- Active Travel: Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Measures to support the delivery of the site
- Public Transport: Public Transport Infrastructure Measures to support the delivery of the site
- Travel Planning: Travel Planning Measures to support the delivery of the site

763. A Transport Assessment, required for all major development as part of the planning application process under Policy DM06: Transport and Accessibility, accompanies the current planning application for BA1 and considers the impact of the development on the safe, efficient and reliable operation of the transport network. It is through this process that any site-specific mitigation required to ensure the impact is managed and mitigated locally will be determined.

764. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

Q4. Is the wording of the policy effective? How would the provision of a Heritage Impact Assessment impact on the determination of a planning application on the site?

765. Yes. The Council considers the wording of the policy is effective. The provision of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) as part of a planning application on BA1 will identify any heritage assets that could be affected by BA1, assess their

significance, evaluate how the proposed development might affect their significance, identify mitigation, and explain any remaining impacts.

766. As part of the informal consultation with Historic England prior to Regulation 19 consultation, they recommended that a HIA should be submitted at the planning application stage and included within the policy requirements. The HIA will allow the decision maker to assess how consideration of heritage assets has influenced the development proposed.

Q5. What is the status of the wildlife site referenced in criterion 6?

767. The wildlife site referred to in criterion 5 of the Plan is classified by the Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) as a Potential Local Wildlife Site (LWS). As such it is identified as having a possible nature conservation value, but has not yet undergone full ecological surveying to confirm if it meets official LWS criteria.

768. Although not formally designated, Potential LWSs, along with Candidate LWSs, are included as part of the LWS network in the Ecological Assessment of Proposed Site Allocations [[EN-NLP 12](#)]. The Executive Summary (page ii) notes the following:

'Harborough is a district with a relative paucity of nationally designated sites (less than 2% of the area) as is described in the draft Local Plan. As a result, the Local Wildlife Site (LWS) network is all the more important as it supports the best examples of semi-natural habitat priority and protected species in the district.'

769. Given this context, it is appropriate to draw attention to the possible ecological value of this Potential LWS in assessing the biodiversity of site BA1.

Q6. Are there any further existing operations nearby which may be impacted by the proposed development? If so, how will the agent of change principle be followed?

770. Proposed modification MM12.13 [[HDC 2 Appendix 1](#)] sets out a new criterion in response to Leicestershire County Council's Regulation 19 representation (ID: 14092). This representation highlights the site's proximity to the consented anaerobic digestion facility which is identified as Site Ref: H27 (Sutton Lodge Farm, Frolesworth Road, Broughton Astley) in the County Council's [Minerals and Waste Safeguarding \[Harborough District\] Document S3/2015e](#).

771. The new criterion, set out in the proposed modifications, aims to ensure that the development proposals for BA1 will not compromise the future operation of the consented anaerobic digester at Sutton Lodge. This will be considered as part of the determination of current planning application for BA1 (Ref: 26/00480/OUT) which is pending consideration.

LARGE VILLAGES

Fleckney

Site F1: Land north of Kilby Road and land west of Longgrey (150 homes)

Policy SA01

Q1. Would proposed housing site allocation F1 have an adverse impact on traffic congestion and road safety in the area?

772. The potential transport impacts of F1 can be appropriately addressed through the mitigation identified in the Council's Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment (2025) and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2025).
773. The subsequent planning application 25/00515/OUT, for up to 170 dwellings on land off Garner Way, proposes access from Long Grey and Garner Way, demonstrating that access arrangements and traffic distribution remain matters to be addressed through the detailed planning process.
774. These measures can be secured through a site-specific Transport Assessment. This will assess the development's impact on the local highway network and identify any necessary measures relating to access, junction capacity, walking, cycling and public transport.
775. This approach is consistent with policy DM06 which requires major development to provide safe and suitable access, appropriate sustainable transport measures and a Transport Assessment where necessary. The policy also requires development to ensure that additional traffic does not adversely affect highway safety or result in a severe residual cumulative impact on the road network.

LARGE VILLAGES

Great Glen

Site GG1: Land north of London Road and east of Leicester Grammar School
(400 homes) Policy SA01

Q1. How would Plan policy SA01 GG1 criterion 1b interact with Plan policy DS05 criterion 1d (ii) and criterion 2, which requires a comprehensive approach to coordinating the provision, phasing and funding of infrastructure taking account of the cumulative and cross boundary impacts arising from the cluster of sites at Oadby and Great Glen?

776. The Council assumes this question relates to criterion 1 in Policy SA01/GG1.

777. Policy DS05 and criterion 1 of Policy SA01/GG1 together require a coordinated approach to the provision, phasing and funding of infrastructure. A proposed Main Modification (MM12.14) further clarifies that this coordinated approach to planning and delivery of infrastructure and services should be fully addressed within the comprehensive masterplan. Land north of London Road and east of Leicester Grammar School will be required to contribute to the cluster mitigation schemes where the evidence demonstrates its development generates or materially contributes to the need. The proposed funding mechanisms would be via Section 106 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy.

Q2. Would policy SA01 GG1 criterion 4 effectively address the transport impacts (including cumulative impacts) of development along the A6? Would it ensure a coordinated approach to active forms of transport across and beyond the site?

778. While criterion 4 of Policy SA01/GG1 targets local highways and parking at Leicester Grammar School, its effectiveness in terms of wider cumulative impacts along the A6 corridor is secured through Policy DS05. To remove any ambiguity and ensure a coordinate approach to both cumulative traffic impacts and active forms of transport, the Council has introduced MM12.14, MM11.3, and MM11.6 within [Appendix 1](#) - Schedule of Proposed Modifications [HDC2]. Together, these modifications explicitly require site-specific masterplanning and corridor-wide transport assessments to take account of the wider site clusters, ensuring that highway mitigation and sustainable transport are coordinated across and beyond the site boundary.

Q3. What is the robust evidence that wastewater and sewerage infrastructure will be available to serve this development?

779. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan [[INF-NLP 2](#)] and subsequent iteration [[HDC 11](#)] clearly sets out the infrastructure required to support the growth and delivery of development proposed in the Plan, including utility infrastructure, such as wastewater treatment works upgrades identified through Anglian Water's Asset Management Plan.

Q4. Policy SA01 GG1 criterion 1 requires a comprehensive masterplan. It does not refer to Plan appendix 6. In this regard, would the policy clearly set out that a masterplan will be required, who should prepare it and what the timescale for its provision and approval mechanism would be? How does this relate to the requirement for a masterplan for policy SA02?

780. Criterion 1 of Policy SA01/GG1 should be read together with Policy SA01(2) that clearly states that "where a masterplan is required, this should address the site-specific requirements set out in Appendix 6". Appendix 6 states that masterplans are to be prepared by developers and must involve the active participation of relevant stakeholders. Appendix 6 also provides for the scope, form and consultation arrangements relating to the masterplan to be agreed with the Council at the pre-application stage and confirms that the relationship between the masterplan and the development management process will be agreed between the developer and the Council.

Q5. How would development of this site reinforce an Area of Separation between Great Glen and Land South of Gartree Policy SA02)?

781. In accordance with Policy SA01/GG1, the development of the site will be guided by a comprehensive masterplan that proactively responds to constraints and opportunities. This process must clearly demonstrate how the physical and visual separation between Great Glen and Land South of Gartree Road will be protected and reinforced to maintain their distinct identity and individual character. Where required, proposals will incorporate boundary treatments that reflect a sensitive urban to rural transition. The interface between built form and

strategic green infrastructure is expected to be managed through the Design Code and controlled through subsequent reserved matters applications.

Q6. Would policy SA01 GG1 part 9 in requiring ‘... no impacts to the amenity of development...’ in relation to waste safeguarding areas be justified and effective?

782. It is appropriate that development demonstrates compatibility with the nearby safeguarded waste facilities and does not prejudice their continued operation. The intention of the wording “no impacts to the amenity of development” is to secure acceptable living conditions for future occupiers rather than requiring no impacts whatsoever as it currently reads.

783. The Council therefore considers the intent of criterion 9 is justified and consistent with national policy, however, the wording could be improved by requiring planning applications to demonstrate that acceptable living conditions would be achieved for future occupiers and that the continued operation of the safeguarded waste facilities would not be prejudiced. The Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification on this basis.

Q7. How would policy SA01 GG1 criterion 8 effectively mitigate any flood risk with particular regard to surface water flood risk? Would it effectively address the requirement for betterment in flood risk terms given it is upstream and close to Great Glen?

784. As detailed in the response to Matter 7, Issue 3, Question 3(vi), flood risk from all sources was a key consideration throughout the site selection process and informed both the allocation of the site and the policy requirements. The evidence concluded that the identified surface water constraints are capable of being addressed, and criterion 8 directly mitigates these risks by requiring a sequential approach to site layout and safe access/egress.

785. Furthermore, because the site occupies a sensitive upstream location, the policy operates alongside Policy DM07 to require development to reduce overall flood risk. Collectively, Policy DM07 and criterion 8 provide an effective framework for ensuring that development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and, where practicable, secures flood risk betterment through integrated sustainable drainage systems.

Q8. There are a number of designated heritage assets within the locality. What is the robust evidence that development of this site would not harmfully impact their significance?

786. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal environmental and heritage constraints associated with the allocation. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) concluded that the sensitivity of heritage assets and their settings will need to be considered, and appropriate mitigation utilized in any development of this site. Potential adverse impacts are addressed through the requirements of Policy SA01/GG1, which requires a Heritage Impact Assessment to assess impact on neighbouring heritage assets, including Stretton Hall and its associated listed structures and the setting of other assets including the row of Grade II Almshouses (Cricks Retreat) and Grade II 39 London Road. The policy specifically requires development to avoid encroachment into the setting of Stretton Hall and its associated gardens, while preserving views of listed buildings along London Road. These requirements operate alongside the wider policy framework. Detailed assessment and mitigation tested through the Development Management process

Q9. Would the requirements of policy SA01 GG1 criterion 6 be clear and unambiguous in relation to new sports/ community hub and pitches? How would development on this site ensure integration with sports facilities in the locality?

787. The Council considers that the intention of criterion 6 is clear, namely that development should preserve semi-natural habitats and deliver a new sports/community hub and associated pitches. When read together with criterion 1 and Policy SA01(2), the policy provides a clear framework for delivery of the new sports/community hub and associated pitches as part of a comprehensive masterplan approach.

788. However, criterion 6 currently combines two distinct requirements, namely the preservation of semi-natural habitats and the delivery of sports/community hub and associated pitches. Whilst the Council considers the overall intention of the policy to be clear, separating these requirements into discrete criteria would improve clarity. The Council would therefore be content with a Main Modification to separate these elements if the Inspectors consider that this would improve the effectiveness of the policy.

Q10. Would the requirements of policy SA01 GG1 criterion 10 in relation to minerals safeguarding areas be accurate, clear and unambiguous? How would the policy address the safeguarded waste sites at Great Glen and Little Stretton.

789. The Site Selection Methodology [[PRE-NLP 5](#)] considered the principal potential effects associated with development including traffic, air quality, ecology, landscape, heritage, and flood risk. Specifically, [Appendix 4: Stage 4 Technical Assessment](#) identified two existing permitted waste sites in proximity could impact amenity of development and confirms that the site does not lie within a mineral safeguarding area.
790. Criterion 9 of Policy SA01/GG1 addresses the safeguarded waste sites at Great Glen and Little Stretton by requiring the planning applications to demonstrate that the proposed development would not prejudice the continued operation of the safeguarded waste facilities. The intention of the wording “no impacts to the amenity of development” is to secure acceptable living conditions for future occupiers rather than requiring no impacts whatsoever as it currently reads.
791. As set out in the response to Question 6, the Council considers the wording could be improved by requiring planning applications to demonstrate that acceptable living conditions would be achieved for future occupiers and that the continued operation of the safeguarded waste facilities would not be prejudiced. The Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification on this basis.

LARGE VILLAGES

Kibworth

Site K1: Land west of Warwick Road and south of Priory Business Park (475 homes) Policy SA01

Q1. Would proposed housing site allocation K1 have an adverse impact on traffic congestion, road safety and air quality in the area?

792. The A6 corridor contains a number of the most sustainable settlements in the District, including the parts of Leicester Urban Area, Market Harborough, and two of the Large Villages (Kibworth and Great Glen). The allocations at these

settlements make up over half (53%) of the housing development identified in Policy DS01 of the Draft Plan and 80% of the general employment development in Policy DS02. All of these sites are located directly on (or very close to) the best public transport service in the District, with strategic development areas at the Leicester Urban Area (Land South of Gartree Road) and North of Market Harborough. This existing bus service provides for both inter urban routes and shorter distance trips within urban areas, making the best use of public transport infrastructure, and creating opportunities to provide new and/or improved services along the A6 corridor.

793. As result, this pattern of growth supports and creates the opportunity for:

- fewer and shorter journeys by private car;
- better use of existing transport infrastructure; and
- shorter journeys with greater potential for sustainable travel (walking, cycling, public transport) offering genuine travel choice.

794. It also helps minimise impacts on the transport network by making use of existing infrastructure and encouraging sustainable travel with the associated health and environmental benefits, making transport impacts more easily and appropriately addressed

795. The Transport evidence has assessed the impacts and proposes mitigation to ensure the impacts on the transport network are mitigated to an acceptable degree. The evidence has been informed by a sustainable transport hierarchy approach which sees walking, wheeling and cycling at the top of the hierarchy in accordance with national and local policy.

796. The mitigation package for sustainable transport (active travel and public transport) has been informed by a strategic assessment through the JTE work and site-specific assessments in the HSTIA. All of the sustainable transport infrastructure (local and strategic) is captured in the Infrastructure Schedule with appropriate prioritisation reflecting the importance of it to the delivery of the Draft Local Plan.

797. Policies DS05 and DM06 require safe access, safe and connected movement, and a Transport Assessment demonstrating that additional traffic would not be detrimental to highway safety.

798. EN-NLP 1: Air Quality Report 2024 concludes that overall, the traffic changes resulting Local Plan in 2041 are predicted to have small impacts on air quality, with no significant adverse effects on human health or sensitive ecological receptors.

Site K2: Land south and west of Priory Business Park (3.1 Ha emp land)
Policy SA01

(Note: Questions relating to the Site K2 are considered under Matter 4 above.)

MEDIUM VILLAGES

Billesdon

Site B1: Land at Gaulby Road (48 homes) Policy SA01

Site B1

Q1. This site already has planning permission for a development of 48 homes. Would the proposed allocation accord with that permission (APP/F241/W/24/3346350)?

799. The permission given generally accords with the Local Plan allocation for 30 self-build or custom plots and 18 affordable First Homes with school drop off area and associated parking.

Site B1

Q2. The site is allocated in the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan. Would this allocation accord with that?

800. The site is not allocated in the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan. The site adjoins a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan residential allocation at Gaulby Road and is close to the Former Highway Depot mixed-use allocation.

801. Planning permission was granted through an appeal at this site (APP/F241/W/24/3346350).

Site B1

Q3. What is the robust evidence to justify the requirement for a school drop off area and associated parking?

802. The provision of the additional school car park stems from identified existing traffic issues highlighted by the local community within the Billesdon

Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed car park and arrangements with the school are designed to ease the problems caused during school drop-off and pick-up times by parents stopping along Gaulby Road.

803. During consideration of application 23/01104/OUT, the Local Highway Authority raised no objection to the proposed car park and confirmed that access through the housing development would be capable of safely accommodating traffic to and from it. This demonstrates that the facility was acceptable in highway terms. However, it does not establish that the facility was necessary to make the development acceptable or that it would be effective in resolving the existing problems.
804. The Inspector also concluded that the housing proposal itself would not cause unacceptable highway-safety effects or a severe cumulative impact on the highway network. The development was not required to remedy the pre-existing parking and congestion problems.
805. This position is reinforced by the pending outline application 25/01548/OUT for up to 62 dwellings, comprising 36 custom housebuilding plots and 26 affordable homes. That proposal omits the school drop-off area and instead includes six additional custom-build dwellings and eight additional affordable homes. The Local Highway Authority has not objected to the proposal on highway-safety, traffic-volume or traffic-flow grounds and has advised that the absence of a school car park would not justify resisting the development.
806. Accordingly, while there is evidence of an existing local problem and of the potential benefit of additional parking, there is limited robust evidence that the school drop-off area is necessary, deliverable or effective as a mandatory requirement of Policy SA01/B1. To remove any ambiguity and ensure consistency, the Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification on this basis.

Site B1

Q4. The site is close to the Billesdon Conservation Area and a number of designated heritage assets along with an area with potential for archaeological remains. What is the robust evidence that development of this site, in the manner proposed, would ensure the significance of those heritage assets would not be harmfully affected?

807. The conservation area and heritage assets were considered in the Heritage analysis HFC-NLP 1 and an archaeological analysis of this site was carried out

by the Leicestershire County Council Archaeology Team which is available in HFC-NLP 2

808. To ensure the protection of the heritage assets and conservation area planning policy SA01 requires a HIA be submitted and agreed when an application is submitted.

Site B2: Billesdon Depot, south of Gaulby Road (10 homes) and Site B3: Former Lorry Park, Gaulby Road, Billesdon (5 homes) Policy SA01

Site B2

Q1. How would policy SA01/B2 and B3 ensure the setting of the Billesdon Woodland Pool) Local Green Space is not harmfully affected by development?

809. Policy DM05, read together with the site-specific criteria of Policy SA01/B2 and B3, provides a comprehensive and complementary framework to ensure the setting of Billesdon Woodland Pool Local Green Space is not harmfully affected by development.
810. Policy DM05 affords permanent protection to the openness of the designated Local Green Space itself. It establishes a presumption against new buildings within it, other than limited forms of development that preserve openness, replacement buildings that are not materially larger, or development justified by very special circumstances where any potential harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. This protects the designated area itself from inappropriate development.
811. The specific criteria for allocations B2 and B3 address the separate issue of development on land adjoining the Local Green Space. Policy SA01/B2 explicitly requires development to take account of the setting of the Local Green Space and to provide mitigation for wider landscape impacts. The limitation of development to a maximum of 10 dwellings on up to 0.5 hectares at the site frontage also confines the scale and location of development.
812. Policy SA01/B3 requires development to take account of the setting of the adjoining Local Green Space. It also requires the retention of important boundary trees and hedges and reinforcement with native tree planting. These requirements provide a specific landscape mechanism for retaining and strengthening the vegetated boundary, screening or filtering views where appropriate, maintaining the wooded character of the edge and providing an appropriate transition between the development and Billesdon Woodland Pool Local Green Space.

813. These policies would be applied through the development-management process. A planning application would need to be supported by sufficient information on landscape and visual effects and demonstrate through its design and landscaping scheme how the setting of the Local Green Space has influenced the proposal. Planning permission will be refused where the proposal fails to satisfy these criteria, while detailed landscaping, boundary treatment, implementation and long-term management could be secured by planning conditions or, where necessary, a planning obligation.

Site B2

Q2. Given designated heritage assets in close proximity including archaeology, what is the robust evidence that the significance of those assets would not be harmfully impacted?

814. The conservation area and heritage assets were considered in the Heritage analysis HFC-NLP 1 and an archaeological analysis of this site was carried out by the Leicestershire County Council Archaeology Team which is available in HFC-NLP 2

815. To ensure the protection of the heritage assets and conservation area planning policy SA01/B2 requires a HIA be submitted and agreed when an application is submitted.

Site B2

Q3. How would policies SA01/B2 and B3 relate to provisions in the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan?

816. Policy SA01 B2 Billesdon Depot south of Gaulby Road supplements Policy BPr8 by requiring a contaminated land assessment, a Heritage Impact Assessment and a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. These requirements are not expressly included in the Neighbourhood Plan allocation and would provide additional evidence to inform the determination of any planning application and ensure that contamination, heritage and flood-risk matters are appropriately addressed.

817. The Neighbourhood Plan policy provides flexibility over the precise mix of uses on the wider site, while limiting the residential element to a maximum of 10 dwellings. The two policies should therefore be read together, with Policy BPr8

providing the locally specific framework for the mixed-use development and Policy SA01 adding further assessment requirements.

818. SA01/B3, Former Lorry Park, Gaulby Road, accords with Policy BPr3 of the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan. Both policies allocate the site for five dwellings. The policies should therefore be read together, with the Neighbourhood Plan providing the locally specific policy context for the development of the site.

MEDIUM VILLAGES

Great Bowden

Sites GB1 and GB2: (Land north of Dingley Road and Land off Dingley Road and Nether Green) (15 homes and 85 homes) Policy SA01

Q1. Is the presence of waste facilities in the area a constraint on proposed housing site allocations GB1 and GB2?

819. GB2 criterion 9 acknowledges that the site is in proximity to three existing permitted waste safeguarding sites (Refs: H22, H23 and H28 in the County Council's [Minerals and Waste Safeguarding \[Harborough District\] Document S3/2015e](#)). The criterion aims to ensure that the operation of the waste facilities would not impact on the amenity of the development and that the proposed development would not prejudice the future operation of the waste facilities.
820. Consideration of the potential impacts of the development will need to be demonstrated satisfactorily through any future planning application for GB2. Given the distances between the site's boundary and the waste facilities, development is unlikely to affect future operations or the amenity of future residents. Furthermore, GB1 now has planning permission for 11 dwellings (Ref: 25/00608/FUL). The presence of the waste facilities in the area was not raised as a constraint on development proposals in the determination of the application.
821. Proposed modification MM12.20 [[HDC 2 Appendix 1](#)] inserts the same criterion into the policy requirements for GB1.

MEDIUM VILLAGES

Houghton on the Hill

Site HH1: Land north of Uppingham Road (80 homes) Policy SA01

Site HH1

Q1. How would the requirements of policy SA01 HH1 interface with those of the Houghton Neighbourhood Development Plan? Does this raise any issue of soundness?

822. Policy SA01 HH1 and Policy L3B of the Houghton on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan relate to the same site and are broadly complementary. Policy L3B provides for a reserve allocation of up to 90 dwellings and sets out locally specific requirements relating to SuDS, green and recreational space, housing mix, accessibility, and pedestrian and cycle connections. Policy SA01 HH1 provides the strategic Local Plan allocation and establishes additional site-specific requirements, including the gas pipeline buffer, surface water flood risk and drainage, the existing public right of way (PRoW), and potential noise impacts from the A47.
823. Both policies are consistent in directing development towards the eastern part of the site, in association with the existing settlement, while maintaining the separation between Houghton on the Hill and adjacent settlements.
824. The requirements of SA01 HH1 can operate alongside the Neighbourhood Plan policies. There is no soundness issue arising from the relationship between the two policies. SA01 HH1 establishes the strategic allocation and identifies the key site-specific constraints, while the 2026 Neighbourhood Plan provides additional locally specific requirements that complement and refine the strategic policy framework.

Site HH1

Q2. How would development of this site ensure appropriate regard for the generally rural character and appearance of the locality?

825. Development of HH1 would need to respond to the site's rural edge location and its relationship with the existing form of Houghton. Appendix 4 of the Site Selection Methodology identifies the western part of the site as having Moderate-High landscape sensitivity and the eastern part as Moderate, and concludes that the eastern part is better related to the existing settlement. This

supports SA01 HH1's requirement for development to be focused on the eastern part of the site.

826. The approach is also supported by the 2026 Houghton NDP, which seeks development that respects the form and character of the existing settlement, together with the Local Plan's DS04 and DM04 policies. Taken together, these requirements provide a framework for ensuring that the scale, siting, landscaping and detailed design of development respond appropriately to the rural character and appearance of Houghton.
827. The recent planning application 25/00599/OUT, provides further site-specific evidence of how the development can be arranged in relation to the existing village and landscape.

Site HH1

Q3. Given site constraints, including a gas pipeline and surface water flood risk what is the robust evidence that the development proposed can be acceptably accommodated on this site?

828. The Council's Site Selection Methodology, including Appendix 4 – Stage 4 Technical Assessments for site 8206, identifies the gas pipeline, localised surface-water flood risk and other site constraints, but nevertheless concludes that the site is suitable for allocation as a Preferred Site. The assessment identifies the eastern part of the site as being better related to the existing settlement and indicates that, with appropriate mitigation, the site is capable of accommodating sensitively designed development.
829. The flood risk evidence supports this conclusion. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 identifies site 8206 as being entirely within Flood Zone 1, with approximately 6% of the site affected by the relevant surface-water flood-risk category. It records no access or egress and no significant concerns at the initial screening stage. Nevertheless, Policy SA01 HH1 appropriately requires a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, together with a site-specific surface-water drainage strategy and SuDS management plan. This provides a clear mechanism for ensuring that the detailed development proposal responds appropriately to the areas of surface-water risk and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.
830. The gas pipeline is similarly recognised as a constraint rather than an insurmountable impediment to development. The Council's Stage 4 Technical Assessment identifies that the pipeline crosses the central part of the site and requires an appropriate buffer. This is reflected directly in criterion 3 of Policy

SA01 HH1, which provides a clear policy mechanism for addressing the constraint through the site layout and detailed design. The SHELAA Companion Guide for site 8206 also identifies the proposed buffer around the gas pipeline on the indicative site plan, with no development proposed within the area where the pipeline is located. This demonstrates how the constraint can be incorporated into the development layout rather than preventing development of the site as a whole.

831. This conclusion is further supported by the AECOM assessment undertaken for the Neighbourhood Development Plan, which notes that “the eastern part of the site is away from the high-pressure gas pipeline”. This is consistent with the Council’s assessment that the eastern part of the site is better related to the existing settlement and provides an indication of how the site could be developed while respecting the pipeline constraint and the wider spatial considerations affecting the site.

Site HH1

Q4. Given the proximity of the A47 traffic, would the provisions in policy SA01 HH1 criterion 6 be effective in ensuring no harmful impact on the living conditions of future occupiers of the development?

832. Yes. Policy SA01 HH1 criterion 6 provides an effective mechanism for addressing potential noise impacts from the A47. The policy specifically requires appropriate measures to mitigate noise and protect the living conditions of future occupiers.
833. The requirement can be addressed through the detailed design of the development, informed by an appropriate noise assessment.
834. The Site Selection Methodology identifies A47 noise as a constraint but does not consider it to prevent development, subject to appropriate mitigation. Criterion 6 therefore provides a clear and proportionate mechanism for addressing the identified constraint at the planning application and detailed design stages.
835. The criterion is also supported by the wider Local Plan requirements, particularly DM02 – Amenity and Wellbeing, which seeks to ensure development does not result in unacceptable impacts on the living conditions of occupiers.

Site HH2: Land north of Stretton Lane (24 homes) Policy SA01

Site HH2

Q1. What is the robust evidence to justify the amount of development and density of this site allocation?

836. The allocation of 24 dwellings is supported by the SHELAA assessment for site 21/8135 and Appendix 4 of the Site Selection Methodology, which conclude that the site is suitable, available and achievable, subject to appropriate mitigation. The Houghton on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan also identifies the site as potentially suitable for housing development.
837. The proposed density is considered to be within the estimated capacity of the site and appropriate to its landscape setting and relationship with the Houghton-on-the-Hill Conservation Area. This approach is supported by Policy HN03, as set out in the Housing Mix and Type Topic Paper.

Site HH2

Q2. What is the robust evidence to provide assurance that development would not result in unacceptable impact on the significance of the Houghton on the Hill Conservation Area and other designated heritage assets?

838. The Heritage Analysis of Local Plan Sites identifies the Houghton on the Hill Conservation Area and nearby designated heritage assets, including the Grade 2 Church of St Catharine. It considers the site to make a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area and recommends a Heritage Impact Assessment because of the site's sensitivity.
839. This is reflected in Policy SA01 HH2, which requires development to respect the character and setting of the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings and requires a Heritage Impact Assessment at application stage.
840. This is reinforced by DM03 – Heritage Asset Conservation and Design Standards, with DS04 – Retaining and Celebrating our Heritage and Rural Character and DM04 – Landscape Character and Sensitivity providing the wider policy framework.

Site HH2

Q3. How would the requirements of policy SA01 HH1 interface with those of the Houghton Neighbourhood Development Plan? Does this raise any issue of soundness?

841. The Council assumes this question relates to the requirements of policy SA01/HH2.

842. The Council confirms that the requirements of Policy SA01/HH2 interface effectively with the Houghton on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan. As a strategic policy, the allocation of HH2 within the Local Plan establishes the principle of residential development in this location, updating the spatial restrictions of Policies L1 and L2 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Once this strategic principle is set, the site-specific criteria within Policy SA01/HH2 work in tandem with the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that detailed matters, such as layout, design, and landscape transitions, respect the village's distinct character through the development management process.

MEDIUM VILLAGES

Husbands Bosworth

Husbands Bosworth Site HB1: Land east of Welford Road (105 homes) Policy SA01

Q1. Is presence of mineral deposits in the area a constraint on proposed housing allocation HB1?

843. The site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and therefore a Mineral Assessment will be required in accordance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Development of the site has been thoroughly considered through the Site Selection Methodology [PRE-NLP 5].

MEDIUM VILLAGES

Ullesthorpe

Sites U1 and U2: (Land south of Ashby Road and Land north of Ashby Road)
(30 homes and 50 homes) Policy SA01

Q1. Would proposed housing site allocations U1 and U2 have an adverse impact on traffic congestion and road safety in the area?

844. No. The recently updated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule [[HDC 11A](#)] identifies three specific areas of Transport Infrastructure which could require s106 contributions from U1 and U2. These are drawn from the Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment [[TRP-NLP 2](#)] (see Appendix F Site Pro Forma for Site ID: 10649 and 8180 respectively) and give indicative amounts for plan making purposes only at this stage for:

- Active Travel: Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Measures to support the delivery of the sites
- Public Transport: Public Transport Infrastructure Measures to support the delivery of the sites
- Travel Planning: Travel Planning Measures to support the delivery of the sites

845. The Transport Assessment, required for all major development as part of the planning application process, will identify any local highway mitigation measures to ensure the safe, efficient and reliable operation of the transport network. It is through this process that any site-specific mitigation required to ensure the impact is managed and mitigated locally will be determined.

846. Wider residual cumulative impacts on the road network of this site (and other local plan allocations) are identified in chapter 3 of the Joint Transport Evidence (Stage 2) [[TRP-NLP5](#)]. The Local Highway (Preliminary Scheme Design) [[HDC13](#)] builds on this work and identifies the off-site road improvements integral to the delivery of the plan in Appendix B.

847. By way of update, a planning application for U1 for up to 46 dwellings (Ref: 25/01565/OUT) has a resolution to approve (subject to the signing of a s106 agreement). In terms of transport, bus pass and travel pack contributions are being sought.

Q2. Is criterion 4 for site allocation U2, regarding impact on the Croft Pasture SSSI, justified?

848. Yes. This is an issue that was raised by Natural England as part of the informal consultation on the emerging policies prior to Regulation 19 consultation. The criterion was agreed with Natural England and reflects their concerns over potential water discharge impacting on Croft Pastures SSSI.

Q3. Is the planning for healthcare and school provision for Ullesthorpe clear and effective? Does it support the housing allocations for the village?

849. The planning for school provision for Ullesthorpe is clear and effective. The EDS forecasts that there is enough primary place capacity to accommodate additional demand from this site. No primary education contribution is anticipated to be required.

850. There is insufficient capacity forecast to be available at the secondary schools in Lutterworth to accommodate the additional demand from this site. A Secondary Education Contribution will be required to expand secondary school places at Lutterworth College or an alternative site that will serve this development.

851. Planning for primary healthcare provision in Ullesthorpe is informed by engagement with the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board (LLR ICB)).

852. Ullesthorpe is served by the Orchard Medical Practice, which has a satellite surgery in the village as well as its main premises in Broughton Astley. U1 and U2 are forecast to generate approximately 194 additional patient registrations, based on the district-wide assumption of 2.42 patients per dwelling.

853. The IDP (March 2026, page 46, Table 12, [INF-NLP 2](#)) records that the LLR ICB identified no specific healthcare infrastructure requirements for the Ullesthorpe allocations individually, given their relatively small scale. However, the cumulative impact of planned growth is expected to necessitate developer contributions towards primary healthcare provision. Based on proximity, the Orchard Medical Practice has been identified as the most likely surgery to accommodate the additional patient registrations arising from the allocations. This does not preclude consideration of alternative or wider infrastructure solutions as the detailed requirements become clearer.

854. The ICB's preferred approach is to accommodate additional patients through the extension of existing practices or increased capacity at existing sites in the first instance. The IDP provides an indicative basis for calculating developer contributions towards enhanced or extended primary care provision, using an estimated cost of £320 per additional patient, equivalent to approximately £774 per dwelling. These figures are indicative and may be revised as development proposals come forward and infrastructure requirements are refined. The appropriate solution and apportionment of costs will be determined through continued engagement between the Council, developers and the LLR ICB, including consideration of cumulative and cross-boundary impacts.

Magna Park (Strategic Warehousing)

Site MP1: Land south of George House, Coventry Road (15.8 Ha Strategic Warehousing B8 land) and **Site MP2: Land at Mere Lane, Magna Park**

Q1. Are the allocations of the sites for strategic warehousing appropriate in the context of a risk of surface water flooding? How do the site-specific policies relate to policy DM07: Managing Flood Risk?

855. Yes. The allocations for strategic warehousing are appropriate in the context of a risk to surface water flooding. Small parts of sites MP1 and MP2 are affected by surface water flooding, significantly less than 25% and 10% respectively.
856. Both sites were assessed in the SFRA Level 2 ([EN-NLP 7](#)). Initial screening ([EN-NLP 7 Appendix B](#)) for site MP2 concluded no specific concerns, while for MP1 the need for a site table was identified [Appendix 6 SFRA Level 2 10595](#). The relevant tests were carried out in line with national guidelines, with Site MP1 passing the Sequential Test and the Exception tests ([EN-NLP 9](#)).
857. Development at both sites would constitute major development (greater than 1000sqm or 1Ha) requiring assessment under Policy DM07: Managing Flood Risk. The site-specific policies SA01/MP1 criterion 1 and SA01/MP2 criterion 11, provide a marker, and reinforce the need for proposals on these sites to have regard to surface water flood risk.

Q2. With reference to site MP2, what is the rationale for the requirement for the provision of a 3 Ha site for travelling show people and is this consistent with any flood risk issues?

858. A concerted and extended site search and assessment process was conducted throughout the production of the plan as detailed in the [Housing Mix and Type topic paper](#) [TPC-NLP8]. This included a comprehensive call for sites and site identification study and a subsequent addendum to evaluate additional opportunities.
859. The sites allocated in the plan for Travelling Showpeople were found to be suitable, available and achievable and this included land at MP2. The detailed site assessment in Appendix 4 of the [Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Assessment 2024](#) [HSG-NLP 7] found the site to be in Flood Zone 1 and therefore with low probability of flooding.
860. The [SFRA Level 2 Appendix B](#) site screening identifies the site as being 100% in flood zone 1 and no significant concerns on initial screening.

Q3. Is the wording of the criteria within SA01 effective? For example, what is meant by, 'as far as possible', and 'consideration'? How does the detailed wording which covers generic issues such as the protection of residential amenity relate to other policies in the Plan and does this provide the potential for confusion?

861. Yes. The wording of policy criteria 5 and 8 within SA01/MP2 and wording covering generic issues is considered effective in conjunction with the framework provided by the plans development management policies, specifically policies DM02, DM06 and DM09.
862. Criterion 5 requires consideration but is not prescriptive about the use of solar panels, because solar is not the only form of low-carbon energy. Policy DM09 Sustainable Construction and Climate Resilience sets a higher bar. Similarly, policies DM06 (Transport and Accessibility) and DM02 (Amenity and Wellbeing) set standards for access by sustainable transport modes and protecting the amenity.
863. In each case, the requirements of policy SA01/MP2 in conjunction with the plan's development management policies, will assist developers in choosing

the most appropriate low carbon technology, sustainable transport measures and mitigations for their development.

864. The SA01/MP2 requirements provide a marker and reinforce the need for proposals for the site to have particular regard to these issues. However, to remove any ambiguity and ensure consistency, the Council would be happy to accept a recommendation for a modification to address any potential for confusion.

Q4. How has the potential impact on designated heritage assets been taken into account in the site selection process, and is the wording of criterion 10 suitably robust?

865. The potential impact of both MP1 and MP2 on designated heritage assets was first considered in the Heritage Analysis of Local Plan Sites ([HFC-NLP 1](#)) and subsequently considered by EMP-NLP 4 in the appendix [Assessment of Potential B8 Sites](#). The analysis informed the detailed site assessment process and the overall summary and recommendation on site selection.
866. Heritage assets, as listed in Heritage Analysis (HFC-NLP 1), are present in the vicinity of site MP2. The analysis concluded the scale of the site would allow development to be located in such a manner as to limit potential visibility from any heritage assets.
867. The wording of criterion 10 is considered suitably robust, given there are no heritage assets on site.

Q5. How would development of this site reinforce the Area of Separation between Ullesthorpe and Magna Park and how has the topography of the site been taken into account in the delineation of the allocation boundary?

868. The development of the site would reinforce the new Area of Separation (AoS) between Ullesthorpe and Magna Park, by respecting the proposed boundary of the AoS as recommended by the Area of Separation Study ([LAN-NLP 3](#)). The indicative masterplan for MP2 focuses built development outside the defined boundary of the AoS and proposes an extension to Bittesby Country Park, in combination these measures reinforce the AoS.
869. The topography of the site has been considered in the delineation of the AoS as evidenced by Figure A.19 and Figure A20 of the Area of Separation Study

(LAN-NLP 3). The boundary of the AoS takes in the slopes of the northern, most prominent, of the two valleys that cross east-west through the area.

Q6. Can the issue of congestion on the A5 be resolved within the lifetime of the Plan?

870. To avoid duplication please refer to the Council's response to Matter 4, Issue 2, question 6 on this issue.