

Matter 11: Implementation of the Plan

Whether the Plan's provision for Implementation and Monitoring is effective?

Policy IM01

Question 1

- 1.1.1. Implementation would rely on planning decisions, conditions, obligations, phased infrastructure and delivery partnerships. Those mechanisms exist: [DS05\(2\)-\(3\), p.41/PDF p.42](#) expressly provides for site mitigation and phasing through conditions and section 106/278 agreements. The issue is whether the necessary interventions can actually be delivered within the housing programme, not whether powers exist to require them.
- 1.1.2. There is some delivery evidence for SA02. [HDC4C, paragraphs 1.4-1.5, p.5](#) identifies the master-developer partnership and New Homes Accelerator support. However, it describes access to potential funding, not an awarded infrastructure grant; [paragraphs 4.1-4.4, p.11](#) support allocation subject to continuing technical work. On 13 October, [LCC Cabinet, item 8\(c\)-\(d\)](#) confirmed unresolved transport concerns and outstanding education/viability matters.
- 1.1.3. HDC should demonstrate one reconciled programme linking the strategic allocations' housing phases to necessary infrastructure, responsible providers, funding status, cross-boundary dependencies and securing mechanisms. This should build on the IDP, not duplicate it. A condition preventing occupation until infrastructure arrives protects against premature development; it does not establish when that infrastructure will arrive. The Panel needs the latter evidence to find the programme effective. [Reg19 sections 2.2 and 4.2, pp.7 and 23/PDF pp.11 and 27.](#)

Question 2

- 1.1.4. The Authority Monitoring Report is an appropriate reporting mechanism, but IM01 does not sufficiently define the decision that follows a warning. [IM01\(1\)-\(2\)\(d\), pp.153-154/PDF pp.154-155](#) links reporting to Appendix 3 and review following significant and persistent housing

shortfalls. It leaves the magnitude and duration of those shortfalls undefined, while making commencement depend on the conclusion of a review. That risks identifying failure without a predictable intervention date, therefore not effective.

- 1.1.5. The reporting duty already requires reasons for non-implementation and any intended corrective steps: [2012 Regulations, regulation 34\(2\), saved version](#), preserved for legacy plans by [SI 2026/169, Schedule 1 paragraph 4\(6\)\(e\), p.8](#). Reporting is therefore not the missing power; a timely, accountable response is the missing link.
- 1.1.6. IM01 should require annual publication of progress against the trajectory and critical infrastructure milestones, defined escalation thresholds, named responsibility and a dated corrective-action decision. A forecast missed dependency should prompt intervention before completed-housing figures disclose the resulting shortfall. The response should distinguish delivery measures available immediately from changes requiring the statutory plan-making process. An AMR cannot itself amend allocations or the housing requirement. [Reg19 section 4.2, p.23/PDF p.27](#).

Question 3

- 1.1.7. The indicators are relevant but incomplete as measures of successful delivery. [Appendix 3, pp.174-176/PDF pp.175-177](#) includes housing completions, five-year supply, air-quality trends, biodiversity gains, infrastructure delivery against the IDP and contribution receipts. The proposed [MM28.1, p.43/PDF p.44](#) adds housing contingency. STNT does not suggest that monitoring is absent.
- 1.1.8. The weakness is the link between recorded activity and usable capacity. Money received is not infrastructure commissioned; a permitted health facility is not an operating service; counting health assessments does not establish that their mitigation occurred. For critical dependencies, add the relevant baseline, target, delivery date, responsible body and action threshold. Report capacity available before the associated occupation phase: school places, operational transport services and network performance, water/sewerage readiness, and

secured drainage maintenance and environmental mitigation. Use provider evidence, without purporting to make HDC control every service or imposing identical measures on every site.

- 1.1.9. The application evidence demonstrates why timing matters. The Monitor and Manage Principles Document (paragraphs 6.3-6.8) submitted with the recent outline planning application for the LSGR (HDC ref: 26/01350) proposes annual monitoring, but places its suggested remedial-fund review after the primary street opens, with a review at 2,000 dwellings if the street opens by 1,595. These are whole cross-boundary development figures, not Harborough's allocation. The detailed specification remains to be agreed. HDC should show how earlier adverse outcomes trigger funded corrective action and how those results feed the Plan's monitoring. End-state success must not conceal an inadequately serviced intermediate phase. [Reg19 section 8.1.7, p.36/PDF p.40](#).

Question 4

- 1.1.10. Not demonstrably. HDC provides resilience measures: varied sites, housing contingency and review triggers. Its [Housing Numbers Topic Paper, paragraphs 6.5-6.7, p.11](#) identifies 2,142 homes' contingency, approximately 16%, and argues that IM01 permits timely intervention. Those measures do not establish that simultaneous delays to infrastructure-dependent sites can be absorbed when homes are needed.
- 1.1.11. There is a material conflict to resolve. [HDC11, section 2, PDF pp.8-9](#) concludes that no infrastructure constraint would prevent or materially prejudice the growth strategy. LCC's later adopted position, identified in Question 1, retains unresolved transport, education and viability concerns. Monitoring cannot reconcile that disagreement retrospectively.
- 1.1.12. Test the trajectory against justified combinations of slower strategic-site delivery, delayed shared infrastructure and constrained contributions, identifying the homes and years affected and the available response. Do not count the same contingency in full both as protection against delayed supply and as provision for additional unmet need. [NPPF paragraphs 69 and](#)

[74, pp.19-21](#) require phase-appropriate evidence, not complete certainty over every later infrastructure item.

- 1.1.13. STNT maintains deletion of SA02 because the current unresolved delivery case is not cured by promising future review. Retention must be supported by a realistic, policy-compliant phasing and mitigation case; a general contingency allowance is not evidence of that site's deliverability. This is a cumulative implementation objection, not a claim that every outstanding detail independently requires deletion. [Reg19 section 4.1, pp.17-20/PDF pp.21-24](#).

Question 5

- 1.1.14. The evidence reviewed does not demonstrate a credible programme for a further legacy review. With [Stage 2 hearings scheduled for November \(ID10, paragraph 2, p.1\)](#), the policy should not rely on preparing and submitting another legacy plan by 31 December 2026. That is the ordinary submission cut-off, not a deadline for completing this examination or adopting this Plan; a later date requires a specific Secretary of State direction under [SI 2026/169, Schedule 1 paragraphs 4\(4\)-\(6\), pp.7-8](#).
- 1.1.15. Five years is an outer commencement limit, not a required waiting period. For a qualifying legacy plan submitted by the cut-off and subsequently adopted, [SI 2026/186, Schedule 3 paragraphs 5-7, p.78](#) requires the notice of intention by four years eight months and Gateway 1 self-assessment by five years after adoption, subject to the specified notice/scoping interval.
- 1.1.16. [IM01\(2\), p.153/PDF p.154](#) already anticipates equivalent subsequent regulations, but that general fallback does not identify which new statutory milestone constitutes commencement. Replace the Regulation 18-led formulation with explicit notice, scoping, Gateway 1, submission and adoption milestones, preserving a defined earlier response to an evidenced trigger. Reconcile the policy's 30-month submission promise with the new process rather than merely changing terminology. The Plan must offer an implementable response, not a review

commitment dependent on a route that may no longer be available. [Reg19 section 2.2, p.7/PDF p.11.](#)

Question 6

- 1.1.17. Only if the commitment identifies a lawful route and a coherent resulting plan. The one-plan rule does not prohibit every focused revision. [Section 15C\(2\)](#) must be read with [section 15GA\(1\) and \(7\)](#), which expressly permit revision of a local plan; [regulation 41 of SI 2026/186, p.36](#) applies the plan-making regulations to that revision.
- 1.1.18. IM01 must distinguish transition from this legacy Plan to the first new-system local plan from any subsequent revision under that system. Saved legacy documents cease to have effect when the new-system plan is adopted: [SI 2026/169, Schedule 1 paragraph 4\(8\), p.8](#). A focused scope may be possible, but it cannot be assumed to preserve a freestanding legacy partial-update route after the cut-off. Specify the lawful process, timetable and resulting coherent policy framework. This corrects the effectiveness of the promised remedy; section 15C alone is not a ground for deleting SA02. [Reg19 sections 2.2 and 4.3, pp.7 and 23/PDF pp.11 and 27.](#)

Question 7

- 1.1.19. Not by itself. A review commitment can respond to subsequently established need; it does not demonstrate that the required homes will be delivered by 2041. The [City/HDC Statement of Common Ground, paragraphs 4.7-4.15, pp.4-5](#) distinguishes the agreed 1,968 homes for 2020-2036 from disputed provision for 2036-2041. HDC considers a further quantified requirement insufficiently established under this Plan's framework. STNT does not import a later-NPPF housing figure into this examination.
- 1.1.20. The trigger is also disputed. [Paragraphs 4.18-4.21, p.7](#) record Leicester City's concern about waiting for another authority's Regulation 19 plan and its request for review upon adoption; HDC had not agreed that approach. There is an additional timing ambiguity: [IM01\(2\)\(b\), pp.153-154/PDF pp.154-155](#) combines a twelve-month trigger with commencement within six

months, whereas supporting paragraph 9.5 says review within twelve months. Resolve that discrepancy and the new-system milestones before relying on the safeguard.

- 1.1.21. [MM26.1, p.42/PDF p.43](#) recognises that contingency could contribute to unmet need, but neither assigns a quantity nor demonstrates its delivery in the relevant years. Require a transparent account of the need properly established for this examination, agreed responsibilities, realistic delivery timing and the contingency remaining after other risks. Future changes can enter a lawful review; unresolved strategic matters material to this Plan cannot simply be postponed, applying [NPPF paragraph 35\(c\), p.12](#).
- 1.1.22. An unquantified future claim on headroom is therefore not sufficient justification for retaining SA02. Its justification and deliverability must be established on their own evidence. STNT's request remains deletion, not the automatic addition of allocations to meet an unverified figure. [Reg19 sections 2.1 and 4.3, pp.6-7 and 23/PDF pp.10-11 and 27](#).