Note on Site-specific Infrastructure Delivery Schedule

1. The Updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (HDC11) was published in September 2026 and accompanied by an updated IDP Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (HDC11A). This lists all of the infrastructure requirements associated with Local Plan growth by infrastructure type (transport, education, healthcare etc).

   Site-specific infrastructure requirements

2. The Panel have subsequently asked the Council to prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS), setting out the infrastructure requirements by site allocation. The updated IDS therefore includes an additional tab organised by settlement/size, as an aide to the examination, summarising the infrastructure requirements associated with individual site allocations as well as by settlement.

3. The site/ settlement tab is able to be filtered and searched by settlement, allocation reference, infrastructure type, funding method (s278/ developer contributions or 3rd party funding), delivery phasing and by prioritisation (integral, fundamental and beneficial). For each scheme the source of evidence is also provided. In this way, the site-specific requirements can be easily identified and understood in terms of their level of significance for each individual site.

4. Since the Inspectors' original request, a further action arose from the Matter 3 hearing on 11th November in relation to additional transport work- as set out in *HDC 25 – Note on Timescales for Additional Transport Work* on the examination website. The Systra Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highways) has now been refined and agreed with Leicestershire County Council and published as HDC35 and HDC34 The updated costs are shown in the latest IDS (dated 19.11.26).

5. HDC and LCC are working towards completing the following by 23 November as per this action:

   1. Agreed Statement addressing LCC's outstanding comments as far as possible; and

   2. Agreeing any additional proposed modifications to the Plan.

   Cumulative schemes

6. A number of the infrastructure schemes listed in the IDS are required to address the cumulative effects of growth, serving to mitigate the effects of more than 1 site allocation. This is particularly the case for transport, education, libraries and healthcare, where infrastructure tends to operate at a settlement level – serving a whole village or part of a town. In the case of transport mitigation, schemes have been designed to mitigate the impact of an increase in traffic flows arising from sites allocated in the Plan as a whole. So, whilst a site can be expected to increase traffic flows in its immediate vicinity, it may also increase flows in a number of different directions, depending on key attractors, with generally decreasing impacts the further is travelled from the site and therefore the more dispersed traffic flows become.

7. There is no robust single methodology at the plan-making stage by which to apportion the costs of infrastructure schemes which address cumulative impacts back to their individual sites. For example, in relation to transport, it is possible when using a transport model to identify the sources of all traffic that is flowing through a specific location or junction. However, when modelling the cumulative impact of a Local Plan, this means that potentially all proposed sites could have some element of traffic travelling through a junction or location of interest. This is illustrated by Table 5.5 in TRP_NLP2 (Harborough STIA) which presents the traffic flow associated with Harborough site allocations as a proportion of total traffic flow through junctions in the 2041 Preferred Scenario. This table highlights that if this were the sole method utilised to apportion contributions, a high number of sites would be contributing 0.1% of the cost of mitigation to multiple junctions.

8. This is clearly not a practical or proportionate way to secure contributions to off-site mitigation measures. The exact contribution towards improvements to the LHN could only be identified at planning application stage once the residual traffic impacts following the application of the vision-based approach, were known. A plan-making stage apportionment would be a notional, theoretical exercise and be likely to be misleading.

9. More generally, the exact contribution of each site to the infrastructure need for which the mitigation is required will be influenced by a number of factors; not all of which are currently known. This includes the timing and rate of delivery of the site compared with delivery of nearby sites and the capacity of relevant infrastructure at the time. In the case of education, for example, ED22 shows the need for an expansion to Kibworth Mead Academy, an existing secondary school likely to be impacted through the pupil yield arising from sites K1 in Kibworth and from site F1 in nearby Fleckney. However, as the IDS indicates, the exact way in

which this need will be met is not yet known. It may involve an expansion to the existing school or may involve a contribution to the proposed new secondary school at the cluster of sites MH1,2 and 3 North of Market Harborough. As such, the exact details of the mitigation, cost and therefore apportionment of the total estimated cost across K1 and F1 can only be known at planning application stage.

10. However, in relation to cumulative transport mitigation schemes identified and costed in HDC35, further analysis has been undertaken to attempt to apportion the costs of mitigation across the two principal development corridors (Lutterworth / A426 corridor and Oadby-Market Harborough / A6 corridor) (see appended Cost Apportionment Exercise). This analysis shows, particularly for the A6 corridor, that the majority of impacts and therefore costs can be attributed to the clusters of sites within the corridor. This is helpful in focusing costs to the sites with most significant impact and proportion of costs.

Table 1: Apportionment of Preliminary Scheme Design cost estimates by Site Clusters

Cluster Sites Contribution (£)			
Cluster Site Names	**Cluster Site Refs**	**Lutterworth Corridor**	**A6 Corridor**
Scraptoft, Thurnby & Bushby	**S1, S2 & TB1**	£6,369 (0.2%)	£667,125 (5.5%)
Oadby and Great Glen	**OA1 & GG1**	£74,341 (2.9%)	£5,904,892 (48.6%)
Market Harborough	**MH1, MH2 & MH3**	£103,452 (4.0%)	£3,441,469 (28.3%)
Magna Park	**MP1 & MP2**	£1,278,827 (49.7%)	£34,705 (0.3%)
	Apportioned Costs by Site Clusters	**£1,462,989 (57%)**	**£10,048,191 (83%)**
	Total Highway Mitigation Package	**£2,570,857**	**£12,158,013**

Viability

11. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment (January 2025 (INF-NLP3), Updated Local Plan Viability (September 2026) (HDC12) and Whole Plan Viability Assessment Update (October 2026) (HDC29) confirmed the viability of the Plan as a whole. Individual site assessments were undertaken for the following strategic sites:

    • Land South of Gartree Road Strategic Development Area: 4,000 units

    • Scraptoft East Land between Scraptoft and Bushby: 950 units

    • Market Harborough Cluster: 1,700 units

12. Each strategic site was found to be viable, albeit for OA1 Land South of Gartree Road the position was more nuanced, and the site was found to be 'marginally viable'.

13. A range of typology assessments were also undertaken and found to be viable. As such, the viability evidence confirms the overall viability of the Plan. It demonstrates that the viability of the Plan is not sensitive to the minor refinement of the costs of infrastructure including through the latest update of the Preliminary Scheme Design work and there is sufficient allowance in the WPVA to cover the known costs which are likely to fall on the developers of the allocated sites. The relationship between the revised infrastructure costs and the WPVA will be addressed in the addressed in the Viability Addendum to be provided on Monday 23 November 2026.

14. In those circumstances and in accordance with the Ministerial letter from Matthew Pennycook MP to the Chief Executive of the Planning Inspectorate on 15 July 2026 , the Council considers that appropriate evidence of infrastructure costs and the viability of the Plan as a whole has been demonstrated through appropriate evidence. Individual site-specific apportionment of cumulative infrastructure costs is not considered necessary in accordance with the Ministerial letter confirming that individual testing of sites is not required in order to confirm the viability of the Plan as a whole:

    'Assessing the viability of plans does not require individual testing of every site or assurance that individual sites are viable. Plan makers can use site typologies to determine viability at the plan making stage.'