# Examination of the Harborough Local Plan 2020-2041

## Stage 2 Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

Written Statement by Harborough District Council

## MATTER 6: Strategic Infrastructure Addendum ***24 November 2026***

This Addendum updates the Council's Matter 6 Statement dated October 2026 in respect of the following updates to Local Plan evidence:

- **HDC33: HDC and OWBC Education Delivery Strategy - Delivery Mechanisms - November 2026** (supplements HDC18)
- **HDC34: Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) 191126 Issue** (supersedes HDC13)
- **HDC35: Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) Addendum Report 191126 Issue** (supersedes HDC13)
- **HDC46: Updated IDS including costs from Preliminary Scheme Design (updated HDC34 and HDC35)** (supersedes HDC11A)
- **Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** (supplements HDC29)

**HDC33: HDC and OWBC Education Delivery Strategy - Delivery Mechanisms - November 2026** (supplements HDC18)

The previously published Education Delivery Strategy (HDC18) undertakes an assessment of the education requirements arising from Local Plan growth. The pupil yield arising from Local Plan growth and the proposed mitigation in terms of education provision are identified for each Local Plan allocation.

The Education Delivery Strategy – Delivery Mechanisms Report, November 2026 (HDC33) supplements this and provides further details in terms of the costings of the educational requirements and makes proposals in respect of their delivery mechanisms. HDC33 does not however amend the educational provision requirements set out in HDC18. In this respect, no further Modifications to policy are required.

**HDC34: Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) 191126 Issue** (supersedes HDCHDC13) and **HDC35: Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) Addendum Report 191126 Issue** (supersedes HDCHDC13)

This Addendum should be read alongside the Addendum to Matter 10, issue 1 Statement for a summary of the changes to HDC 13 and their implications.

**HDC46: Updated IDS including costs from Preliminary Scheme Design (updated HDC34 and HDC35)** (supersedes HDC11A)

The updated IDS includes provides site-specific infrastructure requirements on an additional tab to the previously published IDS (HDC11A). This is organised by settlement/size, as an aide to the examination, summarising the infrastructure requirements associated with individual site allocations as well as by settlement. 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.

The updated IDS includes the final updated transport mitigation costs from the Preliminary Scheme Design work (HDC34).

**Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** (supplements HDC29)

This updates the viability appraisals for the following strategic sites:

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

• Scraptoft East Land between Scraptoft and Bushby:

• Market Harborough Cluster: 950 units 1,700 units

These updated assessments consider the viability implications of updated infrastructure costs arising from HDC46 and HDC46B. In respect of Land South of Gartree Road, the assessment also reflects an adjustment of costs from HDC33 to exclude cost which relate to sites entirely outside of Harborough District, but for which education requirements will be met on land within the Land South of Gartree Road allocation. The results of this exercise can be found at Table 2.2 of the Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum (November 2026). The latest IDS and cumulative transport assumption costs used can be found at Table 3.2 of the assessment.

The assessment results can be found at Table 3.3. The updated appraisals indicate the Scraptoft East (S1) and Market Harborough Cluster (MH1,2&3) sites to be viable at 40% affordable housing provision, with the inclusion of the updated IDS and cumulative transport mitigation costs. In relation to Land South of Gartree Road, the conclusion remains unchanged with the site identified as marginally viable at 35% affordable housing.

**Amendments to Matter 6 Statement following updates to local Plan evidence (listed above)**

This Addendum should be read alongside the Matter 6 Hearing Statement. The following text outlines changes to the original Matter 6 Statement arising from the above updates to local Plan evidence. Additional text is shown as **bold and underlined**. Deleted text is shown as ~~strikethrough~~.

**Matter 6, Issue 1, Question 10**

44. Yes. The Council considers that INF-NLP2 and, subsequently, HDC11 provide an appropriate and sufficiently detailed framework for identifying the infrastructure required to support the growth proposed in the Plan and its delivery over the Plan period**.** HDC11 updates the earlier IDP to reflect the submitted Plan, the latest infrastructure evidence and the further work undertaken during the examination process. HDC11 is supported by the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (HDC11A **now updated by HDC46**)**,** which provides the more detailed project-level information.

48. The updated IDP has been informed by further evidence produced during the examination process. In particular, the transport evidence in HDC10, HDC13 **(now updated in** HDC34**)**, HDC14 and HDC19, the Education Delivery Strategy in HDC18 **(now updated in** HDC33**)**, and the updated viability evidence in HDC12 **(now updated in Viability Assessment: Strategic Site Appraisals Addendum, November 2026)** provide further detail on infrastructure need, mitigation and cost. The September 2026 Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (HDC11A **(now updated in HDC46)** brings the resulting requirements together.

49. The Council considers that HDC11 and HDC11A **(now updated in HDC46)** provide sufficient clarity on the infrastructure necessary to support the Plan as a whole, while the combination of DS05, the individual site allocation policies and the subsequent planning application process provides the necessary mechanism for identifying, costing, securing and phasing site-specific infrastructure**.** This is consistent with the Council's approach that infrastructure requirements should be identified and evidenced at plan-making stage, while detailed requirements and delivery triggers can appropriately be refined as individual sites progress through planning and detailed design.

**Matter 6, Issue 1, Question 11**

53. The Education Delivery Strategy (EDS) [HDC 18] **(now supplemented by** HDC33**)** shows only minor changes in education provision. As such, there are no significant implications for policy wording. **Educational requirements are set out in HDC18 and their estimated costs are set out in HDC33. The two papers supplement each other and should be read together.**

**54.** The EDS provides further detailed modelling, resulting in the following minor amendments to the requirements, which have been summarised in the table

below for clarity. **HDC33 does not introduce any further amendments to educational requirements.**

**Matter 6, Issue 1, Question 14**

80. The evidence follows a clear two-stage approach. HDC19 - The Joint Transport Evidence (JTE) provides the strategic assessment of cumulative impacts and identifies potential mitigation. The JTE then provides budget cost estimates and an apportionment methodology for the strategic mitigation measures. HDC14 explains how this evidence has been applied to Harborough growth. The Council subsequently commissioned HDC13 **(now superseded by HDC 34)** to undertake a more detailed assessment of the local highway measures, including preliminary designs and cost estimates, to test their deliverability and refine the mitigation package.

81. The approach is therefore not simply based on identifying highway capacity problems and requiring developers to resolve them at application stage. The Plan evidence identifies the strategic transport impacts and the infrastructure required to mitigate them, with costs incorporated into the Council's infrastructure and viability work. For example, HDC14 identifies an apportioned JTE off-site highway mitigation package of approximately £4.52 million, while the subsequent preliminary scheme design identifies a wider local highway mitigation package of ~~up to approximately £8.22 million~~ **(now £14,728,870 as updated in HDC34),** subject to the preliminary nature of the designs and cost estimates.

83. The Transport Topic Paper (Part 2) draws the evidence together**.** HDC14 provides a consolidated explanation of the methodology, identifies the principal source documents and brings together the strategic and local highway evidence. The underlying JTE costing report provides the detailed cost and apportionment tables, while HDC13 **(now superseded by HDC34)** provides the more detailed scheme-level information. The IDP then provides the corresponding infrastructure delivery information.

84. There has been extensive engagement with the relevant highway authorities. The JTE was prepared as joint transport evidence with the support of Leicestershire County Council, and the mitigation packages were developed through that process. HDC14 confirms that the modelling and assessment parameters used for HDC13 **(now superseded by HDC34)** are aligned with the JTE evidence agreed by LCC.

**85.** The Council acknowledges that HDC13 had not been subject to LCC's full review by the date of publication of HDC14. **Since this time, the Council**

**and the LTA have carried out an iterative review and a Statement of Common Ground (23 Nov 2026) (HDC44) confirms the LTA is content this evidence is fit for purpose and proportionate to the plan-making stage. The updated Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) report dated 19 Nov 2026 that the LTA is content with has been published (HDC34). An addendum (HDC35) summarises the iterative process and identifies where amendments have been carried out.** ~~The Council has nevertheless continued to work with LCC and has identified that it may be necessary to respond to LCC's comments.~~ This is consistent with the August 2026 Statement of Common Ground (HDC9), which records the ongoing joint work between HDC and LCC and the agreed transport policy modifications.

**Matter 6, Issue 1, Question 15**

89. HDC10 sets out the overall transport strategy and the relationship between the spatial strategy, accessibility and the transport network. HDC14 brings together and updates this evidence, including the assessment of the Plan's cumulative impacts. HDC19 provides the updated Joint Transport Evidence, including the costing and apportionment of strategic mitigation measures, while HDC13 (now superseded by **(HDC34)** develops the principal local highway interventions through preliminary design and costing. This work, undertaken collaboratively with Leicestershire County Council, provides a more developed understanding of the mitigation required and how it can be delivered and funded.

**90.** The later evidence serves to confirm the Plan's chosen growth strategy and its deliverability. It provides greater certainty regarding the nature, scope and cost of measures that had previously been identified at a more strategic level. ~~The revised highway costings are lower than previously estimated, providing a more favourable basis for assessing infrastructure requirements and increasing confidence in potential deliverability.~~ **HDC34 increases the overall cost of the LRN mitigation package. This is due to the costing methodology agreed with Leicestershire County Council as Highway Authority.**

91. The revised highway costings have been incorporated into ~~HDC12 *Updated Local Plan Viability*~~ the **Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** which assesses the cumulative effect of infrastructure and policy requirements and provides the basis for considering they can be accommodated within development viability. **The updated viability assessment of each of the three strategic sites / site clusters remain unchanged from the previous assessment conclusions; namely**

**Scraptoft East (S1) and the Market Harborough cluster (MH1,2 and 3) remain viable with provision for 40% affordable housing and Land South of Gartree Road remains marginally viable at 35% affordable housing.** The Plan is assessed against the latest available evidence, rather than relying on earlier cost estimates. The refinement of transport costs demonstrates that the cumulative infrastructure requirements can reasonably be funded by the development identified in the Plan.

92. The Council has not treated the Reg 19 cost estimates as fixed where better evidence has subsequently become available. The transport evidence has been refined as would be expected as preliminary schemes are developed and more robust cost information becomes available. HDC19 and ~~HDC13~~ **HDC34** therefore provide the most up to date and robust basis for assessing the infrastructure requirements.

**Matter 6, Issue 1, Question 16**

98. This evidence is supported by the Updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (HDC11 and HDC~~11A~~**46**)**.** These documents identify the infrastructure required to support planned growth, its indicative cost, delivery responsibility, anticipated funding sources and, where available, its relationship with development phasing. The IDP therefore provides the link between the transport evidence and the practical delivery of infrastructure alongside the allocated sites.

101. The evidence also recognises the cumulative interaction between the strategic sites. The impacts of individual sites cannot be considered solely on a site-by-site basis. HDC19 provides the strategic cumulative assessment and cost apportionment, while ~~HDC13~~ **HDC34** tests the principal local highway measures in greater detail. This provides a basis for ensuring that the costs of strategic mitigation are appropriately attributed to the development generating the need, rather than leaving cumulative impacts to be addressed retrospectively.

103. The evidence has been developed collaboratively with Leicestershire County Council as the relevant local highway authority. HDC9 **and updated by HDC44** records the position reached between HDC and LCC on the transport evidence and ~~the continuing work to resolve detailed matters~~ **confirms that LCC no longer maintains its previous objection that the Plan must be supported by a separate, fully developed transport strategy or the Topic Paper rewritten to be the equivalent of such.** The subsequent transport evidence has further refined the mitigation

requirements and associated costs. The Council therefore considers that there is an appropriate evidence base and delivery framework for taking the strategic sites forward.

**Matter 6, Issue 2, Question 1**

107. The October 2026 Addendum **and Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026**, prepared by Aspinall Verdi and appended to this Hearing Statement 6, updates the viability evidence to reflect revised infrastructure requirements and costs, including those identified through the updated IDS [HDC~~11a~~**46**] **in respect of the strategic site assessments**. It also considers the implications of the updated national planning policy context. The assessment has been prepared having regard to the NPPF applicable to the examination and the relevant transitional arrangements.

108. The VA and subsequent addenda provide an appropriate evidence base for assessing whether the emerging Plan's policy requirements are justified and deliverable. The assessments consider the cumulative impact of policy requirements, infrastructure costs and other development costs on viability, rather than treating individual requirements in isolation. The October 2026 Addendum **and Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** updates the evidence to reflect revised infrastructure requirements and costs and assesses their implications for the viability of the Plan and its strategic allocations.

114. The October 2026 Addendum **and Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** updates the viability evidence to reflect the revised infrastructure requirements identified through the updated IDS [HDC~~11a~~**46**]. Strategic infrastructure costs are therefore reflected in the updated viability evidence, while site-specific obligations will continue to be determined through the development management process, having regard to the impacts and requirements of individual proposals. The Council's approach distinguishes between costs already incorporated into the Plan's infrastructure assumptions and additional site-specific obligations, avoiding double counting.

**Matter 6, Issue 2, Question 4**

127. The January 2025 VA (INF-NLP3) and the October 2026 addendum **and Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** have demonstrated that the integral and fundamental infrastructure outline in the IDS (HDC~~11a~~**46**) is viable without other funding sources, however the Council recognises that external funding can help

address infrastructure funding gaps and support the delivery of planned growth. In relation to Land South of Gartree Road (OA1), the site's designation as a Government Accelerator Site provides a specific focus for engagement with government to accelerate housing delivery and address infrastructure constraints. Homes England is developing a business case for the infrastructure required to support LSGR, including education provision. This represents active work to establish the infrastructure requirements and explore appropriate funding solutions; it should not, however, be interpreted as confirmation that funding has been awarded.

**Matter 6, Issue 2, Question 5**

133. To address this, Aspinall Verdi has prepared the further addendum report, dated October 2026 **and Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026**, which is appended to this Hearing Statement. 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. The updated viability position of the strategic allocations **is set out at Table 3.3 of Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026**.

134. The updated assessment**s** confirm~~s~~ that the Plan remains viable at 40% affordable housing for non-strategic housing development, having regard to the geographical distribution of the proposed allocations. It also confirms that Scraptoft East (S1) and the Market Harborough Cluster (MH1, MH2 and MH3) remain viable at 40% affordable housing, taking account of the updated infrastructure requirements. **This conclusion remains unchanged within Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026, which takes account of HDC46 and HDC46B.**

**135.** In relation to LSGR (OA1), the January 2025 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. **This conclusion remains unchanged in the Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026.**

**136.** Overall, the October 2026 Addendum and **the Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** provide the further assessment requested by the Panel and demonstrates that the Plan's viability conclusions have been reviewed in the light of updated infrastructure requirements and other relevant assumptions **(including HDC46)**. The evidence supports the retention of the 40% affordable housing requirement for non-strategic development and for S1 and MH1–MH3, while identifying a revised, evidence-based approach for LSGR/OA1. The Council considers that the strategy of the Plan remains justified, subject to the proposed refinement of the affordable housing requirement for LSGR (OA1).

**Matter 6, Issue 2, Question 6**

140. In relation to transport, the IDP (Feb 2025) [INF-NLP1] and IDP (March 2026) [INF-NLP2] contained transport infrastructure and costs based on a draft version of the Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment (HSTIA). This was not intended. The IDP therefore included schemes and costs that did not align with the evidence in the HSTIA [TRP-NLP2]. The updated IDP [HDC11 and ~~HDC11A~~**HDC46**] corrects this, so the IDS **HDC46** aligns with the published HSTIA evidence [TRP-NLP2]. These are factual changes to align the public transport and walking and cycling measures in the IDP with the published evidence, rather than changes to the infrastructure package itself as identified in the HSTIA. This is why the IDP update appears to have so many changes, including to costs etc (e.g. see HDC11 table 1 and 3).

141. For the avoidance of doubt, all of the walking and cycling, public transport and travel planning measures identified in Table 4.2, Table 4.4 and Table 4.6 of the HSTIA [TRP-NLP2] are correctly included in the updated IDP and identified as 'integral' [HDC11A] **HDC46**. This approach ensures the impacts of development are mitigated and provide genuine travel choice as far as possible. This is consistent with the approach set out in the Transport Topic Paper (Part 2) [HDC14] – see para 5.32 for active travel (i.e. walking and cycling) and para 5.49 for public transport (i.e. buses and travel planning) which explain these HSTIA measures are 'integral' to the delivery of the plan in the updated IDP because they:

- Are directly related to proposed site allocations;
- Provide access between the site and key destinations (e.g. town centres, schools, shops etc.).
- The delivery of sustainable transport is strongly supported by national and local policy, and

- They help to ensure travel choice and a degree of modal shift, as well as, potential site-specific transport visions.

142. Beyond these factual changes to the IDP, the only element of the HSTIA mitigation that has been removed in the IDP update is the 'Junction Improvement Measures' in Leicestershire as explained on page 18 of the Transport Topic Paper (Part 2) [HDC14]. Paragraph 5.71 of the Transport Topic Paper (Part 2) explains the off-site road improvement measures have been removed from the updated IDP as they have been superseded by the completion of the JTE and the subsequent Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) which refines the highway mitigation package [~~HDC13~~] **HDC34**.

143. The removal of the HSTIA off site highway mitigation package as explained on P.18 of the Transport Topic Paper (Part 2) and replacing it with the highway schemes from the Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) (~~HDC13~~ **HDC34** Appendix C) does not impact the sustainable transport mitigation package or the plans ability to encourage modal shift.

144. The removal of the HSTIA off site highway mitigation package as explained on P.18 of the Transport Topic Paper (Part 2) and replacing it with the highway schemes from the Preliminary Scheme Design (Local Highway) (~~HDC13~~ **HDC34** Appendix C) does not impact the sustainable transport mitigation package or the plans ability to encourage modal shift.

**Matter 6, Issue 2, Question 7**

148. For Land South of Gartree Road (LSGR, OA1), the October 2026 Addendum and **the Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** reflects updated infrastructure requirements, particularly education provision, and revised market values and development costs. It identifies 35% affordable housing as the maximum level supportable on a marginally viable basis, compared with 40% in the January 2025 WPVA. The Council proposes a 35% target and a 25% policy floor, requiring provision to be as close to the target as viability permits. This evidence-led adjustment establishes a realistic and deliverable requirement while maximising affordable housing provision.

**Matter 6, Issue 2, Question 8**

150. The Council recognises that the delivery of the Plan's strategy depends on the timely provision of the infrastructure necessary to support planned

growth, including transport infrastructure and mitigation of cumulative and cross-boundary impacts. The updated IDP evidence (HDC11 and HDC~~11a~~ **HDC46**) identifies and prioritises the infrastructure required to support the Plan, while the October 2026 VA Addendum demonstrates that the infrastructure identified as fundamental and integral to its delivery, including transport infrastructure, is viable. Taken together, this provides a robust evidence base and a reasonable basis for concluding that the Plan's infrastructure requirements can be funded and delivered over the Plan period as a whole.

**Matter 6, Issue 2, Question 9**

154. The Council recognises that infrastructure requirements, costs and funding arrangements may evolve over the lifetime of the Plan. The evidence has therefore been reviewed to take account of updated infrastructure requirements, particularly in relation to transport and education provision, and their implications for development viability. The viability implications review is set out in the October 2026 Addendum report **and the Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** appended to this Hearing Statement.

159. In summary the Council considers that the Plan provides a sound and proportionate framework for ensuring that infrastructure requirements are addressed alongside planned growth and that development can be delivered sustainably. The October 2026 Addendum report **and the Viability Assessment: Cumulative Transport Cost Viability Addendum, November 2026** validate that the viability implications of updated infrastructure costs have been considered and that the Plan's policy approach remains deliverable overall, subject to the proposed refinement of the affordable housing requirement for OA1. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers, delivery partners and site promoters to support timely infrastructure provision and to maximise opportunities for securing the funding necessary to deliver the Plan's growth strategy.