



Submission Harbourough Local Plan 2020-2041

Infrastructure Topic Paper

April 2026

Contents

1. Purpose and Structure.....	3
2. Background to the Topic	4
3. Overall Approach to Infrastructure Planning	5
4. Key Evidence Studies - The IDP & Associated Evidence	9
5. Consultation Feedback - Shaping An Infrastructure Led Approach.....	12
6. Evolution of Infrastructure Planning Approach.....	15
7. Evolution of Policy.....	17
8. Ongoing Infrastructure Monitoring Arrangements	18
9. Next Steps & Conclusions.....	18

1. Purpose and Structure

- 1.1 This Topic Paper supports the submission of the Harborough Local Plan (2020–2041) and explains how infrastructure evidence has informed, and continues to inform, the spatial strategy, policies, and site allocations. It sits within a wider suite of supporting documents and is intended to act as the bridge between the technical evidence base and the policies of the Local Plan, demonstrating the reasoning and justification behind the Council’s approach.
- 1.2 The paper is informed primarily by infrastructure planning work that has culminated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and associated Infrastructure Schedule, which together form a key part of the Local Plan evidence base. The IDP identifies infrastructure needs arising from the proposed development strategy and sets out how these requirements are expected to be delivered in alignment with national policy, local evidence, and consultation with infrastructure providers. This evidence also underpins the justification for infrastructure-related policies within the Submission Local Plan and should be read alongside other core documents, including the Local Plan Viability Assessment and Strategic Transport Assessment and modelling, as well as Infrastructure Funding Statements.
- 1.3 The purpose of this Topic Paper is to provide background and interpretation of infrastructure planning as it relates to the spatial strategy of the Submission Local Plan. It does not contain detail on specific policies, proposals, or site allocations. Instead, it explains how the Council has applied technical evidence, statutory consultee advice, and national planning policy to shape infrastructure policies and support the delivery of sustainable growth. In doing so, it avoids duplicating the detailed technical analysis contained elsewhere in the evidence base and instead focuses on signposting and contextualising that work.
- 1.4 This Topic Paper is one of a number produced by Harborough District Council to support the Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan. Collectively, these documents provide transparency and a clear audit trail of how the Plan has been prepared. Alongside the Duty to Cooperate Statement, Statements of Common Ground, and the Consultation Statement, this Topic Paper contributes to the overall evidence base submitted for independent examination.
- 1.5 The infrastructure matters addressed in this topic paper relate primarily to the following Local Plan policies:
 - Policy DS05: Development Strategy – Supporting Strategic Infrastructure
 - Policy SA01: Site Allocations
 - Policy SA02: Site Allocation Schedule
 - Policy SA02: Land South of Gartree Road SDA
 - Policy SA03: North of Market Harborough
 - Policy SA04: Scraftoft East

1.6 The Topic Paper is structured as follows:

- Background to the Topic
- Overall approach to Infrastructure Planning
- Key Evidence Studies (including the IDP and associated evidence)
- Consultation feedback – Shaping and Infrastructure Led Approach
- Evolution of Infrastructure Planning Approach
- Evolution of Policy
- Ongoing Infrastructure Monitoring Arrangements
- Next Steps and Conclusion.

2. Background to the Topic

2.1 Harborough District is characterised by a dispersed rural settlement pattern, with particular growth pressures focused on Market Harborough, Lutterworth and settlements close to the urban area of Leicester. Existing infrastructure constraints include limited highway capacity on key corridors (notably the A6), pressure on primary healthcare provision, restricted secondary school capacity in growth areas, and wastewater treatment limitations.

2.2 For the purposes of this Topic Paper, infrastructure includes any structure, building, system, facility or provision required to support the social and economic function and overall wellbeing of the area. This encompasses (but is not limited to):

- Highways, public transport, footways and cycleways;
- Education, childcare and healthcare facilities;
- Drainage, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and flood protection;
- utilities, water and communications;
- Waste recycling facilities;
- Emergency services; sports, leisure and recreation provision;
- Community, social and cultural facilities (including public art); and
- Green and blue infrastructure, including open space.

2.3 Growth places additional demand on both existing and planned infrastructure. Evidence from relevant infrastructure providers, including Leicestershire County Council, Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board, Anglian Water and Severn Trent Water indicates that, in some parts of the District, there is currently limited or no spare capacity to accommodate this growth.

2.4 Accordingly, all new development will be expected to contribute to the provision, improvement and expansion of infrastructure necessary to meet the needs it generates. This may include the delivery of new, expanded or co-located facilities, and will be secured through a combination of mechanisms, including financial contributions, on-site provision (including land and/or built development), and off-site capacity improvement works, as appropriate. Infrastructure may also be supported

through external funding sources, including national programmes for strategic or large-scale provision.

- 2.5 Within this Topic Paper, transport infrastructure is addressed in terms of the overall approach. A more detailed Transport Topic Paper is being prepared in collaboration with Leicestershire County Council to address this aspect in greater depth.

3. Overall Approach to Infrastructure Planning

National Policy

- 3.1 The Submission Local Plan (2020–2041) is being tested against the December 2023 NPPF, with consideration of the December 2024 transitional arrangements. The NPPF requires that Local Plans are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, including in relation to the approach taken to infrastructure planning and delivery. The NPPF embeds infrastructure requirements across plan-making policy rather than treating it as a standalone theme. The most relevant provisions for infrastructure planning are set out in Section 3 (Plan-making), particularly paragraphs 20, 31 and 34.
- 3.2 Paragraph 20 establishes the core requirement that strategic policies must plan positively for infrastructure as part of the spatial strategy, ensuring provision is made for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply and wastewater, flood risk management, minerals and energy infrastructure. This requires that growth is planned in tandem with the infrastructure necessary to support it, rather than infrastructure being considered after development is allocated.
- 3.3 Paragraph 20 also requires that infrastructure considerations are embedded within spatial strategy decisions, ensuring that the scale and location of development are aligned with infrastructure capacity and constraints, and that infrastructure forms part of an integrated and sustainable pattern of growth.
- 3.4 Paragraph 31 requires that local plans are supported by a robust and proportionate evidence base. In infrastructure terms, this includes demonstrating that infrastructure requirements arising from planned growth are identified, assessed, and capable of being delivered within the plan period. IDPs are used to provide this evidence, particularly in demonstrating capacity, constraints, and delivery mechanisms across infrastructure sectors.
- 3.5 Paragraph 34 requires plans to clearly set out expected developer contributions and delivery mechanisms, including Section 106 obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), ensuring that infrastructure requirements are properly linked to viability and do not undermine the deliverability of the plan.
- 3.6 Across the NPPF, there is a consistent requirement that infrastructure provision must be realistic, deliverable and supported by appropriate funding and implementation mechanisms. This includes ensuring that infrastructure assumptions are viable, that

delivery is achievable over the plan period, and that infrastructure is not assumed without clear responsibility or funding pathways.

- 3.7 In addition, national policy requires alignment with statutory infrastructure providers and relevant national frameworks, including highways authorities, utilities providers and environmental regulators. Early and ongoing engagement with infrastructure providers is therefore an essential element of sound plan preparation and is critical in identifying infrastructure capacity, constraints and investment requirements.
- 3.8 The NPPF also requires infrastructure planning to support wider policy objectives, including climate change mitigation and adaptation, flood risk management, sustainable water and energy systems, and the provision of green infrastructure networks.
- 3.9 PPG reinforces these requirements. It emphasises that plan-making authorities must work collaboratively with infrastructure providers and stakeholders at an early stage to identify infrastructure deficits and requirements, assess infrastructure capacity, and determine how deficiencies will be addressed. It also advises that authorities should use available evidence to inform Infrastructure Funding Statements, which demonstrate anticipated funding from developer contributions and how such funding will be used to support infrastructure delivery across the plan period.
- 3.10 Where plans propose significant growth, such as new settlements or major urban extensions, national policy recognises that infrastructure certainty may not be fully established at the plan-making stage. However, it requires that authorities demonstrate there is a reasonable prospect that necessary infrastructure can be delivered within the plan period.

Local Policy Interpretation - Approach to Preparing The Harborough IDP

- 3.11 The Harborough IDP (Reference INF-NLP 1: [Infrastructure Delivery Plan Feb 2025](#) & INF-NLP 2: [Infrastructure Delivery Plan March 2026](#) in the examination library) provides a comprehensive overview of the infrastructure required to support the planned growth set out in the Submission Local Plan.
- 3.12 As far has been practically possible infrastructure needs have been spatially aligned with proposed development sites and strategic allocations, showing how infrastructure requirements vary across the Local Plan area. It also highlights uncertainties and gaps in evidence that could lead to potential delivery risks. These issues will be managed through ongoing monitoring, engagement, and future updates, so that the Local Plan remains deliverable and adaptable throughout its lifecycle.

3.13 The IDP has been based on significant engagement with infrastructure providers, statutory consultees, and neighbouring authorities and reflects this engagement. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) are being used to confirm agreement on infrastructure responsibilities and dependencies through an ongoing exercise. Some SoCG have been submitted with the submission Local Plan, others are planned for progression between submission and examination.

3.14 Evidence and needs assessments

3.15 The IDP is underpinned by clear evidence of need and a structured approach to prioritisation. This helps ensure that resources and delivery efforts are focused on the infrastructure most critical to supporting planned growth. It also provides a clear narrative that links infrastructure delivery to the creation of sustainable, well-supported communities, reinforcing the coherence of the Local Plan.

3.16 To support future investment and funding decisions, schemes should be assigned a recommended priority level based on an assessment of their relative importance and significance. It should be noted that this prioritisation may not necessarily reflect future political and infrastructure provider decisions about how investment should be targeted and should therefore be treated as indicative. The prioritisation indicated is intended to be a practical and pragmatic basis upon which the Council can make decisions, when faced with the need to balance competing priorities. The prioritisation should not be interpreted as indicating that lower priority schemes are not important to make development acceptable in planning terms, and developers will still be expected to make contributions to provide for infrastructure needs as far as is viable.

- **Integral.** Infrastructure that is required for day to day functioning and is critical and non-negotiable for the delivery of the plan. Without it, development cannot proceed. This typically includes connections to infrastructure networks (such as primary access roads or strategic utilities) and are often triggered by the commencement of development.
- **Fundamental.** Infrastructure that is required to ensure specific developments are viable, acceptable, and sustainable. While it may not need to be in place before development begins, it must be delivered in step with growth to meet policy requirements and avoid placing unacceptable pressure on existing services. Such schemes will often be required upon the first occupation of new development and will need to be planned well in advance. Examples may include primary school expansions, bus service enhancements to support site accessibility, local waste and recycling facilities.
- **Beneficial.** Infrastructure supports place-making, sustainability, and improved operational capacity, helping to create inclusive, high-quality environments aligned with Local Plan objectives. While development can proceed without it, its provision is important to realise the full vision and wider societal benefits. Such infrastructure should be identified in the IDP and prioritised for delivery alongside or soon after

development, often secured through planning policy, developer contributions, or design standards, and may include green infrastructure, public realm improvements, community spaces, and digital networks.

- 3.17** This prioritisation framework will be used to inform future funding strategies, guide developer contributions, and shape infrastructure phasing decisions.

3.18 Demonstrating delivery through engagement

- 3.19** Engagement with infrastructure providers is a fundamental foundation of the approach that has been undertaken. It has been important to show evidence that the IDP has been developed in collaboration with those responsible for delivering key infrastructure, and that it reflects up-to-date information on capacity, investment plans, and delivery commitments. Statements of Common Ground have been progressed to demonstrate agreement between HDC and infrastructure providers and can be found in the examination library to provide further insight and detail on relevant aspects of delivery and phasing of infrastructure.

- 3.20** Early engagement has been essential. Infrastructure providers and neighbouring authorities have been involved from the start of the IDP process (see further details below), and have also been engaged as part of the wider development of the Local Plan. Their input has informed site selection, growth options, and spatial strategy choices where infrastructure capacity and investment timing has been important.

3.21 Estimating Costs and Identifying Funding

- 3.22** Infrastructure providers continue to play an important role in providing cost and funding information to demonstrate how infrastructure delivery has been actively considered in the Local Plan. Given the strategic nature of this stage of planning many of the estimates are not definitive but have been benchmarked against similar interventions to give an indication of the scale of investment required.

- 3.23** Cost estimates have been drawn from existing evidence or secondary sources, such as previous studies, or national cost benchmarks, rather than commissioned specifically for the IDP. This is a reasonable approach with sources appropriately caveated and optimism bias applied where appropriate.

- 3.24** The aim is that level of detail provided for each infrastructure item is commensurate with its timing within the plan period and its importance to delivery. For infrastructure anticipated in the later stages of the plan period, indicative costs are deemed appropriate. However, for infrastructure required early in the plan, or identified as critical to delivery, more detailed and robust costings are being progressed. In such cases, a clear explanation of estimated costs, delivery responsibilities, and the intended funding strategy will be provided through updates to the IDP and Infrastructure Schedule, even if full funding has not yet been secured.

- 3.25 In terms of delivery that relies on third-party infrastructure bodies (e.g. the NHS and LLR Integrated Care Board), it has been important to reference their capital investment programmes and regulatory cycles as the timelines can often be slightly misaligned with the review periods for the IDP. Explaining how these programme cycles will be monitored and integrated into future versions of the IDP will be important to demonstrate active coordination and effective management of uncertainty.

4. Key Evidence Studies - The IDP & Associated Evidence

- 4.1 There is a comprehensive evidence base sitting behind the Local Plan related to the topic. All the documents are listed and are available on the Council's website at the following URL:

[Supporting Evidence | Supporting Evidence | Harborough District Council](#)

- 4.2 The principal evidence documents relevant to the Local Plan's approach to infrastructure planning comprise:

INF-NLP 1: [Infrastructure Delivery Plan Feb 2025](#)

INF-NLP 2: [Infrastructure Delivery Plan March 2026](#)

INF-NLP 3: [Local Plan Viability Assessment Jan 2025](#)

INF-NLP 4: [Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum – Market Conditions Feb 2026](#)

These documents summarise the findings from a broader evidence base including but not limited to the following:

EN-NLP 6: [Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1](#) (October 2024)

EN-NLP 7: [Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2](#) (December 2024)

EN-NLP 9: [Sequential and Exception Test](#) (January 2025)

ENP-NL 5: [Joint Water Cycle Scoping Study](#) (December 2024)

EN-NLP 3: [Climate Change and Renewable Energy Study](#) (October 2024)

GR-NLP 1: [Open Spaces Strategy 2021](#)

GR-NLP 2: [Provision for Open Space Sport and Recreation - Delivery Plan 2021](#)

GR-NLP 3: [Playing Pitch Strategy 2022](#)

GR-NLP 4: [Green and Blue Infrastructure Study Dec 2024](#)

TRP-NLP 1: [Leicestershire Local Transport Plan Nov 2024](#)

TRP-NLP 2: [Harborough Strategic Transport Impact Assessment Jan 2025](#)

TRP-NLP 3: [South Leicestershire Joint Transport Assessment Stage 1 Jan 2025](#)

TRP-NLP 4: [Draft Joint Transport Evidence 2.8 – Identifying Mitigation and Costs April 2026](#)

TRP-NLP 5: [South Leicestershire Joint Transport Evidence Stage 2 Sept 2025](#)

- 4.3 The Council's infrastructure approach is rooted in this broad and current evidence base and all brought together within the overarching IDP and associated Infrastructure Schedule. The IDP is a live document to reflect the changing nature of infrastructure.
- 4.4 The following section set out the main findings of the IDP, how they have been interpreted, and how they have directly influenced policy development.
- 4.5 **Harborough IDP Stage 2 Report (March 2026)**
- 4.6 The Stage 2 IDP report updates the findings of the Stage 1 baseline infrastructure capacity analysis and provides further assessment of the preferred Spatial Strategy, including additional engagement with infrastructure providers. The March 2026 IDP includes an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (Appendix A) outlining planned projects across the Council's administrative area. These schedules record identified infrastructure requirements, including type, location, delivery mechanisms, and costs where available. Where information is currently unavailable, or where stakeholders have not yet provided input, further engagement is intended, with updates to the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule planned prior to the examination hearings.
- 4.7 Where infrastructure providers have been unable to supply cost estimates, Arup has where possible undertaken benchmarking to produce high-level indicative costs where sufficient scheme detail exists. These figures are broad estimates and will be refined as schemes progress and more detailed information becomes available.
- 4.8 The Stage 2 IDP builds on the Stage 1 baseline assessment and covers 27 infrastructure typologies across six sectors: transport, education, healthcare, community facilities, green infrastructure, and utilities. A key conclusion is that no infrastructure showstoppers have been identified that would prevent delivery of the preferred growth strategy. Engagement with infrastructure providers indicates that, although investment is required, the strategy is deliverable in infrastructure terms.
- 4.9 The IDP identifies over 300 infrastructure projects. While most directly support planned growth, others address existing deficiencies. These projects span all sectors, with significant requirements in transport, education, healthcare and community and green infrastructure.
- 4.10 Key infrastructure by infrastructure sector identified in the Stage 2 IDP include:
- **Transport:** Strategic modelling identifies mitigation required to address network capacity constraints. Key issues include congestion hotspots (such as the A5

corridor), the need for integrated masterplanning, and cross-boundary collaboration. There is also a strong emphasis on active travel and public transport improvements.

- **Education:** Provision includes a mix of new primary schools for larger sites and expansions of existing schools, with a shift towards larger, more viable institutions. Secondary school capacity is already constrained, with a strategy focused on extensions and new schools for the larger strategic development areas (SDA). SEND provision requirements are recognised but not yet fully defined.
- **Healthcare:** The preferred approach is to expand existing GP practices, with new facilities likely only where growth is substantial, such as at Land South of Gartree Road. Wider primary care services, including pharmacy and dentistry, remain under review.
- **Community facilities:** Identified needs include enhancements to libraries, new or expanded cemetery provision, and improvements to indoor sports and leisure facilities. Some upgrades are already underway.
- **Green infrastructure:** Although the District is largely rural, woodland cover is low. Deficiencies have been identified in certain areas, particularly in sports pitch capacity and quality, indicating a need for significant investment in both natural open space and outdoor sports provision.
- **Utilities and digital infrastructure:** Providers generally indicate that capacity can be delivered, although electricity network reinforcement will be required. Water and sewerage upgrades depend on detailed site information. Many utility schemes are provider-funded, reducing risk to development viability.
- **Delivery, funding, and prioritisation:** Infrastructure delivery will rely on a combination of developer contributions, direct provision, public sector funding, and utility provider investment. Given funding constraints, not all schemes will be delivered, and prioritisation will be necessary.

4.11 The IDP does not currently present a single definitive total cost estimate, reflecting the fact that many infrastructure requirements are not yet sufficiently defined to enable robust cost benchmarking. In several sectors, particularly education, costs have been apportioned to individual development sites, providing a transparent basis for developer contributions, even as overall scheme costs continue to evolve. Similarly, utility infrastructure is largely expected to be funded and delivered by statutory providers, meaning these costs are not always included in developer-funded totals, thereby reducing the direct burden on development viability. Cost estimates will continue to develop alongside scheme design, particularly in key areas such as highways and education.

4.12 Although a single aggregate cost figure is not yet provided, the scale of identified investment clearly indicates a substantial and coordinated programme, likely to be in the order of several hundred million pounds. Greater certainty will emerge as the

Local Plan progresses. A funding gap is anticipated, which is typical for Local Plans of this scale, and is likely to increase as currently uncoded or unspecified interventions are defined and priced. This reinforces the need for the Council to progress the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to support infrastructure delivery across the District.

- 4.13 The information contained within the Stage 2 IDP has informed Local Plan viability testing, which assesses whether proposed site allocations are financially deliverable (see examination library references [INF-NLP3](#) and [INF-NLP4](#) for further details).
- 4.14 IDPs are inherently iterative, evolving documents. As infrastructure providers respond to changing funding constraints and priorities, the information they provide will continue to develop. The preferred Spatial Strategy presented in this version of the IDP reflects the Council's position as of August 2024 and will be subject to further refinement as the Local Plan progresses.

5. Consultation Feedback - Shaping An Infrastructure Led Approach

5.1 Regulation 18 Consultation

- 5.2 The Regulation 18 Issues and Options consultation in January–February 2024 demonstrated clear support for progressing an infrastructure-led approach to the emerging Local Plan. The responses reinforced the importance of evidence-based planning, robust capacity assessments, and ensuring that growth is closely aligned with the timely delivery of essential infrastructure.
- 5.3 This was particularly evident across key topic areas. In relation to flood risk and drainage, there was overwhelming support for an up-to-date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) as a core part of the evidence base, with respondents recognising its critical role, alongside the sequential test, in directing development to safe and sustainable locations. This approach was strongly endorsed by the principal technical bodies, including the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority, while Natural England welcomed the emphasis on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems for managing surface water and enhancing biodiversity.
- 5.4 On water supply and wastewater, most respondents agreed that robust infrastructure capacity evidence is essential to responsibly plan for growth. Concerns regarding river pollution, aquifer protection, and ageing drainage systems further strengthened the case for a coordinated approach. Strong support from the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority, Severn Trent and Anglian Water highlighted the importance of the Water Cycle Study in shaping site selection and the overall growth strategy, confirming that water must be a central determinant of development decisions.

5.5 In terms of transport, although views varied on the best policy approach, there was clear agreement that transport infrastructure must shape and influence growth. Many respondents supported a balanced approach combining sustainable transport promotion with recognition of rural car dependency. In particular, Leicestershire County Council emphasised the need to integrate walking and cycling routes, public transport provision, and parking requirements, reinforcing the importance of a coordinated infrastructure-led strategy.

5.6 Taken together, the responses consistently underline that growth must be underpinned by strong evidence and directly shaped by infrastructure constraints. There was clear support from infrastructure providers for early-stage planning, coordinated delivery, and the principle that development must be supported by appropriate on-site provision and developer contributions. Overall, this stage of consultation provided a clear endorsement of an infrastructure-led Local Plan approach, where development is actively guided, enabled, and constrained by the capacity and timely delivery of essential infrastructure.

5.7 **Regulation 19 Consultation**

5.8 At the Regulation 19 stage, representations consistently highlighted the importance of a robust, clearly justified and deliverable infrastructure policy framework to support planned growth. Overall, the majority of respondents were broadly supportive of growth qualified with the need for clarity and confidence that infrastructure will be delivered in step with development, with particular attention to its adequacy, timing, and overall deliverability.

5.9 A recurring theme was the opportunity for the Local Plan to more clearly articulate how infrastructure will be phased, funded, and delivered over time. Respondents also encouraged strengthened evidence on deliverability, alongside closer coordination with key infrastructure providers, particularly the County Council in relation to highways, education, and flood risk management. This was seen as especially important for sites expected to come forward in the early years of the Plan, where further detail on mitigation measures and delivery arrangements was consistently requested

5.10 Below is a summary of the Regulation 19 plan sections and specific policies where infrastructure issues were raised:

- **Vision and Strategic Objectives.** Representations recognise the ambition of the Vision while emphasising the importance of ensuring it is fully supported by sufficient infrastructure to enable successful delivery. Key themes included a call for greater clarity on how infrastructure delivery will be achieved in practice, alongside the introduction of measurable outcomes and effective monitoring arrangements to track progress. Respondents also highlighted the importance of addressing potential infrastructure constraints to ensure they do not impact the overall effectiveness and delivery of the strategy.

- **Policy DS01 – Development Strategy (Delivering Homes).** Infrastructure-related comments suggested a mismatch between housing growth and infrastructure capacity, specifically highways capacity and the A6. Observations suggest that growth is directed to locations without adequate infrastructure capacity.
- **Site Allocations (Strategic and Non-Strategic).** Representations relating to specific site allocations, including SA01 (Land South of Gartree Road), Great Bowden (Sites GB1 & GB2) and Broughton Astley, emphasised the importance of aligning development with timely infrastructure provision. Key considerations included capacity along the A6 corridor and at key junctions, alongside the need to ensure appropriate education and healthcare provision keeps pace with growth. Respondents also highlighted the importance of managing surface water flood risk through suitable drainage solutions and coordinated infrastructure planning within affected catchments.
- **Transport and Movement Policies.** Representations indicated support for sustainable transport objectives, alongside a constructive emphasis on ensuring that public transport solutions are underpinned by clear and robust capacity improvements. Respondents noted that existing bus services are often operating at or near capacity, and highlighted the opportunity to enhance rural provision and service frequency to better enable a meaningful shift toward sustainable travel choices through appropriate investment. There was encouragement for clarity around the role of strategic highway interventions and the development of more detailed mitigation measures. Respondents indicated the opportunity to strengthen the supporting transport evidence base and to build on existing analysis. Existing pressures on the highway network were noted, particularly along key routes such as the A6 and within settlements including Kibworth, Great Glen, Broughton Astley, and Great Bowden. Overall, it was suggested that additional transparency regarding the assumptions underpinning traffic modelling would be necessary, alongside a balanced approach to mitigation that combines support for modal shift with targeted highway capacity improvements.
- **Flood Risk and Drainage Infrastructure:** Representations showed support for the emphasis on managing flood risk and addressing climate change, alongside constructive suggestions to further strengthen the approach. Respondents highlighted the opportunity to develop a more comprehensive strategic drainage strategy, supported by clear evidence of deliverable mitigation for allocations near flood-prone areas, and enhanced policy safeguards where appropriate. There was particular emphasis on the importance of carefully managing development within Flood Zones 2 and 3, as well as in areas affected by surface water flooding. Respondents supported the integration of effective flood prevention measures, including SUD's, and stressed the need to ensure that drainage infrastructure is fit for purpose. Overall, there was encouragement for all development to be underpinned by evidence of robust flood risk assessments and coordinated, long-term drainage solutions.

- **Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions.** Representations highlighted the importance of providing clear and transparent arrangements for how infrastructure will be funded and delivered in a timely manner alongside development. Respondents supported the strengthening of policy wording to ensure a clear and positive link between development and necessary infrastructure provision, and welcomed greater clarity on the mechanisms that will be used to secure and deliver infrastructure effectively.
- **Education, Healthcare and Community Infrastructure.** Representations highlighted the importance of aligning social infrastructure provision with planned growth, with a emphasis on ensuring capacity keeps pace with development. Feedback indicated that some primary and secondary schools are currently operating at or near capacity, and respondents suggested that clearer commitments to the delivery of new or expanded school places, including SEND provision, were necessary. Similarly, the capacity of GP surgeries and wider healthcare services was identified, with respondents emphasising the value of coordinating improvements in healthcare provision alongside the timing of new development. More generally, representations recognised the vital role of community and social infrastructure in fostering cohesive and sustainable communities. Opportunities were identified to further strengthen provision through additional facilities such as community centres and multi-use spaces, ensuring that growing populations are well supported by a comprehensive and clearly defined package of social infrastructure.
- **Strategic Infrastructure (Cross-Boundary).** Representations emphasised the importance of robust cross-boundary agreements for strategic infrastructure, particularly in relation to highways. Respondents highlighted the value of clear governance arrangements and strong joint working between authorities, supported by a well-developed evidence base, to ensure the effective planning and delivery of infrastructure that spans administrative boundaries.

6. Evolution of Infrastructure Planning Approach.

6.1 The Regulation 19 responses have informed a series of refinements to the infrastructure approach in the Submission Local Plan, with the aim of improving clarity, strengthening deliverability, and building confidence that infrastructure will be delivered in step with growth. The Council has carefully considered these representations and, where appropriate, is proposing Main Modifications to further strengthen the infrastructure policy framework.

6.2 Key responses include:

- **Strengthened Evidence Base.** The Council has updated and enhanced supporting infrastructure evidence since publishing the IDP at Regulation 19 Stage. This has included additional transport modelling, education planning, flood risk assessment, and viability work. This is being undertaken in close collaboration with Leicestershire County Council in its roles as Highway Authority, Education Authority, and Lead

Local Flood Authority. Progress has also been made on Statements of Common Ground to support cross-boundary infrastructure planning.

- **Enhanced Policy Framework.** Policies have been refined to strengthen requirements for infrastructure delivery, particularly in relation to highways, education, and flood risk. Policies place greater emphasis on timely delivery, phasing, and alignment between development and infrastructure provision.
- **Infrastructure Delivery and Phasing.** The Plan now provides clearer expectations around the early delivery of critical infrastructure, particularly in strategic development areas such as Land South of Gartree Road, North of Market Harborough, and Scraftoft East. The role of developer contributions for SDA's is more clearly articulated.
- **Transport and Movement.** The transport strategy continues to be refined to ensure a more balanced approach, combining sustainable transport improvements with necessary highway mitigation measures, supported by ongoing engagement with the County Council.
- **Flood Risk and Drainage.** Policy approaches have been strengthened, with greater emphasis on strategic drainage solutions, cumulative impact assessment, and the application of national flood risk tests, as set out in in TPC-NLP 3: [Flood Risk Topic Paper March 2026](#).
- **Education Provision.** Work is ongoing with the Local Education Authority to prepare an Education Delivery Strategy for Harborough and Oadby & Wigston administrative areas. A number of specific education-related matters are the subject of ongoing joint work, including those relating to the LSGR and North of Market Harborough SDA's and the cumulative impacts of development, particularly in respect of secondary education. The parties are working collaboratively to address these matters through continued evidence-led assessment and delivery planning, and agree that they relate to implementation and coordination rather than the principle of the proposed growth strategy.
- **Community Infrastructure.** The Plan places greater emphasis on the delivery of local centres and community facilities within Sustainable Development Areas, supporting integrated and sustainable communities.

6.3 Overall, the Regulation 19 representations highlighted the importance of infrastructure provision in underpinning confidence in the Local Plan. They also reinforced the value of an iterative, evidence-led approach to infrastructure planning and delivery to support growth across the plan period. In general, comments were broad rather than policy-specific, but consistently emphasised that the effectiveness of the Plan depends on the alignment of growth with infrastructure provision across all policy areas.

- 6.4 In response, through main modifications policy wording has been refined to further emphasise deliverability, clear phasing, and the alignment of growth with infrastructure capacity. The Council considers that the revised policy framework, supported by updated evidence and strengthened infrastructure requirements, provides an effective basis for securing and managing timely infrastructure delivery across the District.
- 6.5 Full details of the representations can be found in S-NLP 11: [Database of Regulation 19 Representations](#), alongside the Statements of Common Ground which develop agreements on how strategic infrastructure issues will be addressed.

7. Evolution of Policy

- 7.1 As a result of representations received and continued collaboration with infrastructure providers through Statements of Common Ground, the wording relating to infrastructure has been positively strengthened across a number of key policies in the Submission Local Plan. The main areas of enhancement are reflected in:
- Policy DS05 – Development Strategy: Supporting Strategic Infrastructure
 - Policy SA01 – Site Allocations (including the site allocation schedule)
 - Policy SA02 – Land South of Gartree Road SDA
 - Policy SA03 – North of Market Harborough
 - Policy SA04 – Scraftoft East (through linked SA01 cluster provisions)
- 7.2 The proposed modifications provide a clear and consistent strengthening of infrastructure considerations. In particular, they introduce more explicit requirements to assess cumulative and cross-boundary impacts, alongside a stronger emphasis on corridor-based planning, most notably in relation to the A6.
- 7.3 The modifications also reinforce the expectation that infrastructure will be properly funded, phased, and delivered, with greater clarity around the use of developer contributions, including Section 106 agreements and the prospective Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This helps to ensure that infrastructure provision is both timely and aligned with the scale of development.
- 7.4 In addition, the policies move towards a more defined and comprehensive approach to transport planning, aligning requirements with Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) and associated strategies for public transport and active travel. Expectations around transport assessments and travel plans are more clearly articulated, particularly in relation to site allocations.
- 7.5 A further positive step is the increased emphasis on strategic and coordinated planning, with policies encouraging linked sites to work collaboratively through masterplanning. This encourages promoters to consider a more integrated and efficient approach to infrastructure delivery across multiple allocations.

- 7.6 Overall, the Council considers that the proposed modifications represent a logical and constructive enhancement of the infrastructure policy framework. They place greater focus on front-loading infrastructure, improving deliverability, encouraging a more joined-up approach across sites and, where necessary, across administrative boundaries. Strategic transport planning, especially along the A6 corridor, is more firmly embedded, and greater clarity is provided around funding, phasing, and delivery mechanisms.
- 7.7 Further details of the actual proposed modification wording are set out in S-NLP 15: [Schedule of Proposed Modifications to the Submission of the Harborough Local Plan 2020-2041 and Policies Map April 2026](#)

8 Ongoing Infrastructure Monitoring Arrangements

- 8.1 The Stage 2 IDP(March 2026) represents a snapshot in time, capturing the best available evidence and stakeholder input at the point of Local Plan submission. It is recognised that the infrastructure requirements, costs, funding streams, and delivery timescales set out in the associated IDP Infrastructure Delivery Schedule are all likely to be subject to change over the lifetime of the Local Plan. To remain effective, the IDP includes for a clear and proactive approach to monitoring and updating, ensuring the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule functions as a live and credible summary of the infrastructure position throughout the Local Plan period.
- 8.2 To manage the risks associated with outdated or incomplete information HDC is committed to undertaking a periodic review of the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule to reflect key changes and infrastructure providers programmes. Triggers for updates could include new infrastructure commitments sitting within future programmes, for example Severn Trent Water AMP9 (2030-35) or National Highways RIS4, or significant funding changes or changes to SDA delivery trajectories.
- 8.3 Regular and structured engagement with infrastructure providers is recognised as essential to keeping the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule current. This will be supported through existing governance arrangements where HDC and key delivery bodies such as LCC, STW and National Grid meet to share strategic planning updates, identify and discuss emerging issues, and agree any changes to infrastructure planning assumptions for specific sites.
- 8.4 By building in a transparent and ongoing monitoring processes HDC is seeking to ensure it has as much confidence in the infrastructure planning associated with the delivery of its spatial strategy and specific site allocations as possible, as well as ability to respond effectively to delivery challenges as they arise.

9. Next Steps & Conclusions

- 9.1 The Council recognises that the IDP and associated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule plays an important role in summarising to present infrastructure evidence clearly and

build confidence in the Local Plans deliverability. To ensure the IDP provides as robust a foundation as possible at examination HDC will consider the following:

- 9.2 **Maintain a live evidence base between submission and examination.** Between submission and the examination hearings HDC will review the need to update aspects of the IDP to reflect any significant changes. This is most likely to be required for transport and education in particular as further technical work is ongoing over Spring and Summer 2026 in these areas with LCC as the Local Highways Authority and Education Authority. This analysis is expected to result in revised programme and phasing information, updated delivery schedules and changes in provider investment plans to account for cost reviews. It is planned that HDC will seek to publish an update to the IDP or submit an update note on these topics in advance of relevant hearing sessions to ensure the Inspector has access to the most current position.
- 9.3 **Additional Statements of Common Ground.** HDC will be seeking to progress additional SoCG with infrastructure providers, such as the County Council as highways and education authority. These will be progressed in the lead up to examination so that delivery responsibilities are more clearly understood and shared.
- 9.4 **Involving infrastructure providers at examination.** HDC will seek collaboration of key infrastructure providers at the examination hearings to support on the evidence base and provide assurance that requirements are understood and aligned with wider investment planning.
- 9.5 The Council recognises that the IDP is an important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan examination. The aim is to present as far as is practical clear evidence that the infrastructure to support planned growth is being properly planned, is deliverable, and supports the scale and distribution of proposed development. With this objective in mind the infrastructure focus for the examination will be to make sure the following issues are conveyed as far as possible in collaboration with infrastructure providers:
- **Alignment between the IDP and site allocations.** Collaboration to ensure that the IDP Infrastructure Schedule is updated prior to examination with the most up to date project information with clear links between infrastructure and site allocations. The link between site allocations and infrastructure varies depending on the geographical context of the site allocations and the potential that needs arise from the cumulative impact of multiple developments in certain locations.
 - **Up to date Information.** It is important that the evidence base is current, robust, and supported by well evidenced engagement with infrastructure providers. Where providers have been unresponsive or limited in the information they have been able to provide we will clearly document the most recent engagement and use the best available evidence. The IDP will be updated to acknowledge uncertainties, explain how these will be monitored, and set out contingency measures and flexibility in delivery assumptions, supported by clear governance and review mechanisms.

- **Funding certainty.** Unsupported funding assumptions, particularly for critical infrastructure, can undermine the Local Plan. Full funding does not need to be fully secured at plan-making stage but the IDP seeks to set out a credible and realistic pathway to delivery. Updates to the Infrastructure Schedule will be made prior to examination to affirm potential funding sources, anticipated timelines, and responsible delivery partners.
- **Clear links between infrastructure delivery and development phasing.** Updates will be provided in relation to the phasing of the SDA's to reflecting emerging details from ongoing masterplanning and pre application discussions with developers and promoters.
- **Evidence of engagement.** Assurance that the Council has engaged meaningfully with infrastructure providers and neighbouring authorities on infrastructure issues is evidenced in the Statements of Common Ground submitted. If the benefit of additional SoCG's becomes apparent these will be progressed in the lead up to examination.

9.6 In conclusion, the IDP should be recognised as a live and evolving document that continues to be refined alongside the progression of the Local Plan into delivery. Its role is not only to present a clear and credible snapshot of infrastructure planning at submission, but also to respond dynamically to new evidence, ongoing technical work, and continued engagement with infrastructure providers. As such, infrastructure planning is inherently iterative, moving from high-level policy formulation through to more detailed development management and delivery. Through ongoing updates, collaboration, and alignment with site allocations and phasing, the Council will ensure that the IDP remains robust, transparent, and responsive, providing confidence that infrastructure requirements can be effectively planned and delivered to support sustainable growth.