



CABINET – 24 OCTOBER 2023

MELTON MOWBRAY DISTRIBUTOR ROAD SOUTH

**JOINT REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND
TRANSPORT AND THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE
RESOURCES**

PART A

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Cabinet of the latest position regarding the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road South (MMDR S) project, part of the Melton Local Plan Strategy and seek the Cabinet's approval for the proposed way forward in light of the financial implications detailed in this report. The report includes a revised cost estimate for the scheme, sets out the implications of this in respect of the Council's agreement with Homes England (HE) for Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) grant towards the project and recommended next steps.

Recommendations

2. It is recommended that:
 - a) The County Council's ongoing commitment to Melton Borough Council's (MBC) Local Plan strategy be confirmed;
 - b) Homes England (HE) be informed that despite the best efforts of the County Council and MBC, both parties are unable to meet the terms and conditions required to receive the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) capital grant previously offered by HE;
 - c) It be noted that as a consequence of b) above, HE has advised the County Council that the HIF capital grant offer will be withdrawn;
 - d) It be noted that in the absence of HIF grant the County Council will be unable to proceed at present with construction of the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road South (MMDR S) and that MBC and other stakeholders be advised accordingly;

- e) The County Council's Capital Programme 2023-27 be amended as set out in paragraph 20 of this report, noting that this will include funding for development of an alternative delivery strategy (£0.5m), costs incurred on programme which will be unrecoverable (£1.3m), and withdrawal of the existing strategy (£1.7m) for the MMDR S at a likely total cost of £3.5m;
- f) The MMDR North and East scheme be amended as required; and
- g) The Director of Environment and Transport and the Director of Corporate Resources following consultation with the relevant Cabinet Lead Members, be authorised to pursue discussions to seek additional funding, including with MBC, the local Member of Parliament, the Department for Transport and developers.

Reason for Recommendation

- 3. To reaffirm the Council's commitment to supporting MBC's Local Plan and wider transport strategy.
- 4. Previously, HE had offered £18.2m HIF grant, equivalent to 42% of the total cost, conditional on the MMDR S scheme being fully funded. Due to estimated costs increasing to £70m, due to sustained high inflation, this is not now achievable due to the County Council's very challenging financial position and, despite extensive dialogue with HE, it has not been possible to find an alternative way forward.
- 5. With the HIF grant withdrawn by HE, it will not be possible to proceed with the scheme for the range of reasons detailed in this report. This will have a number of consequences for the County Council, MBC and stakeholders including developers, and will also require some minor changes to the associated Melton Mowbray Distributor Road North and East (MMDR NE) project which is currently under construction.
- 6. Having completed a considerable amount of project work in preparation of the MMDR S scheme over the past few years, the County Council is in a good position to use all this work to apply for other funding streams as they become available in order to financially support the future development plans. MBC is in support of this.

Timetable for Decisions (including Scrutiny)

- 7. Subject to the approval of the recommendations in this report, the proposals outlined would progress alongside completing the required adjustments to the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and Capital Programme.

Policy Framework and Previous Decisions

- 8. In May 2016, the Cabinet agreed to continue developing the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy to identify an appropriate package of transport measures

necessary to support Melton's Local Plan and authorised the Director of Environment and Transport to undertake the necessary consultations and negotiations as required to enable the definition of a preferred route for the MMDR NE.

9. Since that date, a number of reports have been submitted to the Cabinet seeking approval for the various stages of development and delivery of the scheme.
10. In November 2019, the Cabinet was advised of a successful HIF bid of £15m for the MMDR S.
11. In March 2020, the Cabinet considered a report on MBC's master planning for the Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhood (MSSN). This detailed possible implications for the County Council, including financial risk connected to the acceptance of the grant offer from HE towards the cost of the MMDR S.
12. In June 2020, the Cabinet considered a report on the latest position with regard to the HIF grant offer and the decision by MBC to approve a masterplan for the MSSN. The Cabinet raised a number of concerns, most notably that the masterplan did not demonstrate the financial viability of the MSSN. The Cabinet also noted that the masterplan was approved despite it containing unresolved errors and inaccuracies which had been raised by the County Council.
13. In December 2020, the Cabinet was advised of work led by the County Council in collaboration with landowners and developers, which showed the MSSN was capable of being financially viable. That was dependent on the previously approved masterplan for the MSSN being revised. The Cabinet resolved inter alia that, subject to an agreement with MBC on mitigating the financial risk to the County Council and to the completion of other necessary agreements, authority could be given for the County Council to enter into a Grant Determination Agreement (GDA) with HE in respect of the HIF grant. The Cabinet also noted that MBC was seeking to cap any agreement at an amount which was inadequate.
14. The County Council accepted conditionally the HIF grant for the MMDR S by decision of the Cabinet at its meeting on 17 September 2021. The total cost had increased to £43.1m, comprising scheme costs of £37.5m, £0.6m development costs and £5m portfolio risk contingency. The original grant amount was increased from £15m to £18.2m at the time of signing the GDA in December 2021 contributing towards the increased scheme costs. Under the HIF agreement, the County Council agreed to allocate funding of £5m and forward fund up to £20m.
15. In February 2022, the Cabinet approved the Capital Programme 2022/23 to 2025/26, which included the MMDR S. The Cabinet on 23 September 2022 agreed a revised capital programme and highlighted the need to review the current Capital Programme.
16. In September 2022, the Cabinet agreed for the County Council to become a signatory to the Leicester and Leicestershire Statement of Common Ground on

Housing and Employment Land Needs, setting out the collaboration undertaken to reach agreement on strategic housing distribution and other matters in line with the Government's Duty to Cooperate, supporting progress on respective emerging local plans.

17. On 25 November 2022, the Cabinet considered a report regarding the financial implications for the Council of delivering growth in the County and agreed the approach and principles to address and manage the risks, noting the challenges associated with delivering the existing Capital Programme and the need to ensure that forward funding was recovered.

Resource Implications

18. HE is currently subjecting the project to an extension of time in relation to the resolution of material breaches to the GDA, this was extended to 29 September 2023. The material breach has occurred because HE have requested that the project will underwrite any scheme funding shortfall and confirm the scheme is fully funded. This is a commitment the County Council cannot make due to its own challenging financial position. During this period the County Council sought confirmation of continued support from MBC for the scheme, and a proposal for longer term funding via Section 106 contributions to cover forward funding the infrastructure beyond the current Local Plan period. This was discussed at MBC's Cabinet on 13 September 2023.
19. Whilst a significant amount of work has already taken place to understand the ground conditions on the site of the MMDR S potential constraints and preliminary design works have commenced, the early stage of the programme means that the costs estimations are still subject to change.
20. At a subsequent project meeting with HE, the content of the MBC Cabinet report of 13 September was confirmed and a further request for an extension of time was requested by officers to allow the implications of MBC's Cabinet report to be assessed and a report to be prepared for the County Council's Cabinet. This current extension request has been confirmed and will take the County Council to 31 October 2023, by which time the County Council would need to confirm its ability to continue with the scheme, providing assurances over cost, availability of funding beyond that currently allocated in the MTFS and programme surety noting:
 - a) The current scheme estimate including remediation plan savings of £4m, is £57.4m. Due to the potential for costs to change in this complex scheme, given it is only at an early stage of design and has yet to achieve a planning permission, it is recommended that the portfolio contingency amount is increased to £12.5m noting changing external market conditions which continue to affect infrastructure pricing. For the avoidance of doubt the total estimated costs for the project including portfolio contingency and development costs (£0.6m) is £70.5m and represents a gap of £27.4m from the current County Council MTFS allocation.

- b) £15.5m of the additional funding is anticipated to come from further forward funding of developer contributions (additional contributions from index linking and additional housing numbers). The remaining additional funding totalling £11.9m would need to be a direct County Council contribution to the scheme.
- c) The current assumptions regarding receiving developer contributions towards MMDR S are that the Council will receive these from 2025 to 2037, however, this is largely outside of the County Council's control, as illustrated in the table below:

Stage	£m
Planning permission granted	0.0
Planning permission submitted (maximum)	18.5
Unsecured within current adopted local plan	7.3
Unsecured outside current adopted local plan	9.7
Total	35.5

There is a high risk that not all these contributions will be received, due to the level of affordable housing and viability of sites, and any shortfall would need to be made-up by the County Council. A reasonable assumption is that circa 80% of the developer income is ultimately received, leaving the County Council to fund £7.1m.

- d) The forward funding of £28.4m (the anticipated contribution from the dependent development) will require the Council to borrow. The cost of borrowing will include interest charges and require Minimum Revenue Provision contributions to allocate funding for the principal repayment of the loan. Considering the amount and timing assumed for developer contributions, the average yearly revenue cost would be £2.7m per year for 20 years.
- e) The high inflationary environment is also impacting the education provision relating to the housing that the MMDR S scheme enables. Latest estimates are that the new secondary and primary schools will cost £45m. However, associated developer contributions are only expected to be £28.8m. This will lead to a shortfall in funding that the County Council would have to meet of £16.2m, equivalent to borrowing costs of £1.8m. The developer contributions will also require borrowing to allow forward funding costing an average of £2.7m each year.
- f) The County Council would be required to fund a total of £23.9m comprising the unsecured funding (£11.8m), the contingency for developer funding not received (£7.1m) and the original commitment (£5m). This would also need to be borrowed costing £2.6m per year in revenue for 20 years. This would bring the total borrowing costs to £9.8m per year for 20 years.

- g) The County Council would be required to have the infrastructure project start on site by March 2025, to draw down all of the HIF grant by December 2025 and to be completed by September 2026.
 - h) Subject to the decision by the Cabinet, the County Council's MTFS Capital Programme will require amending to reduce the current capital allocation for MMDR S from £37.5m, which is currently expected to be externally funded, to £3.5m of County Council funding to cater for the alternative MMDR S delivery strategy and closure of the MMDR S programme. The portfolio risk contingency will also be reduced by £5m.
21. If the scheme were to continue, the County Council would need to identify savings of £9.8m per year. This is equivalent to a Council Tax increase of 2.5% for every household in the County.
22. Further details concerning financing of the scheme and options which have been considered are set out in Part B of this report.
23. The Director of Law and Governance has been consulted on this report.

Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure

This report has been circulated to Members representing the electoral divisions in the Melton area: Mr. J. T. Orson CC, Mrs. P. Posnett MBE CC, Mr. M. Frisby CC and Mr. B. Lovegrove CC.

Officers to Contact

Ann Carruthers
Director, Environment and Transport
Tel: (0116) 305 7000
Email: Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk

Declan Keegan
Director, Corporate Resources
Tel: (0116) 305 7668
Email: Declan.Keegan@leics.gov.uk

Janna Walker
Assistant Director, Environment and Transport
Tel: (0116) 305 7215
Email: Janna.Walker@leics.gov.uk

PART B

Background

24. The MMDR S is part of a proposed distributor road identified in the Interim Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy as necessary infrastructure to support the planned growth of Melton Mowbray, which is set out in MBC adopted Local Plan.
25. The scheme is proposed to continue from the MMDR NE at a junction on the A606 Burton Road, west to the A607 Leicester Road.
26. A scheme plan is attached as Appendix A to this report.
27. The principal aim of the scheme is to enable the delivery of additional housing and employment in the town. An ancillary benefit is the expected congestion reduction within Melton Mowbray and improved access to the town centre. It would also reduce the number of HGVs travelling through the town centre, thus also offering air quality benefits. However, the main benefit to the town relating to congestion and air quality will be delivered by the MMDR NE scheme.
28. A number of reports have been considered by the Cabinet at key stages during the scheme's development, including the background, justification and progress of the overall MMDR scheme.

Current County Council Financial Position

29. As reported to the Cabinet in September 2023, the County Council now faces an even more challenging financial outlook. The current MTFS anticipates a funding gap of £13m in 2024/25 rising to £88m by 2026/27, despite savings of £62m being targeted. An initial review of the position in light of the continuing inflation pressures, including the 2023/24 pay offer, indicates that the Council will face additional costs in 2023/24 and future years.
30. Based upon the available information, and assuming Government support is not forthcoming, the County Council's budget gap is set to grow from £13m in 2024/25 and could realistically exceed £100m by 2027/28. It is inevitable that the £62m of savings planned will have to increase significantly and that the County Council will need to give serious consideration to further Council Tax increases.
31. The County Council will not be able to resolve this problem on its own; either expectations of what can be delivered will have to reduce or new funding found. £100m is almost one fifth of the Council's net budget.
32. The pressures of high inflation levels, coupled with an ever-increasing demand for core services, is presenting a challenge across the whole local government sector. However, as a very low-funded authority Leicestershire needs to be mindful of the commitments it can make.

33. The County Council continues to press the Government to address the imbalance on relative funding levels between local authorities. However, the Government appears to be maintaining the current funding position until the next parliament.
34. The Council's Capital Programme will also need to be reviewed with only essential priority projects progressing. The current four-year approved capital programme includes £278m of discretionary Council funding which includes prudential borrowing of £122m. The additional revenue costs arising from this borrowing total £9m per annum over 40 years, assuming internal borrowing. This clearly places even further pressure on the Capital Programme as a whole with projects much further advanced with lower risk to the Council taking priority. This includes MMDR NE whereby the additional funding required to deliver the project was via borrowing.
35. Despite the difficult position facing all local authorities and as detailed above in relation to the County Council's own financial position, officers' persistent attempts to lobby the Government and HE for additional funding support for the MMDR S project via the existing HIF grant have been refused. The strict conditional approach adopted by HE has been repeated across the country whereby other local authorities (for example Suffolk County Council, Essex County Council and Medway Council), have either been forced to withdraw or were unable to comply with the conditions of the grant.
36. The County Council and MBC are unable to meet the terms and conditions of the HIF grant because the grant represents an unacceptable risk in the current financial climate and far exceeds the County Council's commitment at the time of the original bid and the County Council's capital programme allocation. The grant will therefore be withdrawn by HE.
37. HE's raison d'etre is to accelerate the pace of housebuilding. By not prioritising additional funding for this scheme, despite other projects not progressing, HE is sending a clear signal to the County Council that it should carefully consider whether it is value for money to increase its own contribution when it has so many other competing priorities.

MMDR S Financial Position

38. As reported to the Cabinet earlier this year as a part of the MTFs proposals, the current total budget provision for the MMDR S is £43.1m (including portfolio risk), of which £18.2m would be funded from HIF grant and the remainder from developer contributions.
39. The project was subject to a suspension in the ability to claim expenditure by HE in November 2022, after questions were raised about the ongoing funding available to deliver the scheme; this came after the estimate was revised in July 2022 from £43.1m to circa £70m (inclusive of portfolio risk). HE subsequently asked for the County Council to confirm in a remediation plan that such funds to close the gap were available immediately. As a part of the remediation plan development, the County Council worked with stakeholders to prepare a plan in response exploring funding options, alternative delivery methods, the potential

for additional income and identification of any likely efficiency savings to reduce the funding gap. The County Council was also asked to continue to work at risk through this period, however, to minimise spend, the engaged consultants and internal design staff were told to formally pause work.

40. A 'Remediation Plan' detailing route options including reduced classification of the infrastructure was submitted to HE on 3 February 2023. This was not formally acknowledged by HE until late March 2023, where further information was requested by letter, with further reservations indicated regarding the perceived availability of County Council funds to complete the project.
41. A 'Remediation Plan – confirmed preferred route' document was submitted on 31 March 2023 and reaffirmed that, following scrutiny from key stakeholders and additional transport modelling, the Council's preferred scheme remained the distributor road in its current form as a link road between the A606 and A607 and as detailed in MBC's adopted MSSN Masterplan. This preferred route had been discussed and ratified at an officer meeting on 29 March 2023 with HE in attendance.
42. The revised plan looked at options for increasing housing density on the site alongside a review of Education provision to make further land available for housing and thus further supporting the infrastructure delivery costs via additional Section 106 contributions. The report also explored a number of cost savings which could be made, additional funding which may be available, benefits of providing the full route and confirmed a revised programme for delivery.
43. The County Council has continued to attend monthly and ad-hoc meetings with officers from HE, completing all monitoring obligations timeously during the period from breach in November 2022 until present. Equally, officers have, where possible, sought to inform all stakeholders of the process and progress on the project subject to confidentiality clauses imposed by the Grant Determination Agreement (GDA).
44. Noting the need for any changes to be in consultation and agreement with MBC, the Council confirmed this would require formal scrutiny via the Cabinet to HE. This process was delayed by the pre-election period at Melton (for district council elections) which concluded on 6 May 2023.
45. Since the formation of the new MBC Administration, various meetings with landowners, MBC officers and HE have been held to ensure proposals within the Remediation Plan could be reaffirmed during the first available Cabinet meeting at MBC.
46. The MMDR S Project was discussed at MBC's Cabinet on 13 September 2023 and it was confirmed in principle that MBC '..... remained committed to securing the delivery with MMDR S in partnership with LCC.' By doing so it noted '....it will explore the options and opportunities to further boost the delivery of housing and associated contributions towards the provision of the road infrastructure in the short and medium term'. Despite the clear commitment and support from MBC, this cannot at this point provide certainty

as to quantum or timescale of any additional funding and therefore does not alleviate the issue of the level of funding the County Council would need to forward fund or meet in full in order to deliver this scheme.

47. The MSSN development also requires education provision including new secondary and primary schools at an anticipated cost of £45m. This is intended to be funded from developer contributions of £36m, which may reduce to £28.8m due to viability issues and need affordable housing referenced earlier in this report. This will lead to a shortfall in funding that the County Council would have to meet of £16.2m, equivalent to borrowing costs of £1.8m. The developer contributions will also require borrowing to allow forward funding costing an average of £2.7m each year.
48. The shortfall and forward funding for the MMDR S scheme would require total additional borrowing costs of £9.8m per year on average for 20 years.
49. A combination of a later start date, higher commodity prices (and a shortage of supply) and a more difficult market for construction projects has meant that costs have substantially increased resulting (taking into account additional income and cost reductions) of a project funding shortfall for the MMDR S in excess of £23.9m. Therefore, as a result of this increased scheme forecast, the scheme is no longer within the allocated budget envelope set out in the current MTFS. The scheme cost estimate was last formally reviewed in July 2022 with an outturn of c.£70m (including portfolio risk).
50. The Council has recognised the need to change its approach to funding infrastructure associated with district council local plans, hence the principles agreed by the Cabinet on 25 November 2022 attached as Appendix B to this report.

Options for Consideration

51. The Cabinet is being asked to decide on the next steps for the scheme due to the current contractual extension of time expiring on 31 October 2023. It is noted that, despite requests by the Council, no further funding beyond the current allocation of £18.2m is available from HE, despite growing inflationary pressures.
52. There are two options available to the County Council on this basis and they are as follows:

Option	Financial implications of the scheme	Borrowing costs 20 years*	Certainty over those costs H – High M – Medium L – Low	Potential benefits
1. Proceed	£23.9m (Highways inclusive of contingency for developer shortfall) £16.2m (Education inclusive of contingency for developer shortfall) £57.2m (forward funding) £97.3m Total	£.9.8m per year on average	M/L - due to the scheme still to be delivered and reliance on developer funding.	Accelerated delivery of MSSN and infrastructure benefits of links with MMDR NE
2. Withdraw	Cost incurred to date £1.3m Estimated cost of closure £0.5m Alternative mitigation strategy (highways) £0.5m Contingency £1.2m £3.5m Total	£0.4m per year	M/L - Capital and reputational cost of practically withdrawing from the GDA is to be confirmed.	Core service spend protected. MMDR S reverts to phased approach for delivery in line with original Melton Local Plan. Alternative funding streams can be accessed with the potential of increased support.

* Interest and Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) assumed at 11%

Option 1

53. Continue to deliver under the HIF scheme accessing additional borrowing. Benefits and risks for this option are as following:

a) Benefits:

- i. Grant is available to support accelerated delivery of the infrastructure, thus supporting the delivery of MBC's Local Plan;
- ii. The Southern route links with the Northern and Eastern route to alleviate network pressures and accelerate the development of Melton Mowbray Town Centre;
- iii. The provision of 2146 dwellings, education provision and a new local centre is brought forward, and Section 106 receipts received quicker.

b) Risks/disbenefits:

- i. Increased financial strain placed on the County Council to borrow circa £96.8m to complete the infrastructure against a context of a very difficult financial position for the Council. Necessitating £9.8m of new savings to be identified;
- ii. Programme increasingly pressured/undeliverable in terms of grant draw down and end date;
- iii. Further contractual disputes with the funder may occur meaning further delays and costs associated;
- iv. HE could choose to clawback grant if programme is delayed beyond current proposals, resulting in further financial risk (further details are listed in paragraphs 58-62 of this report);
- v. Significantly increases the time before the County Council could consider a major infrastructure scheme elsewhere in the County;
- vi. Costs remain an estimate and could increase when site investigations commence.

Option 2

54. Withdraw from the HIF scheme and work with MBC to pursue alternative delivery methods. Benefits and risks for this option are as follows:

a) Benefits:

- i. Avoids significant additional borrowing costs for the Council;
- ii. MTFs funds are reallocated to preserve core services; significant forward spend reduced;
- iii. Further time to access alternative funding streams which may offer value above the current HIF allocation of £18.2m;
- iv. Significant progress has already been made around route design and planning processes, so delays to initial stages of future delivery may be limited.

b) Risks/disbenefits:

- i. Legal process of extricating the County Council from the GDA may be lengthy/costly;
- ii. Government Departments may limit ability for the Council to access further Government funding streams.

55. It is recommended to progress with Option 2, alternative delivery strategy, and financial commitment for the reasons detailed in the report. To proceed with this option will consist of the following key actions:

- a) Work with key stakeholders to deliver access and infrastructure to either ends of the current development area to kick start organic growth/delivery of the corridor.
- b) Work with MBC to support the on-going delivery of its Local Plan in a way that maximises developer contributions.
- c) To continue working with key stakeholders on the MMDR S scheme to ensure the Council remains in a positive position should alternative funding streams be identified.

Consultation

56. The scheme has been subject to several processes involving consultation with the public, including as part of MBC's Local Plan development, a preferred route consultation in 2017, a formal planning application process in 2018/19 and a public inquiry in relation to compulsory purchase of land in for the MMDR NE of the road in 2021.

57. Reports regarding the scheme have previously been considered by the Environment and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee (in December 2017, June 2018 and June 2019). The scheme has been discussed as part of regular MTFs reports to the Scrutiny Commission as part of the Environment and Transport Capital Programme.

Legal Implications

58. Although HE ceased funding the scheme in 2022, it had previously provided instalments of grant funding which facilitated the progression of project work. A question then arises as to whether the proposed withdrawal from the scheme would entitle HE to seek to recover grant monies already provided.

59. Under the GDA a distinction is drawn between General and Fundamental Defaults. Broadly, a failure to progress the scheme is in the nature of a General Default. Fundamental Defaults on the other hand more closely relate to situations of illegal behaviour (acts such as bribery).

60. HE's remedies for a Fundamental Default include a contractual entitlement to recoup monies already paid¹. However, with General Defaults, HE's remedies

¹ Clause 12.1.4

are more limited (although HE would technically have a right to claim damages²).

61. A formal withdrawal from the scheme would likely give rise to a further General Default for the purposes of the GDA. However, a withdrawal would be unlikely to amount to a Fundamental Default and therefore the risk that HE will seek the recoupment of monies already paid is probably low.
62. Whilst the Assurance Framework for the Housing Infrastructure Fund -Forward Funding, (which is appended as part of the GDA) makes reference to HE being able to recover any unspent funding in the event that the funded project is not delivered by the agreed date, in practice given that the Council has worked on this project on a self-funding basis for a significant period of time, it is not expected that there will be a significant risk of the Council remaining in receipt of any unspent funding. All grants are paid in arrears of completing works and therefore no unspent funding remains.

Equality Implications

63. The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to consider the need to eliminate discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity between different protected groups.
64. The MMDR S was identified in the Melton Local Plan as essential for the delivery of the planned growth in the District. The Plan itself was subject to an Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment. Any future delivery model for MMDR S will be subject to further assessment in line with the County Council's policy and procedures.

Human Rights Implications

65. There are no Human Rights Implications directly arising from this report. Implications associated with the any future delivery model for MMDR S will be subject to Human Rights Assessments, as appropriate, prior to decisions being made.

Environmental Implications

66. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been carried out in respect of the MMDR NE. Works on an EIA for the MMDR S had commenced and been developed in partnership with the relevant developer partners on the site. This activity was approximately three months from conclusion.
67. This will be considered as a part of the MMDR S alternative delivery model referred to in this report and presented as a part of future decisions, such as planning permission, once the detail is confirmed.

Background Papers

² Clause 12.5

9 May 2016: report to the Cabinet - 'Progress with the Development of a Mowbray Transport Strategy':

<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=4602&Ver=4>

24 March 2020: report to the Cabinet – 'North and East Melton Mowbray Distributor Road - Making of the Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads Order for Land Required'

<https://politics.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MID=5993#A162737>

26 April 2022: report to the Cabinet - North and East Melton Mowbray Distributor Road – Land Assembly

<https://politics.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MId=6743>

23 September 2022: Report to the Cabinet - North and East Melton Mowbray Distributor Road – Approval to submit Full Business Case

[https://politics.leics.gov.uk/\(S\(bceou120k23rqv55d2gvfa3d\)\)/documents/s171226/NE_MMDR%20FBC](https://politics.leics.gov.uk/(S(bceou120k23rqv55d2gvfa3d))/documents/s171226/NE_MMDR%20FBC)

23 September 2022: Report to the Cabinet - Medium Term Financial Strategy – Latest Position

<http://cexmodgov1/documents/s171253/MTFS%20Update%20Supplementary%20Report.pdf>

23 September 2022: Report to the Cabinet - Leicester and Leicestershire Authorities – Statement of Common Ground Relating to Housing and Employment Land Needs (June 2022)

<https://politics.leics.gov.uk/documents/s171194/SoCG%20Cabinet%20report.pdf>

3 November 2022: Report to the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee – North and East Melton Mowbray Distributor Road - Update

<http://cexmodgov1.ad.leics.gov.uk:9075/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1293&MId=6736&Ver=4>

9 November 2022: Report to the Scrutiny Commission – North and Eastern Melton Mowbray Distributor Road – Cost Implications

<http://cexmodgov1.ad.leics.gov.uk:9075/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=137&MId=6872&Ver=4>

25 November 2022: Report to the Cabinet - Managing the Risk Relating to the Delivery of Infrastructure to Support Growth

<http://cexmodgov1.ad.leics.gov.uk:9075/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=6751&Ver=4>

Appendices

Appendix A – Plan of the MMDR S scheme

Appendix B – Principles for Funding Infrastructure to Support Growth

This page is intentionally left blank