

PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE: 30th April 2025

Agenda item: 5

APPLICATION NO: F/YR21/0852/O

SITE LOCATION: Fridaybridge Agricultural Camp, 173 March Road, Friday Bridge

PROPOSAL: Erect up to 102 x dwellings, a community building/museum and sports changing facilities involving the demolition of existing buildings (outline application with all matters reserved)

Update No.1: Consultation response from Cambridgeshire County Council Planning and Sustainable Growth Team

1.0 Background

1.1. On 23rd April 2025, following publication of the Planning Committee Agenda, the Local Planning Authority received an email from Cambridgeshire County Council Planning and Sustainable Growth Team advising that their consultation response of 27th August 2021 was not referenced within the Committee Report.

1.2. Within their email, Cambridgeshire County Council Planning and Sustainable Growth Team attached a copy of their previous consultation response which requests an indicative total of £1,720,725 for education mitigation projects, to be split as follows:

- Early Years education – £366,261 (Project:- Additional Early Years Places in Friday Bridge Primary School)
- Primary education - £715,081 (Project:- Expansion of Friday Bridge Primary School)
- Secondary education - £624,338 (Project:- Expansion of Thomas Clarkson Academy)
- Libraries - £15,045 (Project:- Enhancement of Wisbech Library)

1.3 The email and consultation response from Cambridgeshire County Council Planning and Sustainable Growth Team can be viewed on the Council's website.

2.0 Conclusion

2.1 Policy LP13 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014 states that all new development should be supported by, and have good access to, infrastructure. Furthermore, policy LP13 states that planning permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is, or will be, sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the requirements arising from the proposed development.

2.2 The contributions requested by Cambridgeshire County Council Planning and Sustainable Growth Team are considered necessary to make the

development acceptable and they meet the tests of CIL regulations in that they are, i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; ii) directly related to the development; and, iii) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

2.3 It is therefore considered that the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would be supported by, and have good access to, sustainable educational infrastructure provision to support and meet all the requirements arising from the proposed development, contrary to policy LP13 of the Local Plan.

2.4 On the basis of the above, officers consider it necessary to amend refusal reason 7, to include reference to the contribution requested from Cambridgeshire County Council Planning and Sustainable Growth Team.

Update No.2: Consultation response from FDC Trees Consultant

3.0 Background

3.1 On 28th April 2025, following publication of the Planning Committee Agenda, the Local Planning Authority received a consultation response from the Council's Trees Consultant which related to an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) received by the Local Planning Authority in March 2025.

3.2 The consultation response concludes that the updated AIA lacks sufficient detail identifying which trees would be removed or impacted, and which trees may cause shade to properties and increase pressure to remove them.

3.3 The consultation response from Council's Tree Consultant can be viewed on the Council's website.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 With consideration given to the outline nature of the planning application and the complexity of survey requirements at this stage, in addition to ensuring consistency with the agreed approach for further ecology surveys, it is considered that removals and other impacts on trees could be addressed within a subsequent Reserved Matters application (in any event of planning permission being granted).

4.2 The Tree Consultants consultation response therefore does not change the officer view set out within paragraph 9.81 of the Committee Report, which states that, although the proposed development would result in some conflict with policy LP16 of the Local Plan as it does not demonstrate retention and incorporation of all existing trees, it would not be reasonable to refuse the planning application on this basis due to the absence of any identified harm to the arboricultural value of the site.

4.3 The Tree Consultants comments relating to trees shading properties is consistent with Refusal Reason 5, which states that the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed quantum of development could be

accommodated within the site without the proposed dwellings and associated gardens being significantly overshadowed by existing trees to be retained.

- 4.4 On the basis of the above, officers consider that the consultation response from the Council's Trees Consultant does not materially alter the recommendation as set out within the Committee Report.

Update No.3: Additional information submitted by agent

5.0 Background

- 5.1 The Local Planning Authority has received additional information from the agent on 28th April 2025, comprising:

- A Heads of Terms document, titled 'Planning Obligations Statement', stating that the applicant agrees to enter into a legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority to meet all Section 106 requirements.
- A letter from MTP Developments Ltd (MTP), dated 14th April 2025, stating that they have an interest in acquiring the site should outline planning permission be granted on 30th April. The letter states that the offer is predicated on MTP acquiring the site with their Registered Provider partner, Platform Housing, and a commitment to deliver the scheme as 100% affordable housing with a mix of intermediate sales and rental tenures. The letter states that MTP can also confirm that, as a Homes England Strategic Partner, this development is allocated funds as part of MTP's current programme to support the delivery of affordable housing.
- An email from the agent relating to the additional documents.

- 5.2 The Heads of Terms document, letter from MTP and email from the agent can be viewed on the Council's website.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 Due to the late nature of the submission of the additional information by the agent, officers have not been afforded sufficient time to fully consider the additional information and whether it materially alters the recommended refusal reasons. Officers have therefore not formally accepted the additional information and, notwithstanding this position, the additional information does not alter the overall recommendation to refuse the application.

Recommendation: REFUSE – This update results in the following amendment to the officer recommendation within the agenda.

Amend refusal reason 7 as follows, to include reference to the contribution requested from Cambridgeshire County Council Planning and Sustainable Growth Team:

- “7. The application is not accompanied by a Heads of Terms or any other form of agreement to provide the contributions requested by Cambridgeshire County Council Planning and Sustainable Growth Team (£1,720,725), the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (£33,354) and the NHS Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Integrated Care System (£87,691.56), which are considered necessary to make the development acceptable. The application therefore fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would be supported by, and have good access to, sustainable infrastructure provision to support and meet all the requirements arising from the proposed development, contrary to policy LP13 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014.”*