

Agenda Item	Application Reference	Additional Info Received/Updates to Committee																									
5	25/01073/FUM	An extension of time has formally been agreed until 7th August 2026. A formatting error has occurred in the table following paragraph 31, resulting in each box within the table having been numbered. The table should appear as follows: <table><tr><td>Unit size</td><td>1 bed</td><td>2 bed</td><td>3 bed</td><td>4 and 5 bed</td></tr><tr><td>Number of Market</td><td>0</td><td>9</td><td>16</td><td>9 and 2</td></tr><tr><td>% Market</td><td>0</td><td>25</td><td>45</td><td>30</td></tr><tr><td>Number of Affordable</td><td>4</td><td>10</td><td>8</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>% Affordable</td><td>17</td><td>42</td><td>33</td><td>8</td></tr></table> An objection has been received from the British Horse Society (BHS), which is available to view in full on the public access website and is summarised as follows: - Insufficient mitigation of impacts on equestrian users. - Failure to secure “<i>inclusive improvement</i>” and access to the public rights of way network. - Submitted Transport Assessment considers pedestrians, cyclists, buses and motor vehicles but no assessment of equestrian movements. - Original funding for the Burwell-Exning corridor was secured ten years ago, since when updates to national policy and guidance has been introduced. - The proposals for the Exning end of the corridor recognise the need to accommodate equestrians and the Burwell end should therefore also do so to provide a continuous strategic link. Additional S106 funding could have been secured through the current application to support this enhancement.	Unit size	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 and 5 bed	Number of Market	0	9	16	9 and 2	% Market	0	25	45	30	Number of Affordable	4	10	8	2	% Affordable	17	42	33	8
Unit size	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 and 5 bed																							
Number of Market	0	9	16	9 and 2																							
% Market	0	25	45	30																							
Number of Affordable	4	10	8	2																							
% Affordable	17	42	33	8																							

		- Amendments requested to: secure additional funding for the Burwell-Exning corridor; review the detailed design of the Burwell-Exning corridor to ensure that it accords with current national policy, guidance, and design principles; secure a planning obligation to require the completion of the corridor prior to a given trigger, to be agreed by the Local Highway Authority. <i>Officer response:</i> - The BHS objection statement that the NPPF requires planning decisions to “<i>identify and pursue opportunities to promote walking, cycling and horse riding</i>” is inaccurate. The only mention of horse riding in the NPPF is in the definition of National Trails provided in the glossary: “<i>National trails: Long distance routes for walking, cycling and horse riding.</i>” Paragraphs 96, 110, and 116 (to which the BHS objection refers) do not relate to National Trails, which are mentioned only at paragraph 105, which states that “<i>policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.</i>” The application does not affect any existing public rights of way and provides adequate links to the existing rights of way network in the vicinity. - The Officer Report addresses the County Transport Assessment Team’s (CTAT) request for additional funding for the Burwell-Exning corridor at paragraph 80. The BHS objection contends that securing an additional financial contribution would allow the Burwell-Exning corridor to be enhanced for equestrian use. Following receipt of the CTAT comments, the LPA sought clarification as to how an additional contribution would meet the tests of the CIL Regulations 122. The email response from the CTAT referenced only walking and cycling facilities, making no reference to equestrian enhancements nor providing any further specific justification for the additional funding request. The BHS comments do not alter the assessment made at paragraph 80 of the Officer Report. - The Burwell-Exning corridor is a separate development project that is not directly related to the current application and its detailed design and construction timetable is not, therefore, a matter for consideration in relation to the current proposal. - It is noted that the BHS objection is predicated on Section 9 of the NPPF, which relates to the promotion of sustainable transport. Within this section, paragraph 116 clearly states that “<i>Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.</i>” The Local Highway Authority and CTAT have not advised the LPA that such unacceptable or severe impacts would result from the development in the absence of additional funding towards the Burwell-Exning corridor and the concerns raised by the BHS
--	--	---

		are not, therefore, considered sufficient to provide sufficient grounds to justify a refusal of the application. <i>Applicant response:</i> The applicant's agent has provided a direct response to the BHS objection, which is available to view in full on the public access website. In summary, it states that: - The access strategy and associated infrastructure for the wider has already been established through the previous (outline and reserved matters) permissions and the current application should be assessed in the context of this approved and established framework. - Policy BUR1 does not include any equestrian requirements, the BHS comments do not identify a specific bridleway or byway affected by the proposal nor demonstrate how the current application would prejudice existing equestrian access. - The application does not deliver, control or amend the Burwell-Exning corridor nor provide a mechanism through which its design can be reconsidered. - No justification has been provided for additional funding contributions from the current application for the Burwell-Exning corridor. - No objection is maintained by either the CTAT or the LHA to the proposal. - The BHS requested amendments are neither reasonable nor capable of being secured through the current application.

Planning Committee Update –