

Pinewood Screen Hub - Wexham and Ivers Community Board Community Mitigation Asks

This note provides a response to the 'Asks' provided to the Council in March 2021.

Principles for S106 contributions and conditions

The tests of lawfulness are detailed within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the associated guidance (PPG) and within the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. Paragraph 002 of the PPG details that planning obligations can assist in mitigating the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable in planning terms.

As set out within the NPPF (para 57) to meet the tests obligations must be:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

As set out within the PPG and NPPF (para 56) planning conditions need to meet the following six tests:

- necessary;
- relevant to planning;
- relevant to the development to be permitted;
- enforceable;
- precise; and
- reasonable in all other respects.

Assessment of Mitigation Requests

Officers and relevant technical consultees have considered the Community Mitigation Ask Requests. The applicant, Pinewood Group Ltd (PGL) has also been consulted.

The requests have been categorised as follows:

- A. Requests that reflect measures already being proposed/considered either within the application, via planning condition or via S106 planning obligation.
- B. Requests relating to potential mitigation measures worthy of consideration.
- C. Requests which would fall outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework and cannot therefore be considered. A number of these requests are not directly related or relevant to the proposed development and have been discounted on this basis.

A high level summary with headings under the three categories is provided below. A more detailed schedule itemising all the 'asks' and with commentary follows.

It should be noted that any approval would be subject to planning conditions, regulating the development to avoid/minimise impact on residential amenity for example relating to approval of detailed design, landscape implementation, construction management, traffic management, noise levels, etc.

Summary

A. Mitigation measures being proposed / agreed

- Air Quality: Air quality mitigation measures via sustainable travel measures.
- Traffic Management: The improvements to both Seven Hills Road and the Five Points Roundabout.
- Sustainable Transport: Visitor Attraction shuttle bus and Studios shuttle bus.
- Traffic Management: Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
- Signage: A signage strategy to be agreed and implemented.

B. Mitigation subject to further consideration / negotiation

- Air Quality: Contribution towards the implementation of the Air Quality Action Plan.
- Environmental Mitigation: Contribution towards mitigation of impacts in Black Park.
- Sustainable Transport: Contributions towards walking and cycling improvements.
- Community Impact: Apprenticeships/training opportunities for local people.

C. Requests that fall outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework and cannot therefore be considered.

- Air Quality: specific funding requests that do not reasonably relate to the development.
- Traffic management: signage / works that do not reasonably relate to the development.
- Highways improvements: measures that do not reasonably relate to the development.
- Green Belt mitigation: measures that do not accord with Green Belt policy.
- Environmental mitigation: improved access for local residents generally that do not reasonably relate to the development.
- Community impact: specified measures that are not related nor relevant to the development.

Schedule: Community Mitigation Asks (March 2021) with commentary

The requested mitigation 'asks' are considered under 3 categories:

Category A – reflects measures proposed / agreed.

Category B – under consideration / subject to negotiation + agreement.

Category C – falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework.

Community Mitigation Asks	
Air Quality	Category A / B / C - Comments
A detailed air quality mitigation strategy is implemented along with a monitoring system along all roads across the area affected by additional routed and rat running traffic. This should continue as long as the visitor attraction is in operation and funding provided to Bucks Council to operate and manage the scheme.	A – mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Statement (ES) to be secured (via S106 and planning condition/s). There is already a network of passive diffusion tubes (monitoring) on most roads that may be affected by additional routed and rat running traffic.
Contribution towards the implementation of the Air Quality Action Plan for the Parish.	B – under consideration. Financial contribution being actively negotiated with PGL.
Funding provided for air quality mitigation filtering units to all schools and nursery schools affected by any additional traffic in Iver, Wexham, Stoke Poges and Fulmer. Funding for maintenance and upgrading of these should be provided for 10 years.	C – falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. There is no evidence to support the requirement for Air Filtration Systems (AFS) at schools in the Ivers. The Air Quality Action Plan for South Bucks is focussed on reducing emissions at source.
Traffic Management	
The improvements to both Seven Hills Road and the Five Points Roundabout must be completed before this development is occupied and open to the public.	A – both schemes to be secured. One scheme to be implemented prior to opening and the second in accordance with an agreed phasing strategy.
The designated access route for construction traffic must be clearly signposted and monitored so that traffic will avoid all the local villages, particularly for very large loads.	A – to be secured via condition (CTMP), as part of each and every RM application, this will include matters of construction routing and times of deliveries etc.
Signage	
The designated access routes to the proposed development and the existing Pinewood sites must be clearly signposted from the M40 pointing traffic to Junction 1 and the M4 pointing traffic to use only the A412/A4 to avoid all the local villages and this must be monitored.	A – to be secured. A signing strategy is to be secured covering routes between Iver station in the south to the M40 in the north.
The impact of rat running traffic travelling to the new development via Stoke Poges local roads will require engineering works to the following junctions:- a) From the M40 junction 2, Collum Green Road, Gerrards Cross Road and Stoke Common Road which will form part of any satnav route plus signalisation will be required. b) The section of the Bells Hill between Rogers Lane and Pennyletts Green will require additional signalisation and traffic calming on Hollybush Hill.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. These routes have minimum numbers of additional vehicles present as a result of the development (single figures) and these junctions are so far removed from the development no justification could be argued.

Highway Improvement	
The A 412 is a fatal accident blackspot and speeding hotspot so this should be improved by the introduction of traffic lights at the junction of Black Park Road and the A412.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. The development does not cause this issue or make the issue any worse and therefore there is no justification in requiring it to seek to mitigate any issues at this junction.
The increased volume of traffic on the A412 will impact on the safety record of this road and the installation of an average speed camera installation is required.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. The increase in traffic is not significant enough to represent a worsening of the road safety, so mitigation is not required.
The Pinewood Green Area should be protected from rat running by Studio and Experience traffic by a scheme that is acceptable to the residents. It also requires a residents parking scheme to prevent staff and visitors parking in this area. The parking scheme will require funding to implement and to provide on-going monitoring by enforcement officers.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. Pinewood Green will benefit from 7HR being upgraded making that route faster and more desirable. Parking in Pinewood Green has been demonstrated to not be caused by Pinewood, and so this is not a development issue to resolve.
A contribution to a traffic management scheme across the Ivers to reduce traffic congestion.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. It is not a development issue to resolve traffic congestion in the Ivers, the impacts of the development have been mitigated through the identified schemes.
Residents walking from Wexham Street and Rowley Lane do not have a pedestrian footway between the end of the developed area and the entrance to Black Park which should be provided to protect the public.	C/B - the specific request falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. However a contribution to improved pedestrian / cycle routes is under negotiation, and while the application of such funds would need to be focussed where it is likely to have most benefit, there will be some flexibility.
Green Belt Mitigation	
The proposed development is sited in around 32 hectares of the green belt and the loss of this amenity will require mitigation to replace this large area of open green belt which will be lost forever.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not public open space so it would not be reasonable to seek to replace it, otherwise this requirement would not accord with Green Belt policy.
The provision of Alderbourne Farm as mitigation is not sufficient given that this is already open green belt land. It is remote from many residents and requires new rights of way to be provided to connect with those existing in the Ivers, Fulmer and Wexham.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. Alderbourne Farm is not part of proposals.
Thorney Park is a well used site that should also be provided in mitigation as it is closer to the many in the community. These two areas should be protected in perpetuity as a local public asset.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. Thorney Park is owned by Buckinghamshire Council and managed by the country parks team, although it is not a designated country park.
A comprehensive network of public rights of way should be put in place to link up existing rights of way in The Ivers, Wexham, Fulmer and Denham.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. Such a requirement is not related to the development. It would also not be deliverable on land outside the control of the applicant.

Environmental Mitigation	
Black Park and Langley Park are already under significant pressure should be protected from large numbers of additional visitors coming from the Pinewood Experience	A / B – The scheme design includes measures to mitigate impact on Black Park. A financial contribution to mitigate impacts on Black Park is also subject to negotiation.
Access to the Parks for local residents should be enhanced by the provision of a green bridge across the A412, which is going to have a significant increase in traffic.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. The development is not responsible for providing additional links between the parks, there is no severe impact on the A412 or a Safety case to require this. A Green Bridge between Black Park and Langley Park was looked at many years ago, however the footprint of this type of structure is significant and would significantly impact on Black Park and Langley Park.
Sustainable transport actions should include: - The walking and cycleway link to Iver Station should be completed via Bangors Road, Iver High Street and Thorney Lane North and South.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. The signing strategy identifies the most appropriate walking and cycling routes. The suggestions are not the identified routes and therefore could not be a requirement of the development.
- Wood Lane needs upgrading to provide a cycleway and footpath.	B – There are PSDF S106 contributions for this. Further contributions also being negotiated in the context of sustainable access for workers in particular.
- A new footpath from Seven Hills Road/A412 to the Denham Quarry roundabout.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This may be a good idea but it is not required to make this development acceptable. It certainly does not link the development with visitors or staff.
- An electric bicycle scheme should be provided linking Pinewood to the Thornbridge Road shops, Iver Village and Iver station.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not required for the development to be acceptable and would have very little benefit.
- The existing shuttle bus service to the complex needs to be extended and rerouted to wider area of the Ivers.	B / C – the expansion of the shuttle bus service is proposed and will be secured via a S106 obligations, however this is for staff / visitor access and not a general bus service. The shuttle bus service is there for the operation of Pinewood Studios and the development. Incidental benefits to the wider area are positive, but the applicants are in no way obligated to provide this nor is it their responsibility to supplement a paucity in local bus services.
- Improvement to local bus services to Uxbridge and Slough perhaps using Pinewood shuttle buses.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This could be considered as part of CIL or other contributions however the application has dealt with this issue through the provision of private services to manage their impacts, rather than being reliant on a commercial operator. Local operators will respond to commercial demand and it cannot be this applications responsibility to subsidise these routes.
The opening hours need to be reduced to provide a longer respite period for noise and disturbance for local residents.	B – as far as reasonably practicable, significant adverse noise impacts will be mitigated by appropriate conditions so additional mitigation is not required.

The provision of funding for a 25 year legacy countryside management service with project officers (who will have access to a developer funded pot of money) delivering local countryside improvements to mitigate the impact on and enhance the biodiversity and landscape/farmland character. This would serve to protect the wider area for future generations.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not required to offset impacts on biodiversity as the biodiversity net gain calculations indicate there will be an increase in biodiversity value at the site post-development. Any mitigation required for species (e.g bats/birds/newts) would be secured and most likely be dealt with onsite.
An acoustic protection scheme should be provided to local residents impacted by raised noise levels.	B - this will be a consideration at detailed design and Reserved Matters Approval stage. If necessary appropriate planning conditions will be considered.
Community Impact	
Fund an integrated ANPR/CCTV system to provide coverage of the Iver Parish area. This should cover all entry and exit points and be extended to residential rounds. Access to footage would be complaint with all relevant legislation. The scheme mirrors the approach taken by the Smartville projects run by community groups and these groups could manage the project once installed.	A / C - There will be CCTV at junctions – the specific request for funding falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. Highways will require CCTV to be present at the two new signals junctions in accordance with the ITS team requirements, however the remaining suggestion is disproportionate and would not be supported by the Highway Authority. There would also be concerns about this proposal on privacy and other grounds.
A significant number of the proposed apprenticeships/training schemes to be reserved for local people.	A / B – an apprenticeship scheme is agreed and the detailed arrangements under negotiation.
A proportion of the proposed business units to be available at a reduced rate for social enterprises in perpetuity and to local start-up and other small and medium sized businesses for up to three years at significantly reduced rates.	B / C - Local employment priority notification measures agreed and detailed arrangements under negotiation. The specific request falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework.
Contribution funding an Iver Heath Village Centre.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not relevant to the development proposed.
Contribution to a local secondary school	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not relevant to the development proposed.
Improvement to car parking provision at local shops	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not relevant to the development proposed.
An upgrade of street lighting and playground equipment in Wexham Parish	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not relevant to the development proposed.
An annual contribution of £50,000 to The Ivers Parish Council fund to be allocated for a period of ten years for local green space mitigation projects in the Ivers area.	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not relevant to the development proposed.
Payment of a fund of £500,000 to The Ivers Parish Council for improvement and upkeep of community buildings in the local area	C - falls outside the scope of the planning regulatory framework. This is not relevant to the development proposed.