



Strategic Sites Committee 23/10/2023 Update

Application Number:	PL/22/06443/FULEA
Proposal:	Full planning permission for production space and supporting buildings for screen-based media and associated services/industries. The development of approximately 168,718 sqm GEA total floorspace comprising : sound stages, workshops , office accommodation, studio hub associated outdoor space such as backlots and unit bases; entrance structures and reception; security infrastructure, mobility hub; cafes; parking; bridge; incidental supporting buildings; associated infrastructure; public art; upgraded vehicular access onto Marlow Road; new cycle and pedestrian accesses; a new cultural/educational/recreational building; a new community building and associated landscaping, publicly accessible recreational land and ecological and environmental enhancements/habitat creation Land Adjacent South Side Marlow Road And A404 Junction Westhorpe Park Little Marlow Buckinghamshire
Site Location:	Land Adjacent South Side Marlow Road And A404 Junction Westhorpe Park Little Marlow Buckinghamshire
Applicant:	Dido Property Limited (Company Ref: 67692)
Case Officer:	John Fannon
Ward(s) affected:	Flackwell Heath, Little Marlow & SE
Parish-Town Council:	Little Marlow Parish Council
Date valid application received:	21 June 2022
Statutory determination date:	11 October 2022 (EOT 27.10.23)

This update report comprises:

1. Highways + Transport submissions
2. Further Representations
3. Amendments to Report
4. Plans - a selection of plans are attached for information

1. Highways + Transport submissions

- 1.1 A significant number of documents have been submitted since the publication of the report to Committee, these are referred to by the applicant as *Transport Submissions in response to the Buckinghamshire Council and National Highways Responses dated 29th September*. It should be noted that officers have for some considerable time made clear to the applicant that early September was the cut off for a full and final submission to allow the application to be reported to Committee on the 23rd October.
- 1.2 The main documents are listed below. This is followed by an officer comment on the key documents.
- i. **VISSIM modelling (N16)**
 - ii. **Internal Layout (N15)**
 - iii. **Car Parking (N17)**
 - iv. **Westhorpe Interchange Note**
 - v. **Active Travel Strategy (N14)**
 - vi. **Draft Site Management Plan (R04)**
 - vii. **Passenger Transport**
 - viii. **Travel Plan**
 - ix. **Note: Response to Buckinghamshire Council Comments on Wide Area Network Assessment** – received 19th October. No comment.
 - x. **Stage 1 Road Safety Audit A404(T)/ A4155 Westhorpe Interchange Improvement** – received 19th October. National Highways have responded stating *“For avoidance of doubt, ... this is not an RSA1 in accordance with GG119 and is not the RSA1 as required by National Highways to be completed at the end of preliminary design and to be instructed by National Highways (in consultation with Bucks CC who will be signatories to the RSA brief).*
- 1.3 It appears that much of this information is clarification and summary of previously submitted information. However one document does include significant proposals and details not previously considered. The report **Active Travel Strategy (N14)** includes proposed improvements to the Volvo bridge that have not been previously submitted prior to or as part of the full and final submission in September 2023. It is accepted that the Supplementary Transport Assessment does make mention of improvements. It states at paragraph 6.61. *Potential improvement to the Volvo Footbridge through the implementation of ramps to allow for cyclist access and the increase of the parapet height on the bridge to 1.4m, to improve cyclist safety.* However no details were formally submitted previously. This is now being put forward as part of the mitigation strategy rather than identifying it as a potential improvement at a later stage. The details proposed show Volvo bridge ramps on the west side of the A404 removing some of the public open space, trees and vegetation, and positioned close to residential properties. The land is not within the applicant’s control and is on land outside highway limits. The ramps would need planning permission but they are not included within the application. These works would need to be considered by both National Highways as the strategic highway authority and Buckinghamshire highway as the local highway authority.
- 1.4 It would be unfair to accept these changes at this late stage in the process as the consultees and public have been given the opportunity to comment. Therefore this document is not being treated as amended information nor does it form part of the points of clarification or comments on the application being reported to committee.

VISSIM modelling (N16)

- 1.5 The applicant has provided this Note in response to the concerns raised in the Highway Authority's (HA's) comments relating to the Supplementary Transport Assessment (STA). The HA has commissioned Atkins to review the response and the results of the VISSIM modelling and a summary of findings is as follows:
- The results summary written by Vectos provides information on individual junction performance. No reference to queueing back has been noted, which is evident from the queue length analysis shown in the appendices and from previous video footage.
 - An example of the above is at Parkway roundabout where queues in 2034 AM peak for East arm under Option 2 Managed are 53pcu's or 300m – this is extending back through Westhorpe Interchange (WI), as it is only a 32m approach (5 pcu's). If we look at the 5 min queue analysis tables in the appendices of the modelling note “WIE18037.125.TN.21.1.2”, we can see that queues are starting at the Wiltshire Roundabout from 08:15 and remain long for 15 minutes until 08:30. This queuing extends back west through the network and has a knock on impact along the A4155 from 08:20 to 08:40, with high queues forming and blocking through the various junctions and along the A404 slip roads.
 - It is evident from the results and the queue length analysis undertaken by Waterman that during the AM peak, there is queueing westbound along the A4155 that extends back through all junctions. This has not been considered as part of the Note submitted.
 - Delays have increased for some approaches, which are considered severe for local residents and BC.
 - There are increases in queues and delays east of Westhorpe interchange that were not present in the reference case model and therefore is a direct result of the development and new site access roundabout.
 - Journey time comparisons and Level of Service (LoS) were not presented alongside the queue and delay results, to provide further evidence of local impacts along the A4155.
- 1.6 It should be noted that the above is a summary of some of the issues that have been identified by Atkins up to this stage, when taking into account the limited time available to assess the submissions. It is however evident that there are a number of concerns that remain outstanding, therefore the HA's position in relation to the likely severe impact on the local highway network as a result of the additional development traffic remain as detailed in the HA's response to the STA.

Internal Site Layout (N15)

- 1.7 The applicant has again stated that they consider BC should only be considering the access from the public highway and no further into the site, as the site is to remain private.
- 1.8 The HA has previously given its reasoning as to why we consider it important to ensure that the site layout is safe and fit for purpose, as required by paragraph 130 of the NPPF, and the HA's position on this has not changed.
- 1.9 In relation to the ground floor of the western section of the northern car park, the applicant has now confirmed that the western part of this area contains plant and access would therefore be for maintenance. A swept path for a van entering this area has been provided. The eastern part of this area is a parking/marshalling area for materials and props and there will be no public access to this area either.

- 1.10 The HA's comments relating to the ground floor of the southern car park raised the issue relating to the standard (western) parking space, adjacent to where the door to the Pavilion has been removed, and the applicants own tracking showing that, due to the space being adjacent to the car park wall, the car would position itself adjacent to the southern edge of the parking space which may impact on the ability for people to access the car with ease.
- 1.11 The applicant has referred to the separation between the space and the wall, however the applicants own tracking demonstrates that with the level of separation proposed a car would need to pull out and re-enter the parking space at least one more time to be able to park centrally within the space. This should not occur in a newly designed car park and has not been addressed by the applicant. This issue therefore remains outstanding.
- 1.12 A further point raised in the HA's response related to an HGV exiting the site and the tracking showing that it would take up much of the two lanes on the approach to the site exit and in turn would impact on the ability for other vehicles to utilise the other lane on the approach to the roundabout access. There was concern that this had not been taken into account in the VISSIM modelling. The HA is aware that National Highways raised the same issue.
- 1.13 The applicant has confirmed that the appropriate priority rule in the VISSIM modelling has been added, which has dealt with the issue raised above.
- 1.14 It should however be noted that there remain issues raised in the HA's response to TAA2 in relation to how vehicles use the site and no swept analysis being provided for large sections of the site, which have not been addressed and are still outstanding.

Car Parking Response Note (N17)

- 1.15 The applicant has increased the scope of the parking surveys to include additional streets within Marlow to the south of the original scope. This is as requested in the HA's response.
- 1.16 The applicant has not provided any further details in relation to the ability to secure appropriate mitigation should issues be identified. The applicant refers to the ability for appropriate detail to be secured within a S106 Agreement, however the HA has not had sight of any wording that the applicant may consider to be appropriate and therefore is not in a position to confirm that the strategy as proposed is acceptable.

Westhorpe Interchange Note

- 1.17 Aecom has provided a Note on the implementation of LTN 1/20 at the A404 Westhorpe Interchange.
- 1.18 The Note recognises that the existing shared use infrastructure along the A4155 Marlow Road is not compatible with the requirements of LTN 1/20. It also recognises that due to the existing extent of the public highway corridor and adjoining private property boundaries it is considered unfeasible that sections of the existing provision can be upgraded to be compatible with LTN 1/20 without the need to acquire additional land and potentially significant construction works.

- 1.19 The Note states that to the west of the site LTN 1/20 requires a grade separation when a facility crosses traffic lanes where the speed limit is 60mph. However, should the speed limit be reduced to less than 50mph it introduces an opportunity to use signal-controlled crossings of the carriageways.
- 1.20 It is stated that opportunities to provide a crossing of the interchange which is compliant with LTN 1/20 include retaining the current speed limit and provide a grade separated solution or to reduce the speed limit and improve the existing facilities and provide new signal controlled crossings. However, the Note states that based on the currently available information, it is anticipated that neither the HA or Marlow Film Studios own or control sufficient land in the vicinity of the Westhorpe Interchange to enable such a solution to be delivered. In relation to the alternative solution, reducing the speed limit would be subject to a public consultation and the outcome of which would not be guaranteed.
- 1.21 In relation to the proposals across the Westhorpe roundabout, the Note states that an application will be made to the Council to reduce the speed limit to 40mph. In relation to this it is again important to note that the change to the speed would be subject to a public consultation and the outcome cannot therefore be guaranteed. It is proposed to increase the height of the bridge parapet to 1.5m to accommodate cyclists over the bridge, however the note states that this is subject to structural assessments that have not yet been carried out.
- 1.22 It is also proposed to increase the width of the shared use facility over the A404 Westhorpe Interchange to 3m wide with a 300m buffer. This would also be subject to structural assessments that have not yet been carried out. The details provided do not therefore confirm to the HA as to whether the proposed improvements are physically possible.
- 1.23 It is also very important to note that any changes to the Westhorpe roundabout junction would be subject to approval from NH, and as far as can be determined by the HA at this stage, such approval has not been received. The HA therefore considers that, based on the submitted information, it has not been demonstrated that the improvements across the Westhorpe junction can be delivered and in turn can be relied upon.

Active Travel Strategy Response Note (N14)

- 1.24 The Note states that detailed plans have been produced for proposed pedestrian and cycle improvements and are contained within Appendix of the Note. While the plans show an improved 3m wide cycleway and 2m wide footway route leading to the east of the development along the existing PROW and through land in control of the applicant, the plans showing the route to the west of the development through Marlow, while showing where existing and proposed crossing points are provided, lack detail of any other improvements that may be required.
- 1.25 The applicant has suggested that they will provide a contribution to the Council in order for the Council to deliver the identified improvements to crossing points along the route to the west of the site. However, the HA has stated before that improvements should be identified and detailed on plans so that they can be secured as part of any planning consent for the applicant to delivery as part of a S278 off-site highway works agreement. As submitted, the HA does not consider adequate improvements have been identified and adequate details have not been provided to address the concerns previously raised.

- 1.26 The HA's comments to the WCHAR assessment contained within the response to the STA highlighted that there were parts of the proposed walking/cycling routes that required further consideration in terms of improvements to make them more attractive to walking and cycling. Measures to make drivers more alert to the presence of cyclists were suggested, and questions were raised as to the appropriateness of routes that did not benefit from a separate footway provision. Such improvements have not been detailed further in this latest round of information.
- 1.27 Previous responses from the HA have highlighted the need to improve side road crossings on the A4155 Little Marlow Road route leading from the Westhorpe junction to the west, however the applicant has simply responded to suggest that the carriageway painting that is currently in place should be subject to maintenance by the Council. However, the HA's previous responses were clear in that these side road crossings along this main route should be brought into line with LTN 1/20 with them being raised to footway level and an extract from LTN 1/20 has previously been included to demonstrate to the applicant what the HA would require. The applicant is not proposing these improvements. The HA remains of the view that these improvements to the A4155 corridor are required to make the route safer and more attractive to pedestrians and cyclists.
- 1.28 The applicant is now proposing to deliver improvements to the Volvo Footbridge to allow for its use by cyclists by adding ramps. While the ramps will aid in the movement of cyclists and physically impaired persons across the bridge it is noted that the width of the bridge will remain at 1.8m, which is not wide enough to act as a shared facility for both pedestrians and cyclists.
- 1.29 It is also the case that the ramp to the west of the bridge is shown to land on land that is not shown to form part of the public highway. The ramp also falls within an area that is designated as green space in the Local Plan. The applicant has given reasoning as to why they consider exceptional circumstances exist for the loss of this green space, however this will require consideration by the LPA and therefore at this stage the HA is not able to provide further comment.
- 1.30 It is also noted that changes to the Volvo footbridge would require the approval of NH and at this stage the HA is not aware that NH approval has been given. When taking this, land ownership issues and green space issues into account the HA considers that the applicant has not demonstrated that the improvements to the footbridge can be delivered and in turn provide a safe and attractive route for cyclists and persons with physical impairments.
- 1.31 The Note also refers to the improvements proposed to the Westhorpe Roundabout, however as stated in the HA's response to the Aecom Note, the proposed improvements would be subject to structural and design assessments that have not been carried out and they would also be subject to approval by NH. As the applicant has not demonstrated that either of these things have occurred, the HA is not currently able to determine whether the proposed improvements are actually deliverable. This in turn brings into question the ability of the applicant to deliver a safe and suitable walking and cycling route across the Westhorpe roundabout and into Marlow.
- 1.32 Mindful of the above, the outstanding issues with the walking and cycling proposals for the proposed development does not enable the HA to have sufficient certainty in the ability of the applicant to achieve the proposed modal shift away from the private car and to also deliver a site that is sustainable and not over reliant on the private car as a main form of transport.

Draft Site Management Plan (R04)

- 1.33 The HA's response to the STA submissions referenced the need for a Site Management Plan to be submitted in order to outline how the internal workings of the site will operate, resulting in the applicant now submitting a Draft Site Management Plan.
- 1.34 The Management Plan confirms that access will be needed by servicing vehicles at various time to all of the buildings which are served by a network of internal roads and flexibility is needed on how the site operates.
- 1.35 Section 3 deals with Management and confirms that access to the site is controlled by a security gate which will only allow authorised vehicles onto the site.
- 1.36 It is stated that swept path analysis was submitted with TAA2 to show how vehicles enter/leave the site and then move around the site. In relation to how vehicles move around the site, the HA's response to TAA2 highlighted a number of areas where no swept path analysis had been provided, for example there were a number of cul-de-sacs where the road terminated without any turning area to allow vehicles to turn and avoid reversing over extended distances. It does not appear that any further swept path analysis has taken place, therefore the previously raised points relating to the tracking of vehicles around the site are still outstanding.
- 1.37 The 'On Site Management' section confirms that a 10mph speed limit will be adopted around the site. It is stated in the Note that there are areas where larger vehicles cannot pass each other, and it goes on to state that when vehicles do arrive at these locations there is good visibility to ensure they can see each other. It is issues such as this that have been raised in previous HA responses, however the applicant has not provided adequate detail at this stage to demonstrate that there is adequate forward visibility at locations where vehicles cannot pass to allow an opposing vehicle to wait at a suitable location to allow another to pass.
- 1.38 It is also stated that some manoeuvres will be managed by banksman to guide drivers and to ensure that when larger vehicles are turning, all users of the site are aware of the vehicle turning and that sufficient space is provided. It is unclear in what areas these instances may occur, and whether this may result in larger vehicles having to undertake multiple turning manoeuvres on main pedestrian routes within the site. It is not clear why a new development should be designed such that some vehicles are expected to require banksman in order to carry out turning manoeuvres within the site. The site should provide safe and suitable access and be designed to either provide adequate turning areas clear of routes used by vulnerable users of the site, or through routes should be provided to avoid the need to turn.
- 1.39 Section 4 of the Management Plan deals with 'Monitoring and Review'. It is stated that a baseline survey will be undertaken within 6 months of occupation of phase 1 of the development in order to record the following information:
- The number of deliveries to the Site;
 - The vehicle classification;
 - Whether the vehicle is fossil-fuel or electric;

- The arrival time;
- The length of stay;
- The purpose of the trip including item description;
- Whether the vehicle contains a consolidated load; and
- Whether the supply company is a member of any best practice scheme, such as FORS.

1.40 The applicant will undertake future surveys on an annual basis for a minimum period of 10 years after the first survey.

1.41 It is stated that the results of the surveys will be reported to BC as the local planning and highway authority and where appropriate remedial measures will be identified to ensure that the objectives of the SMP are being met.

1.42 While the Draft Site Management Plan contains measures that would be expected from such a plan, it does not adequately deal with the issues relating to the movement of vehicles around the site to ensure that a safe and suitable passage for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists is maintained.

Passenger Transport

1.43 The Council's Passenger Transport Team has considered the additional information that has been provided by the applicant. They have confirmed that the additional detail behind the proposals for public transport is helpful and they are now comfortable with what the applicant is proposing, however they fully appreciate that there will need to be more work on the specifics of delivery in due course.

Travel Plan

1.44 The Council's Travel Planning team has considered the additional information that has been provided by the applicant. They have confirmed that there remain a number of outstanding points that require addressing. The issues that remain are around the areas of cycle and walking catchments, mode share target clarity, time available for the TPC for TP tasks, new sustainable transport route funding, off-site parking monitoring area and management and the difference between total daily trips in the best case scenario and the total number of parking spaces. Full comments will be provided in due course; however the Council remains of the view that the mode shift the applicant is relying upon is unrealistic

1.45 Overall the highway position has not changed and the reasons for refusal remain as set out in the report.

2. Further Representations

2.1 It has been brought to our attention that Appendix 1 incorrectly attributes comments to Marlow Town Council which they are not and are representation from Cllr Scott and Cllr Funnell. This is an error, and an amendment is included at section 3 below.

Additional representations – Councillors:

2.2 **A statement has been circulated to members by Cllr Clarke.** This is in support of the application. It states:

I would commend the application for approval because of the many substantial benefits. My ward, Abbey, will directly benefit from:

Employment opportunities:

- *Especially for those young people coming out of Buckinghamshire College and Buckinghamshire New University from the various faculties in particular the Media Faculty, both these facilities are in my ward, and I am pleased to highlight that both these educational institutions supported the application.*
- *Also there will be a range of employment opportunities for others both in the local and wider area, including skilled trades people, administrators and artisans and the creative industry.*
- *Opportunities for training, for both graduates and non-graduates through many apprenticeships in the proposed Culture and Skills Academy to be installed on site.*

Transport Improvements:

- *New bus route from High Wycombe to Marlow and Maidenhead, giving access to both British Rail and the Elizabeth Line, note that the new bus route will start in my ward, and improve connectivity and economic opportunities for my residents and business owners.*
- *Removal of the existing queuing back onto the carriageway to exit the A404 Westhorpe, a vital improvement to stop this important trunk road becoming congested, as it is a vital link from the M4 to the M40 at Handy Cross (in my ward). This solves a problem for us, as there is no funding for these improvements.*

Other wider benefits include:

- *Increase in general spending power of people employed at the new facility, as well as custom for hospitality and retail spend.*
- *Substantial increase in biodiversity, with new land to the north of Spade Oak Lake, a place widely appreciated for country walks including from people living in my ward.*
- *Improvements to walking and particularly cycling, with new off road paths, which will particularly benefit young people.*
- *Solar panels generating basic energy needs, topped up with renewables.*
- *Making use of a landfill tip in a way that makes a positive impact on the local and wider economy of Southern Buckinghamshire.*

I do understand the controversy of proposals in the Green Belt, but the Government policy allows

for 'very special circumstances'. A development of this calibre is, in my view, clearly a very special circumstance, and I give the scheme my full support. A golden opportunity not to be missed!

Additional representations – public

- 2.3 The total number of support representations has increased from 3262 to approximately 3621. The total number of objection representations has increased from 2313 to approximately 2491. An amendment is included at section 3 below.
- 2.4 It is noted that the applicant has advised that they have submitted their own calculation and advise that the numbers should be: Support – 3555; Objections – 2066; Neutral – 25. The differences may be due to the fact there may be some duplicate comments (which we caught in some places) and there were some neighbours who commented more than once. It may also in part be due to human error.
- 2.5 The applicant raises a concern that we have not consistently referenced standard and non-standard letters of objection and support. They ask that the note (within the Table at para 4.2) differentiating standard from non-standard letters of support should be omitted entirely or a similar note be included in the objection column. It is acknowledged that a number of objector letters are based on a “standard” template. The reason for recording the standard support letters separately is that they came directly from the applicants. In light of this clarification it is not considered that the report needs an amendment in this regard.
- 2.6 Additional objection comments (not already included in the report summary at Appendix 2):**
- *Rejection of this proposal allows for the Council to discharge their current obligations under RUR4, the CROW act, S106 and work towards delivering a Parkland amenity space.*
 - *Proposed discharge of surface water from holding tanks into Westhorpe Lake and the Newt Ditch known as Spade Oak Brook will discharge surface water via a pipe into a ditch near resident's property on Westhorpe Farm Lane. Bore hole is adjacent to discharge pipe and excavations could contaminate drinking water.*
 - *If planning is approved, residents of Westhorpe Park should be rehoused. Access of heavy goods vehicles should be limited to 9.30am to 4.00pm.*

Additional representations – organisations

- 2.7 Buckinghamshire College Group** - letter of support. In summary:
- *This proposal is in line with helping us deliver on our educational, skills and career goals, as this will offer valuable and critical opportunities and pathways for Buckinghamshire's young adults to enter the film & TV industry. The proposal also directly supports the implementation of Buckinghamshire Local Skills Improvement Plan which has been endorsed fully by the Secretary of State for Education.*
 - *We also affirm our commitment to work with Marlow Film Studios to improve support for Buckinghamshire's skills targets by utilising their Cultural & Skills Academy which will provide an on-site, dedicated education facility, enabling students to work directly with industry by offering a unique on-site education and experiences, working directly with industry professionals.*
 - *We deliver courses that Marlow Films Studios would support, and lead students into new career opportunities that don't exist today, especially our courses on subjects like VFX, set design, post-production, and sound design.*
 - *A significant proportion of College students are resident in the Opportunity Bucks wards and*

often do not have access to the support of their more affluent peers. Marlow Film Studios is committed to supporting new routes into the film and high-end TV sector securing local talent which will help to raise aspirations for many of the County's more disadvantaged students.

- *Buckinghamshire College Group passionately supports the Marlow Film Studios to create a new dynamic film studio which offers high quality and much needed capacity and where they place education at the heart of the project.*

2.8 Officer Response: Issue relating to education and skills are addressed at Section 8 of the report.

2.9 **Save Marlow's Green Belt** Transport Evidence Review (Motion): This report provides a review and critique of the transport evidence submitted in support of the planning application. In summary:

It is concluded that development at the Application Site:

- *is unsustainable in transportation terms thereby failing to meet the requirements of paragraphs 105 and 110 (a) of the NPPF;*
- *does not demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved thereby failing to meet the requirements of paragraph 110 (b) of the NPPF; and*
- *would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.*

It states that no conclusion regarding the residual cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development can be drawn as the assessment is flawed.

2.10 Save Marlow's Green Belt has also submitted a further representation opposing the development. In summary:

- ***The development's harm to the Green Belt does not outweigh its benefits.*** 2017 Green Belt Study by WDC shows that the site is not capable of removal from the Green Belt. Streaming industry is now maturing and need for further film and HETV production facilities is weakening, therefore its contribution to the UK economy would be trivial. The development will not create 4,000 new jobs, rather it would create a workplace for existing jobs. No estimates for local GDP. Proposed skills and training programme lack sufficient detail.
- ***There is no justification for the selection of the proposed site.*** Report by BC from Lampton-Smith-Hampton implies that the proximity to West London is not a material consideration as there are many examples of successful studios around the UK.
- ***The development is contrary to Local Plan (RUR4).*** Application is contrary to RUR4 and Little Marlow Gravel Pits SPG 2002. Decision by BC cabinet to reject the designation of the country park does not weaken the purpose of policy RUR4.
- ***The increased traffic will endanger lives and increase pollution.*** Comments from BC Highways show that the development would adversely affect the users of the existing road network and would lead to additional on-street parking. As stated by National Highways, it would be illegitimate for BC to decide on the application until they have submitted a final recommendation. Development will harm the wellbeing of the residents of Marlow especially those at Westhorpe Park Homes.
- ***The development will harm the environment and damage the visual amenity and character of the area.*** The development is out of keeping with its surroundings and will disfigure the landscape. Further environmental concerns have been reiterated by experts such as The National Trust, The Chilterns Society etc.

2.11 Officer Response: Issue relating to Highways are addressed at Section 14 of the report.

3. Amendments to report

Page 3 – Case Officer should read John Fannon.

Page 6 – para 1.9 states that Biodiversity Net Gain is afforded ‘moderate’ weight. This should be amended to read ‘significant’ weight.

Page 8 – para 2.4 states a ‘public right of way’ that runs alongside some of the western boundary of the site in a north-south direction. This should read ‘path’ not a public right of way.

Page 16 – add paragraphs summarising planning permissions for the more recent, modern extensions to Westhorpe House.

3.8 Westhorpe House applications:

23/05487/MINAMD - Proposed non-material amendment to permission Change of use of buildings from office use (Class B1) to residential use (Class C3) to create 33 dwellings (9 x 1 bed, 17 x 2 bed and 7 x 3 bed) together with alterations to the buildings, bin and cycle storage, landscaping, parking and ancillary works granted under planning ref: 17/07122/FUL. To be determined.

17/07122/FUL - Change of use of buildings from office use (Class B1) to residential use (Class C3) to create 33 dwellings (9 x 1 bed, 17 x 2 bed and 7 x 3 bed) together with alterations to the buildings, bin and cycle storage, landscaping, parking and ancillary works. Approved November 2017

Page 17 – Paragraph 4.2, the figures including those in the Table should be updated to; letters in support 3621, letters of objection 2491.

Page 19 – Paragraph 5.8, NPPF reference should be 2023 rather than 2021.

Page 143 - Appendix A1 – The comments under the heading Marlow Town Council (Neighbouring ‘Parish’) should be listed as letters of representation from Cllr Scott and Cllr Funnell rather than Marlow Town Council comments.