



Pinewood Working Group

Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 17th November 2020

Start Time: 18:01

End Time: 19:35

Attendees: Trevor Egleton, Luisa Sullivan, Wendy Matthews, Ralph Bagge, Carol Gibson, David Brackin, Ciaran Beary, Alan Wilson, Graham Young, Daniel Gigg, Christine Urry, Andrew Smith, Sara Dutfield, Alice Williams.

1. Chairman's Introduction

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Pinewood Working Group and highlighted the Terms of Reference which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

2. Pinewood Presentation

Sara Dutfield, Director of Turley, the planning consultants for the application delivered a presentation to the group and highlighted the following key points:

- The application is supported by a comprehensive transport assessment in line with the sustainable transport strategy. The application demonstrates suitability and identifies transport strategies which include a travel plan to ensure non car travel and a shuttle bus exclusive to the visitor attraction.
- The application will include a comprehensive visitor booking procedure to ensure that transport in the area is managed.
- Visitor numbers will be controlled: 5,000 on weekdays, 6,500 during school holidays and 8,500 on weekends.
- Ample capacity to control traffic movements, subject to road safety audit. Safe and acceptable access is provided for all modes of travel.
- The traffic impact has been carefully assessed. Based on model agreed with Buckinghamshire Council. Assessment shows that no existing junction will experience adverse traffic impact.

- It was suggested that a subsequent meeting be arranged with Turley transport officers to deliver a more detailed outline of the transport proposal.

Andrew Smith, Director of Pinewood highlighted the following key points:

- The model of a visitor attraction has distinct differences to a tourist park. No rides or exteriors and is a lot more controlled.
- The attraction had been modelled using film experience, experience with some IP (multiple theme experience) and all IP (one principal theme).
- Ticket and ride provisions, will come in through Slough.
- Shuttle services from Slough.
- Timed entrances. Tickets have to be booked in advance in order to control numbers.

The following points were highlighted in response to questions from the Group:

- The applicant was taking into account suggestions of a Park and Ride scheme. The suggestion had been submitted post decision.
- Discussions were taking place internally as to how the attraction will mitigate vehicle parking in the vicinity.
- Concerns were expressed regarding traffic mitigation, how visitors will be directed to specified routes. It was highlighted that the operations of the road network would be a suitable topic for a future meeting.
- Shuttle buses will provide a minimum modal split of 60/40. There will be a dedicated series of shuttle buses initially to Slough train station.
- The modal split will be guaranteed and it was anticipated that this would be a restriction within the section 106 agreements.
- Thinkwell, Planning Consultants recommended this system as best practise to manage traffic flow and provide a positive visitor experience.
- The size and square footage of the visitor experience would be similar to the Harry Potter studio tour and the applicant anticipated a similar attract ability. It was highlighted that the figures published in the most recent application for the Harry Potter studio tour could be used as a guide for members, with the difference that no VIP experiences will be operated late in the evening.
- The Chairman emphasised that the planning application was live and that the group would have to ensure that the discussions did not breach planning protocol.
- The film experience was centred around the Pinewood brand as opposed to a specific film franchise which required the experience to be based at the studio itself.
- Any other planning applications that had the potential to impact the scheme such as the Colne Valley M25 service station had been included in the environmental impact statement. However no planning application had yet been submitted. A review would take place if the application was granted.
- Andrew Smith suggested that Shepperton Studios be used as a guidance model for mitigation. Section 106 costs and additional funding came to £25 million. £15 million was used for highways improvements.

3. Planning Officers Presentation

Daniel Gigg, Planning Officer, Buckinghamshire Council updated the group and highlighted the following key points:

- Daniel had attended the most recent Community Board meeting to update on the progress of the planning application. Since the last update, the statutory consultation had closed on 15th November 2020 and officers were in the process of reviewing feedback.
- There were plans for the application to be considered by the Planning Committee in February 2021.
- It was explained that when a planning authority makes a decision on planning applications there were mechanisms and measurements in place to ensure that the application is acceptable. This includes section 106 agreements and planning obligations along with planning conditions. Buckinghamshire Council were bound by government and law to apply very strict tests before conditions can be placed on a permission.
- Daniel would prepare a note that identified what tests are in legislation contained in Community Infrastructure.

ACTION: Daniel Gigg

- The following examples were given of how conditions were used in terms of planning applications:
 - Mitigate impacts on highways infrastructure - Pedestrian crossing
 - Securing gains - bio diversity gains
- Section 106 used for securing financial contributions:
 - Increase in local population causing strain on school capacity, then a school could be set up.

The following points were highlighted in response to questions raised by the group:

- Section 278 was used as a mechanism for a developer to undertake works on the highway and was supplementary.
- The planning officers could advise the group further around relevant timings for decisions. The applicant was working towards February 2021 to present the application to the planning committee, but planners were not yet in a position to make a decision on mitigation measures. The planning officers would continue to be invited to the group as needed and feedback to applicants.
- It was suggested by members of the group that research be done into the Harry Potter Studio tour planning application to use as a template. The Chairman responded that the group would have to be careful to not impact what the planners were doing. It was highlighted that the planning officers would make contact with officers at relevant councils.
- If it was considered necessary to put in parking restrictions this would go through a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process. The TRO would be separate consultation and would be secured as part of mitigation process but would fall into separate process under the Highways act.

- The group will look at exploring additional mitigation measures that weren't included in Section 106. Group handling supplementary local issues. Is there a limited subset of mitigation requests received? Background to testing processes can be included in note. The local planning authority makes assessment and decision.

4. Forward Plan

The next meeting would be focused on the transport/highways model and how it would operate on a local level.

Meetings would be held every two weeks.

The planning team and applicant would arrange for maps to be circulated in order to give a clearer picture of the area.

ACTION: Daniel Gigg, Sara Dutfield