



# IVER PARISH COUNCIL

*(incorporating Iver, Iver Heath and Richings Park)*

63, Chequers Orchard  
Iver  
Bucks  
SL0 9NJ

South Bucks District Council  
Planning Department  
Capswood  
Oxford Road  
Denham  
Bucks  
UB9 4LH

10<sup>th</sup> August, 2009

Dear Sir/Madam,

## **Iver Parish Council response to Planning Application 09/00706/OUT by Pinewood Studios Limited**

### **1. Iver Parish Council Response**

Iver Parish Council (“IPC”) is totally and strongly opposed to the outline planning permission application by Pinewood Studios plc (“Pinewood”).

### **2. Green Belt Policy**

The area of land proposed by Pinewood for the outline scheme is Green Belt land as shown on the Proposals Map page 13 being part of the current South Bucks District Council (“SBDC”) Local Plan. In accordance with Policy GB 1 “Green Belt Boundaries and the control over development in the green belt” planning permission will not be granted for development other than for those items listed (a) to (h) under Policy GB 1. That policy goes on to state that development would only be permitted if it did not affect “the character or amenities of the Green Belt, nearby properties or the locality in general...” and “the scale, height, layout, siting, form, design and materials of any new building would not adversely affect the character and amenities of the Green Belt, nearby properties or the locality in general...”

IPC is of the view that the present proposal does not fall within any of the exceptions listed (a) to (h) and would most certainly adversely affect the character of the Green Belt and nearby properties and that the scale, height, layout, siting, form and design would substantially affect the Green Belt character and nearby properties and the locality in general.

### **3. PPG2 guidance**

PPG2 guidance on Green belt development refers to 5 reasons to maintain green belt.

Urban Sprawl – to allow this proposal to go ahead would result in it being a precursor for further applications for housing or commercial development in an area that protects against urban sprawl from West London. There is already significant pressure on the area due to the adjacency of the M25 corridor

Preventing neighbouring towns merging – Iver Heath is referred to by Pinewood as urban; it is in fact 73.4% greenspace. This development would lead to an increased risk of this application being a precursor for further development in the green belt.

Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – Pinewood refer to the area being of low quality but it is part of the green belt which serves to protect South Bucks from encroachment into the countryside.

Preserving the setting and character of historic towns.

Assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land – this land is neither derelict nor urban; it has been used for minerals but reverted to countryside and should remain as green belt.

IPC submits that this proposal is contrary to four of the five reasons to maintain greenbelt and that should be a reason for turning down this application.

### **4. Policy GB 4**

SBDC policy GB 4 states that proposals to establish new employment generation in the Green Belt will not be permitted. This application proposes employment generation in the Green Belt and is therefore contrary to policy GB 4.

There are no other Green Belt policies that would allow for development of the type proposed by Pinewood to be established on the land included in the planning application by Pinewood.

### **5. Colne Valley Park**

SBDC policy L6 refers to the Colne Valley Park and states that proposals in the Colne Valley Park will only be permitted where “they safeguard existing areas of countryside from inappropriate development and do not involve urbanisation of the Park...”. The area contained in the Pinewood proposal is within the Colne Valley Park and therefore in accordance with that policy any proposal should not be permitted.

### **6. Policy EP3**

SBDC policy EP3 refers to The Use, Design and Layout of Development and states that development will only be permitted where its scale, layout, siting, height, design external materials and use are compatible with the character and amenities of the site itself, adjoining

development and the locality in general. In respect of the Pinewood application paragraphs (a), (b),(c), (d),(e) and (f) are relevant.

The scale of the Pinewood application will not be in proportion with the existing nearby properties; the siting of buildings will adversely affect nearby properties and the locality in general; the height of the proposed development takes no regard of the height of the buildings in the locality, buildings as high as 22m will be in close proximity to the existing domestic property estate in the locality; the proposed buildings (albeit this is only an outline plan) will not respect and harmonise with the surrounding properties or with the locality in general; the use of the land for the Pinewood proposal will be detrimental to the character and amenities of nearby properties due to noise, disturbance, visual intrusion loss of privacy, increased traffic and other nuisance.

## **7. Special Circumstances**

The application by Pinewood in Document 2 includes 105 pages to justify that there are Special Circumstances which would allow this proposal to be approved even though it is totally within the Green Belt. IPC would submit that despite the amount of effort spent on attempting to establish Special Circumstances it has not demonstrated that as a fact and it is noticeable that there are no testimonials giving credence to the value to the film industry of having permanent “live/work” film sets.

IPC is aware of letters of concern from members of the film industry that the permanent film sets proposed by Pinewood are not what the film industry needs.

Pinewood Studios Limited does not make films; it is a provider of facilities which it lets to companies that make films, TV programmes and other companies which have some affiliation to the film, TV and creative services.

Those who come to Pinewood to make films wish to use the services of companies in Pinewood Studios. It is by no means proven that producers and directors of films, TV programmes and advertising would wish to use the facilities that Pinewood is proposing particularly when the facilities will have the complications of residents from 1400 properties in the area.

For those reasons IPC considers that the application is only dressed up as a live/work facility to enable Pinewood Studios Limited to build 1400 properties in the Green Belt which is most certainly contrary to SBDC planning policy as set out above.

## **8. Policy H9**

SBDC Local Plan policy H9 refers to the Residential Layout & Design requirements for proposals involving the development of land for residential purposes. It states that the proposal would have to be compatible with the character of the surrounding area in terms of density, layout, design, height, scale, form and materials. In addition the proposal would not adversely affect the character of nearby properties or the locality in general for example through overdominance or obtrusiveness.

IPC is of the view that this proposal should be rejected due to it not complying with the principles of policy H9.

## **9. Traffic issues**

The problems of traffic in Iver Parish have been well documented and are well known to both SBDC and more pertinently Buckinghamshire County Council. SBDC policy TR6 states that SBDC with the Highways Authority will seek to, inter alia, minimise the impact of traffic on the environment.

IPC submits that the impact of traffic generated by this proposal will have a highly detrimental effect on traffic in the whole area of Iver and the adjoining parishes. The only attempts to alleviate traffic problems are the separate plans for two roundabouts at Five Points and Seven Hills Road/A412 junction. Neither of the 2 plans does anything to alleviate traffic issues in the area and in both cases there are no improvements to the feeder roads onto the two roundabouts. The potential for an additional 4000 extra vehicle movements a day to and from the site plus traffic coming onto the site to work would lead to the already congested area of Iver and surrounding parishes becoming even more congested with no planning for easing congestion.

SBDC policy TR5 requires that traffic movements would not have an adverse effect on the amenities of nearby properties on the use quality and character of the locality. The increased traffic movement brought about if this development went ahead would have a significant and deleterious effect on the traffic in the area which is as noted above already heavily congested throughout many hours of the day.

## **10. Impact on the Community**

Iver Heath is a community of 3750 adults living in largely semi-detached and detached properties in a setting which is semi rural and comprises 73.4% greenspace. Project Pinewood estimates a living population of 3,100 which is considered by IPC to be conservative considering there will be 1400 dwellings. 3500 people would be more likely. This proposal therefore almost doubles the population in Iver Heath and the impact on the community will affect the whole parish of Iver together with adjacent areas of Fulmer, Wexham and Denham.

Increased traffic with no improvements made to feeder roads to the two proposed roundabout developments will only serve to increase pressure on the road network in Iver parish and rural roads going through Fulmer and Wexham.

It is noted that the proposal envisages a junior school on the site. However, the need in the area south of the M40 and in the east of South Bucks is for a secondary school; there is plenty of Junior School provision in the area but the nearest secondary schools are in Burnham and Chalfont and Chalfont Community College is currently full. There are Secondary places further north in the county but the need for a secondary school becomes necessary if there is a doubling of the current population.

The proposal envisages a ten year construction period. This will have a major impact on the community of Iver which will result in a deleterious effect on house values in the Iver Heath area.

Pinewood do not consider that this site will be a tourist attraction. There will be permanent film sets in the context of a living/working environment. When Pinewood opened its site in the late 1970's for a weekend the surrounding area was jammed with cars for 10 miles around. This site will be a tourist attraction whether Pinewood believe it or not; people want to visit film sites and this will be no exception. That will only add to the impact on the local community.

Local residents have expressed their concern as to the sustainability issues of the project which they do not see as anything other than a building project dressed up to look like a project for the creative arts; there is no evidence to suggest that this proposal is what the film industry wants and will use for film sets. Film production companies do not want to film on the same film set all the time and they do not want the complications of local residents being in the area.

## **11. A Building Project**

IPC and the residents who have attended public meetings on the project in their hundreds believe that this is basically a building project trying to use Green Belt land on the basis that it is a project for the creative arts.

Pinewood have yet to implement the “Masterplan” on their current site that was approved by SBDC some years ago. That plan provided 97,400 sq m of useable space for the creative industries. Little if any of the “Masterplan” has yet been put into effect. The amount of space for use by the creative industries in the “Masterplan” far outweighs the amount of such space dedicated to the creative industries in the current proposal. For example the academy could be housed on the current Pinewood Studios site.

All of the above leads IPC to the conclusion that this proposal is basically a house building project on Green Belt land. It disguises itself as being for the creative industries but it will only lead to 600+ jobs. This is a small return for allowing 1400 houses to be built on Green Belt.

If it is assumed that properties in this area, if of mixed development i.e from 1 Bedroom properties to 5 bedroom properties (as stated by Pinewood), will have an average selling price of £300,000 per property. 1400 properties will therefore sell for £420,000,000.

**That assumption alone clearly demonstrates that the major impetus for this proposal on Green Belt land is to increase the revenues of Pinewood Studios Ltd.**

## **12. Summary**

In summary IPC is totally opposed to this proposal. Public meetings have shown the level of objection from local residents throughout the whole parish of Iver as well as Fulmer, Wexham and Denham.

Iver Parish Council strongly suggests to SBDC Planning Committee that they should totally reject this application for all of the reasons above and fundamentally to prevent unnecessary development on Green Belt land in South Bucks.

Yours faithfully,

Glenda Collins  
Clerk to Iver Parish Council



# IVER PARISH COUNCIL

*(incorporating Iver, Iver Heath and Richings Park)*

63, Chequers  
Orchard  
Iver  
Bucks  
SL0 9NJ

South Bucks District Council  
Planning Department  
Capswood  
Oxford Road  
Denham  
Bucks UB9 4LH

10<sup>th</sup> August 2009

Dear Sir/Madam,

## **Iver Parish Council response to Planning Application 09/00707/FUL by Pinewood Studios Limited**

### **1. Iver Parish Council Response**

Iver Parish Council (“IPC”) is totally and strongly opposed to this full planning permission application by Pinewood Studios plc (“Pinewood”).

### **2. Green Belt Policy**

The area of land proposed by Pinewood for the Five Points Roundabout scheme is Green Belt Land as shown on the Proposals Map page 17 being part of the current South Bucks District Council (“SBDC”) Local Plan. In accordance with Policy GB 1 “Green Belt Boundaries and the control over development in the green belt” planning permission will not be granted for development other than for those items listed (a) to (h) under Policy GB 1. That policy goes on to state that development would only be permitted if it did not affect “the character or amenities of the Green Belt, nearby properties or the locality in general...”.

IPC is of the view that the present proposal does not fall within any of the exceptions listed (a) to (h) and would most certainly adversely affect the character of the Green Belt and nearby properties and that the scale, layout, siting, form and design would

substantially affect the Green Belt character and nearby properties and the locality in general.

This application is linked to outline application 09/00706/OUT and provides for changes to the Five Points Roundabout on the A412 and three other feeder roads. The planned changes take out a large swathe of greenbelt land designated as a playing field on the Local Plan map. This is considered by IPC a damaging removal of greenbelt and a gross urbanisation of the roundabout for little apparent benefit for reasons as set out below.

### **3. Traffic issues**

The changes to the Five Points Roundabout despite taking a large area of Green Belt land do not appear to make any changes to the five roads that feed into the roundabout. The A412 leading to Denham will still remain as a single two way carriageway which is currently congested for four hours of the day during rush hours. This scheme will not relieve that congestion. The Pinewood Road leading to the studio complex, Wood Lane leading to Iver and Langley and Slough Road leading to Uxbridge all remain single two way carriageways. This scheme will have no effect on those roads. The A412 leading to Slough is not altered by this scheme.

IPC sees no benefit in this scheme as it does not appear to solve the traffic congestion in Iver Heath and merely serves to urbanise the whole area around this roundabout with extra street furniture such as traffic lights and other signage.

### **4. Tree loss**

IPC considers that the loss of trees on Green Belt land in the area around this roundabout would be seriously detrimental to the character of the village of Iver Heath of which the Five Points Roundabout is key landmark but one which is currently not urbanised as would be the result of this scheme.

### **5. Summary**

In summary IPC is totally and strongly opposed to this application, considers it unnecessary and not helpful in relieving traffic on the roads of Iver.

Iver Parish Council strongly suggests to SBDC Planning Committee that they should totally reject this application for all of the reasons above and fundamentally to prevent unnecessary development on Green Belt land in South Bucks.

Yours faithfully,

Glenda Collins  
Clerk to Iver Parish Council



# IVER PARISH COUNCIL

*(incorporating Iver, Iver Heath and Richings Park)*

63, Chequers  
Orchard  
Iver  
Bucks  
SL0 9NJ

South Bucks District Council  
Planning Department  
Capswood  
Oxford Road  
Denham  
Bucks UB9 4LH

10<sup>th</sup> August 2009

Dear Sir/Madam,

## **Iver Parish Council response to Planning Application 09/00708/FUL by Pinewood Studios Limited**

### **1. Iver Parish Council Response**

Iver Parish Council (“IPC”) is totally and strongly opposed to this full planning permission application by Pinewood Studios plc (“Pinewood”).

### **2. Green Belt Policy**

The area of land proposed by Pinewood for the Denham Road/Sevenhills Road Junction scheme is Green Belt Land as shown on the Proposals Map page 13 being part of the current South Bucks District Council (“SBDC”) Local Plan. In accordance with Policy GB 1 “Green Belt Boundaries and the control over development in the green belt” planning permission will not be granted for development other than for those items listed (a) to (h) under Policy GB 1. That policy goes on to state that development would only be permitted if it did not affect “the character or amenities of the Green Belt, nearby properties or the locality in general....”.

IPC is of the view that the present proposal does not fall within any of the exceptions listed (a) to (h) and would most certainly adversely affect the character of the Green Belt and nearby properties and that the scale, layout, siting, form and design would

substantially affect the Green Belt character and nearby properties and the locality in general.

This application is linked to outline application 09/00706/OUT and provides for changes to the Denham Road/Sevenhills Road Junction by means of creating a roundabout on Green Belt land. This is considered by IPC a damaging removal of greenbelt and an urbanisation of the area. The roundabout does not in the opinion of IPC make any significant effect other than encouraging more traffic to use Sevenhills Road.

### **3. Traffic issues**

As noted above the implementation of a roundabout at this junction will only have the effect of encouraging more traffic to use Sevenhills Road as a cut through when the Denham Road to Iver Heath is congested which is the case for two hours each morning and in the evening also. Sevenhills Road is a narrow carriageway road ending in a single carriageway with limited passing room at its western end. The encouragement of traffic on that unsuitable road is in IPC opinion highly undesirable.

### **4. Tree loss**

IPC considers that the loss of trees on Green Belt land in the area around this roundabout would be seriously detrimental to the character of the village of Iver Heath.

### **5. Summary**

In summary IPC is totally and strongly opposed to this application, considers it unnecessary and not helpful in relieving traffic on the roads of Iver.

Iver Parish Council strongly suggests to SBDC Planning Committee that they should totally reject this application for all of the reasons above and fundamentally to prevent unnecessary development on Green Belt land in South Bucks.

Yours faithfully,

Glenda Collins  
Clerk to Iver Parish Council