

LITTLE MARLOW PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Public Meeting held virtually via Zoom on Wednesday 4th November 2020 at 7.30 pm to discuss the Planning Application submitted by Buckinghamshire Council for the continued use of Spade Oak Quarry for film-making purposes.

Present

Little Marlow Parish Council: Cllr Valerie Brownridge (Chair), Cllr Jason Downes, Cllr Kath Acres, Cllr Anna Crabtree, Cllr Vivien Morton, Cllr Geoff Fitchew

Buckinghamshire Councillors: Cllr David Johncock, Cllr David Watson,

Representatives of Buckinghamshire Council (BC): Charles Brocklehurst (Interim Head of Special Projects Property and Assets), David Broom (Independent Ecology Consultant), Neil Rowley (Director, Planning, Savills)

Public: Quentin Falk, Anthea Falk, Pat Banfield, William Northcroft, Stuart Crabtree, Verity West, James Rose, Mike Overall, Louise Griffiths, Dilys Barratt, Martin Dru, Guy Rigby, David and Sarah Brown, Douglas Fergusson, Roy Mills.

1. Cllr Valerie Brownridge welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that it would be recorded to ensure accurate minutes for distribution. Charles Brocklehurst had been sent the list of questions from parishioners in advance (copy at Annex A) and attendees would be welcome to ask additional questions. Charles Brocklehurst undertook to provide written answers to the submitted questions for the LMPC meeting on 10th November.

2. Charles Brocklehurst gave a short presentation outlining progress with the country park since Buckinghamshire had acquired the land 12 months ago.

On acquisition the site was derelict, habitat unmanaged, and the perimeter path was in a bad state. Since then Muschallick Road had been cleared of fly tipping and 24/7 security is now in place. A new access track to the island had been made and invasive species destroyed. The tern rafts were being repaired and work was scheduled to clear the back streams to lower the water level. They were in the process of appointing consultants to design a new drop off and pick up area for Little Marlow school. £50k had been spent so far. The total area of the Country park is c600 acres, the lake is c70 acres and habitat compartments c 40 acres. The film set site is c5 acres Charles Brocklehurst said that the key point about the application was that it was “enabling development”. There had been no previous investment in the lake or in Little Marlow Lake Country Park (LMLCP). The country park needed to be self-funding. There was therefore a link between film set use, habitat improvement and wider country park improvement. We had an opportunity now to take forward a vision for LM Country Park.

The meeting was then opened up to the public for questions.

Nature and Wildlife

3. Verity West expressed concern that the planning application was based on a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal done over a year ago. This Appraisal recommended that further impact surveys should be done and it appeared that these further impact surveys had not been carried out either for the original temporary application under Permitted Development or for this new application for extended use. She would have expected an impact survey and a full ecological appraisal to have been attached to the application. David Broom advised that further studies

had been undertaken earlier this year and in response to this, several areas had been excluded from the film set site. Charles Brocklehurst agreed that prior to the Parish Council meeting on Tuesday 10th November he would let LMPC have a summary of the surveys they had done and measures they had taken to ensure that the use as allowed under Permitted Development rights and the proposed continuation of that use were not harmful to the area concerned. Verity West expressed concern that habitat and wildlife were already under threat from the existing works on the site. She therefore wanted more thought to be given to habitat and wildlife considerations before we planned to extend it for a further 3 years. She was aware that restoration work was planned but that was to repair damage done. She was trying to prevent damage in the first place. She wanted to see a net gain from the project not just putting back what had been destroyed. Charles Brocklehurst asked that it be recorded that he didn't agree that they had damaged the habitat or destroyed anything. The area concerned had been assessed before they undertook any work to it and the amount of habitat it provided was very limited, if any. The gravel works area was largely derelict when BC acquired it and the activities undertaken had not damaged habitats.

4. Cllr Jason Downes asked whether the impact on the surrounding nature reserve of a further three years of operation of the film set had been assessed and documented and if so whether it was possible for this assessment to be released. Charles Brocklehurst confirmed that the impact not been assessed and documented prior to this application for continued use, but that such an assessment had been undertaken prior to the Permitted Development temporary application, but had not been published.

5. Verity West drew attention to the fact that it was now a lot further on in the year and any surveys which had been undertaken for the temporary application under Permitted Development were no longer valid for this time of the year. Bats were now hibernating in the trees which surrounded the site and were being disturbed by the noise and the light which could be fatal to them. She cited this as an example of how the information we had and the surveys done were not sufficient for what was being proposed on the site. She added that noise and light pollution did not just affect wildlife and habitats but also the local residents.

6. Cllr David Johncock pointed out that the full environmental impact of the film set could not be assessed because filming had not yet started. He suggested that an application to extend the current temporary application granted under Permitted Development until spring 2021 could be made to allow the company to finish its filming and if there was a desire to continue using the site for filming or anything else thereafter, then a new full Planning Application with a full ecological appraisal could be submitted. Mr Brocklehurst agreed to consider varying this application so that it became an extension for the current temporary application to enable filming to finish and then submitting a new application for continued use of the site for film making purposes for three years.

7. Responding to concerns raised about the fact that the Carrington lands were not included in the application for continued usage in spite of the amount of activity on them, Charles Brocklehurst explained that the Carrington lands would not be required after the current film set left in spring 2021. This led to a question about why there would no longer be any need for a car park under continued usage of the site. Charles Brocklehurst responded that there was no intention for the current film company to remain beyond their current film set, although they might run over the 9 months period because of lock-down, in which case they have an option to extend on a monthly basis for a further three months. The only reason for seeking an extension for the continued use of site for film purposes was to attract another film company to raise funds to invest in the Country Park. A subsequent film company might not

want so much land. The fact that the site would be available to whichever film company wanted to use it in future raised some concerns but Charles Brocklehurst assured those present that they had put a number of conditions in place for the existing film company and would do the same for any future film companies.

Noise and Light Pollution

8. The meeting agreed with Charles Brocklehurst's suggestion that the "good neighbour" concerns relating to noise, light, working hours etc might be addressed in writing rather than at the meeting. (A copy of the written answers are attached at Annex B.) Charles Brocklehurst said that the current agreement with the film company limited noise and light pollution and that the noise from generators should be resolved soon when a connection to the main electricity supply was made. Traffic should not go through the village as fluorescent signs would show film related traffic where to turn. He added that he was keen to set up better lines of communication with residents both to keep them informed as plans progressed and to deal with any complaints swiftly when they occurred. It was agreed that Charles Brocklehurst, the Chairmen of the two Residents' Associations and the film company would work together to set up a communication channel via social media and the Parish Council website.

Change of Use

9. Cllr Jason Downes pointed out that the planning application contained a site lay-out for the set as an integral part of that application. Given that this would be taken down when the current film company left and any new film company would put up a different set, would this render the application invalid? Neil Rowley responded that the drawings submitted with the planning application for continued use set out an example of how the film set might be laid out, but this could change over the time the film company was there. It was not intended as a permanent lay-out. What was important was the parameters which were set out on the drawings such as build height and what could be done in which areas. These would apply whichever film company was on set.

10. Cllr Jason Downes asked about the ancillary use of the agricultural field for parking and marquees and whether this meant that all the fields between Little Marlow and Bourne End could be used under this ancillary use on a temporary basis whenever they liked. Neil Rowley explained that Permitted Development rights allowed land adjacent to a building operation to be used as a site compound for that operation. Only land adjacent to the film set could be used. The amount of land they would use was likely to be minimal and certainly not everywhere between Little Marlow and Bourne End. Cllr Downes refuted this. He pointed out that the two fields were technically adjacent to the site. The area of protected trees to the North of the site would, in his interpretation of what adjacent meant, imply that the marquees and parking were not adjacent to the film set. But if we took it that they were adjacent, then this would mean that the entire field was adjacent to the film set and in fact that both fields were adjacent. He was greatly concerned that a very wide interpretation of that could be presented for Permitted Development. What he was essentially saying was that the film set triggered the ability for someone to trigger Permitted Development rights to use the entire agricultural field north of the lake for whatever they wanted in relation to the film set. Neil Rowley agreed that was what Permitted Development allowed but added that the film companies were only going to use the land they needed.

11. Moving on to questions about clean up and restoration, Neil Rowley said that full restoration of the site was required under permitted development and that the lease provided

for a retained deposit to ensure that funds were available for this restoration. He confirmed that the planning application could not be used to alter the greenbelt status of the area.

12. Responding to a question about Muschallick Road, Charles Brocklehurst said that although Muschallick Road was technically private, it was impossible to stop pedestrians using it, but hopefully the planned new footpath from Fern Lane through the Carrington owned fields to the country park would provide a safer alternative.

Financial benefits

13. William Northcroft asked how we could be sure that the benefits did actually materialise and were used to improve the whole Country Park area as this was the whole purpose of allowing the land to be used for film-making. Charles Brocklehurst responded that it was for the Parish Council to ask that Bucks Council enter into a S106 agreement with the developer. The Council should ask Bucks Council to make it a condition of granting planning permission that the funds raised from the use of the site for film making purposes should come back to into the Country Park. Cllr David Johncock and Cllr David Watson had already suggested this. Charles Brocklehurst also took the opportunity to re-assure the meeting that on the question of conflict of interest, there was a strong divide between the regulatory function of the authority and the executive function.

14. Charles Brocklehurst was questioned about whether the film company would stay on given the investment they had made in the set. He responded that there was no evidence that the company would go beyond their current term in spite of the significant amount of money they had spent. It was quite normal for film companies to spend huge amounts on sets and then dismantle them after 12 weeks.

Parking and visitor facilities for Country Park

15. In response to a question about where visitors to the country park would park now that the area originally envisaged for car parking was going to be used for filming, Charles Brocklehurst said that there was a separate application at the pre-app stage covering a variation of the original restoration plan which proposed putting parking provision along the concrete road going towards the fishermen's car park. There was also some land available within the gravel yard which could be used for parking.

Compliance

16. Complaints were made about the bleeps from plant equipment etc being heard from as early as 5.30 Sunday morning and lights coming on at 6 am and still being on at 7 pm. Charles Brocklehurst undertook to follow up. Concerns were also raised about compliance with any conditions which were set for the operation of the film set.

Country Park Liaison Group

17. It was agreed that it would be useful to set up a liaison group to discuss the vision for the country park development and its implications. This working group would consist of the two local Bucks Councillors, Mike Overall and representatives of Buckinghamshire Council, local Residents' Associations and LMPC.

Next steps

18. The Parish Council's response to the planning application would be determined at the LMPC Meeting to be held virtually on Tuesday 10th November at 8pm and comments fed in to Bucks Council Planning Department. Residents could also feed in their comments to Bucks Council via the Planning portal on the Bucks Council website.

Summary

19. Cllr Valerie Brownridge summarised the outcome of the meeting as follows:

- Charles Brocklehurst would look into the possibility of varying this application so that it became an extension for the current temporary application to enable filming to finish and then submitting a new application for continued use of the site for film making purposes for three years which would include the requested ecological reports.
- Charles Brocklehurst would let LMPC have a report before the Parish Council meeting on 10 November on the additional wildlife and habitat surveys which have been done this year.
- Charles Brocklehurst would provide LMPC with written answers to the questions on lighting, noise, working hours etc before the Parish Council meeting on 10 November.
- Cllr Jason Downes and Charles Brocklehurst would discuss a mechanism for communication and complaints.
- A working party/liaison group would be set up to look at the vision for the country park with Charles Brocklehurst.
- The Parish Council would discuss the planning application at its meeting on 10 November and feed in comments to Buck Council, which would include asking that if planning permission is granted, one of the conditions should be that the funds raised from the use of the site for film making purposes should come back to into the Country Park.

Cllr Valerie Brownridge thanked everyone attending the meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm.

Annex A

Questions for Charles Brocklehurst

From: Anthea Falk, William Northcroft, Vivien Morton, Roy Mills, Dilys Barratt, Verity West, Kath Acres, Sophie & Chris Doherty, Jason Downes, Anna Crabtree, Martin Dru, David Brown

On Nature and Wildlife:

1. Could Charles comment on the following, please:

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal appears to have been carried out with no prior information regarding proposed plans. The PEA does not provide enough information on its own to make a planning decision. It makes very reasonable and clear recommendations for further impact surveys, to determine the ecological baseline. The survey was carried out in October 2019, but the covering letter was written in October 2020, indicating no further impact surveys have been carried out. If they were, they do not appear in the documents accompanying the two applications.

The Council should not have granted permission for the temporary development, without this further survey information, as they won't have discharged their duty with regard to European Protected Species (bats and GCN). There is also the potential for the work to commit a legal offence under other legislation relating to reptiles, nesting birds, badger setts, wintering or breeding birds on the lake.

The BCC Ecological Officer commented prior to the first application decision:

“The PEA is provides a good initial assessment of the sites ecological value. It is clear that there is potential for the site to be of importance to a large number of different protected and notable species. The report makes recommendations that further surveying will be required to clarify there presence or absence. It is unclear how the site might be used and therefore it is not possible to assess what potential impact might result. It might be the case that lighting, noise and disturbance from people moving through the site could have a negative impact on protected wildlife. RECOMMENDATION(S) Further details need to be made available with regards to the nature of the proposals. This will inform what potential impacts might be and what further surveys might be needed. Until a better understanding of the proposals and what the potential impacts might be, it will not be possible to give detailed comments on this.” (sic)

The following recommended condition was also identified by a BCC representative:

“there being no disruption of the wildlife resident in the reserve (in addition to all the birds that feed and roost around the lake, there is a large population of glow worms which need to be conserved).”

The noise and light pollution being made at the site, is having a detrimental impact on the local wildlife, including a European Protected Species (bats) as well as badgers, owls and wintering birds. This will be especially hazardous during the hibernation/winter period. Many surrounding habitats are also being negatively impacted:

- The adjacent field is being used as a car park, removing the local barn owl foraging habitat, the badger foraging habitat, disrupting small mammals, etc.
- The ground has been badly churned up in places, potentially affecting reptiles and invertebrates, which will take time to recover.
- The trees and hedgerows surrounding the site are being disturbed by the movement of traffic, vehicle pollution, etc. This vegetation provides vital habitat shelter and food source for bats and birds.

Questions:

2. The PEA attached to the planning application seemed to require several further investigations to be carried out (relating to bats, badgers, newts, etc.) but there is no sign of those in the application documents. Have these been done? What did they say? What actions have been taken to avoid, for example, disturbing hibernating bats?
3. Similarly, I understand that some of the birds and wildlife now using the lake are quite rare and special. The film set is very close to what is possibly the most important area of the lake, namely the "island" area. What has been done to assess the impact the film set may have on the wildlife and to minimise that? Concerns in this area could include things such as the level of noise generated on set. Are additional wildlife protections required due to the different seasons impacted?

Regarding impact of noise and light pollution:

4. We have been troubled for weeks now by the constant noise of lorries/trucks etc. reversing on the film site. There's a continual beep beep going on, even during weekends, what mitigation can be put in place for this?
5. When it started, we assumed it was due to some building work which would last 3 months or so and then be over. The idea that it might go on and on for another 3 years is concerning.
6. The letters from Savills presented in both applications, state the working hours and the use of bunds to mitigate noise and light pollution. Can we expect these commitments to be adhered to and specifically is this contractually agreed?
7. For the local residents who are clearly being impacted, what does "occasional Saturdays" mean in practice? Could this be specified in the permission? How would that be enforced?
8. How is this negative environmental impact consistent with the location's designation as a nature reserve? How could this possibly not be impacting negatively upon wildlife?
9. Will there be a prohibition on gunfire, pyrotechnics, etc. during filming, as this will clearly have a serious negative impact on wildlife and is not consistent with the country park SPG?

10. Persistent hum from the generator. If this was an issue of noise when the storage facility was sought in Coldmoorholme Lane – particularly in relation to a nature reserve and wildlife – why is this issue not being addressed here?
11. This (photo below) has been the view from Little village for the last couple of weeks (until Saturday just gone). Terribly un-ecological and very disruptive to the local surrounding wildlife as well as residents. How can this be consistent with operating a nature reserve?



12. Also, this negative impact seems to be inconsistent with the designation of Little Marlow as a conservation area – this application is not located in the conservation area however (as we have been reminded many times by the council) it has a clear impact upon the conservation area hence should be referred to the conservation officer for approval.
13. As there has been no actual filming taking place so far, we do not know what traffic movements, noise and future light pollution will result. How is it appropriate to consider a three year approval prior to filming starting?
14. How can the council handle the conflict of interest when the council is the land owner receiving income from the site whilst also enforcing noise and light pollution? Particularly the poor track record on this with other council owned sites.

I remain concerned that the council office considers that it is able to discharge the responsibilities of compliance with planning consent together with commercial guidance and consultation with operational matters. This is rather old school thinking. The major accounting firms have long since removed this potential conflict of interest having realised that it is not possible to provide commercial consultancy from the same stable without compromising the compliance aspect of the audit. The four major international firms, with annual revenues of around \$1.5 billion have all signed up to this approach. What system of controls has the council put in place to ensure they can operate both functions?

15. Can we please have a process and communication method so that residents know who to contact if there are problems?

16. Could we please ensure that there is a condition of approval that traffic cannot use the road through the village to obtain access to the site?
17. Will the film set gravel the footpaths near the site as they are getting very muddy?
18. I am concerned that the field being used for a large building with strong lights on the outside and the carpark (presumably lights will be in the car park too later in winter) was not in the original plan and as far as I am aware does not belong to the council. I think the field is part of the Carrington estate in Green Belt – surely there should have been an application for temporary change of use because this is a very big material change of use. I never saw an application if there was one. It is a change in primary use of land even if ‘temporary’.
19. [On the restoration plan] The spit is crust over shifting sand. The works that will have to be done to make a wide track to the 2 hides will be excessively damaging to the environment. Why fell trees to make a flight path – this is for the second hide so that visitors can see incoming birds. The birds seem to manage perfectly well at present.

Relating to the change of use:

20. Which company has BC reached the agreement with to lease the Little Marlow land, Pinewood Group (they may have an obligation to the film companies) or the film company itself? I noticed that was redacted on the planning application but I am asking because in my limited knowledge of how film companies work a company is often set up specifically to make a film then closed down once the film has been made making it very difficult to chase bad debts. Again you may know more about how these thing work than I do.
21. Clearly the studio would not have signed an agreement with the council for such a short amount of time as that of the temporary planning application. What is the term of the contract with the studio and why was long-term nature of this development not disclosed when the temporary application was submitted? – this seems to be a clear breach of the NPPF relating to temporary applications. Please comment.
22. What will be the status of the land after 3 years or 10 years? Is there a 10 year plan for LMCP? The first application was for 3 months. How can this be considered appropriate with respect to the country park special planning guidance? What is the plan to implement this?
23. Who will be responsible for restoring the land back to how it was?
24. Will it revert to green belt agricultural land or will it lose that status and become available for development?
25. Is Muschallik Rd. going to be closed to the village? I do walk along there although I am aware it is not officially open to walkers.
26. Some of that is addressed in the planning application but how do we guarantee it? Lafarge being a case in point.
27. In Savills letter of 14th October 2020 the Land Use assessment states that:- “The principle of use of the site for film-making purposes has been established by virtue of the grant of prior approval by the Council in March 2020 for the temporary use of the site for film-making purposes. The current proposal for the continued operation of the site for film-making purposes for the next three years would serve as a continuation of the existing use, with no resultant increase in intensity of use. it is therefore considered that the principle of the land use for a temporary three year period is acceptable.”

This suggests that, having established the principle, further extensions could be requested.

Questions:

28. If one year was sufficient, why is the present extension request for three years. Why not for one or two years? The initial proposed timeframe was for a much shorter duration and only in the summer. Presumably the impact on both the human and animal neighbours will be different in other months. Why has the period been extended so dramatically (i.e. from 3 months to 3 years)? Are they likely to be finished in less than 3 years? Could a permission be granted for a shorter period that still allows filming to be completed?
29. Can we be assured that there will not be requests for further extensions that have nothing to do with Covid 19 or the current filming, but are for different film shoots? In other words will the current application lead to a permanent or semi-permanent outdoor filming location?
30. I understand that the prime reason for allowing filming is to generate income for restoration and implementation of Country Park facilities. This is an admirable aim and wholly necessary.

Questions:

31. How can any income, in whole or part, be firmly written into any planning condition?
32. Can the latest restoration plan for the Tarmac site that was finally agreed with BCC be implemented at the end of the filming period?
33. Can we be assured that there will be no 'creeping' expansion of any currently designated brownfield site?

On the planning application more generally

34. I notice that on the planning application a bund is shown all around the site. Is this new or existing? If new can the council guarantee that it will be removed at the end of the 3-year term?
35. I understand that it was originally envisaged that parking and visitor facilities for the Country Park would be provided in the location now occupied by the film set. What alternative facilities accessible via Muschallick Road are you now going to provide to alleviate traffic and parking congestion in Little Marlow and on Coldmoorholme Lane?
36. I cannot see a plan for the application 20/05079/pnp4e registered on the 14th of January 2020, is this normal?
37. The closest I can find is section 3.3 of the environmental study which designates two areas that are included in the scope of the study; namely area A and Area B. From these it is clear that the Area A does not extend south of the junction where Muschalik Road

turns west to meet the Moors. This is completely at odds with the plan submitted in application 20/07719/r9ful which now shows the boundary as extending far to the North of the junction referred to in the Environmental study.

38. Where the location has changed from the original application, can we expect the use of bunds will be extended to cover the areas to the north of the original proposal?
39. Are you proposing to reissue a revised environmental study to cover the enhance size of the scope of the development?
40. Are we correct in assuming it is not the intent that the application 20/07719/r9ful is covering the same location plan as the original application, 20/05079/pnp4e?
41. if this is correct is it true to say this is really not about a change of dates but in reality a completely new application?
42. In the updated application for the new extension of the time and area of the development it gives assurances that the land will on expiry of the temporary change of use, be returned to the original status. For the avoidance of doubt, can this be specifically addressed such that the area A in the environmental study will be returned as brownfield site, while all land to the North of that will be reclassified as agricultural land and returned to that condition?
43. The council has failed to enforce the footpaths condition to the athletics track application, so how can you convince the public that conditions relating to this application will be enforced?
44. The benefits mentioned to the Parish Council with respect to potential improvements in the area are not tied in any way to this application, which seems rather rushed-through. What guarantees can you give that these are in any sense real? Is there any way that we, can ensure that a condition of the planning permission is that at least a proportion of the financial gain can be ring fenced for the Country Park or the parish?

Annex B

Spade Oak Lake Answers to Residents' Questions

1. Nature and Wildlife

Para 4 – Just to be factually correct, the Lake carries no formal status as a 'reserve', although the Island has no public access and with its sand spit, is seen as the main wildlife habitat (where we are working with Bucks Bird Club and a LML Community Partnership representative on a Habitat Management Plan). We are also investigating the potential for wetland habitat improvement in the former Black Poplar plantation (Back Stream).

Para 5 – the site is meant to go dark at 6pm (8pm during filming) so in so far as there is any 'detrimental impact' from 'noise and light pollution', it is marginal.

- Bullet One - To say the ancillary use of the field has 'removed foraging' is an over statement – it's temporarily reduced it. There's no certainty that the use of this field would be repeated in the future.
- Bullet Two - The ground has not been churned up, as the Filmco have put down a protective surface. Only the footpath is 'churned' by off road cyclists and footfall – we have widened it to ease the puddling problem.
- Bullet Three - And there always has been traffic on Muschallick Road and recently, the frequency of movement has largely been TWU tankers, due to a sewer collapse in High Wycombe.

4. We will look into the 'beep, beep' issue (the Filmco have telehandlers on site and there was some weekend working in the field, to urgently erect a marquee). The generator noise will reduce as soon as we get SSE to connect. Additional generators for filming will be positioned at the eastern end of the site, within an acoustic fence

6/7. The Council could impose planning conditions restricting the hours of operation.

8. See Para 4 comment above

9. The Lease requires prior notification if night filming and/or pyrotechnics are occurring. Residents will be forewarned if and when this occurs.

10. See 4. Above

12. The Conservation Area runs along the back of the Church Lane properties. So it's separate from the film set, but perhaps not 'distant.' Setting is a subjective issue. The film set site itself cannot be seen from the conservation area; some of the ancillary use in the field can be seen, as the photograph demonstrates. so it could be said to affect its setting. It's an issue that 'weighs in the planning balance' (the ancillary use is not part of the planning application).

14. The claim that there's a conflict of interest between the Council's regulatory functions and its executive ones is incorrect – there is strict governance.

15. Yes we need a forum for better communication

16. Yes we can strengthen signage to prevent traffic going through the village.

17. Yes, we have already widened the said footpath.

18. This is permitted development. The Use Classes Order allows temporary work sites in conjunction with adjacent uses. This has all been agreed with the Council.
19. Already partially complete, with Bucks Bird Club support. Needed for flail mowing. The Bird Club advise that ground nesting birds need clear flight paths.
20. Not an issue. Robust covenant and deposit held
21. Yes they did – 9 months, with option to extend up to 3 months
22. Remains Green Belt with Local Plan policy applying. This application cannot remove the land from the Green Belt.
23. The Filmco, if required by the Council
24. Only if further planning consent were to be granted
25. It's not a public highway or footpath and unsafe given TWU's HGVs. Plan is to put in new footpath link to Fern Lane
26. The Council are not Lafarge
30. Correct
31. Sn 106-type agreement (technically, a 'Unilateral Undertaking' as the Council cannot enter into an Agreement with itself)
32. A separate application for minor variations to the 2014 Restoration Plan is to be submitted, as that Plan was never enforced properly and no longer reflects reality. It is a fall back possibility, if an acceptable 'after-use' were to be approved.
33. Yes, it's a self contained 'compartment', although proposals will come forward for other parts of the Lake, linked to other LMLCP objectives
34. See 32. above
35. If this means additional parking, that forms part of the variation to the Restoration Plan scheme and re Coldmoorholme Lane, the subject of preliminary informal discussions with residents
36. It's a Permitted Development ('PD') prior notification, so there was no requirement for consultation.
37. The PEA report considered the entire area, not just the proposed film set.
38. It hasn't materially changed – the application includes existing areas of concrete hardstanding. There was an existing (Tarmac) bund along the northern side, which has been extended.
39. No, the PEA study covered a wider area so we see no need to re-issue it.
40. The boundary has changed slightly as site preparation works have been carried out.
41. The key point is that the PD application cannot be granted for more than nine months. So a new planning application is required to cover the period from the expiration from nine months. We have taken the opportunity to tidy up some discrepancies that have arisen, there is nothing more to it than that.

42. The temporary planning application can require all film set plant/equipment/buildings to be removed at the end of the temporary period and returned to its original condition. As planning authority, BC will impose a condition to this effect (which is also embodied in the current Lease).

43. Still to happen. Change of landowner hasn't helped.

44. See 31. above – for the PC to request

041120