

Princes Risborough Steering Group meeting		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	Wednesday 9 September 2015, 7 p.m. at the Princes Centre	
<b>Present:</b>	<p>Andy Ball Stewart Baxter</p> <p>Ian Churchill Richard Clayton John Coombs Gary Hall David Knights Dave Maycock Jim Stevens</p> <p>Alan Turner (chair) Matt Walsh Rosie Brake Ian Manktelow (IMa) Fionnuala Lennon</p>	<p>PRTC Risborough Area Residents Association</p> <p>PRTC Risborough Area Partnership</p> <p>PRTC PRTC and WDC</p> <p>WDC Askett Society PRTC roll B agent for HS2 select committee</p> <p>PRTC and WDC Risborough business group Planning Policy Officer, WDC Policy team leader, WDC ATLAS team, HCA</p>
<b>Apologies:</b>	<p>Bill Bendyshe-Brown Dan Brown David Johncock</p> <p>Ian Moore (IMo) Richard Stevenson Rolf Van Apeldoorn</p>	<p>Buckinghamshire County Council Risborough Rugby Club Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability, WDC</p> <p>Princes Risborough School Risborough Area Partnership Longwick Parish Council</p>

Minutes	Actions
<b>(1) Agreement of previous minutes</b>	
The previous minutes were agreed	<b>WDC</b>
<b>(2) Review of previous actions</b>	
<p>WDC to share the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) when finalised. There is to be a stakeholder forum meeting in Aylesbury on 28<sup>th</sup> September. IMa will bring the numbers to a future meeting of the steering group.</p> <p>SB raised concerns that the issue of how the potential figure of 2500 homes had been arrived at had not been fully explained yet. Critical to do so.</p> <p>IM agreed it was important to ensure all understood the analysis of the housing number options &amp; implications. Balance between local concerns &amp; housing needs. HEDNA provided useful input to the issue. Perhaps best addressed at</p>	<b>WDC (c/f)</b>

Minutes	Actions
<p>meeting on 30th Sept.</p> <p>RB &amp; AT encouraged SG members to return completed housing questionnaires which would provide information on local housing need.</p> <p>JS provided feedback on role of the SG and its work from community soundings he had undertaken: no immediate adverse reaction to major growth to the town; more interest in facilities such as schools and doctors surgery as means of improving the town, rather than specific demand for a new road; any new road needs to be linked to job creation; concerns about local school capacity; concern if housing provision was being driven by immigration.</p> <p>RC advised that the website had been updated with details of the plan project.</p>	
<b>(3) Review of Vision and Objectives</b>	
<p>RB outlined the urgent need to agree a final version. There had been discussion of them at the last meeting but no formal note made of the outcomes. She invited feedback on current draft version from the SG.</p> <p>SB noted that it was important to keep the vision succinct &amp; focused and provide more detail in the objectives. He highlighted a number of changes that he had noted were proposed at the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add 'sustainable' to 'modern green market town'</li> <li>• 'Thriving' should be added to reference to the High Street; and reference made to other facilities such as recreation</li> <li>• Reference to schools &amp; healthcare should be preceded by 'high quality'</li> <li>• Reference should be made to encouraging future generations to stay in the town; encouraging business investment; &amp; people living &amp; working in the same place.</li> </ul> <p>DK queried if specific reference should be made to Monks Risborough?</p> <p>AT considered that as the remit of the plan covered the parish of Princes Risborough, this included Monks Risborough so no need to refer to it separately.</p> <p>IC suggested that the vision was getting too wordy &amp; repetitive &amp; suggested that 'sustainability' and 'thriving' not be added as</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>these references were covered by existing words.</p> <p>The SG agreed to the changes described by SB &amp; as modified by IC.</p> <p>Action: RB to redraft vision &amp; objectives on basis of group discussion &amp; recirculate as a final version.</p>	<p><b>RB</b></p>
<p><b>(4) Report from the Project Board and update from the Project Team</b></p>	
<p>RB provided an update:</p> <p><i>Transport:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project team has met frequently since last meeting. It considered issue of transport objectives &amp; number of alternative options for bypass location to be considered in transport modelling – reduced to 6 options. RB to share options tested. <i>Post-meeting note: BCC have requested assessment of 9 options.</i></li> <li>• It was acknowledged that the strategic transport scenario was very important and strategic modelling work was happening in parallel to (not before) the town based work.</li> <li>• Four scenarios would be tested using the County Transport model in looking at impact of each option to 2033. This approach reflected Dept for Transport criteria &amp; will demonstrate junction pressures as well as network capacity pressures. The scenarios are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No additional growth &amp; no new highways infrastructure (do minimum)</li> <li>○ Add growth but with no new highways infrastructure</li> <li>○ Add growth plus the road options</li> <li>○ Highways infrastructure without growth</li> </ul> </li> <li>• JS queried if the growth assumptions would focus just on Princes Risborough growth or growth elsewhere in the county? RB advised it would focus mainly on local growth.</li> <li>• IM noted that the TEMPRO model assumptions were based on the old South East Plan and therefore factored in a reasonable level of growth in places such as Aylesbury &amp; the northern part of the county.</li> </ul>	<p><b>RB</b></p>
<p><i>Leisure / open space</i></p> <p>RB also updated the SG on work taking place within the Council on reviewing the leisure and public open space needs for Princes Risborough – outputs likely to be available shortly.</p> <p>AT noted the current plan by the Town Council for Wades Park</p>	

Minutes	Actions
– should be fed into the review. RB to put WDC staff in touch with PRTC.	<b>RB</b>
<p><i>Agents' forum</i></p> <p>RB advised that a meeting took place at end of August. Penelope Tollitt was planning on meeting CEOs for the promoters towards the end of October.</p>	
<p><i>Project Plan</i></p> <p>RB - work had started on developing a detailed project plan for the work on Princes Risborough in light of Local Plan issues raised by IM. This will be shared with the SG in due course</p>	<b>RB</b>
<p><i>Landscape Assessment</i></p> <p>RB – Landscape impact assessment now started – will be undertaken by WDC. RB will share the methodology, which is in preparation.</p>	<b>RB</b>
<p><i>Schools</i></p> <p>RB advised that a meeting had taken place with the secondary school &amp; County Council. BCC not opposed to relocation of school but there was likely to be a major funding gap if it were to relocate to the urban extension. Issue of potential funding from the Education Funding Authority needed to be explored. The issue of local primary school capacity was also discussed</p> <p>IM advised that Ian Moore was going to look at the costs of upgrading the existing school to accommodate increased capacity as a comparator to likely relocation costs. Would help inform the decision to either improve the existing facility or relocate to a new site.</p> <p>GH queried whether this would affect immediate expansion plans by the school?</p> <p>RB advised that there were no objections to immediate expansion plans but need to consider if they are practical if relocation is the end game.</p> <p>RB advised that Princes Risborough Primary school doesn't wish to relocate but would be happy to share site with the secondary school to create a through-school.</p> <p>AT noted the site was very restricted with limited room for expansion.</p> <p>IM reminded the group that developers can only be asked to contribute to the education costs generated by children arising from their new developments, so could not be asked to bear full costs of relocation of existing schools.</p> <p>RB advised that in terms of potential primary education provision to serve the new urban extension, options were to</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>create 1 new primary school of two forms of entry and increase capacity at other schools in the town; or create two new primary schools on the site, one of two forms of entry, and one of one form of entry.</p>	
<p><i>Drainage</i></p> <p>RB advised that WDC had met with BCC to discuss the case for undertaking a drainage study across the potential expansion area using existing methodology.</p> <p>AT highlighted residents' concerns about existing drainage problems in the town &amp; lack of meaningful response from BCC.</p> <p>IC added that there should be a requirement for</p>	
<p><b>(5) Local Plan deadline</b></p>	
<p>IM advised the SG about the recent ministerial statement requiring local authorities to have up-to-date local plans in place by early 2017 or risk government intervention. In response to this, WDC has been considering how it might meet this challenge. Preferred option is to hasten production of local plan &amp; absorb the Princes Risborough growth strategy as a chapter within it rather than deal with it as a separate AAP. This would allow resource and time savings to the timetable in respect of not producing two separate plans, consulting on them separately &amp; having two examinations. This approach would also de-risk the Princes Risborough proposals in terms of Duty to Cooperate as this would be absorbed within discussions and joint working on the local plan as a whole. The work &amp; role of the SG would remain unchanged with this new scenario.</p> <p>JS queried how the work of the SG would remain unchanged?</p> <p>AT advised that the SG would push to retain the same level of influence in the new approach as it would have had if WDC had continued with the AAP. RB confirmed that the group would have the same level of discretion over the plan for Princes Risborough as it would have had under the AAP.</p>	
<p><b>(6) Work programme / engagement programme</b></p>	
<p>RB advised the SG on the key dates &amp; themes for forthcoming meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 Sept (7 pm) – housing numbers, tenure, Community Land Trusts and self-build;</li> <li>• 14 Oct (note 6pm start) – results of the modelling of new road options</li> <li>• 5 Nov (whole day) – other infrastructure (non-transport)</li> <li>• 14 Nov (whole day) –Town Centre, retail &amp; employment,</li> </ul>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>followed by transport strategy matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18 Nov (7 pm) – viability part II</li> </ul> <p><i>Post-meeting note – full dates, times and venues circulated to group on 18<sup>th</sup> September.</i></p>	
<b>(7) Viability</b>	
<p>FL gave a presentation providing a brief overview of the National Planning Policy Framework context for viability, how it worked in planning terms, and issues particularly faced by large long term developments.</p> <p>IM shared a previous high level appraisal for the development of the urban extension. It highlighted the balance sheet in respect of potential contribution for infrastructure – but will need to be refreshed and refined. Issue of land value critical. Careful negotiation would be required with developers in due course.</p> <p>SB queried how CIL &amp; S106 would operate with the development?</p> <p>JS queried if LEP funding would be factored in?</p> <p>IM confirmed that potential for transport funding need had been flagged up with the LEP. S106 agreements can only require developers to contribute to infrastructure needs directly generated by their developments. CIL is a more general charge introduced by WDC which is based on the floorspace of development. It is intended to contribute to any wider or strategic impacts. He reminded the group that WDC would award 25% of CIL generated by the development to the Town Council.</p> <p>AT queried what would happen if land values were too high &amp; development didn't occur; also could contributions to infrastructure be sought from developments around Aylesbury given impact they would have on highways network?</p> <p>IM – need to work on basis landowners want to get return on land at some stage – useful to flush out difficulties sooner rather than later. Strategic impacts on the highway network from development outside Wycombe district will need to be addressed by the County Council through the Local Transport Plan.</p>	
<b>(8) CIL</b>	
<p>IM highlighted that a report would be considered by Cabinet on 21 September in respect allocating 25% of CIL generated to the Town Council on basis that notwithstanding proposed change in Local Plan / AAP Strategy. He reminded the group that CIL receipts would not be submitted until development</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>starts on site.</p> <p>AT noted that CIL across the district could potentially yield substantial receipts and there was a lot of competition for a slice of it.</p>	
<p><b>(9) Introduction to planning</b></p>	
<p>RB highlighted that if more people did not sign up for the training event, it would not be effective to run it. Members of the SG who had not yet responded were strongly encouraged to attend along with other members of the groups they represent &amp; to let Aude Pantel know by Friday. If sufficient additional numbers did not sign up, then likely training event would be cancelled. <i>Post-meeting note: the event was cancelled due to insufficient numbers.</i></p>	
<p><b>(10) AOB</b></p>	
<p>GB queried if there was anything more the SG should be doing to investigate infrastructure funding &amp; delivery at this stage? IM advised that a refresh of infrastructure required was needed initially to highlight what was needed &amp; when. Work on this was underway.</p> <p>RB asked the SG to think about how they might set up a Community Land Trust &amp; what its objectives would be in preparation for the next meeting.</p> <p>SB asked for an update on current planning applications in the town. RB provided a brief overview of forthcoming planning appeals; the application for De Gravens Meadow had not yet been determined; she also noted that the Leo application had now been submitted.</p>	
<p><b>(11) Next Meeting and future dates</b></p>	
<p>Wednesday 14 October, note earlier start time of <b>6 p.m.</b>; Wednesday 18 November 7 p.m., both at the Princes Centre.</p>	