

Princes Risborough Steering Group- extra meeting

Date of Meeting:	Wednesday 30 September 2015, 7 p.m. at the Princes Centre	
Present:	<p>Andy Ball Stewart Baxter</p> <p>Bill Bendyshe-Brown Richard Clayton Gary Hall Dave Maycock Jim Stevens</p> <p>Richard Stevenson</p> <p>Alan Turner (chair) Andy Emmett</p> <p>Aude Pantel Ian Manktelow (IMa) Sarah Oborn Brian Daly Rob Blaikie Louise Thomas Fionnuala Lennon Dinah Roake</p>	<p>PRTC Risborough Area Residents Association Buckinghamshire County Council PRTC PRTC and WDC</p> <p>Askett Society PRTC roll B agent for HS2 select committee Risborough Area Partnership</p> <p>PRTC and WDC Rugby Club (in lieu of Dan Brown)</p> <p>Planning Policy Officer, WDC Policy team leader, WDC Urban Designer, WDC Housing Team Leader, WDC Housing WDC Urban Designer, TDRC ATLAS ATLAS</p>
Apologies:	<p>Dan Brown Ian Churchill</p> <p>John Coombs</p> <p>David Johncock</p> <p>David Knights</p> <p>Ian Moore (IMo) Rolf Van Apeldoorn</p> <p>Matt Walsh</p> <p>Rosie Brake</p>	<p>Risborough Rugby Club Risborough Area Residents Association Risborough Area Partnership</p> <p>Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability, WDC</p> <p>WDC</p> <p>Princes Risborough School Longwick Parish Council</p> <p>Risborough business group</p> <p>Planning Policy Officer, WDC</p>

Minutes	Actions
----------------	----------------

Minutes	Actions
(1) Introduction	
AT presented the evening and introduced AP to the group.	
(2) Affordable Housing - WDC perspective as Local Housing Authority (Brian Daly, WDC)	
<p>BD provided some information to help the SG in having a basic understanding of affordable housing – above the social only element but below market housing.</p> <p>3 different strands of affordable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social rented – managed by registered providers • affordable – rented – rent control : 80% of market value • intermediate housing <p>social housing = long term / for life as opposed to contemporary affordable housing not for life</p> <p>key criteria is a minimum of 2 years local connection to the District (living or working) – not for those born in PR but currently living elsewhere</p> <p>SB asked clarification over the figures – is it demand or supply? BD explained the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - since 2009 only 9x4beds were provided in PR. - currently 1569 households on the housing register but only 50 households from PR are waiting for social housing (those we know of) <p>RC highlighted the great difference between the affordable housing element from the new expansion (at 40% this would mean 1000 homes) and the need of only 50 PR households. This means that the expansion would meet need from people on the register across the whole District.</p> <p>BD reminded the SG that WDC deleted many from the housing register recently (there used to be over 3500 households) as the eligibility criteria were restricted</p> <p>JStevens raised strong concerns over the eligibility process which he sees through his work with Citizen Advice Bureau: the waiting time has increased to several years this is not an average though because it is an advert and bidding system (differences between popular and unpopular areas) – supply isn't there to meet the demand due to less new build coming</p>	WDC (c/f)

Minutes	Actions
<p>forward.</p> <p>DM asked clarification as to where the properties come from : has the council powers over empty homes?</p> <p>BD explained that empty homes make up a very low proportion of the affordable supply – 1 officer at WDC working on this.</p> <p>GH raised concerns over the low figure (50 households) at PR, saying that it must be skewed. People are turned away from the housing register as a result of tightened criteria.</p> <p>BD confirmed that certain bands which used to be eligible now aren't.</p> <p>AT said PR people are pleading with the PRTC as they need properties / can't afford homes.</p> <p>AB added that since Right to Buy there are no council properties to rent.</p> <p>BD confirmed that there has been a huge increase in sale of right-to-buy properties at a discount level over the past 30 years.</p> <p>SB asked whether there are any accepted calculations to know how many people need affordable housing – IM clarified that it is the role of the HEDNA (Housing and Economic Needs Assessment) - this is not a specific figure for PR though but for the overall District requirements (1 in 4 household in affordable need) – with the expansion we are not looking to meet PR needs only but wider District needs.</p> <p>GH reminded that historically High Wycombe had provided supply then PR.</p> <p>BBB asked clarification on empty properties: are they registered providers properties or private – BD clarified they are private properties.</p> <p>BBB expressed concerns in relation to the District wide need, which could be housed in PR, displacing the 50 PR households somewhere else in the District, which would be an issue.</p> <p>AT reminded the SG that the PRTC had been particularly interested to investigate options around affordable housing for local people.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">BD to provide figures on empty properties</p>

Minutes	Actions
<p>(3) Community Land Trust and self build / custom build (Dinah Roake - ATLAS)</p>	
<p>Dinah Roake gave an overview of Community-led housing models, including pros/cons, what worked or didn't.</p> <p>Community led housing models sits within a complex delivery landscape where there is less public funding available yet communities aspire to more self-determination. At the same time there is a strong imperative for increasing housing supply.</p> <p>One of the issues is that there isn't one organised community led housing sector – these are grassroots movements</p> <p>Self-help housing for example helps bringing back local housing into use. See also Community Gateway networks.</p> <p>Community Land Trust: these were set up by the 2008 Housing and Regeneration Act to help local groups to hold land in trust (not squander or divvy them up)</p> <p>Community led criteria : the expectation is that people who live and work locally can be members of it (similar to a cooperative)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - see Community Land Trust Handbook <p>Setting up a CLT would require to think carefully about governance and accountability for decision making in holding these assets</p> <p>Local authority can lead the process but community must keep control over it.</p> <p>CLT in rural areas have been used to respond to very local needs.</p> <p>People who live in the area don't necessarily need to be the ones doing the design work etc. a group could come together even if they don't have time to do the provision element, but they would hold the land and get a registered provider to lease the land for them.</p> <p>Local Lettings policy would be administered by the CLT.</p> <p>GH asked if this was similar to rural exception schemes – DH said it was on a bigger scale.</p>	<p>AP to circulate presentation</p>

Minutes	Actions
<p>Accountability is key – needs to be thought about. If a farmer gives their land they want the land to be held in perpetuity. If the LPA helps with a grant, it can't be to a flaky organisation.</p> <p>Some community groups have worked on a full coproduction, co design and co-deliverability.</p> <p>Brixton Green – land was identified in the Masterplan in 2009; local group wanted to lead on this rather than having regeneration done to them. The scheme included 300 homes – mixed incomes – all for rent (between 150 a week to 550 a week). Set up as a housing cooperative.</p> <p>Stewardship structure: the council will be the developer (borrowing money) whilst the CLT will be buying a lease at market rate for 250 years.</p> <div data-bbox="256 860 1070 1294" data-label="Diagram"> <pre> graph TD Council[Council] --> OCBody[Overarching Community Body] Council --> CLT[CLT = charity] OCBody --> Housing[Housing Cooperative] OCBody --> Tenants[Commercial tenants 1, 2, 3] </pre> </div> <p>Issue is around control – the LPA needs to be comfortable with this.</p> <p>DR gave a brief presentation on self-build and custom- build initiatives, how it works in planning terms and how it could be a model for delivering alternative housing in the expansion area.</p> <p>A key advantage is that this removes the developer profit cost = it is cheaper for the end user.</p> <p>Difference between self-build and custom-build is that the former is within an individual personal control / bespoke whilst the latter is often larger (a contractor building one-off homes)</p> <p>PRTC is very keen to see homes built for local people - CLT route is likely route to achieve this.</p> <p>To get to that position requires a reasonable purchase arrangement.</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>AT expressed his personal view that the TC needs to bring in a community association to build homes but the CLT would retain control.</p> <p>A key question is where the money would come from.</p> <p>AT asked if CIL could fund this.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: it is unlikely that this would comply with the CIL regulations.</i></p> <p>BBB asked whether this was a legally compliant prospect which was answered affirmatively. BBB said he would support this as a means to provide local homes for local people, something that the rural exception scheme wouldn't have achieved on private land.</p> <p>DRoake highlighted the need to do a lot of business planning to progress this.</p> <p>JS asked if Right to Buy would be excluded from this.</p> <p>DR said 2 mechanisms would keep it into rent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - charity to be set up - a housing cooperative <p style="margin-left: 150px;">} together</p> <p>Self-Build example – Graven Hill = 1900 homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LA bought land at Market value - land put in landholding (100% LA owned) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development company –infrastructure and green infrastructure <p>LA did some events to test whether there is appetite – local awareness = self-procurement / self-build approach ; doesn't necessitate a CLT</p> <p>CLTs have done many surveys to understand their population needs and build their case – in particular for older people housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - co housing models <p>Cashflows can be an issue - so how to pay for the long term?</p> <p>Self-Build is exempt from CIL.</p> <p>Local assessment of need would need to be done by the PR CLT (WDC doesn't go down to that level.)</p>	
<p>(4) Housing numbers(Ian Manktelow)</p> <p>IMa did a presentation on the District's analysis of the housing number options & implications. This was to respond to an issue raised at a previous meeting on the reasoning behind</p>	<p>AP to circulate presentation</p>

Minutes	Actions
<p>the 2500 figure for PR.</p> <p>IMa explained that at strategic level there is a need to balance between needs and supply. Providing a 5 year supply of housing in particular is a crucial requirement.</p> <p>The housing and economic development needs assessment is the key study to understand our needs at District level – the HEDNA doesn't go down to town level.</p> <p>In terms of housing needs, it is based on a Housing Market Area which as a best fits equates Aylesbury Vale DC, Chiltern DC and Wycombe DC (similarly a Functional Economic Market Area or FEMA is drawn for the purpose of assessing economic development needs across the area).</p> <p>The housing need is established by projecting past trends (using national figures) then moderating it by considering various factors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local trends in migration - market signals : affordability / overcrowding / land prices / concealed (couple living at parents) or homeless households. <p>Market signals adjustments are inevitably going to push the numbers up in our area.</p> <p>And if the economic projection is higher, then you need to balance homes (number going up) with jobs.</p> <p>This gives the objectively assessed needs or OAN.</p> <p>SB asked if OAN takes into account Green Belt or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. IMa clarified that it doesn't.</p> <p>The OAN is a policy-off figure: the green belt, AONB and other constraints will be taken into account when looking at the supply side of the requirement (they will constrain the supply of land). In other words, the OAN is not the final housing target (the requirement) in an adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>R Stevenson asked clarification with regards to houses which would be freed up in 20 years. IMa said the HEDNA projects households (not distinguishing the types of needs) – all these households will need a dwelling, be it 1 or 5 bedrooms.</p> <p>IMa explained that the yearly OAN amounts to 751 homes for the overall District, as opposed to 402 target in the Core Strategy. This equals a total of 15011 over 20 years but our</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>supply is only 9000.</p> <p>This includes an expansion at Princes Risborough in the 1900-2500 homes range. Even with PR we still need to find / firm up land for 6000 dwellings. A Green Belt assessment is currently underway (findings by Christmas).</p> <p>The supply is a moving target – WDC will need to keep monitoring it.</p> <p>SB raised concerns over the ability to defend against going over 2500 homes at PR – AVDC could challenge this. IMA said that WDC will need to test higher options, and show it can't be done (on grounds of sustainability / infrastructure etc.)</p> <p>AT said that if you had good commuter links, it is a good option.</p> <p>AT raised the issue of car parking density in relation to new developments – is there an opportunity to create a PR standard? Something to come back to.</p> <p>IMa emphasised the risk for Oxfordshire but also London to ask us to meet their needs – Duty to cooperate goes two ways. This highlights the importance of getting a plan in place quickly.</p> <p>We are already two years in the plan – how does this affect the numbers? IMA said that completions are taken into account in the calculations.</p> <p>The key issues are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - agreement with AVDC - a plan for the three authorities - whether it can be built at such high rates – unlikely <p>A lack of 5 year supply means we are vulnerable to hostile applications. We have 1 year to sort out a plan (examination mid 2017)</p> <p>DM asked how the need was suppressed – this will come out of the HELAA assessment.</p> <p>BBB – can we do a NDP? As set out in previous meetings, no because it would be based on current lower targets and not a target derived from the OAN.</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>(5) Density and Urban Design (LT)</p> <p>Louise Thomas gave a presentation on density in new developments and urban design principles. Density is a measure; not an implied quality. Places with the same density don't necessarily have the same form. In comparing existing areas of PR in terms of density, the Avenue was taken as a mid-point: 25 dwellings per hectare. St Dunstons Close, a recent development in Monks Risborough, is 31 dpha. These dwellings have smaller gardens, but a bigger open space with more money spent on it.</p> <p>Lower Waterways, a scheme in Oxford, was built at a high density but this isn't noticeable thanks to clever landscaping and more shared spaces. Density is only good quality if character and context are understood.</p> <p>AT said that because the expansion area is overlooked by the AONB it would be inappropriate to have flats.</p> <p>LT described how the new area could be a network of walkable neighbourhoods. density creates customers (e.g. to shops)</p> <p>The PR work needs to establish a land use "budget" = how many hectares are needed for each use? Out of the overall 188 ha of the expansion area it was established that 74 ha would be for development.</p> <p>As it happens, it is much easier to defend a use than a policy.</p> <p>In working out what it will look like spatially, there can be lots of permutation in the mix, and permutations in densities. It's not fixed.</p> <p>BBB said that density will be a key issue – Network Rail are developing options for underpass at Park Mill Farm. PT and BBB have met with Peter Keen to talk about business expansion by moving to Philip Jeans land [<i>Post-meeting note: this was before Park Mill Farm application</i>]</p> <p>RClayton was surprised to see the number of people per household so low – but this is 2011 Census data.</p> <p>AB asked how many of the 188 ha has already been agreed for sale by landowners – IMA said there is development interest on most of it.</p>	<p>AP to circulate presentation</p>

Minutes	Actions
<p>What is happening at Leo pharma? There is a range of scenarios, but the application will need to be determined prior to the expansion. BBB highlighted the need to keep existing employment land – if Leo is lost then we will need to find new employment land to replace it.</p>	
<p>(6) Work programme / engagement programme</p>	
<p>AP reminded the SG on the key dates & themes for forthcoming meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 Oct (note 6pm start) – results of the modelling of new road options • 5 Nov (whole day) – other infrastructure (non-transport) • 14 Nov (whole day) –Town Centre, retail & employment, followed by transport strategy matters • 18 Nov (7 pm) – viability part II <p><i>note – full dates, times and venues circulated to group on 18th September.</i></p>	