

## **Statement of Consultation - Appendix 12**

**Princes Risborough Town Plan –  
Stakeholders Workshop (December 2015)**



would be urbanised, it would potentially act as a traffic calming measure onto Mill Lane.

- No strong feelings either way but any new housing should be sympathetic to the existing adjoining housing
- Issue of flooding needs to be addressed – can any new built development be accommodated north of Mill Lane?
- Generally seen as a positive move by the group to accommodate some development north of Mill Lane, but it needs to be substantial enough to create a presence.
- One suggestion that perhaps development should also be accommodated next to the rail line – no consensus on this suggestion, and the issue of flooding problems and desire to create a green boundary was raised.
- Loop idea for Public Right of Way
- Mixed views in group:
  - More development would help blend Kingsmead in but logic of best way to screen Kingsmead being more development! Instead protect AONB setting and views

**3. Are the Strategic and Local Open Spaces in the right areas to suit the landscape, access and the nature of their activities? (Floodlighting would be required for some strategic open spaces where these are sports pitches i.e. off Mill Lane).**

- Floodlighting of sports pitches could be problematic in relation to views from the AONB – landscape impacts important as this is a very dark area at the moment
- It will be crucial to have pockets of green throughout the urban development, not just the streets landscape, to retain the area's current green feel
- Accessibility to sports facilities if they are at the periphery will be a key challenge.
- It comes back to what is the brief for these facilities.
- Makes sense to locate sports facilities north of Mill Lane. Though a query was raised about what the sports pitch needs were and whether providing some 3G pitches within the expansion area would reduce the space needed overall for sports pitches?
- Sports facilities provided in the urban expansion should not unnecessarily duplicate what is available in the town – if these can be expanded or improved to provide increased capacity to meet demand, this would be preferable. Wades Park & the secondary school currently provide two useful hubs for sports & leisure provision in the town – would be good to improve these as way of integrating existing & new communities. Maximising use of existing facilities rather than creating all new facilities on the expansion area may also help scheme viability.
- Small pitches will also be provided as part of the primary school, sites – good to explore if these can also be shared for community use.
- All new green spaces should aim to accommodate a mix of uses rather than single uses.

- Some concerns were raised that the larger green spaces were located at the edges of substantial housing areas and there was consensus that some green space and play facilities should be incorporated within the housing areas to act as a focal point, cater for local needs and contribute to a sense of greenery within the housing areas.
- Floodlighting would be a major problem in views from Whiteleaf and Ridgeway AONB. Avoid Mill Lane, consider other locations e.g. in buffer Lower Icknield Green way or invest in pitches or secondary school
- Avoid PROW (Public Rights of Way) running through flood-prone areas (e.g. problem in Aylesbury)

**4. Should the buffer around the Sewage Treatment Works be used as parkland and to accommodate the development road?**

- Buffer is 1.5 odour units – need confirmation from TW what that means in metres.
- The land could also be used for employment uses or for sports facilities.
- Idea of a compact sewage plant raised but Thames Water not keen. Thames Water stated that it's a small works which is due to be improved and odour is not a significant issue.
- It was agreed that the indicative road alignment be moved towards the sewage works, inside the cordon sanitaire, to allow the proposed open space to be more accessible and useable to new housing to the east.
- As an aside it was felt that insufficient modelling had been done on the new relief road.
- Buffer around the STW should have a use and be designed to distract from the STW, e.g. sealed commercial units, some sporting & play uses.
- Probably yes. Not suitable for vulnerable uses because of flood risk. Make a green corridor by linking up to adjacent green.
- Pitches? Reed beds/more natural area?
- Parking for local centre and changing facilities
- Doesn't smell a lot currently, even better when upgraded
- See report Instruction of Air Quality Management Odour Guidance for Planners

**5. Is development too close to Alscot Conservation Area (CA) on the north and south sides?**

- Views differed, some people feeling the development is too close to the south.
- Development could be sympathetic – design constraints higher to deal with the conservation area. Protecting the CA by a buffer was seen a conservatist view.
- The group considered that the approach taken to the Alscot Conservation Area was good, no additional changes were highlighted
- Key aspect is presentation of view from the junction of Alscot lane with Longwick Road , looking towards Kop Hill

**6. Should more of the areas with surface water flooding risks be included for development?**

- Unanimous no

**7. Does the network of green lanes and spaces (Park Mill and Kingsmead Green Lanes, and Twin Track Railway Park) help to connect the different areas?**

- Yes, the Park Mill Farm green way is strong – better route to access the town.
- The green lanes were seen as connecting the different areas.
- Twin track Railway Park: what happens to this area when the safeguarding area is removed / used? What does it look like? Will people use it to walk? There needs to be other options needed for green spaces to make up for loss if and when this is used for twin tracking
- Green lanes : are they corridors for people or ecology (for people – shared spaces) – if for people they will require some form of lighting – maybe low rise – to be safe places to walk and cycle through
- The western green lane was felt too linear at the moment: it was felt that wider and narrower spaces could be introduced
- There were some questions as to whether rights of way can be diverted (yes they can although the green lane would use an existing path)
- The proposed network of green links was welcomed, particularly as they create circular walks & are linking destinations – however, it is critical that they incorporate safe crossing points across the rail line.
- The green link running west from Wades Park was seen as a particularly effective route linking different community & leisure uses.
- PROW link to Chilterns AONB, look beyond the development and town centre to how it brings people up to the hills. ‘Gateway to Chilterns’
- How to get across watercourses/boggy ground – boardwalk?
- Need to show how connections continue through into the town.

**8. Are the three different density levels broadly appropriate and in the right areas**

- 40 is quite high... is a low density and potentially prestige site appropriate next to Kingsmead? What happens if Leo density not consistent?
- Does 40 mean apartments? (not necessarily). Need to preserve viewpoint that is currently shown with high density (see marked up map).
- What of need to relocate Hypnos? Could improve in-situ. The business has good visibility on Longwick Road. Ambition for more employees to travel sustainably. Lack of car parking, lorry units for storage. Important for employees to be able to access town centre (for shopping and lunch)
- Greenness is important
- The graded approach was broadly welcomed

- The space treatment between Longwick and the expansion area needs careful consideration – it seems quite close on the plan. There could be redistribution of land use with a narrower buffer.
- It was felt that the area opposite the Leo site could be of higher density whilst the area nearest to Alscot on the western side of Longwick road could be medium rather than high density
- There was much discussion on this but the consensus was that the arrangement shown as broadly right. The group was keen not to create a ‘two town’ effect, so concentrating higher densities close to the town centre was the right approach.
- Incorporate green space into the development
- Consider roofscapes from Whiteleaf and Ridgeway and lighting (street lighting)
- Lower densities e.g. soften boundary to Crowbrook Stream, Green Corridor and Alscot conservation area

**9. Should community and sporting facilities be concentrated on site or should opportunities to improve existing facilities in the wider town be considered?**

- Depends on the detail of space that is required
- The fire station was also mentioned as a facility in the town centre which could be relocated, thus unlocking land for development in this prime town centre location; the site would be better used for retail; the fire station could be relocated next to the railway line or in the sewage treatment works buffer. A question asked was what is the catchment of the fire service in PR? if it serves the hinterland in the Chilterns it might not be appropriate to relocate further out in the expansion area.
- With sports and leisure facilities, it is better to expand and improve existing facilities where possible, and not duplicate provision in the expansion area.
- Could more facilities such as a MUGA be provided in Wades Park?
- There was some debate over community facilities – recognising that larger community meeting facilities were lacking in the town, and the pivotal role that the community centre near Wades Park could have in integrating existing & new communities – would be good to expand it, and provide an additional community meeting space within the expansion area – perhaps linked to and shared with one of the primary schools. Community facilities should cater for a local catchment.
- It is important that the long term management & maintenance costs & arrangements are considered as part of the decision making on location of community & sporting facilities.
- Need to show distribution of existing facilities; potential for better integration of public and private sports use; easier to manage – so other space can be used for amenity
- Centralised facilities – need for parking.
- But if distributed, improves accessibility

- Community meeting space – not a lot of space left in current Wades park master plan. Helps with integration but adds pressure to existing.
- Primary school could provide community space (co-located)

**10. Is it better to have two local centres associated with two smaller primary schools (1 or 2 FE each), or combine the community and retail uses in one local centre?**

- One local centre would start to compete with the existing high street / town centre which is to be avoided (see vision)
- Better to have 2 local centres as they effectively serve 2 neighbourhoods
- Colocation principles were supported by the group.
- There is apparently capacity for 700 units before any new primary school is needed. Further clarity is needed about phasing – when would schools be required? The idea of two schools in 2 hubs was accepted, if 3FE was what was required.
- There was much discussion on whether from a place-making perspective one or two local centres/schools was desirable. The consensus was that there should be two focal points creating a heart to each neighbourhood. Another advantage of this approach identified was that it provided more flexibility in terms of delivery of a school if development comes forward in different parts of the site.
- Could be a phasing issue... adds flexibility.
- to combine the two centres could increase the threat to the town centre
- Further to walk to one centre.
- Potential for intensification of town centre

**11. Are the primary schools in the right areas?**

- The balance of a smaller one and a bigger one is sensible.
- The relationship of the schools to the proposed road will be important to pin down
- From an operational perspective, the County Council is flexible on whether a 3FE or 2Fe+ 1FE schools are provided.
- Another suggestion was to relocate the smaller school closer to the rail line and Mill Lane so it could potentially combine with an existing 1FE school in the town on the same site.
- It was noted that viability testing may also influence whether one or two schools was deliverable.
- Creating safe routes to schools (both primary & secondary) was highlighted as an important aspiration. The aspiration to calm and reduce traffic in the town centre was important in improving access to the secondary school.
- Should larger primary school be closer to the railway line?
- Remember connectivity to Longwick primary – improve access across Sportsman's junction.

**12. As future employment land needs to be clustered within an extended Princes Estate, should the local centres include a small amount of 'flexible use' units for further retail or small business space?**

- Access to the Prince Estate is really bad; inadequate connection was seen as a major concern
- There is a need for a one man shed sort of land / lockable facilities
- There was a strong view that we shouldn't run the risk to lose a major employer like Hypnos
- There could be employment around the STW in the form of small starter units.
- The office space at the local centre was welcomed by the group but the lack employment space within the expansion area was still seen as a major issue by some.
- There was a question around how the new road could help access to employment area(s)
- The existing Hypnos employment site be kept, rather than having the employment off-site and on the Princes Estate.
- The Princes Estate site is inaccessible, although route 17 could improve that.
- There was consensus that expanding the Princes Estate would not work given its access limitations.
- The person from Hypnos explained that currently the firm employs around 250 people – largely drawn from a local area. Relocation to the Princes Estate was not feasible because of the access issues and the type of vehicles that would require access.
- There was no consensus on whether an employment area should be provided within the expansion area – good access would be a key consideration, and it may be better to locate housing on the current employment area given its proximity to the town centre. However, there was consensus that employment provision should be made somewhere within the town to accommodate any businesses displaced from the expansion area.
- With regard to local centres, the provision of flexible units with retail at ground floor and office space above was viewed positively.
- Carefully consider lorry routing if putting B2/B8 on Princes Estate – could have effect of pulling lorries from M40 and B4009 Chinnor and villages
- Need for restrictions? Mixed views in group. Let business grow, accept lorries + traffic
- Yes, flexibility is key, esp close to the railway station and town centre.

**13. Does the Revised Preferred Scenario fit the agreed Vision?**

- Nothing in this scenario prevents the Vision being achieved. The devil will be in the details. One thing missing is about the connections
- This question was not specifically discussed, however during the course of the discussion, two key areas where it was considered that the revised scenario was inappropriate were:

- The scenario shows a main road running through the development area. The Steering Group is strongly supportive of a link road route that runs around the edge of the expansion area – which could also provide decent vehicular access to any expansion of the Princes Estate. Conclusions should not be drawn on the road option to include in the plan, until the appropriate assessment work has been completed.
  - The assumption that an expansion to the Princes Estate would be adequate to accommodate relocated businesses – without significantly improved access.
  - Additionally, the need to test the viability of the revised scenario was highlighted.
- Nothing in this scenario prevents the Vision being achieved.
- Summerleys Road access to Princes Estate not good for HGV – travelling on to High Wycombe/Milton Keynes/M40.
- Option 17 could improve access to Princes Estate – encouraging inward investment.

### **Other notes:**

- Sewerage routing? All utilities could be sited along development road.
- Ponds: amenity value?
- Rerouting – see map from table 2 making greater use of Longwick road
- Proposals should include improvements to the bus service, with a suggestion of a rapid bus transit through the site to the train station.
- Need to be clear what the assumptions on the rail crossings are. Unless there is a CPO it will not happen. The existing crossings are dangerous.
- Concerns about overall scheme viability.
- Floodlighting impact from AONB escarpment?
- Safe crossing for school (Between town centre and other side of road near roundabout)
- For key school routes be wary of shared space solutions, e.g. crossing by M&S, parents perspective over safety of road crossings could influence transport choice to school
- More pitches here? (field east of development out of grey area south of road) but avoid floodlighting because of AONB
- AONB views and PROW line (pointing south-east of diagram to bottom of page)
- Improving public walkways through town centre – traffic constraints
- Busiest-traffic with improved employment. Need to cater for peds/cyclists etc. appropriately – pointing to junction at Princes Estate
- Consider lorry routing from employment

- Pitches – sensible use of the land (plot next to Summerleys park)
- Link up green corridor and PROW (green space north-east of Summerleys ponds)
- Sports pitches? (pointing to green areas beneath Longwick road)
- (see picture for diagram) ‘need a circular cycling/walking route’ LEISURE. Lower Icknield greenway, buffer around housing with green corridor on eastern length.
- PROW through flood-plains...
  - Need to identify which routes flood now and will flood in future
  - When these flood – what are the alternatives?
  - Whilst some current routes flood and people deal with it, the routes are primarily leisure routes. In future people will be reliant on the routes for commuting, etc...so must be useable.
- Does the green wrap round here and can PROW wrap around to create a nice loop? (parcel adjacent to Kingsmead on other side of road)
- Crossing points across the road – to access green space/countryside (on area near Alscot/Kingsmead Meadow)
- Consider speeds and safety speeds and crossing points (on road through development adjacent to Lower Icknield way)
- Lower density adjacent buffer (below Longwick road)
- High density (west of twin track railway park)