

## Princes Risborough Steering Group meeting

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	Wednesday 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2016 at The Princes Centre, 7 p.m.	
<b>Present:</b>	Bill Bendyshe-Brown David Johncock  Ian Manktelow (IMa) Jim Stevens  Alan Turner  Matthew Walsh  Andy Ball Linda Cannon Clegg Rosie Brake Sarah Oborn Rolf Van Apeldoorn Andy Quigley Ian Moore (IMo)	Buckinghamshire County Council WDC Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability Strategic Planning Manager, WDC PRTC Roll B Agent for HS2 select committee WDC Member and deputy Cabinet member for Planning and Sustainability Chairman, PRTC chairman and Risborough Business Group WDC Member and PRTC Chairman, RARA Principal Planning Policy Officer, WDC Conservation and Design Officer, WDC Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council Risborough Rangers Princes Risborough School
<b>Apologies:</b>	Stuart Baxter David Knights	Askett Society WDC Member
<b>Did not attend:</b>	John Coombes Charles Vint Gary Hall Richard Clayton	PRTC Monks Risborough Society PRTC and WDC Member RACP

Minutes	Actions
<b>(1) Minutes of previous meetings on 8 and 12 September</b>	
<p>Draft minutes of these minutes had been circulated to the group for comment. Comments received on the minutes of 12 September were received and incorporated. No comments were received on the 8 September notes.</p> <p>AT pointed out that the minutes of 12 September still showed him as Chairman of PRTC. This will be corrected.</p> <p>LCC said that RARA would have liked to have seen actions set against the points recorded for the scrutiny session, to demonstrate that issues are being responded to.</p> <p>IMa affirmed that the team are working to update the plan in response to consultations and technical work. The team is in</p>	<b>RB</b>

<p>discussion with DJ on timetable and will dovetail meetings to outcomes of work. The intention is to share work as we go along.</p> <p>Overall, the steering group agreed that the questions had been answered, and DJ confirmed that all the points had been answered and in writing. WDC will be required by the planning Inspector to prepare a consultation statement that sets out how the plan has responded to consultation and engagement. Topic papers will make clear how WDC reached their position in the plan.</p> <p>LCC felt that the questions raised in the scrutiny session hadn't been answered in any way, shape or form, and requested that this should be minuted.</p>	
<p><b>(2) Wycombe reserve sites – lessons on capacity</b></p>	
<p>SO tabled a summary presentation on the reserve sites, which is attached to these minutes (refer to presentation for summaries of issues).</p> <p>She explained that the sites had been reserved for future need for many years. WDC released them in Nov 2014 – all greenfield – within or adjoining High Wycombe (one in Wooburn Green). They had not been developed historically because of significant issues. WDC have established liaison groups for each site and an infrastructure group to address cumulative effects and needs.</p> <p>Development briefs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gomm Valley and Ashwells is now out for consultation</li> <li>• Terriers from Monday 17<sup>th</sup></li> <li>• Abbey Barn North – further work required.</li> </ul> <p>Briefs are aiming to achieve efficient use of land – but in a design-led approach which is appropriate to the context.</p> <p>She stressed that figures given here are provisional.</p>	
<p><b>a. Abbey Barn South</b></p>	
<p>Constraints and context give a developable area of 16 hectares with a net density of 27-30 dph (dwellings per hectare). This ranges from 45 dph in west – less dense in east. SO confirmed that the woodland ride is part of a Registered Park and Garden, which is a high-order protective designation. Noisier areas alongside the motorway have been allocated for business and sports use. School provision will be made by extending the existing school site on the Daws Hill development.</p>	
<p><b>b. Abbey Barn North</b></p>	
<p>Hardest of all 5 sites – in a bowl - major technical review.</p> <p>Difficulties of access – fall of 12m.</p> <p>Local Wildlife Site on east of site.</p> <p>Major surface water issues – topography.</p> <p>Track of former railway</p>	

<p>Significant trees and Ancient Woodland.  11.3 ha overall, but mostly undevelopable, not finalised.  Maybe 3-4 ha – max 100-11 homes.  Pastures-style housing not a good precedent for design.  Maybe not traditional housing – to avoid retaining walls etc.  IMa added that the access to the lower end of the site is in three ownerships.  LCC wondered whether it was worth it to pursue the site when it is so difficult.  SO confirmed that synergies with Abbey Barn South make it worthwhile, including bringing the woods into public access. IMa added that there is a need to improve Abbey Barn Lane at the bottom – opportunity to sort out through this site.</p>	
<p><b>c. Terriers</b></p>	
<p>The relatively flat nature of this site means it is suitable for meeting the sports requirement from the reserve sites.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure being proposed for the site includes improving mini roundabouts, footpath links, and buses. There is difficulty providing a second point of access – but need to retain the opportunity, especially for bus access. There are issues of traffic on A404 to tackle.</p> <p>JAS reminded the group that a Park and Ride had once been proposed for this site. IMa replied that there had been resistance to this – consequently, there is more land for housing.</p> <p>MW observed that Hazlemere also taking a big hit. IMa added that there could be over 1000 homes and includes land in GB/AONB.</p> <p>LCC pointed out that the scale of development in and around Princes Risborough (including Longwick and Haddenham) is of a completely different order to this.</p>	
<p><b>d. Slate Meadow</b></p>	
<p>A key constraint here is fluvial (river) flood risk. Further work is needed to see how much of the site is developable – maybe 2-4 ha, with a net density of 30-38 dph.</p>	
<p><b>e. Gomm Valley and Ashwells</b></p>	
<p>Because of the constraints, possible only one-third of the site is developable – about 74 ha, giving between 480 and 540 homes.</p>	
<p><b>Princes Risborough expansion</b></p>	
<p>Overall area is 155 ha, of which 89 ha are constrained, so a net developable area of 75-77 ha. Densities currently working out at an average 32 dph – most comparable to Terriers.</p> <p>BBB added that it is a wet area with many springs. RB informed the</p>	

group that the County Council are in the process of commissioning a drainage study for the area. SO added that the Crowbrook corridor has a capacity of 50 ha to address flooding. EA guidance requires a 50m buffer for the brook which is not developed. AT also cautioned that Inspector of the Mill lane enquiry pointed out that flooding could be managed.

IMa added that there are technical solutions available to manage surface water flooding, while fluvial flooding is more difficult.

LCC said that RARA is concerned about the process and the wider picture – PRTP put ahead of LP. Doubling size of the town - is it sustainable? WDC have not tested the Green Belt as other counties have tested it. Steering group minutes do not show questions and challenges to numbers. Plus Haddenham and Longwick need to be considered in the wider picture. AVDC's option for a new settlement at Aston Sandford was a shock

DJ said it would be wrong to scaremonger about Aston Sandford – it has not been decided.

MW affirmed that WDC and PRTC have gone out of their way to address RARA's concerns. We need to continue the process.

### **(3) Remit of transport working group**

JAS tabled the terms of reference for the group. MW apologised for not forwarding these to the group earlier.

LCC raised concerns about rail capacity. JAS agreed, both services and car park. AT confirmed that the TC have annual meetings with Network Rail, Chiltern Rail and the local MP but since the change of CEO at Chiltern they have become unresponsive. Since Chiltern's franchise is up for renewal over the next few years, should Risborough's requirements be fed into franchise discussions? JAS clarified that this would need to go to the DfT, with lobbying by the County Council. The steering group could feed into this process via WDC.

LCC asked about the role of the Highways Agency (HA). JAS explained that the HA, now Highways England, was only responsible for trunk roads and motorways. The relevant body is the local Highway Authority, which is the County Council. A County Council officer is included in the working group.

IMa added that it might be a challenge to get BCC to attend – and WDC can't promise an officer due to the need to prioritise the Local Plan. But will ask Dan Fenn to support the next meeting of the group. WDC will talk to BCC and suggest that John Rippon might be the most appropriate officer.

JAS confirmed that he felt the working group was well equipped to

<p>take on the responsibilities. DJ suggested that the group could focus on what is under local control and so deliver against expectations.</p> <p>MW asked the steering group to confirm the membership of the working group, which was agreed. LCC expressed concern about the gender imbalance of the group.</p>	
<p><b>(4) PRTC CIL share</b></p>	
<p>MW explained that PRTC have established a CIL working group as a sub-group of the finance committee – will use monies for high impact projects – initially a new storage area for Risborough Rangers TFC and the Wades Park master plan. Then move money into longer term projects. MW will attach the relevant PRTC minutes to these notes.</p> <p>It was confirmed that PRTC would receive 25% of CIL when plan approved – expected to yield around £5.5m.</p> <p>DJ stressed that WDC’s experience showed that CIL could be spent many times over.</p> <p>LCC felt that CIL should be used for something special – perhaps sport, or to support Risborough as the Gateway to the Chilterns.</p>	<p><b>MW</b></p>
<p><b>(5) Town infrastructure priorities</b></p>	
<p>RB had prepared a brief exercise to help the group in priority setting, since her previous invitation to the group had yielded little by way of response.</p> <p>LCC, JAS and some others felt that public engagement was needed for this – it was not for the group to take sole responsibility.</p> <p>IMa pointed out that WDC need to prepare the plan to a Government-imposed timescale. Have to put the Local Plan to bed. Further detail would be developed through the masterplan process which would be subject to public consultation.</p> <p>BBB added that the steering group elected Members are mandated as part of a representative democracy – this is part of the consultation process – WDC are looking for a steer. General public will get their say.</p> <p>LCC suggested that this could be put to upcoming meetings of RARA for wider feedback. This was agreed.</p>	
<p><b>(6) Taking local initiatives forward</b></p>	
<p><b>a. Wades Park master plan</b></p>	
<p>Louise Thomas has been engaged to develop this – a draft expected before Christmas.</p>	

<p><b>b. GP surgeries</b></p>	
<p>MW/AT met with Wellington House Surgery – meeting next month with Cross Keys. The idea of relocating and merging was well received. Extra services could attract funds from the CCG (Clinical Commissioning Group).</p> <p>LCC felt that a health and education working group could be established to promote local priorities. DJ explained that health delivery is the CCG’s responsibility so it is for them to drive it. Similarly, education provision is the responsibility of the County Council. IMo confirmed that BCC are preparing a planning application for the expansion of the secondary school.</p>	
<p><b>c. Sports facilities</b></p>	
<p>MW explained that as the Town Council would be seeking to take on ownership/ maintenance of new sports provision, this would be an area for local discretion and influence.</p> <p>It was agreed to establish a sports working group, to include IMo, AQ, MW, LCC and AT. RB will send info from WDC communities to help inform their deliberations.</p>	<p><b>MW</b> <b>RB</b></p>
<p><b>d. Community Land Trusts</b></p>	
<p>PRTC will pick up action on this – to prepare a note on CLTs for the next meeting. RB emphasised that the group would need to be ready to seize any opportunities as they arise.</p> <p>See CLT website: <a href="http://www.communitylandtrusts.org.uk/funding-and-resources/resources/start-a-clt--business-planning-tenure-land-and-planning">http://www.communitylandtrusts.org.uk/funding-and-resources/resources/start-a-clt--business-planning-tenure-land-and-planning</a></p>	<p><b>AB</b></p>
<p><b>(6) HEDNA update and Duty to Cooperate</b></p>	
<p>IMa unable to share latest draft/figures – will be before end October to coincide with Chiltern and South Bucks consultation on their draft Plan. We can say that they are not going up.</p> <p>Ongoing – AVDC challenge through Hearn’s report – our response will go into final revision of plan.</p> <p>Expect to reach an agreed figure with AVDC over next few months. They are convinced we have fully explored district capacity.</p> <p>WDC challenged Hearn’s report overall, including more at Risborough, and the massively expansion of Kimble.</p> <p>WDC is reviewing plan – an update we always said we would do.</p> <p>We will work out total potential supply from latest figures to give</p>	<p><b>IMa</b></p>

<p>current need.</p> <p>AVDC plan to scrutiny/Cabinet in December – targeted by Government.</p> <p>BBB asked if WDC objected to Aston Sandford. IMA explained that it would be inconsistent with the position that AVDC will be taking some of WDC’s need. However, if it were to go forward WDC would need to work with AVDC in much more detail.</p> <p>BBB asked if AVDC inspector will look at WDC? IMA said AVDC likely to get to EiP (Examination in Public) first. Planning Inspector will look at overall need; issue and wider context of Bucks. Agreement with AVDC will short-circuit strategic debate. WDC will make representation on AVDC’s plans; we don’t want AVDC to fail.</p> <p>LCC asked how Government would intervene if plans fail. DJ said the Government would appoint a consultant at AVDC – WDC’s plan would be set back. LCC asked if there had been any precedent on this. IMA said the Government had intervened in a couple of cases, post-EiP – taking longer overall! IMA has sounded out CLG (the Department of Communities and Local Government) and the feedback is that they would take a pragmatic view.</p> <p>DJ confirmed that without a plan, the district has no five-year land supply, which makes us vulnerable to hostile speculation.</p> <p>AT added that you would get development of 2500 homes piecemeal anyway, and no infrastructure.</p>	
<p><b>(7) Developer update</b></p>	
<p>RB fed back to the group on the latest meeting with agents and landowners on 5 October. Progress on resourcing a master plan process has been frustrating. However, a Government capacity funding announcement is expected soon and WDC will be applying for this.</p>	
<p><b>(8) AOB</b></p>	
<p>JAS asked for an agenda item on master planning next time – funding, timescale, scope. He reminded the group of the actions assigned to Dan Fenn. RB will follow these up.</p> <p>AB suggested an earlier start time, of 6pm. This was agreed.</p> <p>DJ advised that the agenda should be tailored to limit the business to two hours.</p> <p>LCC offered to forward letters from RARA to WDC on to MW to share with the group.</p>	<p><b>RB</b></p> <p><b>RB</b></p> <p><b>LCC</b></p>

<b>(9) Next meeting</b>	
Tba	