

Princes Risborough Steering Group meeting

Date of Meeting:	Tuesday 13 th September 2016 @ The Princes Centre	
Present:	Stuart Baxter Bill Bendyshe-Brown David Johncock Ian Manktelow Ian Parkinson Jim Stevens Alan Turner Matthew Walsh John Coombes Dann Fenn Charles Vint David Knights Phillip Hayes Gary Hall	Askett Society Buckinghamshire County Council WDC Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability Strategic Planning Manager, WDC Risborough Area Residents Association 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 PRTC DRF Consulting Ltd Monks Risborough Society WDC Member RARA WDC Member and PRTC
Apologies:	Andy Ball Linda Cannon Clegg Rosie Brake	PRTC RARA WDC

Minutes	Actions
(1) Minutes of last meeting – 22 June 2016 – clarifications and actions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarification – that Charles Vint is the replacement rep for the Monks Risborough ● Item 2 – Draft rat running report: - <p>Speed data collection in Mill Lane – MVAS to be arranged for November</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Draft report to be updated to incorporate previous comments from steering group and then submitted to steering group meeting in October for approval. Further updates may be necessary as more MVAS data is collected.</p> <p>Measures in the draft report have been incorporated into the current</p>	<p>BBB</p> <p>JS</p> <p>RB</p>

<p>scope of work for Jacobs traffic forecasting.</p> <p>The minutes were then agreed.</p>	
<p>(2) Remit of Transport Working Group</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MW proposed that more of the transport work should be channelled through the transport sub group (TSG) who would then feed into the main steering group meetings. ● Membership of the TSG was agreed as follows: Jim Stevens (Chair), Stuart Baxter, Charles Vint, Alan Turner, Matthew Walsh, Bill Bendyshe-Brown ● It was agreed that a BCC officer would be invited to attend these meetings 	<p>IM</p>
<p>(3) Update On Highway Design</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dann Fenn presented a detailed update on highway design in a number of sections – the headlines and key discussion points for each section are set out below: <p>(a) Underpass – outline design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Design included 5m footway and 3m cycleway in a “swept around” design. ● Location – towards the northern end of Wades Park but not right in the corner where the existing crossing is due to the Leo site development and for urban design reasons to link directly through to the main development area. ● Wide enough to allow twin tracking and there has been liaison with Network Rail. Construction would mean some limited disruption to rail services. ● Design includes LED lighting ● Safety audit undertaken. <p>In discussion the following points came out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The footpath/cycleway would run along the inside edge of the park before joining Church Lane; ● Access for heavy equipment for construction would have to be through the park; ● Topographical surveys have been done that show that the drainage will work – draining into the nearby stream; ● Line would need to be closed for about 7 days to allow for construction; ● The prevailing view was that it would not be desirable to have seating as part of the design due to risk of anti-social behaviour; ● Importance of high quality LED lighting emphasised ● Adoption would be by Network Rail or BCC in terms of maintenance. Would need commuted sum; ● Confirmed that you would be able to see through to the other side when approaching the underpass. Suggestion that there could be some public art provided. 	

<p>(b) Costing of relief road</p> <p>Following a closer look at route design, topographical surveys, review of ground conditions, and updating to use real 2016 costs (as opposed to 2013 costs), the costs were shared at the meeting on a confidential basis at this stage.</p> <p>These indicated a reduction in the costs relative to the Jacobs figures on a like for like basis.</p>	
<p>(c) Southern Alternatives</p> <p>DF presented an alternative road alignment (which had included a stage 1 safety audit and topographical survey) including the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Route “hugging” Culverton Farm, with two junction alternatives onto the A4010 – the preferred on being a roundabout; ● Closure of Upper Icknield Way between A4010 and upper Shootacre Lane (retain for walking and cycling); ● Roundabout at junction with Picts Lane ● New route through the Picts Lane development area, including scope for improved access to the station – design includes traffic light junction to enable this; ● Revised alignment on Summerleys Road to minimise impact on properties (no buildings required, minimal impact on boundaries/gardens), including increased bridge width ● Through the development area, a mix of 30 mph up to Longwick Rd and then 40mph ● Revised junction arrangements with Mill Lane ● Similar treatment to Jacobs design at Grove Lane junction/underbridge (a priority junction with the priority route being Grove Lane – i.e. the relief road) <p>Clarification points/issues coming out of discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is scope for access to any potential development area to the rear of Poppy Road, either directly off new road across field or directly off roundabout with Picts Lane; ● Suggested that roundabout with A4010 should be moved into the field to achieve a ‘straight ahead’ alignment for the relief road. ● It was confirmed that the road width was 7.3m throughout and this would fit on the available land through the Picts Lane development area ● There was a discussion about whether road width should be increased to 10m – it was explained that as well as increasing cost and not fitting/increasing impact on properties, it would not necessarily increase capacity and would increase safety concerns. It was agreed however that a technical and qualitative 	<p>DF</p>

<p>assessment would be carried out to compare a 7.3m wide relief road versus a 10m wide relief road and this work would then be scrutinised by the transport working group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was the suggestion that the road should be 30mph throughout the development area – it was noted however that this would reduce journey time and hence its attractiveness as an alternative route. ● On Summerleys Road it was confirmed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allowances have been made for stats - The bridge height and width allows for HGVs - A low noise surface would be used - There would be some re-profiling of the road - There would be some accommodation works to access people’s properties. ● A larger scale detailed plan of the Summerleys Road and railway bridge proposals was requested for the transport working group to scrutinise ● It was suggested that route 17 or an alternative wider bypass route should be safeguarded as an improvement to allow for this in the longer term. This would require BCC safeguarding procedure and it was suggested that this should be raised with BCC at a senior level now. It was agreed to await the BCC response on the Plan before bringing this back to the Steering Group. <p>DF confirmed on a confidential basis at this stage that the cost of this revised design was lower than his revised estimate for the Jacobs design, based on market rates at 2016 prices.</p> <p>It was suggested that it would be prudent to keep the ‘Optimism Bias’ percentage uplifts (40% roads and 66% bridges) unchanged and as per the DfT guidelines at this stage.</p> <p>It was confirmed that Part 1 compensation claim cost and property acquisition were not built into these estimates.</p> <p>(d) Option 17 route costs</p> <p>DF confirmed that he had reviewed Jacobs cost and that these had come out marginally higher than Jacobs costs.</p> <p>There was a wider discussion about strategic transport solutions. It was agreed that we would await the BCC response on the Plan before taking this forward, and future actions focussed on a Member level meeting between WDC and BCC, and involving local MPs to lobby ministers.</p>	<p>DF</p> <p>DF</p> <p>IM/RB</p> <p>DF/IM</p> <p>IM/RB</p>
<p>(4) Transport related questions left over from the Scrutiny Session</p>	
<p>The remaining questions were discussed which focused on strategic transport issues which led to a wider discussion about strategic</p>	

transport solutions. It was agreed that we would await the BCC response on the Plan before taking this forward, and future actions focussed on a Member level meeting between WDC and BCC, and involving local MPs to lobby ministers.	IM/RB
(5) AOB	
It was noted by AT that tonight's meeting demonstrated how the Steering Group had scrutinised the emerging proposals and helped bring about a number of positive revisions to the proposals	
(6) Next meeting	
Next meeting: 12 th October, 7pm, Princes Centre.	