

## Princes Risborough Steering Group meeting

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	Wednesday 11 May 2.30 p.m. Committee Room 1, WDC	
<b>Present:</b>	Stuart Baxter Bill Bendyshe-Brown Rosie Brake Richard Clayton David Johncock  Ian Manktelow Ian Parkinson Aude Pantel Jim Stevens  Alan Turner Matthew Walsh Rachel Wileman	Askett Society Buckinghamshire County Council Planning Policy Officer, WDC Risborough Area Partnership WDC Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability Policy Team Leader, WDC Risborough Area Residents Association Planning Policy Officer, WDC PRTC roll B agent for HS2 select committee  WDC Member and chairman of PRTC Risborough Business Group BCC Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Manager and BCC Lead for Princes Risborough
<b>Apologies:</b>	Andy Ball Dan Brown John Coombs Gary Hall David Knights Ian Moore (IMo) Richard Stevenson Rolf Van Apeldoorn	PRTC Risborough Rugby Club PRTC PRTC and WDC PRTC and WDC Princes Risborough School Risborough Area Partnership Longwick Parish Council

Minutes	Actions
<b>(1) Meeting arrangements</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MW regretted that teas and coffees were not provided. Noted.</li> <li>the SG was under the impression that PT had promised to attend the meeting – WDC officers had no awareness of this.</li> </ul>	<b>PT to attend next SG meeting</b>  <b>Next SG meeting to be in the evening</b>
<b>(2) Issues raised during consultation</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RB had produced a thematic summary of the main points raised</li> </ul>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>during the consultation and it was suggested at the start of the meeting that the SG goes through the list and discuss key remaining issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We received 367 responses, including over 200 online - some of the weaknesses are technical.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Shootacre alternative</b></p> <p>RB updated on BANG meeting – positive overall – emphasis on Shootacre being special place, need more assessment of noise and air quality issue ; wanted to know how we looked at the TC improvements – RB highlighted that major highway improvement would be contrary to TC objectives . The A option (alternative to Shootacre) would be acceptable to them. Made aware that Option A would be likely to encourage development there.</p> <p>Jim S found it positive that WDC has listened to the public, but disappointed that WDC doesn't seem to have listened to the steering group re option 17, nor the suitability of Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane to form part of the new relief road . JS reiterated that the steering group had raised concerns about the suitability of Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane for some time, including the need to publish the A option as part of the public consultation. DJ stated that the decision on the final option and for the relief road has yet to be taken by WDC.</p> <p>RB explained that the extra work about to be commissioned will look at Shootacre alternative and costing; The preferred provider has worked on the High Wycombe Town Centre Master Plan – responsive and nimble</p> <p>JS said that the relief road high cost items of infrastructure are the railway bridges and for this reason the consultant needs to know about railway possession procedures and railway civil engineering – as well as highway engineering design. This is essential to ensure that the estimate of costs is reliable; RB said the person in mind was appropriate and reminded that the level of work for the plan is about showing the road is deliverable.</p> <p>Because of alternative work the plan is likely to be published after the summer.</p> <p>RB mentioned that the traffic modelling output already exists for alternative A; Since the majority of the road should be delivered by development it is less likely that economic modelling will be needed.</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>IM informed the group that a wider piece of traffic modelling is happening for the local plan as a whole, looking also at mitigation measures, which will incorporate the final scenario at Princes Risborough. This will incorporate the countywide growth needs.</p>	
<p>RW raised awareness of the work done by BCC through the Health and Wellbeing board – CCG have been engaged</p>	
<p><b>Rail</b></p> <p>Chiltern Railways – AT said that regular meetings are arranged with PRTC, WDC, and Chiltern Railways; IP raised the fact that Chilterns franchise is soon running out.</p> <p>JS referred to Network Rail’s strategies for rail capacity planning and how these might need reviewing by NR to take account of new local plan development. It was agreed that the steering group would be given an update on this – RB to raise this Friday at conference call with NR, see if it is out of date. <i>(post-meeting note – the latest NR Route Study is now expected in June this year)</i></p>	
<p><b>Strategic transport</b></p> <p>LTP4 – BBB raised concern over the fact that the A4010 isn’t in the recently approved LTP4 plan as a strategic route. DJ advised that LTP4 is a very high level plan and that detailed area plans will be produced to support it. However, right now the LEP Strategic Infrastructure Plan discourages the A4010 from being a strategic north south link and the Highways Authority are currently modelling alternative routes for north – south traffic within Bucks that will basically head west from Aylesbury and then follow the M40. We await the outcome of that work before being able to assess the practicality and impact of that proposal.</p>	
<p><b>Traffic measures on Mill Lane / Crowbrook Road and other approaches to Askett</b></p> <p>For the next version of the plan RB is keen that there are specific appropriate measures identified for Mill Lane, Crowbrook Rd and Askett;</p> <p>The group agreed that a <b>working group is to be set up to work</b> on this on tight timescale and identify appropriate measures.</p> <p>Membership of group:</p>	<p><b>RW + BCCAnOthe</b></p>

Minutes	Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rachel Wileman to agree approach with BCC colleagues and identify the right person from Highways authority</li> <li>○ from steering group: Stewart Baxter, Alan Turner, Jim Stevens</li> <li>○ Bill BB as county member</li> </ul> <p>Deadline for proposal – by next SG meeting mid to late June.</p>	<p><b>r</b></p> <p><b>SB, AT, JS</b></p> <p><b>BBB</b></p>
<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Overall pressure on infrastructure especially GPs and dentists has been raised as a key issue.</p> <p>RB suggested it would be helpful to understand what the priorities of the SG / Town council would be on the use of CIL (their 25% and WDC 75% for PR). This might include looking further at the long term plans for Wades Park and the surgery.</p> <p>RW mentioned that the Health and Wellbeing Board has access to funds on this subject – tap into it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DJ discuss with Julia Adey</li> <li>▪ Rachel Wileman to support at officer level</li> </ul> <p>RW also raised awareness of elderly care county wide work; this is on the agenda for Bucks Planners Group on 23 May. Could there be a creative solution at PR to provide for some of this? Discussion with BCC adult social care required.</p>	<p><b>DJ / RW</b></p>
<p><b>Flooding</b></p> <p>JS asked whether additional work had yet been undertaken by WDC on Flood Assessment. IM set out that work has been done at strategic level. Developers will need to do a strategic drainage study.</p> <p>RB indicated that this needs to be done at masterplanning stage.</p> <p>JS raised concerns with the engagement of the developers to ensure the master planning is successful.</p>	
<p><b>Parking</b></p> <p>Options for extra parking were consulted on but some raised objections. There was agreement that the railway car park will need decking. Many objected to decking the Mount c/p including the SG. RB asked if we don't do the mount, what other options are available?</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>The SG suggested the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of greensward at bottom of New Lane (near fire station)?</li> <li>- Risborough garage+ car park at back of post office</li> <li>- Tesco car park – deck?</li> </ul> <p>IM said that the plan should not be silent on car park but the inspector isn't going to home in on it unless there are a lot of objections</p> <p>IP asked about parking for new development – DJ said we will follow BCC parking standards.</p>	
<p><b>Employment</b></p> <p>AT suggested that the employment allocation could be expanded to the north and west. AP informed the group that there is fluvial flood risk to the north. IM added that the employment advice from Boyer (planning) suggested this site for critical mass argument, but also advised on justified quantum of development: 5/6 hectares. This size doesn't tally with the size of the expansion area. But a bigger site could sit there not being taken up, and turn to housing. AP added that in terms of soundness we can only allocate what is justified.</p> <p>The SG raised the issue of access to the site (last week a lorry crashed into bridge). AT asked whether there would be a soundness issue with access.</p> <p>DJ said we are likely to attract SMEs on the expansion site – AT said recent planning permission for container storage (near station).</p> <p>RB reminded the group that Ercol, Princes Estate and others are successfully operating with this access. It is recognised that the access is suboptimal, but it does not represent an unsoundness argument.</p> <p>AT sought further clarity on Hypnos site - How do we help them to stay?</p> <p>JS requested that a transport DM opinion be sought on the expansion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ measures needed on Summerleys road to deal with Princes Estate expansion: safety and capacity of junction with traffic light needs reassessing;</li> <li>○ Putnams' vehicles are required to route away from the southern end of Summerleys Road (via the bridges) – a</li> </ul>	<p><b>WDC</b></p>

Minutes	Actions
<p>routing agreement may be needed with the future occupants of the expanded estate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will transport DM have a different view about the expansion because it's a green field not brownfield site (what was previous use of Regent Park?).</li> <li>○ Improvements to both bridges will need to be looked at.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Affordable housing</b></p> <p>ORS have to redo calculations; starter homes complicate the picture – nature of affordable housing.</p>	
<p><b>Molins</b></p> <p>RB asked the steering group whether they had evidence that the former Molins sports ground used to be opened to the wider community – WDC needs written evidence – SG to provide for next meeting.</p>	<p><b>AT / GH? others?</b></p>
<p><b>(3) Update on developers</b></p>	
<p><b>Update on developers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PMF – appeal has been validated – inquiry early next year</li> <li>○ meanwhile they submitted a duplicate application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Phillip Jeans (father) is landowner; Patrick Jeans (son) is developer</li> <li>▪ Phillip Jeans has challenged WDC with a judicial review on the Council's decision on Ashill and submitted a number of requests for information.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Mill Lane – appeal decision 14 June (same as Longwick) – decision if allowed will have an impact on the concept plan</li> <li>○ Consortium talking to us about the masterplan process which is the crucial next step.</li> <li>○ Goat Farm (15/06332/OUT pending determination – likely to be determined late summer (update provided post meeting)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>(4) Other items</b></p>	
<p><b>Steering group response</b></p> <p>JS requested that WDC provide the steering group with a full response to each one of its concerns raised through the public consultation – to be dealt with by draft written response – RB to circulate, though it isn't usual practice to do this with consultation responses.</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For example, what is WDC’s response to the suggestion that money saved by providing one primary school instead of two could be put towards funding option 17?</li> <li>• RB responded that each claim on the development must be justified on its own merits – robbing one part of the infrastructure burden to prioritise another doesn’t really work – in fact it’s unlawful.</li> <li>• IM highlighted the difference between the viability argument and what is justifiable in planning terms – i.e. our work shows that there’s a good headroom of value in the development, but the challenge is to justify what is needed out of that value.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Local Plan</b></p> <p>Update on local plan: cabinet report 6 June; draft plan starting consultation 27 June for 6 weeks; update on Green Belt land and discussion with AVDC – position statement on overall housing number hoped to be agreed in next month or so.</p>	
<p><b>(5) Agenda items – not covered</b></p>	
<p>The following agenda items were not covered due to timing issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- steering group response to the draft plan consultation: to be dealt with by draft written response – RB to circulate once ready</li> <li>- Master plan process - details</li> </ul>	<p><b>RB</b></p>
<p><b>(6) Next meeting</b></p>	
<p>Next meeting to be arranged during the last 2 weeks of June – likely to be 22 June evening at the Princes Centre. Head of Service to be invited.</p>	<p><b>EH</b></p>