

Princes Risborough Steering Group Meeting		
Date of Meeting:	Wednesday 12 April 2017 at The Princes Centre, 6pm	
Present:	Bill Bendyshe-Brown David Johncock Jim Stevens Alan Turner Matthew Walsh Andy Ball Rolf Van Apeldoorn Stewart Baxter David Knights Charles Vint Richard Clayton Penelope Tollitt Sarah Barfield Linda Cannon Clegg John Callaghan Rosie Brake Ian Moore	Buckinghamshire County Council WDC Cabinet Member for Planning & Sustainability PRTC Roll B agent for HS2 Select Committee WDC Member and Deputy Cabinet Member for Planning & Sustainability, PRTC PRTC, Chairman, PRTC Chairman and Risborough Business Group Princes Risborough Town Council Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council Askett Society WDC Member Monks Risborough Society RACP Head of Planning & Sustainability PA to Head of Planning & Sustainability (note take) Chairman, RARA Team Leader (Environment and Infrastructure) Principal Planning Policy Officer Princes Risborough School
Apologies:	Gary Hall Rachel Wileman John Coombes	PRTC & WDC Member Buckinghamshire County Council PRTC
Did not attend:		

Minutes		Action
1)	Minutes of the previous meeting 30 January 2017	
	Draft minutes of these minutes had been circulated to the group for comment. Comments received. Approved	
2)	Actions arising	
2.1	On agenda	
2.2	This is still outstanding re devt of town centre potential opportunity. The TC are forming a new group and will update the SG once met. Town Council to write to WDC about the need for WDC to take an active role in bringing developments forward in the town centre	MW
2.3	On agenda	
2.4	Focus Groups have been completed which was facilitated by MW and Ian Moore. DK lead the discussions with MW AND AT Had good feedback, and was very impressed with them. They were pleased about the co-op opening and keen to maintain one high st, there was concerns about the security of the expansion of the town. BBB advised that the co-op usage is low only getting about 3000 people a week and they do have concerns about this. MW needs to type up the notes from the focus groups.	MW MW
2.6	Tesco – MW met with the manager for initial conversations and will be meeting them again. Notes of this meeting will be circulated soon. BBB has also a planned mtg with Tesco/M&S on	
15.	4 May with regards to the security in the town MW still to do	MW

3)	Scrutiny Sessions Schedule of proposed changes from the draft plan and related changes to the concept plan	
	<p>RB sent out the revised draft policies which are still work in progress. Is there anything missing, incorrect? Plans of the concept also tabled.</p> <p>Policies are what planning applications are judged against.</p> <p>Plan (points numbered for ease of reference)</p> <p>RB went through what the main changes were on the plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gone back to restricting development north of Mill Lane, north of Kingsmead so doesn't extend further 2. Sports spaces on open space north of Mill Lane apart from the rugby pitch which will go to the other open space south of Lower Icknield Way 3. Land of north Mill Lane next to railway line – appropriate for a green corridor, helps to create a separation, and remains agricultural land. 4. FB = foot bridge 5. Density of development feathered off stream, second primary school moved further west – although indicative, hatched square off Longwick Rd is for the GP surgery 6. Odour buffer – smaller footprint and different direction 7. Indicative line for relief road, through station site, bordering the built up area and emerging onto the A4010 between its junction with Woodway and Culverton Farm 8. Hatched purple in north west, this is for the relocation of existing businesses in the area (reserved rather than allocated – a planning technicality), currently arable 9. Brown square is possibly a place for allotments but these could also be scattered through the expansion area 10. Arrow red = show intention of linking up devt area with countryside 11. So this is very similar to the original, with the addition of the GP surgery, and only one local centre (as discussed at the last meeting) 12. 2 local centres to 1, any reason why it's where it is now? Located at the crossroads of the new road with Longwick Road maximises passing trade. 13. Do we have a view to what the local centre will look like, what to offer? Convenience store, community and faith space, some space for business start ups. Community space may also (or alternatively) be provided with the pavilion at the sports village. 14. A car park for Monks Risborough station is required and this has been highlighted a number times, Given that the dual tracking is (currently) outside of the plan period, better to deal with this through text, rather than policy, in the plan. 15. Where is the edge of the local plan? It's the District Boundary - around Ellesborough before Stoke 16. Can the Culverton green corridor from Culverton Farm to Park Mill Pond be shown on the concept plan? yes 17. The town centre and railway station is not showing on the concept plan, the plan doesn't recognise TC works. Believe there is weakness in the plans and this needs to be strengthened. RB is revising the TC and Railway station diagrams. Does make sense to put on one drawing but this is about the expansion, not all of PR. It was agreed to refer to inserts on these two other dwgs. 18. There is only one policy which refers to car parking which is quite weak and recognise this needs strengthening. RB to think about how this works. 19. Need to have increase in off street parking (which plan already acknowledges) 20. JC to have a discussion with the TWG about the level of provision and what is recognised and we do about this. We are not yet at a stage to identify sites. 	

21. Issues need to be looked at in a parking strategy and the Delivery plan may help with this?
22. Did County do a parking review? Yes phase 1. WDC has done a parking review – identifies likely future growth in demand.
23. GP surgery location – not attractive location and not easily accessed other than by car, are we missing anything? Currently proposed location reflects what was decided at the last SG meeting. It is also on the bus route. – to be as close to the railway line as possible. GP surgery is this the only one? Cross Keys want to stay where they are.
24. Concern about the GP surgery and relocating both - is there car parking capacity? Need to have sufficient parking
25. Have had a mtg with CCG and the 2 GP surgeries, the Cross Keys are staying where they are and happy with car parking. Wellington House would like to stay but, using Wades Park for additional car parking is not an option for the Town Council, waiting to hear back from them on what markers they want on the plan. The site shown on the concept plan is generous in size. More detailed info needed from CCG/surgeries on what would be the footprint of what they need.
26. Will the developers be required to fund? No, CCG are not specifying a requirement as a result of the proposed expansion, could be a candidate for CIL
27. Where it is now was favoured as still within easy walking distance, serves area well
28. After general discussion, agreed that the location showed on the concept plan is the right location– close as possible to the town – preferably where the bungalow is, but may not be possible.
29. Could we show bus route on plan? Yes.
30. Any reduction in housing? 2425 doesn't include Poppy Road. 2425 is in the expansion area
31. Some fixed points, masterplan for future discussions
32. Green belt at Culverton Hill (shown on plan at bottom) could some sports facility go on it? Yes, but also AONB. Developers have approached the school for additional sports. They won't get permission for housing as green belt.

Policies

P RTP 1

- Point 4 – read this as previously point 3 relates to the whole of 1 – redesignate as 1(d)
- 1c) "Other" – should say supporting infrastructure

P RTP 2

Nothing

P RTP 3

1. Updated buffer plan tabled
2. What do buffer zones mean? Development will not extend into this buffer, protection of countryside etc
3. Protecting the area around Risborough, designating new green belt requires as much an exceptional circumstance as there is to remove land from the green belt. This is a policy about protecting the rest of the countryside. We are robust in stopping people developing; it's as strong a policy as any in the plan.
4. We are waiting text from colleagues to put in
5. Up to parish boundary with Kimble – discussions have taken place with Kimble Parish to see if they are going to do Neighbourhood Plan
6. Have we got a similar buffer along Longwick? No – not necessary to have buffer around everything. Main reason for the buffer along the railway is to help signal to the public that 'joining up' the expansion area and the Kimbles is not on the cards.

7. The policy about the buffer/settlement boundary – should there not be or does the buffer have to be around the outside? Linkage between this policy and policy 5 about green infrastructure, (RB) these are different policies . Crowbrook is a park, buffer is agricultural land, buffer is an empty space between things.
8. What are the green bits? AONB/ green belt apart from the land off Poppy Road which is green belt only

P RTP 4

- d) should this be expanded? What will the enhancements be? It does look a bit bald. – there is supporting text that sits with each point but was agreed to expand.
- f) transport modes – is it clear enough? Need to ensure that cycle and pedestrian links from within the development continue off site to link properly with wider town destinations and therefore wording needs to be modified to ensure the integration point comes across fully. The same applies to the IRR links.
- Would be helpful if we could be more specific about the green corridor. These are in 5 and therefore covered.
- Under a) ‘green and blue infrastructure’ – jargon, could this be rephrased? Do as supporting text rather than a policy change.

P RTP 5

1. Jobs and business – reserve plot (purple in concept plan) wise to put in “if required”?? puts a marker if needed for future and unwanted developer (residential) applications, or just put in policy ‘residential applications will be refused’ or similar, as we have in some other policies in the local plan.
2. Under Community 11 – two primary schools with space for two forms of entry
3. Point 14 – increase car parking capacity for GP surgeries – no point in putting the first bit in as not likely to happen
4. Transport and roads (6/7) talking about high quality - refer to a standard
5. Transport and roads – anything in about safety? There will be increase local traffic as no pavements. Yes, in Policy 6 under 7d and Under 4 also.
6. 7b) linking to external connections to wider area – is this reference to cycle ways off site? Yes and it also relates to 4f above . Therefore could we put “externally” in? stick with the “provide” not “contribute” , but add in ‘key’ connections – reasonable off-site requirement
7. 13) add parking to provision
8. ‘Sure Start’ type centre – are there any plans to develop such a centre within the new primary school? I.e. supporting parenting, diet, fitness, healthy eating etc. This is a good point and will take advice from the County (RB to look into this)
9. Sports provision focused on edge of area to protect from further development. Community preference for sports to be clustered together. Potential to share parking provision for Molins sports ground, and include community centre
10. Sports WG have not met for a while, is it important to meet about this? As this is more for John’s work, we don’t need any more detail. Further detail in the plan may risk challenge from Sport England.
11. Definitely need a sport working group and to get a date in the diary.
12. under 20a) could we have another b) re green corridor re Culverton stream. Existing policy on de-culverting – but also covered under specific site policies (as not in the expansion area).
13. Discussions with DfT are we sure about 15 meters is this absolutely right? Not 25 metres? Best to be cautious as there may also be issues of noise and vibration.

- 14. The primary school is next to a conservation area and playtime can be very noisy. Unfortunately within this environment we have to accept this. Is there anything that can be done?
- 15. 23/24/25 (town centre) this is a little weak in content A new chapter on car parking was requested. What is the contribution? We would welcome any supplementary comment Agreed that JS prepare wording and send something round to the SG
- 16. Relocation of Fire Station in the longer term (unlikely in the short term). Discussions are taking place and PT has met with police/fire. If through this process they get a new fire station then they may possibly move but at the moment they are not planning to move. The opportunity can be preserved for the future.

P RTP 6

- e) the word “excess” to be removed.
- 3) Could this link to P RTP 15? – work still needs to be done on 15
- 4) refers to 15 meters needs to change to 25 meters
- Good to see rat running in the policy but wording to be looked at

P RTP 7

Nothing

P RTP 8

- This has slightly changed since being circulated
- Added in about heavy vehicle routing, awkward place to get to. N.b. Hypnos existing routeing is via Thames.
- Added in about flood risk management
- Bridges in this area – standard height?

P RTP 9

- Add clause on protection and enhancement of Culverton corridor Poppy Road – opportunity if goes ahead to have an access road at back of Poppy Road, which enables residents to park there instead of on the street.
-

P RTP 10

- plans need to show public realm on the junction to join up? RB has arranged for all 3 drawings be on the same map with more enhanced labelling
- Add clause on on-street parking
- 3) scale issue – quantify the level of contribution? Public realm up to £5m

P RTP 11

- Isn't strong in reference to car parking – P RTP 10 to 12 slightly different. Need to be far more positive and consistent. A chapter specifically on car parking was requested in the town plan to pull together all of the existing references relating to car parking dotted throughout the plan and also to strengthen car parking in the context of the TC and the rail stations. A car parking strategy also needs to be developed for the town. It was agreed that the way parking is presented in the plan will be reviewed.
- Reference to New Road add Back Lane in brackets.
- 11/12 relate to existing policies.
- Parking issue on 11 – no positive requirement for car parking expansion. Opportunity for on street parking? Could we develop at back of shops?
- Back Lane concern – some other areas are over used and lack of capacity. Are we in a position to get some compulsory purchase? Wainwrights car park always empty. Potential PRTC project

	<p>P RTP 12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This needs to be strengthened in reference to car parking (see above P RTP11). - Retailers concerned about the Relief Road, Back Lane is crying out for development. <p>P RTP 13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking for Molins to be provided by sports facilities in the expansion area. <p>P RTP 14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add cycle-friendly access. Also add about the friendliness of the feeling of pedestrian/ cycle access - The TWG have concerns about the pedestrian facilities on the signal-controlled junction – cross reference to P RTP6 - Point 5 – de-culverting of stream in context of Culverton corridor. <p>P RTP 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendix c) no reference to car parking infrastructure, this will be added - 2) – southern section of the relief road – Why stopping at Park Mill? Connecting through to Longwick Road too early will add pressure on the Tesco roundabout. This is a detailed matter with the work that JC is doing. <p>Main plan policies Risborough makes reference to them</p> <p>CP7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2f) how is it being managed through the plan? Which modes? What’s happening about rail? - Risborough should lobby to be included in the Chiltern Rail main line services (i.e. main line trains stopping at PR station). - At the last meeting it was said that community centre should be with the sports provision – is this in the policy? RB needs to check this. 	
4.	CIL	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report previously circulated and thanks were given to see it laid out easily. - Re 4th bullet, who does this? This is by Wycombe Cllrs. DJ has asked PT to put paper together to flag this up. - There are unquantifiable costs (community land trust) – how is this fitted in with the money from CIL? The TC are interested in supporting. - Q raised about a recent Gvt report has stated that CIL has not delivered infrastructure on the scale expected. If things are difficult to fund through S106 should we be asking for extra CIL from developers? - PT responded that most Councils haven’t adopted CIL, and there is a Govt consultation paper on standardising CIL. WDC has had CIL for 5 years, so has experience in accurately estimating income - expected to be c£20+m under the current system - 25% will go to PRTC. - 75% into the pot, there is flexibility in Risborough areas. Have tried to effectively ring fence money for Risborough. Flexibility does exist - in practice this relates more to timing of funds being made available – spending decisions are for Members to consider. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted that in terms of Risborough, community centre enhancements were funded from CIL – raised across the District – the Princes Centre has a new mini bus, new tree planting etc. 	
5.	Update on Dan Fenn’s report	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dan’s report is being reviewed. The report will contain technical information and drawings; it will talk about how it is building on the work from Jacobs; the work has been through a stage 1 safety audit. It will include all costs, reviewing the alignments and will set out number of metrics, e.g. square metres of design footprint. - Reassessed costs – this is about the same as before: £49m for construction, £4m for land purchase and £ 1.6m for Part 1 compensation claims. - RB confirmed that full optimism bias and risk contingencies have been retained in the costs. - If there is plenty of value in the land, could we not build fewer houses but still deliver the relief road? We might, but the expansion of Princes Risborough is part of the strategic picture of Wycombe District meeting its objectively assessed needs and meeting the Duty to Cooperate. If we fail on either of those matters the plan will fail altogether. - What is the estimated timescale for the release of Dan’s report? This will be ready to share by end of April, which will be a final draft for revision/discussion. - Will it have recommendations? No, it will simply set out the options. This will be for the Members (Cabinet) to make the decision which will be in the summer. - Clarification given that we will be issuing the final report, but won’t be a formal consultation and won’t be on the on website. - Will it have reference to the volume of traffic on the relief road like Jacobs did? This matter will be covered in the Jacobs’ traffic modelling reports. - JS will send RB questions raised by IP for response. 	
6.	<p>Transport Working Group</p> <p><u>Rail report</u></p> <p>The report was previously circulated and the purpose of the report is to:</p> <p>a) seek the SG’s formal approval of the Chiltern Rail Route – Princes Risborough and Monks Risborough report, after which the report will be formally circulated to relevant organisations and</p> <p>b) to recommend to the SG that WDC are requested to include a Rail Chapter in the draft P RTP informed by the concerns of the Chiltern Rail Route – Princes Risborough and Monks Risborough report.</p> <p>The report was discussed with the following points noted:-</p> <p><u>Issues</u></p> <p>Currently, some peak and weekend train services are showing capacity limitations and this capacity shortfall is seen to manifest in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The number and frequency of trains stopping at Princes Risborough and Monks Risborough stations; 2) 2. The number of available seats on trains that do stop. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The station car park at PR is often full, there is no car park at Monks Risborough and people use nearby residential streets. 	

Opportunities

Rail Infrastructure Strategy:

- a) Meeting demand to 2024
- b) Opportunities to maximise the benefits of HS2 in 2026
- c) The longer term view to 2043

Rail Franchise Agreement

- The current Rail Franchise Agreement with current TOC (Chiltern Railways) is due to expire in 2021.

Next steps:

- a) To seek the SG approval for the report and to then share this report with DfT, NR, the TOC and also the three local authorities for the area (BCC, WDC and PRTC) and the LEP.
- b) It is hoped that productive dialogue between all of the parties will continue on these issues and help to realise the solutions.
- c) Include a rail chapter in the town plan

Other comments:

- The link to Old Oak Common is arguably a 'silver bullet' in terms of capacity and connectivity. There is a current public consultation on the Heathrow expansion and SG members are encouraged to use this opportunity to respond to the consultation say that the Chiltern Line to Old Oak Common rail link is essential for regional connectivity to Heathrow. JS will produce some model words for SG members to use in individual responses to the Heathrow consultation.
- The Heathrow expansion will create many more jobs coming into Bucks. Therefore we do need to try to get a link to Old Oak Common and twin line from MK to Risb, very important to put pressure on Network Rail about the Heathrow expansion.
- Not only twin tracking on the Pr Risborough – Aylesb (PRA) line we also need to press for twin track to Old Oak Common as currently only a single.
- The long term aim to increase capacity on the Chiltern line will be jeopardised if the Old Oak Common does not proceed. Can we encourage bus companies to go via Pr Risborough station? This is very challenging - bus companies are usually reluctant to change routes.
- Additional words on the 'Quick Wins' to be added in the rail report which JS will do and re-circulate

Transport Working Group report

The purpose of the report is to bring a number of matters to the attention of the SG and WDC and to seek advice, direction and decisions on these matters.

Noted:

- The approved Minutes for TWG meetings #3 and #4 attached for SG information.

The matters which arise for the SG and WDC, including those discussed at TWG meeting #5 are:-

(i) Speeding in Monks Risborough and Askett:

MVAS data recorded by the local community in Askett Village Lane, Crowbrook Road

	<p>and Mill Lane indicates a continuing traffic speeding issue, which heightens TWG’s concerns re ‘rat running’.</p> <p>Action for SG: To note this ongoing issue.</p> <p>(ii) Church Lane Public Right of Way: WDC Cllr David Knights raised on behalf of a local resident, concerns with the suitability of this path for Cycle/Pedestrian use as proposed in the draft PRTP. This and alternative ideas were discussed by TWG (see TWG minutes #4).</p> <p>Action for SG: To note that this issue that will need to be assessed in detail as part of the master planning work which should include the development of a network of cycle and pedestrian routes within and outside the expansion area.</p> <p>(iii) WDC responses to TWG’s concerns with the Relief Road and ‘Rat Running’. TWG considered WDC responses given at 30/1/17 SG meeting and noted that WDC have said TWG’s concerns will be considered and addressed within master planning work and that there is sufficient time to do this and make changes. Notwithstanding this, TWG concerns remain unaddressed. TWG would like to record its thanks to John Callaghan (WDC) and Mark Averill (BCC) for giving up their time to attend TWG meetings and provide officer support and advice to TWG. This is very welcome and making a difference.</p> <p>Action for SG: To request WDC to provide indicative timescale for commencing the master planning work and indicate how the technical support will ensure TWG’s concerns are addressed. (see item 7)</p> <p>(iv) Town Centre Public Realm and A4010 Traffic Management Improvements. In response to the previous request made by the SG, TWG considered how these works might be prioritised and phased. TWG scored three options and its <i>preferred option</i> is shown below, which TWG considers will offer potential maximum gain for residents, visitors and businesses, whilst taking into account availability of funding. Although Figure 8 in the draft PRTP shows the public realm works concentrated around road junctions, TWG is of the opinion that the public realm principles and works will need to apply to the lengths of road between the junctions as well to join it all up (i.e. New Road, High Street, Duke Street and Church Street).</p> <p>TWG also discussed: (a) the need for more accurate cost estimates of all of the works (b) possible development ‘triggers’ to ensure the town centre and A4010 works are implemented to a timescale appropriate to the build out rate of the new development and relief road (c) the need to look at development options work for the New Road and Horns Lane development sites (d) deletion of mini roundabouts at the end of Mill Lane (as this could encourage rat running) provided that the junction and school frontage is otherwise controlled/ treated eg. as a ‘shared space’/ 20mph zone (c) the need for public realm surface treatments to be very carefully designed and could vary depending upon use of the area.</p> <p>Action for SG: (a) support TWG’s <i>preferred option</i> for prioritising the town centre and A4010 improvements (b) request timescales from WDC for the detailed design work and the provision of more accurate cost estimates for all the works (c) request WDC to carry out development optioneering work for the New Road and Horns Lane development sites (d) note that TWG would like to be involved with developing the detailed scope, design and timing of the works.</p> <p>(v) Chiltern Rail Route. See rail report minutes above.</p>	
--	--	--

(vi) Off Street Car parking

Following WDC's stakeholder meeting held in mid-March, TWG has carried out some preliminary work looking at off street car parking provision. TWG noted that since the recent introduction of yellow lines in the town, displaced cars have reduced the availability of spaces in the Mount car park to the point where it appears the car park is now almost full on many days.

The Mount car park was previously the only car park that had reasonable spare capacity but this has now been eroded by displaced cars and consequently the off street car parks in the town and at the station are now operating at almost full capacity.

TWG reviewed the content of the draft PRTP and felt that with the passage of time since the draft was issued in Feb 2016, 'car parking' within the plan requires updating and could also be improved by joining up the various aspects of car parking into a car parking chapter.

Specifically TWG felt that the off street car parking policy (PRTP5 #27) appears not adequately defined and the various text statements in the draft appear not joined up. Also the draft Infrastructure schedule in Appendix C makes no reference to off street car parking expansion (except at GP surgeries).

TWG felt the draft PRTP appeared to lack adequate information on possible sites for car park expansion to meet the car parking demand arising from the draft PRTP.

TWG questioned whether the PRTP Concept Plan should include annotations relating to off street car parking expansion and also considered that a comprehensive car parking strategy for the town should be undertaken and the need for this is now acute following the introduction of yellow lines.

Action for SG: To request WDC to consider:

- (a) addressing the apparent lack of information, clarity and policy on car parking in the current draft PRTP by strengthening the wording and policies, cross referencing the station car parking expansion with the rail strategy and pulling this together in a specific car parking chapter in the draft PRTP
- (b) developing a comprehensive car parking strategy (on and off street) for the town, including an evaluation of options for sites and associated delivery estimates
- (c) whether the draft PRTP Concept Plan should be annotated to show town centre car parking expansion
- (d) annotating the draft PRTP Concept Plan to show a new station car park at Monks Risborough Station

Other comments:-

- Is the SG happy with the 3rd option, 3.5 weight limit? Yes, but this needs checking further as such a limit could exclude large 4x4's.
- Phase 1 rat running measures – may not come for a long time if delivery is linked to development in the MR end of expansion area
- When does the Relief Road connect to Mill Lane? Good question – is there a scope to do the full road or in phases?
- PT needs a letter from Town Council which will be sent by the end of this week

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 main issues – (1) about revamping the town plan and parking needs to be much stronger, (2) developing a parking strategy for the town. Agreed this is needed - Timescales for devt of strategy ? - Thanks were given to the TWG for their hard work 	
7.	Masterplan	
	<p><u>Capacity Plan</u></p> <p>The Capacity plan is to flesh out the concept plan, and is in progress. A meeting is taking place mid May by which time the plans should be at a sufficiently firm stage and which will be shared with the SG. Then early June we will be holding an information exercise or public meeting / exhibition, this is not intended as formal consultation. [Post meeting note: in the light of the general election, the public information exercise will be held late June].</p> <p><u>Delivery Plan</u></p> <p>This is about how development and infrastructure are delivered: a step by step guide. WDC shortly meeting with new consultants about this task. The process hasn't got going yet, but could be a year long process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will there be an SG meeting prior to this and will the date be released for the exhibition/public event? No date has yet been set but it will be sent out in good time. - LCC would like to have a discussion with MW about preferences for any format e.g. a public meeting or exhibition. MW advised that this is a matter for the Town Council as they have led on these issues. LCC expressed that she would still like to have discussion with Matt. - Noted that if it was a public meeting not everyone gets the opportunity to speak. One suggestion was to use survey monkey to gauge wider views and giving a cut-off date. This has worked well in the past. But noted this is an 'informal consultation'. - JS requested that the Transport WG be involved in establishing the principles of the master plan, i.e. how do people get across the relief road? PT noted that most principles are in the concept plan. Issues being raised by TWG are for master planning and further levels of detailed planning. Suggested the TWG need to meet before the next Steering Group. There is concern within TWG that the principles of the development layout are already set in stone? PT: it's not. 	
8.	Landowners update	
	<p>PT hasn't spoken to Philip Jean or agents yet</p> <p>PT is meeting with Persimmon and separately with Bloors tomorrow</p>	
9.	AOB	
	LCC advised the SG that RARA presented a petition to WDC which has triggered a debate on 5 June	
10	Date of Next meeting	
	To be arranged – in relation to the capacity plan. JC to lead from WDC	