

Princes Risborough Steering Group meeting		
Date of Meeting:	Thursday 12 November 2015, 2 p.m. Committee Room 2, WDC	
Present:	<p>Richard Clayton Gary Hall Jim Stevens</p> <p>Richard Stevenson (RSt) David Johncock</p> <p>Alan Turner Matt Walsh Rosie Brake Ian Manktelow Aude Pantel Ian Barham John Rippon</p> <p>Ulrika Diallo</p> <p>Richard Smith</p> <p>Stephen Moody</p>	<p>Risborough Area Partnership PRTC PRTC roll B agent for HS2 select committee</p> <p>Risborough Area Partnership Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability, WDC PRTC and WDC</p> <p>Risborough business group Planning Policy Officer, WDC Policy team leader, WDC Planning Policy Officer, WDC Partnership manager, BTVLEP Head of Growth & Development Strategy, BCC</p> <p>Lead Growth and Strategy Officer, BCC</p> <p>Technical Director, Transport Planning, Jacobs Principal Transport Planner, Jacobs</p>
Apologies:	<p>Andy Ball Stewart Baxter Bill Bendyshe-Brown</p> <p>Dan Brown Ian Churchill John Coombs David Knights Ian Moore Rolf Van Apeldoorn Dave Maycock</p>	<p>PRTC Askett Society Buckinghamshire County Council Risborough Rugby Club PRTC PRTC PRTC and WDC Princes Risborough School Longwick Parish Council Askett Society</p>

Minutes	Actions
(1) introduction	
RB set out the scope of the meeting and everyone introduced themselves.	
(2) Road options assessment questions – answers from Jacobs	
These were circulated to the group prior to the meeting.	
The meeting worked through the answers with discussion	

Minutes	Actions
focusing on particular aspects of the response.	
(3) Role of A4010 as part of north south strategic countywide network	
<p>It was confirmed that the assessment uses a county wide model and therefore includes the wider transport network, which allows an understanding of north south movements including on the A4010.</p> <p>AT asked whether that recognised the developments happening around Aylesbury Vale – high number of new residents very likely to be using the A4010 to reach Thames Valley.</p> <p>SM confirmed that growth assumptions of 37,000 homes for Aylesbury had been made when testing the options, over the timescale of the study.</p> <p>IM asked confirmation over the timescale of the study (2036) and highlighted that AVDC options consultation is looking at 31,000 dwellings – even if Aylesbury Vale has to accommodate unmet need from South Bucks too, the 37000 figure is a reasonable and robust assumption.</p> <p>JS was concerned that the TEMPRO assumptions hadn't caught up with the scale of growth anticipated in Aylesbury and High Wycombe. IM pointed out that TEMPRO can't show current planned growth because it isn't adopted yet. Nevertheless the figures used are a good match for the numbers being developed by the Bucks authorities.</p> <p>SM also confirmed that the TEMPRO growth assumptions were consistent with the scale of anticipated growth in Aylesbury.</p> <p>JS said the A4010 currently acts as a local road connecting Aylesbury and High Wycombe but queried whether the modelling had taken into account a possible change in its role to act as a strategic N-S route to the M40/Thames Valley. JS this was relevant in the context of the County Councils N – S strategic review of connectivity through Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>DJ responded that the LEP has done work for the SEP including on the A4010. Initially seen as a strategic north-south route by BCC but WDC is saying there should be alternatives (west) –whether that is feasible or preferred is another matter – but it would help PR</p> <p>IB said that the LEP recognises that a key issue for the county is the north/south connection. The infrastructure plan is</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>proposing to test alternatives for north/south movements.</p> <p>GH raised concerns that there are issues on the A4010 already, which need addressing. New development traffic will only make matters worse at PR which is a pinch point in the network. Therefore there needs to be a discussion on A4010 improvements prior to looking at any growth option.</p> <p>AT agreed and added that an east west route is not a solution.</p> <p>JR said he didn't have a view on whether the strategic route is the A4010 but there is a recognised strategic issue – no alternatives identified yet. BCC will be taking an informed view after alternatives have been tested.</p> <p>DJ said there were 2 issues here</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -a strategic piece of work -a route for Risborough - the meeting should be refocusing on the issues at hand – i.e. the road for PR <p>MW asked for the timescales for the work on alternatives to the A4010. JR said they would be commissioning Jacobs in the next few weeks (brief being drafted). RS will advise on timescales.</p> <p>JR highlighted that the LEP funds to deliver solutions are dependent on growth happening – therefore without tying infrastructure to growth there would be no funding</p> <p>AVDC looking at solutions even further west.</p> <p>AT said that PR was clearly looking at growth, if not embracing it, but there is a need for the right infrastructure to go with it.</p> <p>IM said developers have a role in funding this – degree to which depends on how much the development traffic is using the network.</p> <p>JS said there were in summary two options for a relief road (with variations): an inner and an outer relief road. The group agreed.</p> <p>JS added that if a decision is made to select the inner relief road as the preferred option, there is a need to make the existing A4010 very unattractive to through traffic by installing physical measures on the existing route to increase journey times, reduce through traffic and therefore reduce existing town centre congestion which is one of the objectives of the</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>relief road. JS stated that there is then the question of appropriateness of the inner relief road also performing the function as the main A road N – S route through the town, (potentially 40 mph), running through the middle of a housing estate.</p> <p>AT agreed – an outer relief road should therefore be preferred.</p>	
<p>(4) Role of the LEP</p>	
<p>IB confirmed that the LEP has had close involvement in the PR plan and recognises that the route has a vital part to play in the master plan. The LEP board, which is composed of local business representatives, and elected Members of the 5 Bucks authorities, will examine what is recommended.</p> <p>AT mentioned that he talked to a successful business owner in PR who is relocating to Stokenchurch due to traffic issues. From an economic point of view, an outer relief route is crucial to improve prospects in the town.</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>(5) Report from Jacobs to SG on selecting preferred options to go through further assessment</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM set out how options had been filtered out, from 21 scenarios originally, scoring them against the agreed scheme objectives. • JS pointed out that option 14 (improving the B4009 to the M40 motorway) could not provide a north south solution. SM said there is a rationale for its exclusion and this will be set out in the report. • 10 options were shortlisted to run through the county wide model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 11a/b, through development, 40 mph - 12, outer route - 13a/b, using existing Summerleys Road - 15a/b as 11 a/b but 30 mph through the development site - 16a/b, hugging the east side of the Birmingham railway line. - 17 (intermediate route) <p>AT said that the use of the B4009 made sense but queried the difference of timing between the inner and outer route.</p> <p>JS asked for clarification as to whether the relief road options took into account physical measures being installed on existing A4010 route through the town to increase journey times – he was under the impression it didn't. JS requested the modelling of the relief road options should be carried out with significant measures installed on the existing A4010.</p> <p>RB believed that even if results were to be different, the options would perform similarly relative to one another.</p> <p>JS also asked whether the inner route times were based on a point A to point B modelling, or if interruptions due to junctions crossing points, accesses to properties, on street parking etc. had been taken into account. RS confirmed it was the former at this stage, as this is appropriate for the business case. It is envisaged that the junction strategy and design will be such that delay to through traffic is minimised. Case to DfT for a new road needs to be on aggregate journey times only.</p> <p>AT reiterated that it was vital for the route to help PR town centre economy – this objective is a pivotal part of PR town plan.</p> <p>GH added that to sell this to the public there needs to be a solution that improves the town centre (makes it more people</p>	

Minutes	Actions
(6) Costs and delivery	
<p>SM then highlighted the preliminary indicative cost of each option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11a/b or 15 a/b = 50 to 55 million • 12 = 70 million • 17 = 75 to 80 million <p>JS asked what optimism bias had been factored into the costs, as well as risk allocation.</p> <p>SM explained that at this stage of the assessment it was standard to factor in a 44% optimisation bias (66% on rail sections) + a 20% risk allocation.</p> <p>At the next stage of the appraisal (Stage 2) the optimisation bias reduces to 15% for roads and 23% for bridges, although rail schemes require 40% to be used.</p> <p>GH asked where the money would come from.</p> <p>IM said the principal source of funds is likely to be from the development/developers, provided the road can be linked to development traffic. CIL receipts are unlikely to cover this – current rate would yield just £20M and this would need to cover a range of infrastructure,</p> <p>RSt asked whether the development could happen without the road – short answer – yes.</p> <p>MW said that the difference between the inner and outer road is perhaps in real terms 12 million, out of a development worth billions – not the time to make shortcuts.</p> <p>IM reminded the meeting that if the infrastructure is not deliverable, then the plan will be found unsound by the planning inspector. In that case it would be open season for speculative developers.</p> <p>DJ said there is a need for BCC and the LEP to work together on this as without this plan we get piecemeal development and no road.</p>	
(7) Work programme	
<p>RS confirmed the business case analysis would be available before Christmas, with the proviso of further modelling work as requested at the present meeting.</p> <p>GH asked for confirmation that an environmental assessment had been done as part of this work, including air quality. RB confirmed that an assessment is made at the plan stage but also when the road becomes its own project. She also</p>	

Minutes	Actions
confirmed that there are no known air quality issues at PR at present according to current monitoring.	
(8) Other developments	
<p>AT asked for clarification regarding the impact of the road options on Picts Lane – is there a road alignment? Is there sufficient provision on site for the road and if yes, is that sufficient for a strategic route. JS stated that a relief road for the town would require a e.g. 7.3 metre carriageway width and that the planning consent granted for the Picts Lane site needs to be checked to see what width has been required? (RB to check width allocated)</p> <p>IM confirmed that provision had been made through the planning application in the form of a green space on the side of development. He explained that although the outline application was about 97 dwellings, the reason for a very small application on reserve matters was not linked to a road provision reducing numbers but to the slow and steady approach usually taken by the developer</p> <p>GH raised concerns over development at Chinnor and Saunderton – IM said that the AAP was dead and that a Neighbourhood Development Plan would look at a much smaller scale of growth). Molins application has gone to appeal and the council must say something about what they would have been minded to conclude.</p>	RB
(9) Conclusions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jacobs need to run additional scenarios in the model for the shortlisted options with the agreed A4010 constraints. The business case methodology doesn't allow the A4010 constraints to be included in the business case work (and could indeed weaken it), but the importance of the constraints will be reflected in the narrative of the report. • JR asked if we were ok to divert funding for wider study but IM said this would be a much wider job and would need to involve other Bucks and Oxon stakeholders. IB said this shorter piece of work needs to be finished first (DJ GH and AT agreed – AT said people now want to know what has been decided). <p>JS still concerned that the bigger N-S strategic issue is being pushed away.</p>	
(10) Process / Next Meeting and future dates	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MW asked for more to be shared through emails. • RB reminded the steering group of the workshop 	

Minutes	Actions
<p>coming up on Saturday 14 November, where wider transport measures and town centre issues would be explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A meeting will need to be set up for Jacobs to report back to SG + LEP + BCC + WDC on the outcomes of the further modelling and the results of the business case work. Information to be circulated in advance of the meeting.	