

<b>Princes Risborough transport meeting</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	Tuesday 2 February 2016 9.00 a.m. Committee Room 2, WDC	
<b>Present:</b>	David Johncock Ian Barham Alan Turner Rosie Brake Ian Manktelow John Rippon  Ulrika Diallo	WDC Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability LEP Partnership manager, BTVLEP WDC Member and chairman of PRTC Planning Policy Officer, WDC Policy Team Leader, WDC Head of Growth & Development Strategy, BCC Lead Growth and Strategy Officer, BCC
<b>Apologies:</b>	Gary Hall David Knights Jim Stevens	PRTC and WDC PRTC and WDC PRTC roll B agent for HS2 select committee

<b>Minutes</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>(1) BTVLEP position</b>	
<p>IB set out the position at Princes Risborough from the LEP's point of view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEP have a desire to see the transport work completed. It shows that the scheme costs are on the high side; that they are not simple, nor easily achieved.</li> <li>The LEP represents the voice of the Buckinghamshire economy to central Government and acts as the conduit for the Local Growth Fund. Of the total package of £12bn, 7bn has already been allocated. Bucks got c £60m in first 2 rounds – about £50m expected in next 2 rounds. It's a competitive situation, both in the national context of devolved authorities, but also locally in the context of competing priorities across the county. The Princes Risborough schemes have a place in the LEP infrastructure plan, and the LEP is preparing for the next round of bidding which may be Easter – autumn this year. Further work is needed on scheme feasibility at Princes Risborough, especially in terms of funding gap.</li> <li>There is a big gap in funds for Option 17 that make it very difficult to justify in terms of the wider funding position – it would take up all the likely allocation for Bucks. In the context of supporting the delivery of 50K homes across the county it is a difficult call. The cheaper scheme here might</li> </ul>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>be more realistic – bear in mind LGF is there as the final top-up. Other sources should be explored first, as part of the business case. The wider scheme (option 17) is highly unrealistic so the recommendation is to focus efforts on the cheaper schemes. More work is still required on these.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEP will continue to make the exceptional case for Buckinghamshire because of the degree of growth required, alongside a record of high delivery. The strategic alliance has been asked to look at N-S routes broadly across the county, which may deliver other ways of reducing through traffic at Risborough.</li> <li>• He affirmed that the LEP want to help and praised the work of the steering group in terms of engagement. The current work is important as a baseline from which to develop the case.</li> <li>• The LEP want to ensure that Hypnos remains in the county but also ideally within Risborough. IB has received a letter from Peter Keen regarding the covenant on the SEEDA land and hope to broker a solution.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>(2) Discussion – the economic factors</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AT confirmed that the expansion of Regent Park is supported but that there are access issues if option 17 is not brought forward. Traffic lights lead to congestion at peak times. Hypnos trailers are higher and can't get under the bridge. The restrictive covenant is another issue.</li> <li>• DJ asked if the LGF is the only source of Government funding. IB confirmed that the LGF is the immediate resource. There is separate Highways England funding, possibly in the context of N-S connectivity, but this is related to the HE network only (ie trunk roads and motorways).</li> <li>• DJ asked if an alternative access to the estate could be arranged if option 17 is out of the picture. This would effectively be the bottom part of option 17 which would entail similar issues of railway crossing and environmental impacts. (<i>John Rippon arrived</i>).</li> <li>• IB reminded the meeting that the case is about enabling growth – the value of the Regent Park site, balanced against other locations, e.g. Globe Park, Woodlands in the context of viability and attractiveness. Not exclusively about road connectivity. There is a need to show how the site</li> </ul>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>competes with others across Bucks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IB suggested that a joint venture with Bucks Advantage could guarantee that the land is developed rather than just being an allocation.</li> <li>• AT agreed that there has been a lot of interest over the years – a spot that has potential. But we should be conscious of the need to demonstrate the benefits of the Plan to the residents of the town, showing intent to increase employment opportunities and not risk losing existing employment.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>(3) Discussion – the strategic picture</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the context of N-S routes and the strategic needs of the transport network, IM pointed out that this is a longer game than the current Plan timetable can accommodate. The work shows both 11b and 17 doing good things with a better than base line performance in the town centre.</li> <li>• AT was concerned at the potential negative impacts of the through-route on the new development, and the need to take more land. He asked if there is potential in recent Government announcements on stimulating house building – funds for ‘blockages’ on large schemes – drainage and roads.</li> <li>• IB confirmed that funding sources come back to the LEP – the case needs to be made that the road is enabling development. He contrasted the proposed 2500 at Princes Risborough with the 30,000 that will need to be delivered in Aylesbury Vale. There could be a case as part of a wider Bucks package enabling the overall housing need of 50,000. It’s difficult, but the LEP aims to do its best.</li> <li>• IB reminded the meeting that Bucks authorities are delivering at a higher rate than Bicester – this is part of the message to Government. Ercol and Hypnos can be part of a strong message.</li> <li>• AT asked if a ring road might be considered in the longer-term, if A4010 is confirmed as the strategic route. IB felt it was unlikely that the A4010 will be so, but this is a question for BCC. JR added that BCC are just starting to look at this work and that the results of A418 tests are expected soon.</li> <li>• AT also asked if a wider ring road could be delivered by accepting residential development in the area between town and the road. IM felt that there wouldn’t be much residential capacity there.</li> </ul>	

Minutes	Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DJ reminded the meeting that time is of the essence in getting a sound plan in place. We might need to accept that there is a 'now' and a 'later'.</li> <li>IM confirmed that the current plan document shows option 11 but also discusses option 17. The test for the Plan is a reasonable prospect of delivery and we're not in that position on option 17.</li> </ul>	
<b>(4) Discussion – the design of the through route</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AT expressed concern that the through-route will need to be wide and straight and this will have an adverse impact on the view from the AONB. DJ responded that the route can be tree-lined and won't necessarily need to be dead straight. IM added that the role of trees is critical – this will be in the detail of the design.</li> </ul>	
<b>(5) Conclusions / Actions</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JR to explore how work on an alternative access to Regents Park might be taken forward in the context of constrained funds.</li> <li>IB to facilitate deeper engagement on business needs (AT can provide contacts) and the involvement of Bucks Business First on delivery.</li> <li>Work will continue on developing the North-South strategy</li> <li>The Plan document will continue to show two road options for now.</li> <li>IB to double-check the delivery of ultra-high speed broadband at Regent Park.</li> <li>There is an opportunity for discussion at the BCC/WDC Joint Cabinet Member meeting on Thursday.</li> <li>RB will share the latest draft of the plan document.</li> <li>DJ asked what is needed to secure funds from the LEP. IB responded that this is part of the business case and that engagement with business will help. He will check on funding for roads.</li> <li>DJ thanked IB for providing clarity on the LEP's position.</li> <li>IB confirmed that the LEP are keen to work positively with partners to identify the right solution.</li> </ul>	<p><b>JR/BCC</b></p> <p><b>IB/AT</b></p> <p><b>JR/BCC</b></p> <p><b>IB</b></p> <p><b>RB</b></p> <p><b>IB</b></p>