

Princes Risborough Steering Group meeting

Date of Meeting:	Wednesday 22 June 7.00 p.m. Princes Centre	
Present:	Stuart Baxter Bill Bendyshe-Brown Rosie Brake Ian Churchill Gary Hall David Johncock Ian Parkinson Penelope Tollitt Jim Stevens Richard Stevenson Matthew Walsh (Chair) Rachel Wileman Rolf Van Apeldoorn	Askett Society Buckinghamshire County Council Planning Policy Officer, WDC PRTC PRTC and WDC WDC Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability Risborough Area Residents Association Head of Planning and Sustainability, WDC A4010 / HS2 contact Risborough Area Partnership PRTC and Risborough Business Group BCC Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Manager and BCC Lead for Princes Risborough Longwick Parish Council
Apologies:	Andy Ball Dan Brown John Coombs Richard Clayton David Knights Ian Moore (IMo) Alan Turner	PRTC Risborough Rugby Club PRTC Risborough Area Partnership WDC Princes Risborough School WDC Deputy Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability and PRTC

Minutes	Actions
(1) Annual Review	
<p>a) Membership</p> <p>The group discussed the formation of RARA campaign group in the context of challenging the growth proposed for the town. The group agreed that channels of communication should be kept open for both 'send' and 'receive'. RS and IP were acknowledged as campaign group members and confirmed as members of the steering group.</p> <p>JS pointed out that his role as Role B agent has diminished now that HoC select committee deliberations have concluded. However he continues to have a strong role on the A4010 strategy for HS2 construction and is confirmed as a member of the group.</p> <p>SB confirmed he is the main contact for the Askett Society. Charles</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>Vint is the replacement rep for the Monks Risborough Society.</p> <p>BBB proposed that Princes Risborough School be approached to discuss the most appropriate person to attend the group</p> <p>The group agreed that an alternative representative for sporting matters should be sought. Andy Quigley was suggested.</p> <p>A number of other groups were discussed. It was agreed that BBB as board member for the CCB could cover both the CCB and the Chiltern Society.</p> <p>The involvement of other local parishes was discussed. It was agreed that the finalised minutes would be shared with the surrounding parishes – to be added to the individual parish meeting agendas and feedback invited (to be collated by WDC).</p> <p>b) Chairmanship</p> <p>A potential conflict of interest has arisen now that AT is deputy Cabinet Member. MW accordingly has taken up chairman role at PTRC and thus becomes chairman of the Steering group.</p>	<p>SB</p> <p>BBB</p> <p>Steering group</p> <p>WDC</p>
<p>(2) Mill Lane / Askett / Crowbrook Road issues working group update</p>	
<p>A working group comprised of BBB, JS, IC, SB, supported by RW and John Rippon held a productive meeting to discuss the impact of incremental traffic on these roads. JS drafted a note which was shared with the meeting papers in advance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong E-W movements of traffic (from Haddenham/ Thame towards Amersham / London) lead to potentially 80% of peak traffic being through-traffic rather than local movements. • Crash history shows incidents are focused on right-turn movements and often involve cyclists. It was noted that reported injury accidents may be a little as one-sixth of actual incidents. • The note concludes that a comprehensive approach is needed. The aim is to divert the E-W movements through the town centre via Longwick Road. • A final decision on interventions must rest with WDC and BCC as Highway Authority after engagement with statutory consultees. • BBB noted that the weight restriction on Askett Lane is posted in one direction only. <p>DJ praised the report and the efforts of the working group. The group agreed that count data for Mill Lane and Crowbrook Road would be</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>helpful, using the MVAS. A new pole site will need to be established via the NAG.</p> <p>Some modifications were suggested to the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To mention the risk to cyclists and the under-reporting of injury crashes • To clarify the wording on p.5 regarding the future capacity of the Tesco's roundabout in the context of the relief road. • Sub-title to refer to 'working group' rather than 'steering group'. • Report acknowledges that this is a proposal for consideration by the authorities under pt. 7 – move this statement to the beginning of the report to increase its prominence. <p>MW asked what the timescales would be for progressing/assessing these proposals and how the proposals would be promoted. PT explained the master plan process (see item 7).</p> <p>The steering group accepted the proposals and thanked the working group.</p>	<p>BBB</p> <p>JS</p>
<p>(3) Molins Sports Ground</p>	
<p>RB tabled the email forwarded by Alan Turner from a trustee of the Sports and Social Club. Independent corroboration of this, together with relevant dates, is welcomed – group to use their networks to gather more evidence.</p>	<p>All</p>
<p>(4) WDC response to steering group comments on the draft Plan</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RB explained the work being commissioned in response to the need to look again at the southern options for the relief road. The first task will be to provide a 'second opinion' on the costings provided by Jacobs and this is scheduled for early July. A meeting of the steering group will be scheduled to discuss, and results circulated asap. RS asked if the optimism bias would be included – RB confirmed that this is standard practice for this stage of work. PT added that further work would tend to lift the known costs up towards the optimism bias as they become more certain. DJ cautioned that optimism bias should be included as in a DfT bid for the High Wycombe Town Centre Master Plan the OB was excluded and consequently the project is now short of funds. • MW asked how the gap between the minimum scheme and a preferred scheme might be funded. PT explained that there were a number of approaches to this but one might be to anticipate Network Rail's aspiration to twin-track the railway line, with funds 	<p>RB</p>

Minutes	Actions
<p>from the expansion of the town going to enhance the specification so as to deliver HGV capacity under the railway. JS expressed concern that this would be a grave risk to delivery. PT responded that it wouldn't compromise the scheme as a whole, but might delay the ability to accommodate HGV from day 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RW confirmed that the new road would need to be able to accommodate HGV for BCC to be able to re-classify it as an A class road. • PT and DJ confirmed that there are no appropriate funds from the LEP – their priority is in the north of the County. BCC realistically don't have the funds. But CIL could be used as a fallback position. • DJ confirmed that Network Rail have been giving mixed messages about the scope of the EWR project on the Risborough-Aylesbury line – apparently the line speed and level crossing improvements are now back in scope. • JS suggested that a risk register would be a useful tool to highlight and track these issues. PT agreed but was concerned it might set a precedent for other projects, when there is already an internal risk management framework for projects at WDC. To be added to the agenda of the next meeting. • SB asked if there is a phasing plan for the road – PT explained that this would be developed as part of the master planning work (item 7). • RS asked if the NR tendency to overrun on time and budget would affect delivery. PT responded that this would be dealt with in the master planning work. • IP asked what existing permissions were contributing. The Leo site is contributing £1M either towards the underpass or towards affordable housing. The Whiteleaf site has contributed £1M for the railway footbridge. • Parking – GH suggested that the whole Horns lane / M&S site should be redeveloped along the lines of the Sainsburys at High Wycombe, with retail on the ground floor and parking above. 	RB/MW
<p>(5) Infrastructure priorities</p>	
<p>RB tabled a chart of potential off-site aspirations for the town, with indicative costs for discussion. A sense of the group's priorities will be helpful, so the chart will be emailed for feedback from the group. BBB emphasised that more parking space would be a priority. Further expansion of Risborough Springs should also be included.</p>	All

Minutes	Actions
(6) Update on technical work	
RB tabled a note setting out progress since the last meeting and work that is now getting under way.	
(7) Master Plan Process and developer update	
<p>PT explained the process for preparing a piece of work that will sit between the Plan and individual planning permissions – a master planning exercise whose primary purpose is to identify how the infrastructure will be shared across the land interests (because they are unwilling to enter into equalisation agreements).</p> <p>PT has been looking to the land interests to fund this exercise – agreement has not yet been reached, but discussions are continuing.</p>	
(8) AOB	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB asked what might be Gladman’s next move at Mill Lane. PT unsure – will have to wait and see. • SB asked if anything heard from land interests adjacent to the goat farm – nothing heard as yet. • SB asked what more might be done about protecting the town from further spread – could more Green Belt be designated? PT responded that this would be a matter for the Local Plan but emphasised that the bar for designating new Green Belt land is as high, if not higher, than removing land from the Green Belt (see NPPF para 82). DJ suggested that surrounding land could be assigned as country or village green. SB asked that the project should not lose sight of this issue. • IC pointed out that a recent ministerial letter suggested that the Planning Inspectorate were not paying enough regard in the field to NPPF para 216 regarding the weight being accorded to emerging plans. PT responded that the Risborough Plan is still too early, not having been through the Publication Stage. • IP asked when the plan would be submitted to the Secretary of State. PT responded that if it were linked to the Local Plan then this would be around March 2017 (following a publication period for a version approved by Cabinet/Council in December 2016). 	
(9) Next Meeting	
This will be scheduled in July to consider the latest work from DRF consulting.	RB