

<b>Princes Risborough Steering Group Meeting</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	Monday 30 January 2017 at The Princes Centre, 6pm	
<b>Present:</b>	Bill Bendyshe-Brown David Johncock Jim Stevens Alan Turner  Matthew Walsh Andy Ball Ian Parkinson Rolf Can Apeldoorn Stuart Baxter David Knights Charles Vint Richard Clayton Penelope Tollitt Sarah Barfield 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 Chairman, PRTC Chairman and Risborough Business Group PRTC RARA 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) Princes Risborough School
<b>Apologies:</b>	Gary Hall Linda Cannon Clegg Rachel Wileman John Coombes	PRTC & WDC Member Chairman, RARA Buckinghamshire County Council PRTC
<b>Did not attend:</b>		

<b>Minutes</b>		<b>Action</b>
<b>1)</b>	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting 22 November 2017</b>	
	Draft minutes of these minutes had been circulated to the group for comment. Comments received. Approved	
<b>2)</b>	<b>Actions arising</b>	
2.1	CIL – MW to check – c/f	MW
2.2	Charles B to actively investigate the development opportunities in the town centre – was agreed that although PT has passed this on, that the SG should write to Paul Shackley formally requesting this. Was agreed that AT will speak to PS.	AT
2.3	Chiltern Railway – a meeting should of taken place with the new CEO but this was cancelled at the last minute due to personal reasons. This is in the process of being re-arranged	
2.4	Focus Groups – c/f	MW
2.5	Community Land Trusts – paper has been circulated	
2.6	Tesco – waiting for a date for a meeting and will report back once this has happened	MW
<b>3)</b>	<b>Review of the concept plan and revisions to PRTP policies</b>	
3.1	The updated Concept Plan was shown with the following noted: Reduction in the size of the odour buffer around the sewage works which resulted as part of PMF appeal process.	
3.2	Only one Local Centre now shown, north of the Crowbrook on the Longwick Road/new road crossroads. This is now separate from the school but not sure why. PT to find out. Two local centres preferred, but viability noted. If only one, would prefer it 'towards town' rather than further out and as such will help integrate the expansion area with the existing town.	PT  PT

3.3	Both schools now two form of entry. Parents tend to park on the main roads, we need to have a good drop off site.	
3.4	Development around Kingsmead – not regarded as appropriate. However appeal that was won was not ‘absolute’ – dependent on resolving flooding (or not). Next to the allotments is the flooding area. No provision for parking north of the station.	
3.5	Relief Road – there are no junctions shown, and Mill Lane is not blocked off – but that has not been agreed	
3.6	Possibility of the ‘Culverton’ alternative to using Shootacre Lane for the new road.	
3.7	Land to the rear of Poppy Road – could be accessed from the ‘culverton’ road. Query raised about whether people in Poppy Lane know about this? Yes the information is in the public domain as part of the Local Plan and have also been written (as part of the Local Plan).	
3.8	Plan showed Hypnos relocated, but not certain if Hypnos will move: alternative site to west of railway north of B4009.	
3.9	How many acres is for green space are provided? Question could not be answered at the meeting. <i>This is dependent on PMF. Two applications have been submitted but one has been withdrawn. By the end of February we should hear about the Appeal.</i>	
3.10	Need to have some kind of community facility or multi-purpose building as the residents will be a long way off from other things. We can’t ‘make’ schools offer their facilities for the use of the wider community.	
3.11	Playing pitches to have a club house – if there was one place for a community facility would you have it with a playing pitch or with the neighbourhood centre? Agreed to have it with a Playing pitch (pavilion).	
3.12	Has technical assessments on walk time/distance been done? Yes, this has been done	
3.13	A very responsive local bus service will be essential to enable elderly residents from Princes Risborough to get to the new Dr’s surgery/health centre within the new development	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Review of information on link road: new alignment at Picts Lane and information on costs including bridges</b>	
4.1	Spread sheet discussed – Dan’s is more expensive and not sure why – PT to find out - c/f to next meeting. The accurate of spending is important.	PT/SB
4.2	The risk figure has been reduced, why? Has the project risks been quantified and costed? Strongly recommend that the risk allocation of 20% is not reduced.	
4.3	Optimism Bias – how accurate are the cost estimates? Have all OB contributory factors been assessed and reviewed?	
4.4	Is this a £45m project or £57m project? DF’s revised is (£45.95m) but this is with reduced optimism bias (20%). If this is increased to DfT upper bound values and risk remains at 20% then the £45.95m is actually £59.3m, plus land purchase and Part 1 claims.	
4.5	Prudent to retain OB at DfT levels at this stage, but if WDC is to consider a reduced OB at this stage then it’s strongly recommended that a written commentary of the evidence to support a reduction is required to inform the decision. Who should audit? WDC staff?	
4.6	Under and over bridge works, does this tie in with HS2 rail possession in c.2021? JS advised that Dan said there is potential savings if we co-ordinate work and this is being looking in to	
4.7	Cost of underpass not included (on sheet) as it is not part of the relief road.	
4.8	How are people walking along Picts Lane going to get across the relief road? A proper crossing point within the inner relief road was suggested. Picts Lane is a huge problem with large delivery trucks to Blanchfords, how do we get these off Picts Lane we need to try and resolve this.	
4.10		
	The TWG could have added value if had seen the plan previously, some comments	

	<p>are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What are the primary benefits of this arrangement over the current plan (roundabout)? Pros and cons of each agreement should be produced</li> <li>b) Is there a majority of local support for this arrangement?</li> <li>c) Changes will result in redistribution of traffic movement, including some commercial, traffic, deliveries to Blanchfords merchants. Travel distance could also increase slightly. Has an assessment been looked at? Could be included in the pros and cons.</li> <li>d) Clarification of the design widths of the new relief road on the plan required.</li> <li>e) Pedestrians walking along Picts Lane would have to cross the road at least 3 times, possibly 5 times. The worse road to cross is the relief road, could a crossing be required in the new link road? This could be located slightly to the north of the substation? Possible zebra crossing with a central pedestrian refuge? This would mean crossing the road twice and may help with the calm of traffic?</li> <li>f) 50mph to 30mph speed limit could be beneficial and may slow traffic down? Could be designed to the same spec at the gateways that HS2 will be funding (eg red surfacing, vehicle activated sign, speed limit roundels on road surfaces). Is the change in speed limit where the Princes Risborough Historic market town nameplates will be? If so this to be incorporated into the entry features?</li> <li>g) Turning head of Picts Lane cul de sac – this is too small for lorries to turn around, they could get stuck and would have to reverse all the way back to Station Road</li> <li>h) The stream on the plan, either side of the relief road is the ancient and historic Culverton Mill Stream, this feature should be retained as is the last remaining evidence of Culverton Mill. The stream should be retained as a feature all the way back upstream to Culverton within the potential development land behind Poppy Road.</li> <li>i) Need to have a written report.</li> </ul> <p>In response to the first point, the roundabout was not accepted by WDC because it failed to allow access to the housing development that is currently under construction. An alternative therefore had to be found. No value in doing pros and cons, as the roundabout was not an effective solution.</p> <p>In response to the second, it would not be right to share with local people before the Steering Group has seen it. Waiting for the full and correct costs report prior to sharing more widely.</p> <p>All the other points are noted, and need to be addressed as the design is progressed in more detail.</p> <p>If the local population is in support then these are good proposals</p> <p>Blanchfords – have they been approached? No Do Blanchfords need to stay in Risborough? Yes, it's a local business and the owner lives in Bledlow. But not on Pict's Lane. So much could be resolved if Blanchfords move.</p>	PT
5.	<b>Comments on the Infrastructure proposals/Town Council enhancements and priorities</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Page 10 text of the main report (draft Infrastructure delivery plan) and page 12, fig 5.1 needs amending to include references to Mill Lane and Crowbrook Road rat running.</li> <li>b) Page 33, IRR will increase capacity through PR and will therefore potentially</li> </ul>	

	<p>help ambulances get through the town – text needs amending.</p> <p>c) Bridging the gap for funding for relief road to be HGV ready is a top priority</p> <p>d) Other comments made are minuted under Item 4 above.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Update from WDC on Master Planning exercise</b>	
	All aware that we are putting in a bid to the Government for some money but we still don't know if we are getting funding. We have approached all developers and only Jim Eyre has responded positively. Envisage that it will take about 6 months focusing on master plan.	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Update from WDC on third party discussions</b>	
	<p>a) Discussions taking place with Sumitomo.</p> <p>b) Network rail – this is high on the risk register, Wades Park under pass is one of the critical issues</p> <p>c) WE Blacks about the road through their second phase at Picts Lane</p> <p>d) Blanchfords to be added on list</p> <p>e) Discussions have taken place with properties at Grove Lane, Kimble</p> <p>f) Discussions are also taking place with Culverton Farm. Be aware of the ancient culverton settlement which may require road alignment to be altered.</p> <p>g) Land either side of B4009 – this is public highways, no third parties identified</p> <p>h) residents at Summerleys Lane, particularly near the bridge, where some frontage land may be required.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Update from WDC on GP surgeries and possible sites</b>	
	<p>a) PT would like to know what the reaction is to the idea if the current community centre is redeveloped to provide for 2 doctors surgeries with a community centre over?</p> <p>b) Not in favour, should be a purpose built place, there are a lot of disabled users, costs become horrendous. The benefits of merging 2 surgeries into one is that it will free up the building currently at Wades Park which could be used for a home for Town Council, space for WDC services, (loss of info centre), home for the Police.</p> <p>c) DJ has had meetings with CCG, re East Wycombe and Bourne End as it's a similar situation and they have agreed to merge. The preference is for a single storey building, with both surgeries, but the surgeries remain separate, but with shared services such as ie scanning, ex rays etc.</p> <p>d) Discussion about whether it should be town centre or new development. Need to be accessible by bus, though (see 3.13 above). General view that it should be in the new development. Should we combine the surgery with the local centre? Yes</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Update from PRTC on Wades Park masterplan</b>	
	No update at this time	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Report from the TWG</b>	
	<p>Change in the ToR membership we have added another sentence in re focus group.</p> <p>In the interests of time at the meeting, questions were not answered in detail – answers have been added to the minutes in <i>italics</i>.</p> <p><u>Issues/questions for the SG/WDC from TWG</u></p> <p>a) <b>Resources</b> – due to WDC prioritising its resources on the LP and unable to attend TWG meetings, we are concerned that TWG is now unable to continue its consideration of the proposals for the inner relief road. Therefore:</p> <p>- are there any key risks to the LP timetable that arise from WDC resources limitations, and what is the mitigation?</p>	

*Yes there are risks, but they are managed and mitigated as part of the management of the plan and department.*

- When will Dan F be available for TWG meetings?

*He may not. We have to appoint an engineer to work on the detailed delivery plan. It may or may not be Dan. Whether the appointed engineer attends, or an officer from WDC or BCC attends, is to be decided when the agendas are being prepared.*

- TWG creates additional resource capacity and TWG would welcome WDC identifying priority issues for TWG to consider going forward

*The more detailed delivery plan is when the issues raised by the transport group will need to be resolved.*

- b) **BCC input** – concerned that no officer from BCC is attending the SG/TWG meetings and therefore it is not possible to know what the highway authority's views are. There are risks here, and need to know what we can do to get BCC officers to attend meetings.

BCC have given some feedback and they are clear that closing roads to address rat running is not an option. This was challenged. When it gets to this level of detail, BCC would have to engage with the master planning process.

- c) **Inner relief Road**

- WDC's road consultant hasn't reported back to the TWG on issues and remains outstanding. *Noted*

- We wish to have input into the master planning re pedestrian movement across the IRR and frontage access. *Noted*

- Reported that a 7.3m wide IRR carriageway has the capacity of the predicted traffic volume, is this still the case? *The road has been designed to the standard required to carry the amount of traffic predicted.*

- Map 2 in the draft LP is out of date and requires amending to ensure all third party land is included. *There are many updates needed to the local plan.*

- Is a formal BCC road improvement line also required for the safeguarding route? *This is not something that needs to be addressed at this stage.*

- Is there time left within the overall process for TWG to make comments on the IRR layout? *The basic road alignment has been in the public domain since the consultation in February/March last year. The main feedback from that consultation (in terms of routing) was about Shootacre Lane, and an alternative has been worked up to resolve this. The Local Plan will fix the main points. The more detailed delivery plan will be more specific on the route between those fixed points.*

-Are we running out of time to influence the issue? *see above*

- d) **Rat Running** – further modelling work via WDC has been passed to BCC

- Have BCC responded? *See above.*

- Will the rat running issue be addressed in the LP? *No, it will be addressed in the delivery plan*

- e) **Offsite Infrastructure** – At its next meeting, TWG intends to look at the priorities and phasing of the town centre public realm and A4010 traffic movements and will report back to the SG in due course.

- f) **Railway Capacity/Franchising of the Chiltern Line**

- If this strategy is adopted/funded it will bring improvements to the Chiltern Line through PR, Monks Risbrough and into London. It also includes a proposal to link the Chiltern line to Old Oak Common.

	<p>- Can we investigate if it's feasible to plan the IRR bridge improvements at Kimble and Summerleys Road/Wade park under pass at the same time the HS2 works are carried out? Which authority should pursue this?  <i>This has always been the intention, and detailed discussions are needed with Network Rail to see if this can be achieved. there is a cash-flow issue, in that the money from the developments to fund the infrastructure will not at that stage have been received. At present it is not clear how that might be funded, but discussion will take place with the HCA as part of the negotiations with Network Rail.</i></p> <p>g) <b>A4010 Strategy – see item 11</b></p> <p>h) <b>Project Risk registers</b>  - there are a number of key risks being carried by the LP project, is WDC willing and able to see if these are being monitored/mitigated? Yes we are – DJ reviews this every week and are monitored in the normal way</p> <p>DJ – has declared a personal interest as his son works for Dan Fenn and has passed this over to Alan Turner. Old Oak Common is being pursued with DfT as this link is the emergency link if the Chiltern line gets blocked. Concern expressed that County may drop this as Ian Boll has left, need to keep raising/pressing this issue with them.</p>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>A4010 Strategy Suggestions</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting held in December 2016 with BCC Cabinet Member for Transport/County Cllrs for Risborough/WDC Cabinet Member for P&amp;S and various others.</li> <li>- The strategy ideas are in the report circulated and the SG is requested to consider these, after which the BCC County Cllr for the Risborough's (BBB) has offered to take the matter forward with the relevant authorities at the right time. BBB to discuss with Mark Shaw.</li> <li>- The group welcomed the strategy document and noted that it listed various interventions, grouped under three main headings namely: (1) Reducing traffic demand on the A4010 (2) Building new road infrastructure to mitigate growth and (3) Relieving congested roads at each end of the A4010. Not everyone agreed with every word, but the basic idea, that the A4010 is not the strategic route was agreed by all present.</li> <li>- HS2 – the TWG discussed this and BCC officers appear to be going down the route of implementation subject to, amongst other things, safety audits</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	
<b>12</b>	<b>Report from sports working group – terms of reference</b>	
	Not yet met	
<b>13</b>	<b>How to bring Molins sports ground back into use</b>	
	If we win the appeal, in terms of CPO no longer any hope value and will go back to where we were originally, ground worth £400k. CPO worth investigating? Cricket board would like to get back there. (new map – shown as green space) not on development area.	
<b>14</b>	<b>Community Land Trusts</b>	
	Nothing to report However, confirmation from DJ asking for money for bridge for Princes estate to be	

	used for affordable housing. Might be possible, Wycombe decision. Town Council need to find other ways of finding funding.  When the White paper is published this might help with land trusts/housing associations	
<b>15</b>	<b>TC enhancements and priorities</b>	
	MW wrote back to BCC re community infrastructure supporting the work we are doing. MW to send PT this email.	MW
<b>16.</b>	<b>PR station platform extension</b>	
	To note that this is going to be extended	
<b>17</b>	<b>Policy Team update including key dates</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) PMF appeal is now over and we are now waiting for decision which should be by the end of Feb (seems quick). Post meeting note: inspector has advised the report will be available towards the end of March.</li> <li>b) Molins Inquiry starts tomorrow (31<sup>st</sup>) for 2 weeks</li> </ul>	
<b>18</b>	<b>Future programme of SG meetings</b>	
	This should move to dealing with master plan but there may be local plan business still to conclude. The master plan gets approved by DJ unless it goes to Cabinet. Will TWG still exist if focusing on master plan? Yes.	
<b>19.</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	None	
<b>20</b>	<b>Date of Next meeting</b>	
	To be arranged	