

**Notes of the Princes Risborough Steering Group Meeting – 22 November 2017**

<b>Present:</b>	David Johncock Matthew Walsh Rolf Van Apeldoorn Charles Vint Linda Cannon Clegg David Knights Stewart Baxter Cllr Alan Turner John Coombes Richard Clayton Victoria Gridley Penelope Tollitt Sarah Barfield Rosie Brake	WDC Cabinet Member for Planning & Sustainability PRTC, Chairman, PRTC Chairman and Risborough Business Group Longwick-cum-Illmer PC Monks Risborough Society Chairman, RARA WDC Member Askett Society WDC Member and Deputy Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability PRTC RACP WDC Head of Planning & Sustainability PA to Head of Planning & Sustainability (note take) WDC
<b>Apologies:</b>	Bill Bendyshe-Brown Jim Stevens Andy Ball Andrew Quigley Ian Moore Gary Hall	Buckinghamshire County Council PRTC Roll B agent for HS2 Select Committee  Princes Risborough School  WDC Member

	Item	Action
1.	<p><b>Notes of the last meeting held 26 June and matters arising from previous meeting</b></p> <p>a) Notes of the last meeting b) Agenda papers coming out too – It was LCC who mentioned this and notes of the last meeting to be amended.</p>	Agreed SB
2.	<p><b>Local Plan – final reflections</b> - Trying to achieve individual feedback on how the LP has been reflected</p> <p>a) LP not been very popular with the residents, and why a petition for a better plan was done. Scale of devt is far too much. b) The northern part of Risb, past the Spring, Alscot, is sprawling into Longwick, this is undermining the identity of the town c) Felt that some things were ok to share and somethings weren't ok to share, ie the plan that was circulated at the last meeting, we weren't allowed to take it away. But this was about the only time this happened – most information was able to be shared. d) People not able to come due to maybe timing of meetings? e) Challenge that the elected representatives are not reflecting the views of local people. DK responded that in the context of the District as a whole, , this is the best plan we can achieve at this time. we have listened to residents – but you have to take that view, and consider it against all the other things to take into account. Not all members of the public think the same – nor do all members of RARA. The view is to gain the best possible plan for the town f) Felt that the scale was pre-determined and we didn't have a chance to review. The highest number was always discussed. The constraints are self-imposed but we could have challenged but this wasn't done. Had no specific meeting to</p>	

	<p>discuss the numbers. Agreed – not explicit discussion – but discussed all the issues, in which the numbers were implicit.</p> <p>g) WDC has not pushed back to the Government to have its housing numbers reduced. RARA will send the list of the 24 DC's that done this to PT. PT clear that this was not an option. She would look at the info RARA provided to understand the point RARA is making.</p> <p>h) The issue is the '1000 homes' (in broad terms) to the north of the Crowbrook. Not sustainable Can't the 1000 homes go into greenbelt? - we can only change green belt under exceptional circumstances. What are the exceptional circumstances around Poppy road? Doesn't fulfil the purposes. Haven't targeted that land.</p> <p>i) Re CIL going from Risb to other districts, there hasn't been much devt in PR and CIL hasn't been re directing from Risborough to elsewhere</p> <p>j) Popularity – Arup analysis made the statement that the land making way for 1000 meets the purpose of green belt. That is true – but in terms of sustainable locations, building next to the existing town with its town centre and railway station, even if it had already been greenbelt – and was still fulfilling GB purposes, we could well have still been looking to build there.</p> <p>k) This Town hasn't had much devt and this will be done over 20 years</p> <p>l) Can't we challenge govt first? This is a bad plan and doesn't support sustainable lifestyle. This discussion had already been had earlier in the meeting.</p> <p>m) We haven't been building enough houses in 40 years. Everywhere is getting devt where it's not use to.</p> <p>n) If we don't put them here someone nationally has to take them. This benefits the town and people have different views and will wait for the inspector to make their review.</p> <p>o) What constraints are we going to apply? RARA have researched this. As has already been said, WDC will look at the evidence of 24 DCs.</p> <p>p) In general terms, outlining the fact we are operating under constraints which we may all wish we weren't. There are pressures and these are accelerating – the new housing figures are an increase on the current ones. The next plan will have to investigate this.</p> <p>q) The SG has taken on board comments, listened on what the feedback is, then made the judgement and have achieved this well. The SG as whole should be congratulated as so should WDC members and officers. This has been handled in a very professional way and have the best plan we have in difficult circumstances.</p> <p>r) Wanted Option 17 but got option 11. Should have stuck to the gun? We couldn't afford option 17, these were all put forward to the group. It comes back to what can be delivered and need to show this. And option 17 was favoured but couldn't be delivered</p> <p>s) From experience if we can't afford the right answer what we're doing may be wrong and should have been scaled back?</p> <p>t) Option 11 is as good as Option 17 in dealing with the traffic, it might create other issues, but we are not picking a sub-standard traffic option.</p> <p>u) There can't be much devt without some new road infrastructure and we are actively working on proposals for the stretch from Park Mill site to Picts Lane. Not all traffic will go through the town once the development is underway – and looking at ways to get the road in place in full ahead of the development, but depends on what schemes the government has available.</p> <p>v) If the plan goes ahead the buffer is protected, yes, if not there is no buffer zone.</p> <p>w) If the inspector doesn't like something does this gets amended? If we failed the legal test the plan fails. The Inspector can modify some small sites – but if they find that we should do less at PR, there is no-where else to put that level of development that has been tested through sustainability appraisal etc, so the</p>	LCC
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

	<p>plan would fail. If the plan fails we start again right from the beginning and after March we will need to provide more houses. If that happened the Government might intervene and direct what was to go in the plan.</p> <p>x) Any recommendation that the inspector makes does this go back to consultation? Yes, before the Inspector issues their final report.</p> <p>y) 5 year housing supply - WDC should be focusing on getting this sorted – WDC is – it is sorted via the local plan. There were no transitional provisions from the abolition of the SE plan and the old target. We have 5 years there or there about. The Reserve sites never been put into green belt and not actually allocated for hsg. Cabinet agreed to release these sites for housing – against local opposition - to help. We can't release further land as not gone through plan process. [post meeting note – the other way to boost the 5 year land supply is to permit any speculative applications that comes forward].</p> <p>z)</p>	
3.	<p><b>Explanation of Technical Changes</b></p> <p>a) The schedule of changes was not circulated and will therefore be sent round after the meeting. It compares the policies of the draft plan to the published plan.</p> <p>b) This is just for information, not action required</p> <p>c) Policies have been added - the strategic buffer, expansion in all one boundary for comprehensiveness, added polices on land for businesses.</p> <p>d) Delivery on infrastructure lot of work on this</p>	MW
4.	<p><b>TWG Minutes</b></p> <p><b>TWG #7, 3a) Update required on meeting with the Rail Minister.</b> John Bercow agreed to get a meeting. Not sure if this will be with Chris Grayling or Paul Maynard but they have agreed to a meeting and that a date would be agreed after the budget. The meeting is primarily about the terms of the new franchise, but will also include improvements to PR, push on discussions with Chiltern Rail, Old Common Link, EWR section between Aylesbury and PR for tracking.. AT has a meeting shortly with EWR Delivery Board and will know more when that has taken place.</p> <p><b>Minute 5a) Update required on meeting with BCC</b> Noted that Mark Shaw has agreed to a meeting with Jim S/MW but this hasn't been arranged yet.</p> <p><b>Minute 5b) AT agreed to pursue the allocation of WDC funding to enable the aforementioned intuitive/iterative modelling work to proceed</b> Noted that AT is to discuss possible funding for Jacobs to investigate this work. Victoria Gridley is now picking up the delivery work and has the budget.</p> <p>Noted that thanks to be expressed to Jim for chairing the TWG which have been very effective.</p>	<p>AT</p> <p>AT</p> <p>BBB</p> <p>AT</p>
5.	<p><b>Lessons learned – what has worked well/what could be improved, for the future</b></p> <p>a) TWG worked well which the SG created the TWG</p> <p>b) SG workshops in Chapter house worked well</p> <p>c) Site visits were good</p> <p>d) Jacobs reports were good</p> <p>e) Need to be clearer with local people on the constraints</p> <p>f) More officer resources to keep up with the pace</p> <p>g) Fully engage local people in masterplanning</p> <p>h) To keep a project issues log and regular review</p>	

- i) Do better job at getting the right people at the SG and keeping them here - shame we lost these
- j) RARA played a large part but maybe we didn't have the right people at the start
- k) Not the right diversity, gender mix, lack of younger/older people, some work was done to try and address this, ie LP sessions in the school.
- l) SG did review this about a year ago – and agreed to use working groups to assist this, not clear why that did not happen.
- m) People who sit at this table reflect the town. Very hard to get businesses and young people to engage – Town Council knows as they have tried many things. Have to be realistic.
- n) Maybe useful to go back to the people who were here at the beginning of this group and ask them why they stopped coming, ie timing of meetings? Agreed to this being done.
- o) Noted that there was much more interactive when we had the stalls
- p) Info to be shared as early as possible, and then things can be captured for the issues log in order to stick to this until the issue has been dealt with.
- q) SWG - Education groups, health and wellbeing group, sports group not very robust, more flexible approach to groups, local nursery, teacher of primary and secondary school
- r) Skills around the table limited representation, would like to have seen key people ie Peter Keen? Could have used facebook, TC website to get people interested and engaged.
- s) One person did leave as he felt that the SG wasn't going in the right direction, but only one
- t) Did ask Ian Moore about students attending
- u) Disconnect when Rosie passed to PT, Mtgs became less regular, lost a bit of momentum.
- v) Agreed that thinking more carefully about the structure at the beginning of the Group should of happened
- w) Did we need to empower the group more?
- x) Some people didn't know anything about planning, and that the group was dominated by WDC officers and were talking planning language and we didn't know what it all meant and takes a while to get there. WDC did offer a planning learning info session but this wasn't taken up. Sense it should have been undertaken anyway, and more than once if necessary– but WDC resources are limited, and the SG needed to understand this from the beginning.
- y) AT use to chair this group and again dominated by planners. Should we have looked a Chairman from the community group?
- z) Felt it was heavily waited to professionals. But professional advice was needed. The officers are not on the group, but attend to advise the group.
- aa) Businesses been neglected. Retail should have been a WG in itself. A session was held but got a poor attendance, and was not the right people.
- bb) RARA has 800 members, are they households or actual members? 600 members have signed up. How many of the 600 residents are from the parish of Risb? Not sure
- cc) Its not the number of people it about the comments being made
- dd) NPPF para 17 – the objectives have not been met
- ee) We have to work within the constraints given and take into account what we want to achieve within the constraints
- ff)
- gg) Was disappointed not more engagement with the land owners.
- hh) Felt that we spent a huge amount of time on PMF but we didn't touch on Bloor – but that was because there was an application in on PMF, not on Bloor
- ii) RARA, very pleased we had the scrutiny session and more public meetings in risb

MW

	<p>which they had asked for – although these meetings had been being held throughout the process.</p> <p>jj) Grateful DJ attending</p> <p>kk) Overall vast majority of members have contributed in different ways.</p> <p>ll) We have a better plan than what it would have been</p> <p>mm) If you look at the plan there is a lot of infrastructure were getting compared to others.</p> <p>nn) Greater commitment for regeneration from WDC is needed</p> <p>oo) TC should not be forgotten and Town Cllrs have been involved and thanks given</p> <p>pp) The experts that have come in for a session, have been good and very helpful</p> <p>qq) Suggestion that places on the SG could have been advertised – Longwick did this for their Neighbourhood Plan – they had 3 places, and chose from 6 candidates. The role was set out explicitly, and, having competed for places, people may then have dlt more committed to the group. It also makes it a fari process.</p> <p>a) Should there have been more time spent trying to helping the group to form?</p> <p>b) Clarifying what the ToR, roles of officers are etc? ToR available from beginning, behaviours set out in the ToR about working towards solutions not just scoring points. But perhaps the ToR had become a bit ‘forgotten’ – or not owned by the group?</p> <p>c) Did have a visioning meeting, that helped with the forming of the group</p> <p>d) Never bought into plan as we didn’t debate the numbers.</p> <p>e) This should have been on the issues log – this would have helped officers ensure that all matters were discussed, and provided continuity.</p> <p>f) Observation – what we have tried to do is always be accurate to what can happen and consistent in communication</p> <p>g) Noted that we did run many key stakeholder sessions on the local plan as a whole and did explain the numbers</p>	
6.	<p><b>SG Conclusion</b></p> <p>a) The Town Council as the client feels that the SG has done a sterling job and has now come to a natural conclusion that the SG has completed its function and have informed WDC of this. MW thanked everyone for their time and involvement and that it’s a better plan due to the people around this table.</p>	
	<p><b>Statement to the Princes Risborough Town Plan Steering Group – 22 November 2017</b></p> <p>Upon the dissolution of the Steering Group today, we, the undersigned members of the Steering Group, have prepared this statement to express serious concern about the manner in which the Steering Group has worked and its failure to provide a relevant voice to shape the Princes Risborough Town Plan as part of WDC’s Local Plan.</p> <p><i>The NPPF states ‘Planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings’ (Para 17)</i></p> <p>This first core principle of planning has not been met. On many key areas, the Steering Group has been informed of ‘the answer’ at the expense of working creatively to find ways to improve and enhance Princes Risborough. There was no real intention to empower local people to shape their environment but rather a pre-determined strategy to create the facade of consultation and localism to ensure a quarter of the district’s OAN and accompanying road could be driven through.</p> <p>Its work has been at odds with how a steering group should behave and we are aggrieved that the Localism Act 2011 and NPPF 2012 stressing the importance of involving the</p>	

community has been nothing more than pretence. WDC's 'Statement of Community Involvement' cites involving, consulting and informing, not just the latter.

As members of the steering group we want to go on record that we do not support this plan. The development of the town, the wellbeing of its residents, and the development of the economy should be considered before any expansion on this scale. This plan does not address these key issues and is opposed by over 50% of the residents, proven by petition signatures.

We will be producing a Minority Report for the Planning Inspector detailing the failings of this Steering Group.

Signed:

Linda Cannon Clegg  
Richard Clayton  
Charles Vint

Ian Parkinson  
Ian Churchill  
Richard Stevenson

it was noted that this was tabled at the end of the meeting, and that the statement that the SG had been a failure had not been raised either in the session reflecting on the plan, nor in the lessons learned session. This was unfortunate.