

**Notes of the Princes Risborough Steering Group Meeting - 26 June 2017**

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

	Item	Action
1.	<b>Notes of the last meeting held 12 April</b>	Agreed
2.	<p><b>Matters arising from previous meeting/actions outstanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TC Working Group has now been set up, with Ian Pearce heading up. More of an update will follow</li> <li>- The Focus Group notes have now been typed up</li> <li>- AT/MW have met with the new Tesco Manager and another meeting is to be arranged</li> <li>- An update on the Tesco/M&amp;S meeting is required</li> <li>- Heathrow – 3rd runway consultation – noted that JS, MW, WDC made representation. Heathrow Planning Group – AT is going</li> </ul> <p><b>WDC responses on comments raised on Policy points</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Everything has been done or is being done and explained within the comments</li> <li>- Page 3 – where it says “still under development” this means we need to know exactly what the right way is to do this.</li> <li>- Page 4 – point 15 – separate email note response was handed out and comes under this point. This is in response to JS points raised - JS will take away and read</li> <li>- Page 5 – points PRTP 11 where it says “see comment thread” this is referred to on the email that was handed out.</li> </ul>	<p>MW</p> <p>DK</p> <p>MW</p> <p>MW</p> <p>JS</p>
3.	<p><b>TWG report from JS</b></p> <p>This is the 3<sup>rd</sup> report to this meeting and there are 5 items: The draft minutes of TWG meeting #5 were tabled.</p> <p><b>(a)Chiltern railways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WDC/PRTC met with Chiltern Railways which was a very positive meeting to discuss the Local Plan proposals for Princes Risborough.</li> <li>- Chiltern Railways agreed to provide feedback on the TWG’s rail report and</li> </ul>	

	<p>indicated they are keen to continue meeting with PRTC/WDC, including a meeting with the Rail Minister and DfT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chiltern Railways provisionally agreed to one timetable time change for implementation in Dec 17 – 6.46 at Monks Risb to Marylebone. Other 2 changes not agreed to mainly due to train/track capacity, but will keep under review.</li> <li>- Mentioned car parking at PR – CR advised that they have no plans at present to increase the car park capacity, but happy to discuss how LA’s, LEP and developers can support them on this issue as they move closer to the end of their franchise. . CR data indicated car park at PR is operating at 85%. Noted that it wasn’t, it’s almost 100%.</li> <li>- Franchise expires in Dec 2021. Consultation on franchise bid to possibly start in about a year</li> <li>- Importance of upgrading the single line link to old oak common discussed</li> <li>- Possible request for meeting with Rail Minister (Paul Maynard) and DfT and possibly BCC Highways now needs to be actioned. To also include EWR. Possible two part meeting suggested. As the letter was sent to AT it was agreed that AT should respond asking for a meeting, keeping BCC/WDC in the loop. Items for discussions: TWG rail report contents, future franchise, station car parking, timetabling (stopping at Risborough (due to increase in housing) EWR twin tracking of PRA line, upgrading single line link to Old Oak Common. JS to speak to AT.</li> </ul> <p><b>(b) TWG Post meeting note regarding Inner Relief Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JS reported that the first para of Minute 4 of TWG meeting #3 held on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2017 was fully representative of TWG position, far too brief. Revised wording was agreed by TWG at its meeting #6 held on 17<sup>th</sup> May which more accurately represented TWG’s position on the IRR. Page 2 of TWG’s report to the Steering Group includes the agreed revised wording and JS said this should be read in conjunction with the Minutes of TWG meeting #3 This is also recorded in the Minutes of TWG meeting #6.</li> </ul> <p><b>(c) Feedback from WDC arising from 30 April Steering Group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An issues log has been created to capture all of the issues raised by TWG.</li> <li>- Dan Fenn’s report was discussed and comments were sent to PT on 30.5.17</li> <li>- Comments have been received from range of people and these will be fed back to Dan, just need a clear steer on what needs to be actioned – this is working progress.</li> <li>- RARA has sent a report (after 30 May). Noted that JS has not read this and not sure what it says. Agreed that this report will go to the TWG meeting on 2 August.</li> </ul> <p><b>(d) Master planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WDC informed TWG that issues raised at the time would need to be addressed in the master planning work, however, to date TWG not been given the opportunity to get involved with the development of these plans but work is progressing.</li> <li>- Work has not started since the last PRSG mtg</li> <li>- JS to carry on flagging these concerns up</li> <li>- TWG want reassurance from WDC that they will be given the opportunity to get involved with the development of both plans, rather than trying to retro fit solutions. WDC gave that assurance.</li> <li>- Felt that parking capacity wasn’t emphasised enough at the last meeting. If plan goes ahead the car parking demand will double. These issues were all flagged up at the last meeting. TWG has looked at land in town for possible new car parking,</li> </ul>	<p>JS/AT</p> <p>JS</p> <p>TC</p>
--	---	----------------------------------

	<p>but more assessment work is required, involving WDC and PRTC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is there any indication on when things will happen? House build to get underway in 2021/22</li> <li>- In terms of Town Council, this is a huge aspect of work. There will be more cars etc and there needs to be stops or have a destination if they can't park? TC to get this laid down early with WDC to look at a strategy. This is in the plan. At the moment there is no solution in the town, the plan is to flag up all options.</li> <li>- Need to act quickly when land comes available need to be prepared for next win sites that come along.</li> <li>- Town Council need to decide if they are doing this?</li> <li>- Car park capacity is reached now, Mount car park is now at 100%, Horns Lane is always full. Potential at bottom of New Road? Any TC land?</li> <li>- Tesco issue – if good joined up thinking, could have one development with multi stories?</li> <li>- Urgent matter for strategy to start between WDC/TC now? Is there money that can be invested? We can't do this as a quick fix.</li> <li>- Regeneration WG is looking at car parking and GH is to table this at the Town Council.</li> </ul>	GH
4.	<p><b>Updates</b></p> <p><b>Local Plan timetable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Going to Cabinet/Council in Sept, then the consultation starts in Oct for 6 weeks, then we have 3 months to go through comments before sending to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Examination in the summer, and almost certainly a 'modifications consultation' in the Autumn next year to adopt in early 2019</li> <li>- When plan accepted/approved does it have a review or is it a live doc? This will be reviewed and should be done every 5 years but we have done this more frequently.</li> <li>- What happens to the SG, how does it get monitored – due to be discussed at the Town Council meeting.</li> <li>- AVDC have delayed their plan, now going to Cabinet/Council in Sept/Oct</li> <li>- CDC/SBDC are behind but not by a lot</li> </ul> <p><b>Tech work on NR MOU, design guidance and infrastructure and delivery</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Thanks for JS on his work with the NR MOU. Good progress has been made with NR regarding the drafting of the MOU for the new/improved rail crossings and we have a draft finalised version awaiting comments from BCC hope to have completed the MOU in the Summer with all parties signed up Capacity plan progressing not ready to be shared yet</li> <li>- Capacity Plan = what</li> <li>- Delivery Plan = when/how</li> <li>- Appointing Pick Everard to help with deliverability issues, focussing on phasing, how it will tie in, opportunities for funding</li> <li>- Summersley Road bridge crossing is too low – could this be raised? This is a prime example of what TWG have been talking about, 3<sup>rd</sup> party land acquisition needed? There is a pond near there so there may be a need for a pump station? All these questions are part of the work WDC now has in hand.</li> <li>- TWG raised issues regarding car parking and these are all going on issues log, will these be addressed? They will be but haven't got to that point yet to look at them. Once issues log done this will be circulated</li> </ul> <p><b>Public meeting/street fair</b> Board 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document handed out, this is working progress and will be displayed on 8 July</li> </ul>	JS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- First 4 slides will be displayed at street fair on 8 July, these aren't in scale and not to be misleading</li> <li>- What is being proposed in terms of housing, relief road, employment</li> </ul> <p><b>Board 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gant chart sets out what's happening, how fits together</li> <li>- Consultation up to now</li> <li>- New Relief road - needs to be more crisp</li> <li>- Long distance views</li> <li>- Handling traffic across the town on existing A410</li> <li>- Comments are welcome on this</li> <li>- Leaflets being done/printed</li> <li>- 13 July public meeting, info to be circulated by end of this week</li> <li>- A3 map is still embargoed until 8 July</li> <li>- Affordable homes with 40% being quoted, is this right as it was thought that developers would struggle with this? Policy position is 30% browfield, 40% greenfield.</li> <li>- What does Affordable mean? NPPF definition of affordable housing copied at the end of this note. People from abroad investing – how we going to make sure that we are providing for the existing generation? We have no regulations to control who buys, there is nothing we can do about this.</li> <li>- To make homes more affordable would mean to build more homes</li> <li>- Affordable housing this is district wide –community land trust – TC owns land assets and landlord and controls who goes into it</li> <li>- People can buy, but round here they are unaffordable, to buy something reasonable would mean you need to move out of area, so they have to rent.</li> <li>- Managing expectations what we are proposing?</li> <li>- The audience on day is going to be more elderly people, need to catch the attention of younger people. Yes agreed.</li> <li>- TC plan – huge improvement and ticking all the boxes, could the wording be better? le car parking have a better explanation on the plan? Something like 'more' or 'better'</li> <li>- Gant chart – needs to mention car parking, nothing around delivery of additional car park to be added.</li> <li>- The bit in purple could we block out the entire period re delivery of new cp, ie on street, off street, improved parking?</li> <li>- Public transport to be looked at</li> <li>- Bus plan there should be more coverage, more buses on same route</li> <li>- The word "Indicative" to be added?</li> <li>- Handling traffic, rat running not showing on Mill Lane, can this be included? Yes</li> <li>- Culverton, south of sewage not sure if this right – need to review this.</li> <li>- Countryside arrows – crossed railway line and potential employment area – change to potential employment what does this mean? Potential connection to countryside use instead</li> <li>- Segregation concerns – poss opps re wades park. Could we show were existing schools are also? Molins ground show? Wades park underpass should be a green arrow – looks as if existing town is a ghost town. Still looks like a town of 2 halves should look to be one</li> <li>- Some of these changes may be made after the exhibition as part of finalising the concept plan as part of the local plan.</li> <li>- At the event affordable hsg questions will be asked so need to define what is affordable</li> <li>- Slide 9 – 4<sup>th</sup> bullet – to come out? No, add in mitigates perhaps but should stay in.</li> </ul>	<p>PT</p> <p>PT</p> <p>JC</p> <p>JC</p> <p>JC/PT</p> <p>JC/PT</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Doesn't spoil key views, this is not a selling point</li> <li>- Impact on what is going to happen</li> <li>- Takes Traffic away from main road – that currently passes through the town (commuter traffic)</li> <li>- Town centre plan is a good plan – will this happen through funding? if didn't could we do this anyway, it's relevant to development.</li> <li>- Public meeting 13 July 7-9pm at Community Centre, TC invited WDC to provide update to residents. Have used eventbrite for bookings but there seems to be a lot of duplication, if people who may have booked and have booked too many tickets then let them know. There are some tickets left. It's a Town Council parishioners meeting and are doing a lot of consultation. We need to know what the PR residents want and we will be meeting them first</li> <li>- RARA should have their own stand and would like to be represented. This is completely full and there is a waiting list and RARA is on it.</li> <li>- Could we share a stand? No, very limited space with boards etc, but doesn't stop you from standing anywhere?</li> <li>- Very happy with what we have seen and want residents to have complete access</li> <li>- Not against all of this, were trying to help the residents with concerns. Trying to work imbalance</li> </ul> <p><b>Landowners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting with developers tomorrow - individual meetings first then a joint meeting with everyone</li> </ul>	PT
5.	<b>AOB</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forgot to send Minutes of Sports SG, next meeting 17<sup>th</sup> or 31<sup>st</sup> July.</li> <li>- Outcomes of SWG health wellbeing inputted into plan – through 6 week consultation?</li> <li>- In terms of layout – some answers have been rec'd – from BCC wouldn't want adult playing next to children area.</li> <li>- Move sports pitches around? N as on edge of expansion, unless we moved them to the town.</li> <li>- SWG is more masterplanning, infrastructure – agreed that the SWG notes to come to this meeting</li> <li>- If 5 year supply is out of date? Is it relevant, if not, why not. Charles to send PT questions.</li> <li>- Travellers on Askett lane, the area at top what is this? Agricultural land. And should remain as agricultural land</li> <li>- Gladman site – there was a Longwick presentation and said that it would take 3 years to take and out of the 160 houses, 61 will be affordable.</li> <li>- Barr lane – serious flooding problem – needs sorting</li> <li>- RARA update AGM this Thursday – MW sends apols.</li> <li>- PT still waiting for LCC to send the recording of the council meeting through</li> <li>- Can we ask the Govt to make provision for district councils re constrained area? Has this been done? White paper in but not implemented due to election being called. Not had any feedback on this so can't do anything. We have identified needs, and have been speaking to neighbouring authorities and have done what we should have done to date. RARA barristers said we should challenge Govt.</li> <li>- Agenda papers are far too late coming out, they should be week before meeting.</li> <li>- Number of Members of SG are missing due to them feeling that this is not an effective forum. MW to look into this as to why they are not attending</li> <li>- LCC to send Transcript one gone back to Cttee</li> </ul>	<p>CV</p> <p>LCC</p> <p>MW</p> <p>LCC</p>

**Affordable housing:** Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.

Social rented housing is owned by local authorities and private registered providers (as defined in section 80 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008), for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. It may also be owned by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Homes and Communities Agency.

Affordable rented housing is let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable Rent is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable). Intermediate housing is homes for sale and rent provided at a cost above social rent, but below market levels subject to the criteria in the Affordable Housing definition above. These can include shared equity (shared ownership and equity loans), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing.

Homes that do not meet the above definition of affordable housing, such as “low cost market” housing, may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes.