



## Community Boards

# North West Chilterns Community Board agenda

Date: Thursday 23 November 2023

Time: 6.30 pm – please arrive 10 minutes earlier for registration

Venue: The Princes Centre, Clifford Road, Princes Risborough, HP27 ODP

### **BC Councillors:**

M Walsh (Chairman), C Etholen (Vice-Chairman), S Adoh, M Angell, S Broadbent, R Carington, D Carroll, G Hall, C Harriss, D Hayday, O Hayday, Maz Hussain, M Smith, A Turner and P Turner

### **Town/Parish Councils and other organisations:**

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton, Bradenham, Downley, Ellesborough, Great and Little Hampden, Great and Little Kimble, Hughenden, Lacey Green, Longwick-cum-Ilmer, Piddington and Wheeler End, Princes Risborough, Radnage, Stokenchurch and West Wycombe

If you would like to attend a meeting, but need extra help to do so, for example because of a disability, please contact us as early as possible, so that we can try to put the right support in place.

**This meeting will be recorded:** The information that will be collected will be your name and your comments. They will only be used to assist in producing the meeting notes.

If you do not wish to take part in the meeting, you may submit written representation of up to 500 words which can be read out on your behalf, or liaise with your Councillor. If you cannot do either of these, please advise us and we will consider if there is anything we can do to assist. Written representation must be submitted to Jackie Binning, community board manager – contact details below. For details on how we use your personal information, please see our Privacy Notice – <https://www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/your-council/privacy/privacy-policy/>

For further information please contact: Jackie Binning as detailed below.

### **Questions for the Chairman**

If you have any questions, please email Jackie Binning on [jackie.binning@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:jackie.binning@buckinghamshire.gov.uk) or telephone 07816 118011 by Friday 17<sup>th</sup> November 2023. This will allow our Chairman, Matthew Walsh, time to prepare.

I look forward to seeing you at our Community Board meeting.

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Page No</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Chairman's Welcome</b>	<b>18:30</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Notes of the last meeting</b> To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2023 and the extra ordinary meetings held on 7 and 14 September 2023.		<b>5 - 34</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Petition - School Bus for Lord Williams School, Thame</b> Report to be presented by Neil Beswick, Head of Client Transport, Transport Services (Buckinghamshire Council) - included in the agenda pack.  <b>Questions/Consider recommendations and agree next steps</b> - To be led by Cllr Matthew Walsh.	<b>18:35</b>	<b>35 - 38</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Action Groups</b> To provide an update on the key activities of the action groups (reports for each group included in the agenda pack).  To be presented by Councillor Matthew Walsh.	<b>19:00</b>	<b>39 - 46</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Energy Doctor Service</b> To be presented by Paul Thomas, Domestic Resource Efficiency Officer (Buckinghamshire Council) on the service delivered by the Council.	<b>19:05</b>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Hedgerow Project</b> To be presented by Nick Marriner, Chiltern Conservation Board. To provide an overview of the project funded by the Community Board in 2022/23.	<b>19:20</b>	
<b>9</b>	<b>Funding Update</b> To provide an update on applications received and the budget for 2023/24.  To be presented by Jackie Binning, Community Board Manager.	<b>19:40</b>	

<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>Community Matters</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Buckinghamshire Council Update:</b> to be presented by Sophie Payne, Service Director, Culture, Sport and Leisure, Buckinghamshire Council (included in the agenda pack).</li> <li>• <b>Question Time:</b> to respond to questions received – to be presented by the Chairman.</li> </ul>	<p><b>19:50</b></p>	<p><b>47 - 50</b></p>
<p><b>11</b></p>	<p><b>Date of the next meeting</b>  <b>22<sup>nd</sup> February 2024</b> – Church Hall, St Michael &amp; All Angels, Hughenden, HP14 4LA, 6.30pm to 8pm</p>	<p><b>20:00</b></p>	

This page is intentionally left blank



## North West Chilterns Community Board minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the North West Chilterns Community Board held on Thursday 27 July 2023 in Bledlow Village Hall, Chinnor Road, Bledlow, HP27 9QF, commencing at 6.30 pm.

### **BC Councillors present**

M Walsh (Chairman), S Adoh, S Broadbent, R Carington, D Hayday, O Hayday and A Turner

### **Town/Parish Councils and other organisations present**

S Henson (West Wycombe Parish Council), C Davies (Lacey Green Parish Council) and J Rogers (Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council), S Breese (Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council), V McPherson (Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council), V Smith (West Wycombe Parish Council), S Marshall (Princes Risborough Town Council), P Spence (Hughenden Residents' Association), J Stevens (Lead of the Transport and Road Issues Action Group), J Binning, S Payne and N Surman (Buckinghamshire Council).

### Agenda Item

#### **1 Chairman's Welcome**

Matthew Walsh [MW] (Chairman of the North West Chilterns Community Board – NWC CB ) welcomed everyone to the meeting. MW said that he was happy to be re-elected into the position of Community Board Chairman and was looking forward to working with all members of the Board for a further year.

#### **2 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Buckinghamshire Council Councillors Carl Etholen and Paul Turner; Councillor Simon Cope, West Wycombe Parish Council; Councillor James Cripps, Great and Little Kimble Parish Council, Councillor Helen Holman, Ellesborough Parish Council and Makyla Devlin, Senior Community Board Manager

#### **3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **4 Notes of the last meeting**

The minutes of the meeting, dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2023, were approved by the NWC Community Board.

## 5 Action Group Updates

MW informed the NWC CB of the Priorities agreed for 2023/24 as follows:

- Community Resilience
- Economic Regeneration & Development
- Environment & Climate Change
- Transport & Road Issues

The leads of each Action Group presented their report.

**Community Resilience:** see the briefing report in the agenda pack. Valerie McPherson [VMc] (lead) confirmed that meetings were held every two months (approximately) and the next one would be on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2023. The group consisted of Buckinghamshire Councillors, Parish Councillors and residents and that it was a good mix.

VMc gave an overview of the projects that the Action Group were working on (as detailed in the briefing report). In particular, VMc mentioned that a funding application had been sent from Hughenden Manor (National Trust) to the Community Board on a walking project for young and older people, especially with those suffering with loneliness and vulnerability.

VMc said that the Community Garden was progressing well and that a meeting had been held with the Horses Trust in Speen to discuss a proposal in terms of young and older people with disabilities that required therapy with horses. The Trust were interested in the project but said we needed to find a facilitator because they only managed the horses. This was proving to be difficult but the group were pursuing.

VMc highlighted the success of the Party in the Park event which was the idea of Councillor Shade Adoh's. VMc confirmed that there were a number of food stalls, arts and crafts, a fair, tractors, and entertainment, especially with a singing group of disabled young men and women, and she thanked the team (Shade Adoh, Jackie Binning and Josephine Biss) for all their hard work. MW also thanked VMc and said the Crew Café had their busiest day ever.

**Economic Regeneration & Development:** see the briefing report in the agenda pack. MW (lead) confirmed that the action group were now working on their second networking event on the back of the one held last year at Orchard View Farm. The Bucks Film office, business groups and voluntary organisations attended the event last year and it went very well. MW said he wanted to build on this so plans would be formalised over the summer and all would be invited. Ideas on how to promote and engage this event would be greatly received.

**Environment & Climate Change:** see the briefing report in the agenda pack. RC (lead) advised that the next meeting was on 7<sup>th</sup> August where we would be reviewing Jaaganroop Marshall's excellent spreadsheet which listed a number of aims/objectives. To meet these the group hoped to find some interesting projects

and volunteers. The group were also looking at e-bikes (Buckinghamshire Council initiative) for towns (not rural areas) and if anyone had any interest please contact the group. Tree planting was another initiative and RC advised that Jackie Binning (JB) had been contacting the Board about this for two years and that this would continue.

Sharon Henson stated that West Wycombe Estate were considering e-bikes.

Steven Broadbent (SB) reported there were e-bike trials consisting of 25 bikes (12 in High Wycombe and 13 in Aylesbury). These were being well used and the trial would run to March 2024. You could hire via an App (like the e-scooter) and data was being collected to monitor use. There currently appeared to be an age demographic difference where young people liked the e-scooter and older people preferred the e-bike. They had the same limitations as the e-scooter with speed and GEO locations.

JS mentioned the tree planting in Princes Risborough, in particular along Crowbrook Road, which he thought looked brilliant and said that in future years the area would be transformed.

**Transport and Road Issues:** see the briefing report in the agenda pack. JS (lead) stated that the group was made up of local people who were passionate about seeking improvements and changes to local transport and roads. The group consisted of Buckinghamshire Councillors (Carl Etholen and Ron Gaffney), Parish Councillors, residents and the current Chairman of the Chiltern Conservation Board, Colin Courtney.

The group had modified their 2023/24 priorities to make them clearer on the what the group would like to achieve. The objectives were centred around improving road safety, parking and maintenance and encouraging sustainable transport which in itself would result a net benefit to transport emissions, air pollution and climate change. The group had added a fourth priority to quantify the outcomes of what we were achieving with Buckinghamshire Council. There had been a number of non-responses from Buckinghamshire Council which the group hoped would not continue with the implementation of the new highways contract.

The group had also responded to the public consultation on Local Transport Plan 5 (LTP5) and the England Economic Heartlands (EEH) North-South Transport Connectivity Study which would have an impact and benefit Buckinghamshire and potentially the NWC. In addition, the group had maintained a focus on the A4010 which ran through the North West Chilterns, to obtain proper recognition and policies for the A4010 in Buckinghamshire Council's LTP5 and EEH in terms of its regional approach to transport.

The group had been successful in working with the Council's Pollution team and were now running an air quality monitoring pilot outside Stokenchurch Primary School. A commitment had also been given by the Pollution team to implement air quality monitoring devices at various locations in Princes Risborough (locations to be determined after discussions with Buckinghamshire Council Members) to monitor

air quality before, during and after work on the relief road and the new housing development in the town.

The group met monthly and the next meeting was on 16<sup>th</sup> August. JS confirmed that on the agenda, the Head of Public Transport would be attending to discuss local bus provision and that the group would be priming him on questions. There would also be an item on car and lift sharing, as one of the action group members was very knowledgeable and the group would like to see if this was something that could be run more widely with Buckinghamshire Council support. Highways maintenance was another item on the agenda and said that this had improved, particularly with the repair of potholes, but the group would like to have a conversation around this matter with Buckinghamshire Council officers and the Cabinet Member in due course.

**Question:** Sharon Henson asked why the Parish was not receiving TRO's as they had in the past and had to rely on Buckinghamshire Councillors to provide this information. Steven Broadbent (SB) reported that One.Network was used but was not a foolproof system as TRO's were sometimes late on the system. As an example, the reason for this could be where emergency utilities were installed on a Friday but had to wait until the Monday for an officer to create. SB advised there was no provision for Parish Council use. Simon Breese said that there was a way to obtain this information and that his Clerk knew.

**Action:** SH to email Bledlow cum Saunderton's Parish Clerk to find out further details.

SH confirmed that the Parish used to receive TRO's through the portal. SB confirmed that portal work was ongoing but the Member Briefing Sheet advised Members of works coming in the area and this could be shared with Parishes. MW suggested that Members were told that they could forward this on.

## **6 North West Chilterns Active Travel Aspirations Report**

JS stated that this document was the work of the Transport and Road Issues Action Group, which had been undertaken over the last two years and was about the North West Chilterns Active Travel Aspirations – see report in the agenda pack and the NWC Active Travel Aspirations document and presentation attached.

JS informed the Board of the recommendations which were being presented tonight to the Board for decision – these were:

- To support and adopt our document – so it had a different status and held a greater weight and was not seen as an action group document.
- Formally request Buckinghamshire Council to:
  - Use the document to help develop the Countywide Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).
  - Adopt the document as a supplement to the Countywide LCWIP and make it readily accessible on the Council's Website – so there would be more coverage and publicity.

**Key highlights from the presentation:**

The format of the document was textural information around the geography of the North West Chilterns, including reference to the recent consultation and policy context. In addition there were nine maps showing aspirations for improved cycling and walking infrastructure. An overview of these were as detailed below.

Map 1 – Inter-settlement routes: Buckinghamshire Council (BC) officers were working on inter settlement routes across Bucks as part of developing the Countywide strategic Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. BC officers had recently engaged directly with BC local Members on this specific subject, and in order to help Members with this task, Map 9 had been sent to them by the Community Board Manager along with what the action group felt should be the top 3 priorities, namely: (1) A4010 active travel route (2) the A40 West Wycombe to Stokenchurch and (3) the links between Princes Risborough and Longwick.

Map 2 – A4010 Active Travel Route: This was an important active travel route and JS had promoted this as such to Buckinghamshire Council many times. JS stated that the A4010 was more than a cycling and walking route between the settlements that were situated on the route itself, but it would also act as a feeder route to five existing promoted cycling and walking routes within the Chilterns which crossed the A4010, four railways stations, many local places of interest and villages either side. For example Bledlow Ridge via Haw Lane. Risborough was also due to expand so having the A4010 Active Travel Route something in place prior to or during the expansion would encourage more people to walk and cycle from the outset. In addition, there was expansion in Aylesbury, HS2 were building a new bypass in Stoke Mandeville and Buckinghamshire Council had approved a HS2 funded cycleway along the A4010 linking the proposed Stoke Mandeville bypass with Terrick roundabout, so the jigsaw was coming together but much more focus was required by Buckinghamshire Council on the A4010.

Map 3a – Links between Princes Risborough and Longwick: These were also referenced in the Wycombe Local Plan.

Map 3b – Princes Risborough: These were local improvements identified by the local Climate Action Now group. For example, a cycle route from the Marks and Spencer's roundabout to the New Road zebra crossing which could then link into the High Street. Another example was a link beneath the current railway bridge at Park Mill, Princes Risborough. A Public Right of Way route already existed but the route passed beneath the railway bridge, which was not lit at night, but with 2,500 houses due to be built and major employment around the area, it would make sense to have a proper active travel route linking the new development with Summerleys Road and Kites Park.

Map 3c – Princes Risborough, Potential Barriers to Cycling and Walking: When construction on the relief road works commenced, it was hoped that the existing cycling and walking routes would be protected so they didn't put people off cycling

and walking.

Map 4 – Longwick: Routes were defined within the Longwick Transport Vision and include two links from Longwick village to the Phoenix Trail - (1) Walnut Tree Lane via the bridleway and (2) along the B4009 Lower Icknield Way. Three locations were defined for enhanced crossings due to the housing expansion. In addition, links were shown on the map between Meadle Village to the Relief Road.

Map 5 – Road Crossings: This map showed new or improved road crossings points for pedestrians and cyclists. There were six on the A4010 that were aimed to reduce risk and improve safety for walkers, cyclists, wheelers and dog walkers, so the action group were looking for enhancements. Locations shown were around the Golden Cross Public House, Hearing Dogs for Deaf, Little Lane (near the Rose and Crown), the B4009 at Great Kimble (which would form part of the Princes Risborough Relief Road and the Wycombe Local Plan identified this as a crossing that required improvement) and Walters Hill and Naphill, which was part of a petition received by the Community Board approximately one year ago.

Map 6 – Cadsden: To tie up two important Public Rights of Way - the Ridgeway crosses the road in a stagger and was on a bend. There was lots of traffic and was very hazardous. The plan was to re-surface off road. It was noted there had been some very recent vegetation clearance which had opened up the area.

Map 7 – Ridgeway and Phoenix Trail: The aspiration was to connect Bledlow to the Phoenix Trail and improve the Phoenix Trail between Lower Icknield Way and Horsenden. The Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB) Officer that has provided input to the action group had indicated that there were a number of potential projects that were related to the Ridgeway that CCB officers were working on.

**Questions:**

Sophie Payne (SP) asked if reductions in traffic flow or what people could do as a result of some of the proposals were included in this document, so for example, children travelling to school safely and active travel routes to school. SP asked if these existed in the document. JS said they did and stated that there was an underlying assumption in the document that Buckinghamshire Council would continue its positive work with schools and school travel planning. JS agreed to make reference to this on the document.

**Action: JS to add to the document.**

SB recognised the work that had gone into developing this document and taking information from local people. Buckinghamshire Council however had deliberately consulted with all Community Boards together on their countywide strategic Local Cycling and Walking Improvement Plan (LCWIP) and in due course would be going out to a wider, more formal consultation, as would they on LTP5.

SB stated that “Wheeling” was missing from the document and said that active travel must include less abled bodied people. SB urged this be included.

Furthermore, SB stressed that there was no capital funding for active travel schemes beyond that which could be secured from Government, as funding was all from developers. This was not a financial choice by the Council on whether to fund this and felt that something on this should be referenced in the document.

JS advised that “Wheeling” was already referenced in the actual document although not specifically referenced in tonight’s power point presentation. In terms of SB’s comment no funding being available, JS said he was aware of this, but felt it was really important to have the aspirational document in place so that when money was available through, for example, S106 and CIL, we had a plan which was ready to go. JS advised that the document was referenced as “aspirational” and that it was quite difficult to find the right words to say that no funding was available and that this is stressed in the document.

RC raised the point that SB raised that Community Boards had been consulted on the strategic LCWIP. RC asked if this document was the response to that. RC stated that if this document was a supplement to the LCWIP, there would be 16 and how would there be a priority over one particular Board. Taking the first point, JS confirmed that the action group had taken the initiative to do something around walking and cycling and this document represented this. Other Boards across the County either don’t have an action group relating to transport or their action group were focusing on other things. In totality there was probably three similar projects of this sort that could act as supplementary documents to the strategic LCWIP. In relation to the second point, JS said that SB mentioned that Buckinghamshire Councillors had been consulted on the countywide, strategic LCWIP. JS advised that all Members across the 16 Community Boards had been engaged with and were sent an email from the Transport Strategy and Funding Team (TSFT) which clearly set out what they wanted Buckinghamshire Council Members feedback on in terms of their top three inter settlement routes (shown on Map 1). JS and JB sent an email to all NWC Members and advised that when they started thinking about what three priorities they wanted to put forward, that they consider the A4010 active travel route, the A40 to Stokenchurch and links between Princes Risborough and Longwick. One that was just outside the top three was the Hughenden Greenway, but we could only have three. JS stated that he wasn’t sure if all Members responded and/or what three priority routes they chose.

RC felt that the action group was encouraging unitary elected Members to be casting on what they felt was an improved plan, when Members represented their own constituents priorities. RC therefore was uncertain on the total document. MW confirmed that the email sent from JS/JB to all Buckinghamshire Councillors in January 2023, was responded to by himself, Gary Hall (GH) and Alan Turner (AT) in support of the three recommendations, but he did not know if other Buckinghamshire Councillors responded. As the Community Board Chairman, he had a briefing meeting with TSFT and different proposals were reviewed. An additional meeting was requested but it was not granted by the officers.

MW stated that he, JS and AT were very heavily involved in the Risborough

expansion work, and that they learnt a valuable lesson in that you need text to be included in the overall plan. If you don't, issues would be quickly forgotten in their entirety. AT agreed and said that you definitely required written policy back up. MW advised that it wouldn't just be the Community Board that would look at this document, it would be developers too in terms of contributions within the Risborough expansion, so the work of this group that was put forward to Buckinghamshire Council detailed the aspirations of the North West Chilterns and our preferred schemes at this time.

MW added that the A4010 was regularly used but thought the A413 took priority. Carl had mentioned this at Council. AT added that the aspirational document was invaluable for large scale planning applications as developers would look at every conceivable document that was held by Buckinghamshire Council to see what they might be being asked for when submitting an application.

SB stated that the email sent from TSFT to Members was more than that. It included quantitative data evidence of traffic movement, demand lines, economic information, suggested identifiable routes, and priorities that Members may have from that, and then a meeting, so it was not just an email and was important to stress. SB confirmed that a lot of hard work was carried out by officers at this stage, where they sought local input early in order to formulate a plan, taking into consideration additional input into the countywide LCWIP, which then enabled a draft proposal to be developed. This draft would go out to public consultation so there would be another opportunity to review and make comment.

SB added that none of the work carried out by TSFT prevented the discussions and review of the "aspirational" document. SB felt there would be differences in opinion between Community Boards on what should be prioritised, but the work of the action group prior to being asked the question by Council officers meant that they were able to submit the NWC CB's local priorities. The strategic LCWIP was more than three identified schemes as it included traffic movements, current volumes and estimated uplifts. Buckinghamshire Council would not obtain funding without this because Government would say it did not meet criteria. The action group had identified the Board's local desires, so it was right to identify inter settlement routes.

JS emphasised that the three priority inter-settlement routes identified on the map for local Members to look at were ones that the action group decided from local intelligence. This information was passed onto local Members, not prescribing what they should do as it was totally respected that Members would have their own views.

Shade Adoh advised that she was unsure on how the NWC's document tailored into the countywide document. JS stated that only the three priority routes that were detailed in the NWC's document would be in the strategic LCWIP. In principle, JS said he would like anyone that contacted Buckinghamshire Council about cycling, walking and wheeling/active travel in general, would not only be signposted to the strategic LCWIP, but also signposted to our aspirational document if their enquiry related to

the North West Chilterns because our document included detailed local information on cycling and walking routes and crossing points which would not be in the strategic LCWIP, other than three priority inter-settlement routes. The two documents would work hand in hand. The mechanics on how the NWC document would be signposted to would need to be agreed.

MW highlighted that the three priority routes recommended in the strategic LCWIP were not the same three routes as detailed in the NWC's aspirational document. JS confirmed that they were not and that was why the group requested a meeting with TSFT to understand the logic and make the case to officers to try and get the three routes included. JS said he was very concerned that whilst Buckinghamshire Council officers had referenced the A4010 as an inter-settlement route, it was only part of it - West Wycombe to Saunderton. JS said that there was a high propensity to cycle from Bledlow Ridge and Princes Risborough and in his opinion, a good way to travel from Bledlow Ridge to Princes Risborough would be to come from Bledlow Ridge Village Centre, down Haw Lane, and then drop onto the A4010 active travel route – this would be the quickest route in, the flattest and maybe the safest. Simon Breese thought that you needed to think about the difference between people that were trying to get somewhere and proficient cyclists who liked to stretch themselves going up the hill to the household waste site, so he believed you had two communities. JS advised that Buckinghamshire Council had lots of data and that some was derived from reviewing population centres, distances and whether a route was cyclable, and then looking at propensity to cycle through rankings and connections throughout the North West Chilterns. JS confirmed that many of Buckinghamshire Council's medium priorities matched our map, but it was the top priorities that would feature in the countywide LCWIP, and at the moment it only included one of our priorities, Princes Risborough to Longwick, and didn't include A40 to West Wycombe and only a small part of the A4010. JS explained that was why it was important to put our priorities forward to Buckinghamshire Council Members to give them the choice to propose them.

Darren Hayday (DH) asked if Buckinghamshire Councillors should make comment on the three priority routes. JS requested that at this stage, Councillors should only vote to agree or disagree on the two recommendations in the presentation, and then if the Board was given the opportunity to have a meeting with Buckinghamshire Council officers, then arguments would be put forward as to why the groups three priority routes should be included.

MW suggested that the recommendations be changed in that the Community Board use the document subject to further consultation with Members of the North West Chilterns. But, before it is presented any further, Members should be given another opportunity prior to the vote, to confirm that they were happy with the three priority routes and all aspirations.

SB did not feel there was a point in voting on the aspirational document during the meeting because some Members had formally expressed this, but felt it should not stop a view being taken on the entire document, but not just the three routes.

RC asked JB what the threshold was for voting on this document as some Members not present may oppose it. JB advised that there was no formal threshold, so it was up to the Chairman to agree how the Community Board should take a vote on this document going forward.

DH thought that the vote should be taken this evening and was happy to support it. DH said the document should be taken forward and recognised the work that had been put in by the action group.

MW said that he fully supported the work that had been done but wanted the aspirational document to have as much weight and legitimacy as possible and didn't think delaying the vote to double check for a month to six weeks would be an issue. Surrinder Marshall asked if she was correct in thinking that the document was more granular and not just about the three priority routes, and included what our aspirations were around cycling and walking routes were which would then feed into the strategic document. JS confirmed this was correct and that our document was intended as a supplementary document to the strategic LCWIP. JS stressed that our document was not just about the three priority routes.

After listening to Members, MW requested a separate meeting be held in September 2023 to enable a formal vote to be taken.

**Action: JB to organise a separate Community Board meeting.**

## **7 Community Board Updates**

JB gave a funding update – see information attached.

Vicki Smith from West Wycombe Parish Council asked where their funding application was in the system (ie PID – Project Initiation Document). JB advised that it had been assessed by Atkins and had now been submitted to Buckinghamshire Councillors for a final review. Councillor Vicki Smith and Sharon Henson (Parish Clerk) both thought they had already been agreed. MW confirmed that there was a list of PID's, some would continue because they were within budget, some had drastically gone up in cost, so conversations would have to be had between Town/Parish Council's and the NWC CB, and some had been withdrawn. JB advised that the information was sent to each local Member just under two weeks ago so MW requested that local Ward Members respond.

The NWC CB Action Plan was presented which JB confirmed was an evolving document and was held on our webpage. The plan detailed our priorities and aims and objectives which had been agreed (or were being agreed) by each action group – see information attached.

JB tabled the NWC CB Annual Report – see document attached. JB advised that this had not been created in a template you would expect it to be and explained that it was in a format that we could show residents and groups of the work we had completed over 2022/23 with a few key projects detailed within. JB requested that everyone take a look and if anyone was interested in joining the Community Board,

that they should give them this document to demonstrate the work that the Board had completed. MW added that it was worth a read to see the amount of work we were doing which did not exist three years ago and we had Covid to deal with in between, so if anyone was interested, MW asked it be passed on.

## 8 Community Matters

Sophie Payne (SP) presented the Corporate update – see information attached. SP highlighted the following:

- Play Street scheme – which allowed residents to open up their streets for their children to play safely outside on their doorstep. Residents could apply for a Play Street session to temporarily close their road. SP advised that there were a number of benefits and case studies which can be found on the Play Streets website.
- Love Exploring App – this detailed local parks in the County and was interactive with dinosaurs and fairies to enable children to follow trails around a park.
- Summer Reading Challenge – now live in our libraries and was also linked to a theme for physical activities for children. Lot of activity cards and events and things going on in local libraries, a vast majority were free.
- Better Points App – which is about encouraging people to be active where rewards could be earned with vouchers to spend in retail outlets. Great offers and competitions.
- Cost of Living – reminder on the Helping Hands team at Buckinghamshire Council and Holiday Activity and Food scheme which was currently running. Hughenden, Monks Risborough and West Wycombe schools all had schemes.
- Welcoming Spaces – our libraries had continued with this initiative. Although it is not cold, it has continued as spaces for all families and people to interact.
- Subsidised bus fares – more information can be found on Buckinghamshire Council's website.
- New national fund to support local community organisations, to support people with cost of living issues.

**Post meeting information:** Councils are being asked to help spread the word about the government's £76 million [Community Organisations Cost of Living Fund](#) to support communities most affected by the increased cost of living. The fund will distribute grants to frontline services that have been impacted by increased demand and support low-income households and individuals. Eligible organisations can apply for grants of £10,000 - £75,000.

The closing date for applications is noon on 16 October. Further information is available from the [National Lottery Community Fund](#) website.

- Ultrafast Broadband – this has been delivered in Radnage and Stokenchurch within the North West Chilterns.
- Bucks Rural Business Grant – which provides financial support and helps create opportunities for rural businesses in Buckinghamshire. The scheme would run until March 25 for organisations that employ fewer than 50 people. Funding was available for a variety of projects such as investment in

net zero infrastructure projects, as well as financial support for farm businesses diversifying outside of agriculture.

- Film Office – the locations database had gone live and would be presented at the networking event in October.
- Open Weekend ((29/30 July) – venues offering lots of activities for all ages. Hughenden Manor were doing crafts sessions for children.
- Ward Boundary Consultation – Ward boundaries were due to be published. Councillors would reduce from 147 to 97. Wards would remain at 49, with new boundaries coming into effect at the local elections in May 2025.

Question Time – There were no questions to be answered.

## **9 Date of next meetings**

- 7 September – Petitions meeting on Microsoft Teams
- 23 November 2023 – Princes Centre, Princes Risborough
- 22 February 2024 – Microsoft Teams (subject to change)
- **Post meeting information:** 31<sup>st</sup> August – NWC Active Travel Aspirations Document meeting on Microsoft Teams



## North West Chilterns Community Board minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the North West Chilterns Community Board held on Thursday 7 September 2023 in Via MS Teams, commencing at 6.00 pm and concluding at 7.30 pm.

### **BC Councillors present**

M Walsh (Chairman), C Etholen (Vice-Chairman), S Adoh, S Broadbent, D Carroll and G Hall

### **Town/Parish Councils and other organisations present**

C Davies (Lacey Green Parish Council), S Breese (Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council), V McPherson (Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council), S Reading (Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council and lead petitioner), T MacGillivray (Lacey Green Parish Council)

### **Others in attendance**

J Binning (Buckinghamshire Council), J Stevens (Lead of the Transport and Road Issues Action Group), N O'Leary (Network Safety Team Leader, Buckinghamshire Council), S Sidley (lead petition, Speed Calming in Lacey Green) and M Biswas, A Followell, M Mirza, H Breed (residents)

### **Agenda Item**

#### **1 Chairman's Welcome/Purpose of the meeting**

Matthew Walsh [MW] (Chairman of the North West Chilterns Community Board – NWC CB) welcomed everyone to the meeting to discuss the three petitions that had been received by the Community Board.

MW asked Jackie Binning (JB) to outline the structure of the meeting. JB advised that the following petitions would be presented by Neil O'Leary (NOL):

- Bledlow Ridge Traffic Calming
- Speed Calming in Lacey Green
- Radnage School Safety

JB confirmed that after each presentation there would be an opportunity to ask questions and then the NWC CB would agree the recommendations/next steps. MW informed the CB that the meeting would be recorded for the purposes of JB writing the notes. Once the notes had been approved the recording would be destroyed.

## **2 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Buckinghamshire Council Councillors Darren Hayday, Orsolya Hayday, Robert Carington, Alan Turner; Councillor Simon Digby, Piddington and Wheeler End Parish Council, Councillor Robin Thomas, Stokenchurch Parish Council, Councillor Surinder Marshall, Princes Risborough Town Council, Councillor Wendy Monroe-West, Downley Parish Council, Sophie Payne, Service Director, Wendy Morgan-Brown, Head of Community Boards, Makyla Devlin, Senior Community Board Manager and Nicola Surman, Funding and Support Team Leader.

## **3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **4 Petition - Bledlow Ridge Traffic Calming**

NOL queried how the reports should be presented. JB stated that if meeting attendees had read the petition reports then an overview would be suffice. It was therefore agreed that NOL would read the Executive Summary and the Recommendations and then hand over to the CB for questions.

NOL read the Executive Summary and Recommendations for this petition – see petition report in the agenda pack.

### **Questions:**

Stephen Reading (SR – Lead Petitioner) referred to Recommendation 2 in terms of analysing the speed data in accordance with Bledlow cum Saunderton's Neighbourhood Plan 2017. SR stated that as per the presentation (PowerPoint slides) he forwarded as part of the supporting information, a speed survey which the Parish Council had commissioned from Transport for Bucks in November and December 2022. SR said that this information had also been presented to the NWC CB Transport and Road Issues Action Group (TRIAG) some months ago. The speed data showed that 25% or more of vehicles throughout the survey were travelling at 35mph or more. SR did not think that Recommendation 2 was accurate.

SR added that the Parish Council were looking for something more than what Recommendation 1 described. SR confirmed that the Parish Council would like more than a redesigned sign as the Parish had these already and a Vehicle Activated Signed.

NOL responded and said that he was aware that speed data had been collected, but was not aware of the level it had been analysed. SR advised that very comprehensive data was produced by Buckinghamshire Council which was also detailed in his presentation. Furthermore, some drivers had historically driven at speeds of 60 to 70mph to the end of village, so that's why the Parish Council felt that further traffic measures were required. SR said that he would be happy to have a conversation on what might be possible.

NOL stressed that it was not that he wasn't aware that the data existed, it was more

that the data had not been analysed by designers who would determine what might be the best options in terms of traffic calming.

Jim Stevens (JS) then introduced himself as the Chair of the NWC CB's Transport and Road Issues Action Group. JS confirmed that TRIAG had a met SR a few months ago and discussed at length the traffic conditions in Bledlow Ridge. JS stated that TRIAG supported the petition and the need for physical traffic calming in the village. JS said that it was a linear village, a long straight road with houses either side, and there was not much encouragement for drivers to slow down.

JS confirmed that the Parish Council had over the years implemented softer measures. There were two Vehicle Activated Signs in the village and red friction surfacing and road markings where the speed limit changed, but drivers still drove at speed. TRIAG believed that physical measures were now required which was the basis of the petition and referenced in item 3.7 of the petition report.

JS advised that the NOL's report stated that a chicane/build out could potentially block visibility for people driving to the Cricket Club. JS said that a chicane/build out would really slow traffic down to give way to traffic coming in the other direction. He said chicanes and build outs were used within Buckinghamshire and across the country. JS said that in his opinion a chicane/build would be an effective solution and would slow traffic and create a much safer entrance into the Cricket Club which now had a café and recreation ground as well.

JS asked that the NWC CB ask for an amendment to Recommendation 1 to include an assessment of a chicane/build out.

MW asked NOL what his thoughts were on this. NOL stated that it came down to whether this aligned with the CB's priorities.

In terms of costing, MW confirmed that the report from Bledlow cum Saunderton estimated that chicanes cost approximately £40,000. MW advised that he had not had the opportunity to read the new Highways Toolkit (submitted today) so asked if this was the ballpark figure. NOL stated that he couldn't confirm with any confidence but didn't believe that there was a schedule of costs in the new guidance.

SR reported that Chinnor Town Council had provided that ballpark figure, so although the cost has not been researched, it was based on experience.

JS advised that in terms of the priorities for the NWC CB which had been mentioned by NOL, TRIAG had a series of priorities for the CB. One was around ensuring speed limits were appropriate and enforced and the other was that road safety issues were addressed (there were other priorities too). The chicanes/build out's would fit well within the CB's priorities.

Steven Broadbent (SB) advised that he was talking as a member of the CB at this meeting and not as a Cabinet Member. SB believed that the reference to priorities

related to money and funding, and whether formal consideration of the report was carried out at full Board where it would decide on next steps – this may be to go through the new toolkit process. SB confirmed that there were trigger points in that it brought it back to the CB along with the lead person. SB accepted there were CB priorities, but there were three petitions to discuss and that there may be relative priorities in those as well.

With his Cabinet hat on, SB informed the meeting that there were certain design elements in the toolkit which the CB should be aware of. There would be resources for all CB's where a design would be agreed against a schedule of rates, but the cost was driven by the context. When the work was considered it would factor in how much traffic management was required etc. so it was difficult to give a figure until we had the correct information. SB thought it was better to obtain an accurate figure rather than speculating.

SR requested that we progress the chicane/build out solution. If it was found to be too expensive then at least it had been explored. It was in the petition and SR did not want to let it go as he had a Parish Council meeting on Monday (11/9) and he did not want to report that at the very first hurdle the chicane/build out idea had been rejected.

MW asked if local Bucks Council Members had anything to add – none had anything further to say.

MW asked NOL if the chicane/build out could be included in the petition report. MW stated that it was a key part of the petition and met our CB priorities and said there were funding partnerships with Parish Council's in the area that may assist. NOL advised that it was essentially included in Recommendation 2. NOL added that we needed to make sure the Cricket Club was accessible and the visibility wasn't impaired for residents opposite and for people entering and exiting.

SR asked if timescales to meet, discuss and commission the work could be agreed with NOL (**Action BR/01**). SB stated that he wasn't sure if NOL commissioned a chicane/build out assessment and that it would have to be presented to the CB to do it.

JB felt that the NWC CB needed to consider the new procedures as the chicane/build out proposal may have to follow a different procedure. SB believed that for this one, the soft measures had already been considered by TRIAG, so the technical measures could be reviewed quite quickly.

#### **Summary of the actions discussed:**

**Action BR/01: SR and NOL** to arrange a meeting to discuss the chicane/build out proposal and any another other traffic calming solutions.

**In addition - Action BR/02: SR** to consider Recommendations 2, 3 and 4

MW thanked SR for attending the meeting.

## **5 Petition - Speed Calming in Lacey Green**

NOL read the Executive Summary and Recommendations for this petition – see petition report in the agenda pack.

### **Questions**

Sue Sidley (SS – Lead Petitioner) confirmed that she had organised for a few members of her Road Safety Group and local residents to join this meeting.

SS confirmed that she had sent the speed data which were collected by Community Speed Watch. Trello strips were put down and information from an MVAS unit were collected, as well as photographs showing drivers parking in dangerous situations.

SS asked if the footway in Recommendation 2 was referring to the one on New Road or Main Road. NOL confirmed that it was New Road. SS advised that there were problems on Main Road as well with speed and parked cars which she didn't feel was reflected in the petition report. Community Speed Watch have identified that parking of school cars was creating a huge issue as well as speeding – one driver was caught doing 63mph at 9am outside the school which was considered very dangerous.

SS added that from Main Road there were children coming into school facing the other way from Lacey Green. The speed signs go from 60mph to 30mph and the 30mph sign was not clearly visible. SS confirmed that you couldn't see a school coming up and was on a bend with a bus stop which was a notorious bottleneck and very dangerous. There were also parents parking in the 60mph area on New Road which created a problem on the blind bend coming around the corner from the other direction. SS believed this was an accident waiting to happen and this was why the petition was raised.

SS stated that there had been a few accidents. One car was written off and her son could have been in the vehicle five minutes later. The accident happened quite near the school.

SS referred to the petition report which stated that Thames Valley Police had said there had been no accidents in the area. SS confirmed that she knew of serious accidents in 2022 and had photographs to evidence these.

NOL responded and said that in terms of the Community Speed Watch data, he could not dispute the figures presented but it was for a three month period and no other speed checks had been carried out since December 2022. NOL said that generally, Community Speed Watch data was reviewed over a longer period of time, and this provided a bigger dataset and allowed the Council to get rid of those anomalies. NOL recognised that Community Speed Watch data was an effective tool and had seen great results in other areas. However, it was a slow build and data was

required over a longer period of time (**Action LG/01**).

SS stated that the Parish Council had invested in MVAS units and that data from these units (pre-covid and March this year) provided similar figures, so this delivered quite a long history of speeding vehicles. NOL said that he didn't dispute the figures, but this wasn't Community Speed Watch, which he stated was an effective way of reducing speeds but took time to take effect.

NOL then responded to the other point raised around the number of serious incidents or accidents. NOL confirmed that if no injury was reported then Buckinghamshire Council wouldn't have the figures. When the data was reviewed over the last years, NOL advised that there were five accidents across the Parish but none where speeds were sighted as a contributory factor. NOL stressed that he was not disputing there was a problem, but the policies followed looked to resolve accidents were there were injuries, and then they assessed where there was a risk rather a recorded incident.

SS thought this was a problem because she did not want there to be an accident where a child died.

JS commented that the road through Lacey Green was very similar in many respects to the road through Bledlow Ridge. It was on a ridge, so a linear village and straight road. There was not much encouragement for drivers to slow down and JS said that when the A4010 was blocked with either road works or incidents, the traffic diverted through Lacey Green and Naphill. JS stated that there were peaks in traffic and new vehicles going through which he believed contributed to the speeding problems.

JS advised that TRIAG considered SS's submission prior to the petition was raised and thought that well thought out arguments had been raised. TRIAG was aware that speed data had been collected and reviewed it, specifically in relation to whether there might be a case to reduce the speed limit between RAF Naphill and the school. That stretch of road is currently a 60mph speed limit so the Action Group came up with two reasonable ideas. JS confirmed that the first idea was to reduce the 60mph speed limit to 40mph all the way from RAF Naphill through to where the 30mph speed limit started near the school. The other option was to reduce the 60mph speed limit to 50mph from RAF Naphill, but implement a 40mph buffer limit on the immediate approach to the existing 30mph speed limit school. JS said that NOL was aware of these two suggestions from TRIAG and thanked him for referencing this in paragraph 4.1 in his report.

JS stated there were two other aspects relation to a zebra crossing and a School Crossing Patroller. In relation to the zebra crossing, JS confirmed that the Action Group were not too sure about this because the group had no data to assess. If the request for a zebra crossing continued, TRAIG would recommend that data was necessary to understand the number of people that crossed the road at this location. A feasibility study would be required to look at the return of an any investment to put in a formal crossing. JS felt this was an aspect that was missing

from NOL's report. JS therefore requested that this should be one of the recommendations to enable the possibility of a zebra crossing to be ruled in or ruled out **(Action LG/02)**.

With regards to the second point concerning a School Crossing Patroller, JS stated that the School Sustainable Travel team had confirmed that they were unable to deliver a Patroller as they were unable to afford it, but recommended a third party sponsorship which JS thought was a sensible suggestion. JS suggested this be pursued and if a School Crossing Patroller could be sponsored by a third party, it might reduce the need for the more expensive zebra crossing. He also requested this feature in the Recommendations as well. **(Action LG/03)**

On the point of the zebra crossing, MW thought that to manage expectations, that like the chicane, zebra crossings were notoriously expensive. JS agreed and said they could cost a six figure sum due to the complexity and amount of work that was necessary. It was not just a case of painting black and white stripes on the road surface.

Alison Mueller (AM) referred back to the conversation around the speed data. AM asked if it would be possible to include in the submission or was there a period time that the data was collected from. NOL stated that it depended on how far back the data went. If the data was three to four years old it probably wouldn't be taken as being representative of what's happening now. NOL reiterated that Community Speed Watch data was a really powerful too when applied and regularly kept up.

NOL reported that for speeds and limit changes, the data collected from the loops was over 24 hours, for a seven day period and would collect every vehicle that passed. Community Speed Watch data was taken over periods during a day.

AM referred to JS's discussion concerning the cost of funding a Patroller and asked how much it would be. JS recommended that she make contact with the School Crossing Patrollers lead officer at Buckinghamshire Council to find out the potential cost, but said it would include the uniform, the stop signs and wages. JB to confirm the officer contact details **(Action LG/04)**.

Tim MacGillivray (TM ) reported that the Parish Council had issues with MVAS's where the batteries were stolen in a space of three days. All three new units were down and had taken time to get the repairs completed. TM stated that one of the units was opposite Slad Lane, which was catching all the traffic coming in from New Road, Walters Ash. TM thought that the data he sent SS was quite late but was collected in April 2023. He however thought that the data reflected the information already given and believed that in the region of 22% of drivers were going over 35mph to 40mph, and 22% plus were driving at 35mph to 45mph. TM added that as SS had stated, you have a sweeping bend that's 60mph, and then as you came round the bend it's 30mph, and then within 150 yards you are at the school. You have to slam on your brakes which was unsafe. During very congested times, TM confirmed that people parked on the left hand side.

TM stated that if more data was required he could supply this. The data sent by SS yesterday reflected the same speeds.

Gary Hall (GH) confirmed that he had much sympathy on this matter. He believed there was a big problem and was made even worse when there were parked cars along Main Road by the school because people had freehand to come into the village and just carry on speeding. GH felt there was nothing to break that speed and had encouraged AM to set up the Community Speed Watch after the accident a year or so ago. Although GH didn't like what they had done in Chinnor, he felt that kind of barrier as you come into the village that stopped the traffic and gave priority to oncoming traffic was exactly what was need in Lacey Green at the end of the village. GH stated that there was no budget in Buckinghamshire Council but maybe the Parish Council and other external funders could fund something like this. GH added that a physical barrier to stop the traffic as it came into the village was the only answer.

Cathryn Davies (CD) confirmed that the Parish Council had looked at chicanes and other possible solutions over the years, but the fact they were on a main bus stop route of the 300 bus that went through the village, north and south every 20 minutes, and a working farm in the middle of the village that transported muck hay straw up to 10 times per day, was putting the Parish Council off. CD wasn't sure what the Council would think of chicanes with heavy vehicles going and up and down all the time.

NOL responded and said that any measures would be developed to support the movements in the area, and particularly in rural areas the Design team would make an allowance to ensure that heavy vehicles could get through. The trade off however was that it would be easy for normal vehicles to get through, so not as effective as you would like.

CD acknowledged this, but on another point, which she hadn't raised with NOL, was that she had tried to contact an officer in Buckinghamshire Council about six to nine months ago, concerning three trevello strips which had been put down. The RAF, Buckinghamshire Council, Bradenham Parish Council had all denied any knowledge of these strips and Lacey Green didn't implement this work. CD thought a lot of information on how fast the traffic was going past the RAF base, and how long it took them to get to 60mh plus into the national speed limit zone had been collected, but by who?

CD stated that the data SS had presented from the village, was as TM said, four years of valuable information, including a trevello strip which was put down. She advised that just opposite or just outside Slad Lane, the information collected would give a fair indication that cars coming to the village that hit that 30mph zone were over the speed limit because they didn't have a chance to slow down. CD mentioned that when SS submitted the petition she couldn't find anywhere to download any data to back up what she was doing. CD reported that the Parish Council didn't know

she could and nobody from the Council advised that there should be more information to back up her petition.

CD reported that the Parish Council with Buckinghamshire Council had put down all the yellow lines two or three years ago, but because they were not enforced, people now ignored them and they just parked where they liked. The Parish Council spent tens of thousands of pounds so this was not helpful. Thames Valley Police won't enforce because it's a parking problem and Buckinghamshire Council haven't got the resources.

CD advised that she was not keen on putting in chicanes or anything else if the solution was not enforceable and stressed that the Parish Council had been trying for 20 years to get something done about the speeding through the village.

SS stated that in her petition she had referenced having a zebra crossing to mainly help people cross the road and to slow the traffic down. However, SS said that she was not an expert, but if someone had a better solution she would be open to it, as long as it resolved the speeding issue.

In terms of farm traffic, SS confirmed that she had met with the local farmer – the West family. SS said they would completely be in support of any kind of road safety measures because they had problems with access to their field on Slad Lane as it was constantly blocked with school traffic. She added that the school was getting bigger and there wasn't enough parking. The school had advised that around 70% of children now came from outside the area. SS agreed with CD that a long term solution needed to be agreed.

SS added that she hoped that the speed on New Road was reduced to 40mph as it would encourage people to walk. She reported that Naphill and Walters Ash School had in their new travel plan an initiative for families to walk and cycle to school and park further up the road. At the moment no one would do that because it's 60mph.

SS confirmed she'd had contacted Buckinghamshire Council to try and use the Speen Bus as part of the Spare Seat Scheme. The bus picked up children free of charge from Speen, went past the Pink and Lily and then returned. One of the ideas was to stop by the Whip Pubic House to collect the children from Loosley Row or that end of Princes Risborough, and then continue down to the school to try and move the parking to different areas of the village. SS stated that Countrywide Coaches said they would do this free of charge but then Buckinghamshire Council said they wanted to charge. She thought that no one would want to pay when they could park two minutes down the road.

MW acknowledged this and thanked SS for her impressive piece of work.

With regards to the chicane idea, TM asked where this would be located because the main issue was the sweeping bend. TM believed that the traffic should be slowed before the chicane because of the speed of the traffic.

Carl Etholen (CE) confirmed that he, Shade Adoh and Robert Carington had a meeting scheduled with Mark Davies, the Parking Operations Manager, to discuss enforcement in Lacey Green. They also had a meeting with Mr Newton and Mr Bundock regarding the school bus from Speen. The proposal was to go to Princes Risborough (outside the George and Dragon) then pick up a number of students, visit other locations, and then drop off at the school. This would reduce the number of vehicles coming to the school. The number of collections would need to be agreed. CE understood that a sizeable bus was used with only 15 pupils transported.

CE also thought that with regards to the speed limit reduction, 50 mph was the answer from Walters Ash, right through to the 30mph zone.

CE stated that this obviously came at a cost, but as discussed by the TRIAG, it's the legal fees for changing the traffic regulation order which was expensive. CE said he had tried to contact the RAF to find out if they could contribute. However, RAF officer's continually moved on so it was difficult to keep a track on who to contact. CE said they had families that would probably like the idea of having speed reduction as many of their children would be attending the school.

Anne Followell (AF) informed the meeting that she had lived on the bend for 19 years and her children attended the school. She agreed that reducing the speed limit coming into the village would be a sensible option, but reported that a new nursery in Grimsditch had opened. The entrance to the nursery was on the bend on a single track driveway, so not only were cars pulling out, cars were coming in and had to check there was no oncoming vehicles to ensure there wasn't a head on collision. There were small children in pushchairs walking effectively on the road and crossing the bend to take their older children to school – this was increasing the risk. AF also advised that although additional data was required, it was a high risk area, particularly as planning permission for 11 properties had been granted in the entrance with no footpath. She stated that everyone was concerned in terms of people using the road and pedestrians accessing the village amenities.

AF stated she was also concerned on the idea of a zebra crossing, only because of children having to cross the road with no footpath on the end. SS thought that the crossing would be located near the church, so a footpath would have to be added.

David Carroll (DC) advised that he knew the area very well and that a number of residents had contacted him and raised their concerns. He also agreed with what JS and CE had said. DC asked what the procedure would be to reduce the speed from 60mph to 40mph.

SS tabled a further comment on the road where AF lived. She confirmed that they couldn't do Community Speed Watch in this location because it was too close to where the speed limited changed so they placed trevello strips there instead. SS thought that a 60mph to 50mph would not be suitable and felt it seemed sensible to continue with 40mph along that road.

NOL recommended that data be collected at the points where they would like the speed limit changed and then somewhere mid point to monitor driver habits. The data would then be analysed in terms of percentage above and maybe enforcement level. NOL said that they would also ask the Traffic Management Team at Thames Valley Police for their opinion, as well as other teams within Buckinghamshire Council.

NOL added that FT (Future of Transport) guidance was previously used which was quite binary. Buckinghamshire Highways would bring sustainable transport and planning teams into the equation to provide a better balance. NOL stated that it was not all about the vehicles and that other strategies were searched for which the Network Safety Team would not necessarily know about. For example, if there were plans to place a new bridal way or new cycleway, the team may not know that information so a more holistic approach on the speed would be sought. NOL informed the group that the process was on Buckinghamshire Council's website.

Mel Biswas (MB) referred to the point CD had made around enforcement and the yellow lines, which she felt had helped a great deal. MB stated that she regularly walked passed this spot and noted the near misses. MB also noted that it was the same few vehicles parking on or near the bend which were causing the issues. MB said that she had taken a number photo's and had quite a lot of data. She also commented on those vehicles parking on yellow lines and said they should be stopped, and that a speed reduction would reduce the risk of collision.

In response to MB's view, SS stated that some schools in Buckinghamshire had ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) cameras to catch people parking on zig zags. She wondered if this would be an option. MB thought this was a costly solution and would not stop those individuals. She also wondered who funded these camera's. MW asked what school's SS was referring to. SS confirmed they were outside Hamilton School in High Wycombe and that new locations were being investigated. She also thought camera's were used at Great Marlow School and Wycombe High School as well. MW asked SS to share any information she had with JB (**Action LG/05**).

In terms of enforcement, SB stated that if MB had photo's which showed times and dates and those that evidenced patterns, this would help the enforcement team on the best way to target their activities. SB also thought it would helpful if this information was passed to CE due to the specific work he was doing, so if there was a pattern, the enforcement team could enforce in places that were less visible locally (**Action LG/06**).

With regards to the camera's, SB confirmed that there was a legal process which assess any infringements. SB stated that camera's tended to be on zig zags and outside schools and that requests for local suggestions had been made. Even though Bucks was one of the first counties outside London to install these camera's, a traffic regulation change was required for each. SB said that a public consultation would

also be necessary to get the camera installed. Therefore, if there was a problem with parking on zig zags, SB stated that CE and his Ward Members could suggest a camera in the area. SB stated that people should understand that there is a warning first to offending drivers and a fine thereafter. MB confirmed that she had dates, times and road positions in relation to the yellow lines etc.

MD reported that she did not remember the model and number plates of cars for the regular offenders but believed it was the same people. SB advised that the camera could not deliberately focus on an individual or car.

SS advised that the data sent before the meeting had dates and times of vehicles parking on zig zags etc., as well as weekends when those attending the Sports and Social Club blocked up the road. SB suggested that this information be passed to CE who could review during his meeting with Mark Davies.

CD asked if NOL could have a meeting with the Parish Council and SS so that it could agreed exactly where the traffic data should be collected from. NOL said he would be happy to **(Action LG/07)**.

MW asked JB what the next steps would be. JB stated that primarily further speed data should be collected and any photo's and other supporting evidence should be submitted by **any individual** attending the meeting to NOL and JB **(Action LG/01)**.

#### **Summary of the actions discussed:**

**Action LG/01:** As above.

**Action LG/02:** To rule in or rule out the feasibility and cost of a zebra crossing. **NOL** to add to the Recommendations in the report.

**Action LG/03:** If a School Crossing Patroller could be sponsored by a third party, it might reduce the need for the more expensive zebra crossing. **NOL** to feature this in the Recommendations in the report.

**Action LG/04:** **JB** to provide the lead officer details to SS and AM who manages the School Crossing Patrollers at Buckinghamshire Council.

**Action LG/05:** **SS** to share any information she has with JB on schools that maintain an ANPR.

**Action LG/06:** **MB** to provide CE with the photo's of vehicles parking on the zig zag etc.

**Action LG/07:** **NOL, CD and SS** to arrange a meeting to agree suitable locations to place trevello strips.

**In addition - Action LG/08:** **SS** to consider Recommendations 2, 3 and 4.

MW thanked everyone from Lacey Green for attending. MW said it was very useful and thanked everyone for the valuable work that had been undertaken. MW stated that the Community Board would assist in the journey to make this location safer for everyone to use.

## **6 Petition - Radnage School Safety**

As the Lead Petitioner did not attend this meeting, MW asked the Community Board

if they had any questions.

JS stated that the Parish Council attended a TRIAG meeting a few months back to present their concerns with the traffic around the school. Their petition was largely the product of that discussion.

JS advised that one of things TRIAG suggested was the use of yellow amber flashing lights that could be placed either side of the school during pick up and drop off times. JS said this would draw motorists attention to the fact that they were approaching a school. JS thought this was a good idea but did not see any reference to this in the petition report.

JS confirmed that TRIAG also suggested removing the road centre line and putting edge lines down. JS added that NOL was aware of these, so any future work should look at these to take a view on whether they were feasible and appropriate. NOL stated these were included in Recommendation 1.

MW asked if the Community Board had anything further to add. As no one did, MW advised that the Community Board was happy to agree the recommendations **(Action RS/01)**.

**Summary of the actions discussed:**

**Action RS/01: Cris Everett (Lead Petitioner)** to consider Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4.

MW then thanked NOL for all his hard work and said he found it useful.

**7 Meeting Close**

MW thanked the Board members for attending and then closed the meeting at 7.30pm.

This page is intentionally left blank



## North West Chilterns Community Board minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the North West Chilterns Community Board held on Thursday 14 September 2023 in Via MS Teams, commencing at 6.00 pm and concluding at 6.25 pm.

### **BC Councillors present**

M Walsh (Chairman), C Etholen (Vice-Chairman), S Broadbent, D Hayday, O Hayday and A Turner

### **Town/Parish Councils and other organisations present**

J Rogers (Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council), P Spence (Hughenden Residents' Association), J Stevens (Lead of the Transport and Road Issues Action Group, J Binning (Buckinghamshire Council).

### Agenda Item

#### **1 Chairman's Welcome/Purpose of the meeting**

Matthew Walsh (MW) (Chairman of the North West Chilterns Community Board – NWC CB) welcomed everyone to the meeting to discuss the NWC Active Travel Aspirations document.

MW informed the CB that the meeting would be recorded for the purposes of JB writing the notes. Once the notes had been approved the recording would be destroyed.

#### **2 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Buckinghamshire Council Councillors Robert Carington, David Carroll, Shade Adoh, Councillor Valerie McPherson, Longwick cum Ilmer Parish Council, Councillor Stan Jones, Hughenden Parish Council, Councillor Cathryn Davies, Lacey Green Parish Council, Councillor James Cripps, Great and Little Kimble Parish Council, Councillor Helen Holman, Ellesborough Parish Council, Sophie Payne, Service Director, Wendy Morgan-Brown, Head of Community Boards, Makayla Devlin, Senior Community Board Manager and Nicola Surman, Funding and Support Team Leader.

#### **3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **4 NWC Active Travel Aspirations Document**

Jim Stevens (JS) (Lead of the Transport and Road Issues Action Group) presented a shortened and modified version of the presentation carried out during the Community Board meeting on 27.07.23 – see attached.

JS stated that there were two recommendations which were part of today's presentation. One was to support and adopt the document, and the second was to formally request Buckinghamshire Council (BC) to use the document to help develop BC's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and to make our document available on BC's website.

JS then presented his slides – the key highlights were as follows:

- “Wheeling” was referred to as this was a specific point raised by Steven Broadbent (SB), Cabinet Member for Transport during the NWC CB meeting on 27.07.23. JS stated that although wheeling was already referred to in the document, it was important to make it clear to the Community Board that our document was about Cycling, Walking and Wheeling.
- The NWC Active Travel Aspirations document would complement and support BC's Strategic LCWIP and would provide local information and evidence for those who were interested in cycling, walking and wheeling in the North West Chilterns area of Buckinghamshire.
- The NWC Active Travel Aspirations document contained nine maps but, for brevity, only Map 1 was presented to the Community Board. JS described the map and that it showed local aspirations for inter settlement routes within the North West Chilterns area. These had been developed from various sources, including from feedback received through the consultation carried out with Community Board members earlier this year.
- As an example of content, JS highlighted the active travel cycling, walking and wheeling link from Hughenden Valley, Cryers Hill to High Wycombe and beyond. He also highlighted the A4010 Active Travel Route from High Wycombe through to Stoke Mandeville which was a continuous route with no gaps. JS said this particular route along the A4010 would facilitate active travel movements from all of the new developments around Aylesbury, High Wycombe, Princes Risborough and surrounding areas and was therefore very important.

JS advised that his presentation was to facilitate the discussions at this meeting and referred back to the recommendations to the NWC CB.

## **5 NWC Active Travel Aspirations Document - Question Time**

MW thanked JS for his presentation and asked the Community Board if they had any questions.

SB also thanked JS for the presentation and to TRAIG for putting the document together. He then referred to section 7 in the document where he thought it was trying to set out policies. For example, SB confirmed that there were references to how road repairs across the County should have a different prioritisation. He added

that BC had a very clear highways safety inspection policy relating to highway maintenance, and new ways of working had been submitted to Community Boards, enabling them to manage this issue. SB stated that parking and roads were a Planning matter and asked JS if the document could reference its concerns instead of suggesting a different policy should in place. SB advised that policy making was down to Cabinet Members through full Council. He stressed that he would not be able to sign up to this document if it said that we must change some of our policies in our area and beyond it.

JS confirmed that he had no issue with amending the document and already fully understood that the Action Group were not in a position to set policies. JS stated that the Action Group's work could however provide a very local perspective to help policy reviews conducted by Buckinghamshire Council. JS said that he would be happy to add an introductory paragraph to section 7 and would review the wording of each paragraph of section 7 to ensure consistency with the introductory paragraph. **(Action 01)**.

## **6 NWC Active Travel Aspirations Document - Vote on Recommendations**

MW thanked SB and JS who both had made important points. MW then went to the vote and requested the CB indicated with a "thumbs up".

Before the vote was taken, SB confirmed that he was happy to express a view on Recommendation 1 and only on Recommendation 2 if it was about making a "request". MW stated the vote was about the NWC CB agreeing to "request."

MW then asked the NWC CB for who was in favour. JB informed the Board that Cathryn Davies, Lacey Green Parish Council was in favour but Councillor Robert Carington was not in favour.

MW counted the votes and confirmed that there was a clear majority in favour and said we would take this as approved and that the NWC Active Travel Aspirations document would be submitted to BC as part of the recommendations.

JB asked if the Community Board would like to view the document with the changes before it was submitted. MW advised that he would as he wanted to ensure that all members were happy with the wording **(Action 02)**.

### **Summary of actions raised during the meeting:**

**Action 01:** JS to update section 7 of the NWC Active Travel Aspirations Document around policy setting – i.e., reference the Community Board concerns instead of suggesting a different policy should in place.

**Action 02:** JB to circulate the revised document to the NWC CB. Once the revised wording has been formally agreed, JS/JB will submit the document to BC.

## **7 Meeting close**

The meeting was then closed at 6.25 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Report to North West Chilterns Community Board

<b>Date:</b>	23 November 2023
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Response to ePetition - School Bus for Lord Williams</b>
<b>Cabinet Member(s):</b>	Councillor Stephen Broadbent, Cabinet Member for Transport
<b>Contact officer:</b>	Neil Beswick, Head of Client Transport
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>That the North West Chilterns Community Board notes the Council's statutory duty to provide school transport only for eligible students as defined by the council's Home to School Transport Policy</b>
<b>Reason for recommendation:</b>	The Council only provides home to school transport for students who are eligible to receive it under statutory legislation.

### 1. Executive summary

- 1.1 A petition was submitted by the parents of students from the Princes Risborough area attending Lord Williams School in Thame.
- 1.2 The petition requested that the council arrange transport for students to school after the withdrawal of a commercially operated local bus service that students previously travelled on.
- 1.3 The students concerned are not eligible for council funded transport as described under Buckinghamshire Council's [Home to School Transport Policy](#) as they are not attending their nearest suitable school.

### 2. Report

- 2.1 School transport between the Princes Risborough area and Lord Williams School in Thame was previously provided on a commercial basis by public bus operator Redline of Aylesbury.

The main purpose of the service was to convey Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) students who were eligible for school transport to Lord Williams School. OCC funded the cost of transport for these students.

Buckinghamshire Council did not and has never provided any financial support for this service, from either the local public transport budget or the home to school transport budget.

- 2.2 The vehicle being used by operator who was taking on the OCC contract, Redline, has to pass close to the Princes Risborough area on the way to the first pick up point for OCC's students.

Redline were aware that there was interest from parents in the Princes Risborough area for transport to Lord Williams School, so took the commercial decision to commence the bus service from Princes Risborough on a commercial basis at their own financial risk.

- 2.3 OCC retendered the section of the route that provided transport for their eligible students, and the operator of the winning tender stated that they couldn't replicate the commercial section of the route, meaning Buckinghamshire students who weren't eligible for council funded school transport were left without a bus service.

One of the parents affected by the withdrawal of the commercial service contacted the Council on 26 July 2023 providing details of the number of students affected, 13, and to ask that the council engage with OCC to get the commercial section of the route reinstated.

- 2.4 In response officers from Transport Services requested that OCC ask the new operator to reinstate the commercial section of the route, but unfortunately OCC advised that they were not in a position to be able to support this request as they were focused on the statutory requirement to provide transport for their eligible students.

- 2.5 Transport Services also provided the parents with a list of contact details for operators who currently carry out work for the Council, in case the parents wished to arrange their own transport.

- 2.6 There were no feasible options to offer the students a '[spare seat](#)' for purchase on a Buckinghamshire Council contracted service as there were no services to Lord Williams from the affected areas. The only option would have been to contract a new service, primarily for non-eligible students, which would not be in accordance with the Home to School Transport Policy. Transport Officers held regular discussions

with their counterparts from OCC during August and September to try and find a solution, but by the start of the new academic year there was no transport in place.

- 2.7 In March 2019 Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) Cabinet agreed the Policy that now forms the basis of the current Home to School Transport Policy. This included an associated decision to implement the Policy through the rationalisation of the Council's directly provided school bus routes, so that the Council now only pays for bus contracts to provide transport for eligible children. Non eligible children are able to purchase tickets directly from commercial bus operators on routes which provide transport to schools, where they are in place.
- 2.8 In early October, OCC informed the council that the transport operator who had originally won their tender had decided that they didn't wish to continue after the half term break, and the contract would now be awarded to Redline, the previous operator who had provided the commercial extension of the route from Princes Risborough.
- 2.9 The representatives of the parent group were made aware of the this positive news on 10 October by Transport Services, with the offer that Officers would provide an 'introduction' between the parents and the operator.
- 2.10 The operator and parents have subsequently communicated, and the new service is due to commence from Monday 06 November and will provide a transport option for students travelling from Princes Risborough to Lord Williams School.

### **3. Other options considered.**

- 3.1 The council could have contracted a service to provide transport for the students, but as they are not eligible for transport under the Council's Home to School Transport Policy, and following the decision taken by BCC Cabinet in March 2019, this would have been against the approved Council policy.

### **4. Legal and financial implications**

- 4.1 The council's Home to School Transport Policy has been developed in accordance with the legislative framework set out under the Education Act 1996 and current Government guidance.
- 4.2 The Education Act 1996 provides the following duties and powers on local authorities:
- duty to promote sustainable modes of travel to meet school travel needs - s.508A

- duty to make necessary travel arrangements free of charge to secure suitable home to school travel arrangements for eligible children. Eligibility includes age, distance to school, disability and safe walking routes - S.508B
- power to make necessary school travel arrangements for other children on payment of a charge as appropriate - s.508C
- power to provide travel assistance or travel expenses for children attending early years education, subject to eligibility criteria - s.509A
- duty to prepare a Post-16 transport policy statement setting out transport provision and financial assistance (where applicable) to facilitate attendance of sixth form students at educational institutions - s.509AA and s.509AB

## **5. Local councillors & community boards consultation & views**

### **5.1 The North West Chilterns Community Board's Transport and Road Issues Action Group submitted the following comment:**

“The North West Chilterns Community Board's Transport and Road Issues Action Group (TRIAG) empathises with the Petitioner concerns with the cessation of Oxfordshire County Council's Redline Bus school transport contract and the serious impact this will have on those families in Buckinghamshire that use this bus service. TRIAG also acknowledges the importance of Buckinghamshire Council's Home to School Transport policy in determining the provision of, and access to, home to school transport. TRIAG encourages Buckinghamshire Council Officers to actively and urgently work with Oxfordshire County Council officers to find an acceptable way forward on this matter.”

**North West Chilterns Community Board  
Community Resilience Action Group  
Briefing Report for Community Board Meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2023**

**Purpose:** This report provides a brief overview of the work undertaken by the Action Group since the Community Board Meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2023.

**Priority Objectives:** The group continue to look at the viewpoints of young and older people and crime and anti-social behaviour themes and maintain their focus on the objectives detailed below:

- To consider issues around health and wellbeing, including social isolation and loneliness.
- To improve quality of life and community cohesion between socially isolated/lonely and deprived young and older people
- To consider areas of crime and anti-social behaviour to create safer and connected communities.
- To consider any application regarding community resilience.

**Action Group:** Meetings are held every two to three months. A meeting was held on 9<sup>th</sup> August, the last one was held on 1<sup>st</sup> November and the next is planned for 17<sup>th</sup> January 2024.

**The group continue to work on:**

- Projects around disability: The Community Board approved the “Walk With Us Bucks” initiative with the National Trust – Hughenden, This is a walking project, which will involve young and older people, especially those who suffer with loneliness or vulnerability. The Community Board Manager is working with the Trust on all elements of this project, including the comms, transportation and the walking routes which will have varying difficulties.
- Community Garden: This has been named as the “Orchard View Farm Community Garden” and will be led by Valerie McPherson with a number of keen volunteers. The Community Board will though continue to be linked with the garden.

Lots of work has been carried out in removing the thistles and weeds, and when the weather permits, the land will be renovated. As detailed in previous reports, Briants have kindly agreed to donate the posts and chicken wire, so the garden will be ready for planting next spring.

- Horse Therapy: As mentioned in previous reports, the Horses Trusts in Speen would like to collaborate with the Community Board on a project which works with young and older people with disabilities, and/or in need of therapy with horses. The action group are still trying to source a facilitator, which was requested by the Trust, and it is hoped through a recent contact put forward, that this can be fulfilled.

**Pre-applications – the following are being discussed with:**

- Bucks Music on a singing and music initiation for primary school children and older adults (this is an action group initiative).
- Kherpra Org, an education and learn to cook project, targeted at families, particularly those on a limited budget.
- Bledlow Village Hall for new play equipment.
- Hell Fire Motor Vehicle Club (HFMVC), a club which supports the health and wellbeing of men, is looking at a number of proposals which include activities and events which members can attend, and the renovation of a workshop where individuals can work on their cars, (many of which are collectables/vintage) and enjoy great conversation and collaboration.
- The Repair Barn, Princes Risborough, who are thinking of converting one of their barns to hold motorbike and record memorabilia, for enthusiasts to meet to enjoy conversation, repair their bikes and mull over the collection of records – much like the HFMVC.

The Community Board Manager has linked the Repair Barn and HFMVC together as they may be able to help each other.

It is hoped that funding applications will be received from Bucks Music, Kherpra Org and Bledlow Village Hall by 31<sup>st</sup> December when the application system closes.

**Chairman: Cllr Valerie McPherson BEM**

**North West Chilterns Community Board**  
**Environmental and Climate Change Action Group**  
**Briefing Report for Community Board Meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2023.**

**Purpose:** This report provides a brief overview of the work undertaken by the Action Group since the Community Board Meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2023.

**Priority Objectives:** The Action Group continue to focus on the following:

- To prioritise schemes and initiatives that help achieve and inform the Council's Climate Change and Air Quality Strategy.
- To seek and support schemes that have a sustainable and lasting effect on the North West Chilterns area, improve the built or rural environment, reduce the impacts and increase awareness of climate change, and reverse environmental damage.
- To consider any application in regards to the environment and climate change.

**Action Group:** The Action Group aim to meet bi-monthly; a meeting was held on 2<sup>nd</sup> August, the last one was held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2023 and the next is planned for 13<sup>th</sup> December 2023. Its agendas cover a mix of policy, strategic and fundraising related matters, many of which have been delegated to the group by the Community Board or raised by local councils, the public or by members of the group.

**The group continue to work on:**

- Identifying suitable locations with Town and Parish Council's for tree planting in streets and public spaces.
- Encouraging schemes looking at Wildflower planting.
- Looking at options to install Electric Vehicle charging points in public areas.

**Pre-applications – the following are being discussed with:**

- Stokenchurch Scouts on a proposed pond renovation project.
- The Environment team at Buckinghamshire Council on a Carbon Literacy training proposal for Town and Parish Council's, groups and organisations (this is an action group initiative). This training provides an awareness of the carbon dioxide costs and impacts of everyday activities, and the ability and motivation to reduce emissions, on an individual, community and organisational basis.
- Piddington & Wheeler End Parish Council on a Wildflower project on Chipps Hill.
- Red Kite Housing Association on a Community Nature Reserve on Eastwood Road.
- Chiltern Society on a Cycling Signage proposal.
- Great Kingshill Village Hall on an energy efficiency lighting project.
- St Michael & All Angels on a wildflower scheme on the grounds surrounding the church.

It is hoped that funding applications will be received by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2023, when the application system closes.

The Action Group continue to pursue their spreadsheet which highlights potential areas and objectives where it is felt the group could encourage further applications.

**Chairman: Cllr Robert Carington**

**North West Chilterns Community Board**  
**Economic Regeneration & Development Action Group**  
**Briefing Report for Community Board Meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2023**

**Purpose:** This report provides a brief overview of the work undertaken by the Action Group since the Community Board Meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2023.

**Priority Objectives:** The Action Group continue to focus on the following:

- To seek schemes and initiatives that support new and existing local businesses (urban and rural).
- To prioritise schemes and initiatives that help achieve the Council's Climate Change and Air Quality Strategy.
- To consider any adhoc application in regards to Economic Regeneration & Development.

**Action Group:** The last meeting was on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2023. Meetings are normally held quarterly (approximately) , but due to various reasons, the last was held on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2023.

Progress on actions since the last Community Board meeting are as follows:

- **Business Networking Event** – The event will be held on 29<sup>th</sup> February 2024. The group originally agreed with the Economic Development team at Buckinghamshire Council (BC) that the event would be held in October 2023. However, it was later felt that this may be unrealistic as the Visitor Economic Strategy had to be go through Cabinet and timescales would be tight.

Matthew Broadbent, Senior Economic Development Officer, confirmed on 9<sup>th</sup> November that the Strategy was due to go to Cabinet on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2023.

The comms material has been produced. The promotion of the event will start week commencing 20<sup>th</sup> November 2023. The Community Board Manager will contact all local businesses, promote on Facebook and place flyers in venues where a community board exists. Visit Bucks have also offered to help publicise.

Town and Parish Council's will also be invited, as Ruth Bryant, BC's Film Officer, will be presenting the various opportunities that are available to them, as well as other organisation's.

- **Reducing Energy Consumption** – The Action Group are currently focusing its efforts on helping local businesses reduce their energy usage.

Bucks Business First (BBF) have recently secured funding from the UK Shared Prosperity Fund to support Buckinghamshire Businesses (incl those in the NWC Community Board) on reducing their Carbon Footprint.

The Shared Prosperity Fund could also support for example, new refrigerated equipment, which would lower energy bills for our businesses. BBF will be contacted to find out if a proposal for reducing energy consumption can be agreed.

- **Carbon Footprinting for Local Businesses** - The action group have discussed how they could make local businesses more aware of their own carbon footprint and understand how to reduce it. The Environment and Climate Action Group are considering the Carbon Literacy Training that the Environment Team at BC have produced. It is hoped that this will be piloted and will include an invitation to businesses to attend). Note: see the Environment and Climate Action Group report for further information.

In addition, an initiative in providing local businesses with practical information about what actions are possible (including adaptation) and what the risks and opportunities are, is something the group will consider after they have investigated the proposal in terms of reducing energy consumption for organisations.

- The action group will continue to explore other sources of data that evidence the needs of local business, organisations and individuals and research other possible project opportunities.

**Chairman: Cllr Matthew Walsh**

**Community Board – North West Chilterns**  
**Transport and Road Issues Action Group**  
**Briefing Report for the Community Board – 23 November 2023**

**Purpose:** This report provides a brief overview of the work undertaken by the Transport and Road Issues Action Group (TRIAG) since the Community Board Meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2023.

**Action Group Concerns:**

Since April 2023, TRIAG has been instructed not to contact Buckinghamshire Highways due to the changeover to new contract arrangements. This is affecting TRIAG's work significantly and to some extent, its enthusiasm. There is no clarity at the moment when things might change.

**Priority Objectives:**

TRIAG has 4 Priority Objectives. These were described in detail in the last briefing report and in summary they are:

1. Provide informed, local input into applications, consultations and petitions, in regard to transport and road issues. Ensure correct procedures are followed and an appropriate response obtained.
2. Improve road safety for all road users.
3. Improve the environment.
4. Continue to feed back TRIAG's work on delivering these objectives to Bucks Council to inform their decision makers and secure appropriate responses, remedies and actions.

**Recent Work:**

- TRIAG's Active Travel Aspirations Document was approved by the Community Board in September 2023.
- TRIAG's top 3 inter-settlement Active Travel Routes, described in the document, have been accepted for inclusion in the Countywide and High Wycombe LCWIP's. The top 3 routes are:
  - A4010 full length (Stoke Mandeville to High Wycombe, via Princes Risborough)
  - Princes Risborough to Longwick
  - A40 Stokenchurch to High Wycombe.
- The Council's Head of Public Transport attended a TRIAG meeting in August. A very broad ranging and positive discussion was held on local bus services and gaps in provision.

**Chairman:** Jim Stevens

This page is intentionally left blank

## November 2023 Update from Buckinghamshire Council for Community Boards

### Local Plan – progress and next steps

The Local Plan for Buckinghamshire (LP4B) provides a major opportunity to shape the growth of Buckinghamshire over the next 15 years and beyond. It will identify areas for new housing and employment, while also designating areas for protection and enhancement, such as our valued landscapes, natural habitats and heritage.

Earlier this year we carried out a public engagement survey on the draft vision and objectives for the LP4B. We received about 700 responses to the Local Plan for Buckinghamshire Vision and Objectives which we are in the process of analysing and considering.

We have now published an [interactive map and basic details](#) of the 1,000 or so sites which were submitted in response to our two Calls for Brownfield Sites and our Wider Call for Sites. We are assessing these sites for their suitability, availability and achievability (including viability) to accommodate development. This work will help us to shape the first Buckinghamshire Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).

Our next local plan public engagement work is likely to take place in early 2024, subject to Cabinet approval. This will be on possible high-level growth scenarios for the spatial distribution of new development to meet assessed levels of housing and employment need.

\*\*\*

### PickMeUp expands to Flackwell Heath

Wycombe's PickMeUp on-demand bus service, introduced by Buckinghamshire Council to reach residents not serviced by regular bus routes, has expanded to include Flackwell Heath. The expansion will help improve links from Flackwell Heath to Loudwater, Cressex, Booker and other parts of town.

Launched as a pilot in September 2022, it is funded by a three-year, central Government Rural Mobility Fund grant. It has proved popular, providing 1,500 rides per week and running Monday to Friday from 6am to 7pm.

Now after reviewing how the service is being used, and in response to requests from the local community, the council and operator Carousel Buses are pleased to extend the benefits of the service to many more potential passengers.

An additional vehicle will now operate at the morning and afternoon peak to keep up with demand. Fares reflect other local bus services and bus tickets such as Wycombe Smart Zone tickets and Concessionary Bus Passes are valid.

Bookings are made in advance via the PickMeUp High Wycombe app or by calling 01494 296021 to arrange a convenient nearby pickup point.

[www.pickmeupwycombe.co.uk](http://www.pickmeupwycombe.co.uk)

\*\*\*

## **Cost of Living update**

### **Community Food Chain Campaign**

The Helping Hand team has recently launched the Community Food Chain Campaign which aims to increase public food bank donations and raise awareness of volunteering opportunities available at local food support organisations. You can find out more here – <https://www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/campaign/community-food-chain/>

If you would be interested in finding out how you can support this campaign please contact Hannah Tomlin, Food Lead Co-ordinator, Helping Hand Team – [hannah.tomlin@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:hannah.tomlin@buckinghamshire.gov.uk)

### **Helping Hand team/ MEAM referrals**

The Helping Hand team has identified a cohort of residents who are within Opportunity Bucks areas and have made a high number of applications for support from the team. With their agreement, these residents have been referred on to our Making Every Adult Matter (MEAM) Team who can offer intensive support to develop a better understanding of the challenges these residents are facing and help to connect them with additional services who can further support them.

### **Welcoming Spaces**

There are locations throughout the county, including Buckinghamshire libraries and community venues such as churches and halls, that have continued to offer a Welcoming Space to residents throughout the summer months.

Now that we are moving into autumn we are looking at ways in which Welcoming Spaces can again offer residents warm and friendly places to go and meet with others this coming winter. More information on resources and guidance for setting up a Welcoming Space will be available shortly.

If you have any queries in the meantime please contact Laura Davies, Operations Manager, [laura.davies@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:laura.davies@buckinghamshire.gov.uk)

### **Energy Doctor**

Buckinghamshire Council has introduced a new Energy Doctor scheme as one of the initiatives funded by its allocation of the Government's UK Shared Prosperity Fund.

Under the scheme, domestic resource efficiency officers are visiting qualifying homes to assess and advise on measures that can reduce energy consumption and costs.

The team also installs suitable low-cost measures in homes such as draught proofing, hot water cylinder insulation jackets, reflective radiator panels, secondary glazing film and LED lights.

To qualify for an Energy Doctor visit, applicants must meet all of the following criteria:

- They rent the property through a private rental agreement, or own and live in the property
- The household has an income of £30,000 or less (before tax), is in receipt of means-tested benefits such as Universal Credit and Council Tax Support, or a member of the household is disabled
- The domestic property has an energy performance certificate (EPC) rating of D, E, F or G, or does not legally require an EPC

To find out more about the Energy Doctor scheme, and to request a visit, go to the [council's website](#).

### **Revenues and Benefits**

Council tax collection remains on target despite obvious pressures in the community and as a result additional funding is being made available to the discretionary housing payment fund to support residents who may have one-off difficulties preventing them paying their rent.

\*\*\*

## **Buckinghamshire Council consultations**

Current consultations and surveys from Buckinghamshire Council are available to view on our website <https://yourvoicebucks.citizenspace.com/>

This page is intentionally left blank