



Notice of a meeting of Council

Monday, 27 March 2017
2.30 pm
Council Chamber - Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Chris Ryder (Chairman), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Matt Babbage, Paul Baker, Garth Barnes, Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Flo Clucas, Chris Coleman, Mike Collins, Bernard Fisher, Wendy Flynn, Tim Harman, Steve Harvey, Colin Hay, Rowena Hay, Karl Hobley, Sandra Holliday, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Adam Lillywhite, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Paul McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Dan Murch, Chris Nelson, Tony Oliver, Dennis Parsons, John Payne, Louis Savage, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Pat Thornton, Jon Walklett, Simon Wheeler, Roger Whyborn, Max Wilkinson, Suzanne Williams and David Willingham

A Moment of Reflection

(to be led by the Mayor or the Mayor's Chaplain)

This will be of an inclusive nature. All Members are welcome to participate but need not do so.

Agenda

6.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on Tuesday 21 March.	(Pages 3 - 10)
7.	MEMBER QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on Tuesday 21 March	(Pages 11 - 18)

Contact Officer: Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, 01242 774937

Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Pat Pratley
Head of Paid Service

Council – 27 March 2017

Public Questions (13)

1.	Question from Michael S Barnes to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan (Hopes to attend)
	<p><u>Employment Land Allocation</u></p> <p>What was the evidenced employment land allocation level for Cheltenham stated in the 2014 draft plan and what is the level of employment land allocation now?</p>
	Response from the Leader
	<p>The amount of employment land allocated in the pre-submission version of the JCS in June 2014 was 64.2 hectares. Of this, an area was identified in Cheltenham Borough as part of Strategic Allocation A5 (North-West Cheltenham Urban Extension). This contains approximately 23.4 hectares of employment land to be delivered up to 2031 (10ha of which is to be for 'B' class uses' and, in terms of site area, is divided roughly 70%/30% between Tewkesbury and Cheltenham Boroughs as shown on the relevant indicative site Plan.</p> <p>Through the JCS examination this topic has been discussed in detail, and provision for 192 hectares of B class land within the plan period (between 2011 and 2031) has been agreed through the Joint Core Strategy. At least 84 hectares of the employment land allocated in the latest version of the JCS (main modifications – February 2017) is provided on strategic allocations. In Cheltenham the same area of land measuring 23.4 hectares is allocated for employment purposes as part of Strategic Allocation A5.</p> <p>In addition, a new strategic allocation has been made at West Cheltenham (Site Allocation A11 refers). This contains approximately 45 hectares of employment land to be delivered up to 2031 and, in terms of site area, is divided roughly 25%/75% between Tewkesbury and Cheltenham Boroughs respectively as shown on the relevant indicative site Plan. Main Modification Policies SP1 and 2 and their explanation text set out in detail how employment provision will be met across the three JCS authorities.</p>
2.	Question from Michael S Barnes to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p><u>Development inevitable</u></p> <p>Since Alex Chalk MP is strongly pushing for the Cyber Centre to be positioned in Cheltenham and now a sum of £22million has been ear marked, is it now inevitable that the development of the last of Cheltenham's greenspace will happen?</p>
	Response from the Leader
	<p>Development on the site is neither inevitable nor on the last of Cheltenham's green space.</p> <p>Policy A11 of the JCS (main modifications version – February 2017) identifies approximately 45 hectares of B-class led employment as part of the emerging West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation. This will be focussed upon a cyber-security hub and other high technology, and high 'Gross Value Added' job generating development and ancillary uses.</p> <p>Modifications to the JCS to allow for development of a strategic allocation at West Cheltenham</p>

	<p>constitute part of the emerging joint Core Strategy which was agreed by councils in February 2017. However hearings need to be held by an independent inspector to consider the changes in detail and to hear from residents and stakeholders. After this the inspector will write her final written findings and the councils will need to make any changes she requires for soundness before they can decide on whether to adopt the plan.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to the West Cheltenham allocation, it should be noted that significant areas of the site are being set aside for Green Infrastructure and that built development will not occur in these areas. The council is also currently funding work to look at the provision of Local Green Space in relation to the emerging allocation.</p> <p>The development of West Cheltenham is part of a wider, coherent land use strategy for the Borough being put in place through a combination of the JCS and the emerging Cheltenham Plan. Both these documents introduce strategies that embody a wide range of complimentary proposals to help steer development and achieve a sustainable future. Both plans should therefore be considered in their entirety and in this regard, it should be noted there exists a suite of policies designed to protect much of the natural environment and ensure that local communities continue to enjoy the multitude of benefits that the natural environment provides.</p>
3.	Question from Ann D Barnes to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan (Hopes to attend)
	<p><u>Cyber Shops</u></p> <p>Springbank has had local shops derelict for over 10 years. It is understood that the site is now being considered for housing. There have been many complaints regarding the lack of transport for the basic necessities for those who do not own a car or a computer. Are we expecting all to use cyber shopping? With some areas having little or no broadband how is losing the green fields going to help?</p>
	Response from the Leader
	<p>Sadly there has been no retail or community activity at Springbank Shopping Centre for more than 10 years. It has not proved possible to attract new users to the site and no commercial development proposals have been forthcoming during that time.</p> <p>The emerging Cheltenham Plan has designated the site as a potential housing allocation to help meet objectively assessed housing needs in the Borough up to 2031. The location is a sustainable one being situated within the Principal Urban Area (PUA) where there is a general presumption in favour of development.</p> <p>The site itself comprises entirely of previously developed brownfield land. It is central to the established community and benefits from nearby open space facilities, accessible public transport services, community resource facilities, and primary and secondary schools; all of which are within a short walk. In addition, Springbank Community Resource Centre contains a pharmacy, and a Neighbourhood Shopping Area containing local retail facilities exists in nearby Hester's Way.</p> <p>The future development proposed at West Cheltenham (strategic allocation A11 in the Joint Core Strategy) will provide new community facilities together with opportunities for high quality public transport links which will serve to improve connectivity throughout neighbourhoods in West Cheltenham including the Springbank Area.</p> <p>A strip of land will be safeguarded as part of the proposed Springbank allocation to facilitate the</p>

	possible future construction of a bus link between Pilgrove Way and Springbank Way. This would help knit together existing communities in the north and south which are currently physically separated in terms of vehicular access.
4.	Question from Ann D Barnes to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p><u>Local Employment</u></p> <p>The Cyber Centre will undoubtedly require specific and specialist talent. It is unlikely that the bulk of those being employed will be existing locals already living in the area. The Cyber Centre offers no benefit to current local employment or residents to any great degree. Will there be any direct links and scholarship programs with local schools and colleges to ensure opportunities can be satisfied locally?</p>
	Response from the Leader
	<p>The proposed strategic allocation at West Cheltenham, whilst focussed on cyber activity does not provide exclusively for the cyber industry and is actually B-class led as explained by Policy A11 of the JCS. This means that a wide range of employment uses could be accommodated which may form part of the supply chain to high technology industries.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the Council recognises the importance of the cyber industry and associated high 'Gross Value Added' jobs to increasing the prosperity of the area. It is important over time to shift the balance of jobs for school and university leavers toward higher skill and paid employment through focussed improvements in educational attainment and skills.</p> <p>The Local Enterprise Partnership is working with the University of Gloucestershire to improve the skills and knowledge economy in this regard, as well as attracting and retaining people currently holding these skills. It is also an area which the newly established Employment and Skills Board should address.</p> <p>One option being considered through the development of the Cheltenham Plan, and another way of helping to ensure that the resident workforce has the correct skills to match the requirements of local employers might be to introduce a policy which requires proposals for major housing development or major commercial development to include an Employment Skills Plan (ESP). Such plans would need to identify opportunities for the employment and skills development of local people through the implementation of the development proposal.</p> <p>The ESP would need to specify targets that conform to industry standard benchmarks expected from the particular size and type of construction proposed. Assuming this approach is supported in responses to the consultation on the Cheltenham Plan, then more information on this would be developed through the next stage of plan making (the pre-submission version of the Cheltenham Plan) due later this year. Further information on maximising opportunities presented by the cyber security industry can be found on pg. 11,12 and 28 of the Cheltenham Plan Part One Preferred Options Consultation Document.</p>
5.	Question from Mr Peter Holt to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>Where can I find a printed copy of the <u>latest</u> traffic impact assessment for the West Cheltenham site and has there been a combined impact assessment for the West & North West sites ? Where can a printed copy be found please ?</p>

	Response from the Leader
	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 32) states that all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment, which would be submitted with a planning application for the development. It will then be used to determine whether the transport impact of the development is acceptable.</p> <p>No planning application for West Cheltenham has yet been received and so we would not expect to have a traffic assessment at this time. However, through the Joint Core Strategy process we have been conducting modelling on the overall traffic impacts which includes sites at both West and North West Cheltenham. The latest work on this, and the emerging JCS transport strategy is available here http://www.gct-jcs.org/Examination/New-evidence-base-and-supporting-documents.aspx</p> <p>Further work to develop the transport modelling using the most recent model (known as the 2013 model) is ongoing, which will allow further development of the JCS transport strategy. The inspector's hearings on the JCS, expected in the summer are likely to discuss this new modelling further.</p>
6.	Question from Adrian Kingsbury to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>Please confirm :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What the total area of land under the control of Cheltenham Borough Council is Designated as Greenbelt? b) What the area of Greenbelt defined as West Cheltenham that is under the control of Cheltenham Borough Council is? c) What the area of Greenbelt considered to be Cheltenham Racecourse and is under the control of Cheltenham Borough Council is?
	Response from the Leader
	<p>The answers below are rounded to the nearest hectare, based on measuring existing maps of the areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 815ha (total green belt within the Cheltenham Borough boundary, taken from the current Local Plan mapped area); b) 86ha of the emerging West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation is within Cheltenham Borough; c) The Local Plan does not specifically define an area as the 'Cheltenham Racecourse', but the area around the racecourse itself is around 130ha.
7.	Question from Adrian Kingsbury to to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>The 2014 draft plan showed the West Cheltenham area strategic site as safeguarded, what was the sequence of events and justifications that which now support an employment led site of some 45 hectares with the inclusion of initially 500, then 750 and now 1100 houses?</p>
	Response from the Leader

During the JCS examination detailed evidence was heard over a number of sessions on both the Green Belt sensitivity of the site and the potential for development which would meet both economic and housing needs at West Cheltenham. The agendas for these sessions, and the documents produced in relation to them are available on the JCS examination webpage, particularly relevant are the JCS Green Belt papers EXAM 142 and EXAM 196.

The JCS authorities have considered strategic allocation options at West Cheltenham through the plan making process since the Broad Locations report in 2011, and allocation options were considered in 2013. Whilst the Pre Submission Plan identified the land for safeguarding for future development, the Hayden Sewage Treatment plant which forms part of the site and emits odour curtailed further development of the allocation at that time.

Severn Trent is now working with the Council on measures to improve odour emissions, which when undertaken will release parts of the site for development. The latest statement of common ground outlining these measures and the emerging masterplan for the area is at EXAM 198 and a priority for this proposed allocation is ensuring effective masterplanning of phase 1 and a future phase 2.

The JCS inspector heard this evidence over the course of the examination. In December 2015 the inspector published EXAM 146 which contained the 'Inspector's Preliminary Findings on Green Belt Release, Spatial Strategy and Strategic Allocations ' paragraph 113

"Taking account of housing and employment needs overall, including GCHQ's requirements, and my reservations on certain other potential strategic allocations, it seems to me that the Cheltenham part of this proposed safeguarded area might be suitable for allocation. Views are sought from the JCS and other participants on the potential for allocating land in this area."

After hearing further evidence on the emerging allocation at paragraph 126 of EXAM232 the Inspector's interim findings, she writes:

"An additional employment led site at West Cheltenham has been agreed for allocation by the JCS team, who suggest it is also suitable for about 500 dwellings, albeit the developers have put forward a figure of 750. This is in a sustainable location on the edge of Cheltenham and, for the reasons given in my Preliminary Findings, I recommend this site for allocation in the JCS. Allocating this site for 500 dwellings would reduce the remaining unmet requirement to 1,039 (1,539 – 500)."

After further hearings, in her most recent communication, the Inspector's "Note of Recommendations made at the hearing session on 21 July 2016" she writes:

"West Cheltenham Safeguarded Land Part of this area has already been recommended as a strategic allocation and I do not propose re-visiting those discussions. It is the remainder of the area proposed for safeguarding that I have re-considered. This proposed safeguarded land makes a significant contribution to the Green Belt according to the AMEC report. Consequently, there is a very high bar to overcome in demonstrating exceptional circumstances. However, in my judgement this bar has been reached for reasons which include the following: there would be a major benefit in Severn Trent Water removing the Hayden Sewage Works from the area, resulting in significantly improved living and working conditions; it would result in a co-ordinated development in two phases, preventing further piecemeal development in the area; it would provide a strong Green Belt boundary; there would be significant contributions to infrastructure, including schools.

	<p>Consequently, I find that exceptional circumstances exist for the release of this land from the Green Belt and, therefore, its safeguarding is sound.</p> <p>Furthermore, the JCS team might wish to consider exploring the possibilities of phase one being expanded and additional housing being provided in this area during the Plan period.”</p> <p>The JCS team have considered this in light of the statement of common ground, and work on the capacity of the site for employment and housing purposes, and maximising the sustainable utilisation of the area. Through this work, the main modifications plan has been prepared, identifying at least 45ha of employment land and 1,100 new homes for the area between the plan’s adoption and 2031.</p>
8.	Question from Carol Kingsbury to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan (Cannot attend)
	Will the West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group receive any assistance in developing a green space application for consideration by the Inspector ? Other communities have had so much time to prepare theirs but we have not.
	Response from the Leader
	The Main Modifications consultation running till the 10 th of April at www.gct-jcs.org will allow detailed representations on West Cheltenham to be made, which will be passed in full to the inspector. There will be further hearing sessions (likely to be in early summer) where representations on West Cheltenham can also be made. Work will continue to be undertaken to support the communities in developing their consideration of local green space, through elected members and neighbourhood coordination groups.
9.	Question from Carol Kingsbury to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	How many local young people will be able to gain employment from this Cyber Hub ? Will there be any scholarship programs and or direct links with local schools ?
	Response from the Leader
	It is important that the local community benefits from any development at West Cheltenham and work is ongoing to develop the emerging employment opportunities from this site, which is identified in the plan as a large and high quality employment development. Because this work is ongoing numbers of prospective young employees are not yet established. Through the master planning of the site and on going social sustainability work the above will be progressed and connections fostered.
10.	Question from Rachel Fargher to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	Exam 142 of the JCS Examination Base, Green Belt Topic Paper, cites responses to a questionnaire from over 550 individuals and businesses regarding changes to the Greenbelt boundary. Can the council confirm how many of the 550 individuals/businesses are located in the Springbank and Hester's Way wards?
	Response from the Leader
	<p>The figure of 550 responses relates to the ‘Issues & Options’ stage consultation on the Cheltenham Plan. It was a consultation not required by the statutory plan-making process, but it was undertaken in line with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>For a response to be accepted to that consultation, an address was not required if a valid e-mail address was provided. Therefore, a significant number of respondents did not provide their address and no detailed data exists to show how many respondents came from which ward.</p>

	I would again emphasise that the consultation was part of the Cheltenham Plan and not the JCS. It did not include any suggestions for Green Belt release in the Borough and was undertaken in June-August 2015, well before the West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation was included in the JCS Main Modifications.
11.	Question from Rachel Fargher to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	Exam 142 of the JCS Examination Base, Green Belt Topic Paper, references an intention to always have the ability to make non-strategic changes to the Greenbelt boundaries, can the council explain what is meant by non- strategic in this context, and what is the limit of a non-strategic change to the Greenbelt boundary.
	Response from the Leader
	<p>The questioner may have misinterpreted the Green Belt Topic Paper.</p> <p>Green Belt boundaries can only be amended through the local plan process. It has always been the intention that the forthcoming Cheltenham Plan should have the ability to make local non-strategic changes to the detailed boundaries of the Green Belt, but only if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.</p> <p>It is however clear from work carried out for the JCS, that the potential for such Green Belt change is likely to be limited. Indeed, the recent consultation on the 'Preferred Options' stage of the Cheltenham Plan proposed no additional changes to the Green Belt.</p>
12.	Question from Mary Nelson to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	In view of the recent serious accident in Albion Street involving an elderly lady knocked off a mobility scooter, please can you state which 'Disability Groups' were consulted over Phase 1 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan, and were the Phase 1 plans that were shown to these Disability Groups implemented <u>exactly</u> as they had been shown, or had any changes been made to those plans either before or during the course of the Phase 1 implementation?
	Response from the Cabinet Member
	<p>The Phase 1 designs were discussed during a site visit with the CBC Accessibility Working Group in March 2016.</p> <p>Representatives attended from the following organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Star College; • Insight Gloucestershire; • Shopmobility; • St Vincent & St George's Association; and • CBC Councillors. <p>The attendees represented a wide range of disabilities, from mobility impairments, to blind & deaf impairments.</p> <p>Verbal descriptions of the scheme were provided to the attendees, to ensure that everyone was provided with the same information. The Phase 1 scheme presented to the accessibility group is as constructed.</p>
13.	Question from Mary Nelson to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor

	Andrew McKinlay
	<p>The Albion Street accident must now raise even greater safety concerns regarding the permission that has been given in the CTP Traffic Regulation Orders for a new bus route to cross through Boots Corner bisecting the existing bus route, once Boots Corner has been closed to general traffic (although remaining open to buses, taxis, private hire and other permitted vehicles).</p> <p>Is it CBC's intention to still permit this dangerous new bus route to cross the newly created public realm space which has long been claimed to be a major benefit of closing Boots Corner?</p>
	Response from the Cabinet Member
	<p>GCC Cabinet approved the following in July 2015:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accept the recommendations from the Traffic Regulation Committee made on 15 January 2015 relating to the inner-ring road changes, with the exception of the Boots Corner proposed trial; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Make those elements of the traffic regulation orders relating to the Cheltenham Transport Plan, as detailed on the Traffic Regulation Order Proposed Restriction Changes Schedule at Appendix B of the decision report; and (b) Defer a decision on the elements of the traffic regulation orders relating to Boots Corner. 2. Authorise the Commissioning Director: Communities and Infrastructure to implement the scheme through the following phased approach: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Albion Street – October 2015 to February 2016; (b) Imperial Square and Oriel Road – April to July 2016; (c) Royal Well – Summer 2016; (d) Contingent on the successful implementation of the other schemes, a Boot's Corner experimental order and trail [sic] scheme – Spring 2017. <p>The TROs that were consulted upon in 2013 - 2014 for Boots Corner were not approved and no changes to the existing TRO for Boots Corner currently exist.</p> <p>Work is currently ongoing to determine TROs to be trialed under a 'Boots Corner experimental order'. If the trial is implemented and is successful, designs to re-cast the public realm at Boots Corner will be created.</p>

Council – 27 March 2017

Member Questions (13)

1.	Question from Councillor Bickerton to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>Could the Council please give an estimate on the difference to public infrastructure funding to Cheltenham as a direct result of the Tewkesbury Planning decision to grant planning permission on Farm Lane, Leckhampton ahead of any agreement on the JCS Community Infrastructure Levy? Would this simply be the difference between the agreed TBC/REDROW S106 payments and the Community Infrastructure Levy proposals for the 200 new homes to be delivered in the CBC local plan, could this please be explained.</p>
	Response from the Leader
	<p>There are too many variables to give a realistic estimate of this. The application at Farm Lane was made before a CIL regime was in place, but a CIL regime is not a requirement of JCS policy. S106 payments will vary when a CIL is put in place. Strategic allocations can be progressed through S106 funding on either the Cheltenham or Tewkesbury side of the boundary, and each Borough is a separate collection authority. Similarly, in relation to what monies could have been gained for Cheltenham, since the CIL examination has not yet taken place, and discussions on how CIL monies will be pooled between the authorities are ongoing, it isn't possible to quantify.</p>
2.	Question from Councillor Bickerton to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>On Thursday the 2nd March, Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council voted unanimously in support of LEGLAG in the revised legal challenge to the Court of Appeal on the Farm Lane planning permission and are an interested party in the case. In taking this decision the Parish Council sends a message to the Court of Appeal, that the Parish has an interest in the Local Green Space on White Cross and secondly seek a plan-led approach and masterplanning as advocated by CBC Planning in their objection letters. It was serious mistake for LEGLAG to go alone and unfortunately the High Court viewed LEGLAG as some NIMBY group with little consideration of the wider public interest or public support and the sympathy was clearly with TBC Planning Officers.</p> <p>The case is now re-focused on two grounds, Inspector Ord's Preliminary Report and the lack of Plan-Led Masterplanning. There would be no need for CBC Officers to attend court or engage separate legal advice and the general Bolton 'one set of costs' rule means that interested parties are not at risk of awarded costs. Could the Leader of the Council agree in principle to joining with the Parish Council, given the unanimous vote at full council on the NPCU call-in request on the 6th July 2015, to becoming an interested party, this will demonstrate to the court that CBC have an interest in the case, promote CBC's previous submissions and provide clarification that this site is indeed a urban extension of Cheltenham?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>While I do not support Tewkesbury's decision to approve the Farm Lane application, the Council has to take an objective approach in considering whether to become involved in any court proceedings.</p> <p>Through the JCS examination the JCS Authorities (including Cheltenham) have argued that development at Leckhampton amounts to an urban extension to Cheltenham, and have given detailed reasons. These issues have been thoroughly investigated through the JCS process. The JCS Inspector's Preliminary Findings and indeed, though subsequent to Tewkesbury Borough Council's decision on the planning application, the JCS's Inspector's Interim Report have been considered and commented upon in the High Court judgement; neither were</p>

	<p>considered to be matters that could have affected the decision made by Tewkesbury Borough Council at the time it was made.</p> <p>Given that Cllr Bickerton does not seek officer expertise and testimony, (which it is agreed would be inappropriate given how exhaustively these arguments have already been put and the potential for conflict with the officer's involvement in the JCS process) then Cheltenham Borough Council would not have anything new to add or offer in becoming an Interested Party in the court case. Furthermore, the Council would suffer the potential for conflict with, and reducing resources for, the work to progress the JCS which is at a crucial stage.</p> <p>This Council has not been a party to the original proceedings and it would be hard to see how the Court would be persuaded, on any application requesting it being added as an Interested Party, that it would be desirable to add the Council in order to resolve the issues, particularly if this would also be on a basis of the Council not taking any active part.</p> <p>It is far from clear the extent to which this Council being an Interested Party with no active part in the matter could add to LEGLAG's case in seeking permission to appeal the High Court's decision or even the Court of Appeal's considerations should that permission application be accepted and successful. Presumably the point of being added to the case would actually to be to seek to support LEGLAG's case that the High Court judgement was wrong and this is not a situation where it can said with confidence that this Council would be able to resist any cost applications that may be made against it by any other parties to the case.</p>
3.	Question from Councillor Louis Savage to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	When does the Council plan to adopt the green spaces on the Battledown Park estate, including play facilities on Redmarley Road
	Response from the Leader
	<p>In these circumstances the general procedure leading up to adoption should be as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developer considers the landscape element public open spaces in the development to be complete and then makes contact with the council and a joint site visit is arranged to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Check that the areas to be adopted as public open spaces correspond to those shown in the approved drawings and referred to in any section 106 agreements ○ Confirm that the hard and soft landscape elements are in accordance with the approved drawings and specification ○ Inspect the quality of the works to ensure they conform to relevant standards and/or good practice • There is usually a period of negotiation and rectification following this meeting. When any problems have been resolved and the council is satisfied that the site is to a standard acceptable for adoption, the site has reached practical completion • Following practical completion, the site usually remains with the developer and they will maintain it for twelve months. This allows any plant failures to become apparent and to be replaced by the developer and also allows 12 months for the legal aspects of the land transfer to take place • All being well, adoption/transfer will normally take place at twelve months from practical completion <p>With specific regards to the Battledown development; the developer has recently approached the council to arrange a joint site visit to start this process. Given the scale and diverse nature of the areas for adoption, a degree of negotiation and rectification may be required. Consequently; it is difficult to predict when practical completion will be achieved as this is dependent on the developer and the quality of their works or any rectification required.</p>

	<p>The Public Open Spaces and associated play areas on this development are currently maintained by the developer and are accessible by the public. Maintenance by the developer will normally continue up until the date of the land transfer to the council.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Tim Harman to the Cabinet Member Finance, Councillor Rowena Hay</p>
	<p>Will the Cabinet Member outline her plans to improve the condition of Public Toilets including those in the Bath Road Car Park. In the case of the men's facility in the Bath Road the walls are covered in graffiti and there is a seat missing from one pedestal?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>Repairs and maintenance to the public conveniences are currently undertaken on a reactive basis, the works to the Bath Road car park public convenience, are in hand and should be completed within the next seven days.</p> <p>These facilities as you know were taken on by the Bath Road Traders, although the Council actually pay the independent cleaner, he has recently been asked to let the council know when things are not working.</p> <p>An audit of all the public conveniences has been completed and identifies that the existing annual operational costs amounts to £140.5k and future refurbishments costs estimated at £380k. In the light of our ongoing budget constraints I am intending to ask the Asset Management panel to consider what options we may want to investigate, in particular speaking with the business community.</p> <p>Our continued support to public toilets is demonstrated by the successful securing of a grant of £136k towards the provision of 2 Changing Places facilities that caters for the more disabled. One facility will be provided in Pittville Park, the location of the second is yet to be determined and will be influenced by the feedback from the public consultation which is due by the end of April.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Tim Harman to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p>
	<p>In the financial year 2015-16 an additional £4,500 was added to the budget for Gulls specifically for the purpose of conducting a survey . It has now been confirmed that the survey was not carried out and that the balance was returned to the General Fund.</p> <p>The Gulls group is hoping to recommend a strategy for tackling the Gulls issue which may include a survey in order to better target resources on problem areas. Will the Cabinet Member consider supporting the work of the Group by looking at any agreed plan including possible funding for a survey?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>Following discussions at the Gull Focus Group in February 2016, it was decided and clearly minuted, that for a number of reasons, a gull survey was not considered to be the best use of funds.</p> <p>The principal reasons included:-</p>

	<p>1. The complexity and cost of producing a scientifically valid survey; and</p> <p>2. The fact that problem areas in Cheltenham had already been identified over the years from public reporting of gull issues.</p> <p>More recently, it has been suggested at the Gull Focus Group that a national survey would provide better intelligence than local surveys, as these are not linked and do not show the displacement of birds from one area to another.</p> <p>The merits of a gull survey can be explored again as part of a growth bid, but the business case for this will need to be clearly evidenced by the Gull Focus Group, so that it can be assessed against other spending priorities.</p>
6.	Question from Councillor Diggory Seacome to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>In view of the extra demand for egg replacement and subsequent 'gull proofing' of roofs this year, could the relevant cabinet member provide a breakdown of the types of property where this is being asked for, under headings such as, private, private (multi occupation/multi ownership) and commercial?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>Owners that have requested egg replacement in 2017 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37 multiple occupancy residential buildings; • 32 single household residential properties; • 14 commercial properties. <p>The multiple occupancy buildings tend to be large blocks of flats and access to these buildings is likely to be problematic and in some cases may prevent them from being included in the egg replacement programme.</p> <p>An officer is currently surveying these properties and if the Council is unable to include them in the programme, owners will be advised accordingly. A few more commercial properties may also join the programme, subject to confirmation by the owners.</p>
7.	Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>With regard to the planned new traffic lane creating contra-flow traffic on Clarence Parade in phase 3 of the CTP, is the main purpose to constrict the flow of traffic towards Boots Corner, if not, what is it?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The changes to the highway network as part of Phase 3 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan (CTP) do not introduce a new lane as stated by Councillor Lillywhite.</p> <p>The Phase 3 works re-instate the previous two-way operation of Clarence Parade and Clarence Street. This achieves a number of the stated CTP objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It allows two-way movements on streets, thus reducing the need to follow the clockwise one-way system; • Two-way traffic reduces traffic speeds; a significant factor in collisions; <p>It provides additional permeability for vehicles and cyclists in the local area.</p>

8.	Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	The CTP TRO documentation indicates that the existing flow of traffic on Imperial Lane is away from the Promenade towards Rodney Rd, ('New Map' 12/09/2016). This appears to be a mistake and there are no Regulation Orders to change this. Can you please clarify if the flow of motorised traffic on Imperial Lane is to be towards or away from the Promenade?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	There is an error in relation to the arrow on the plan, so I thank you for alerting me to this fact, which colleagues at GCC are now addressing. The direction of motorised traffic on Imperial Lane is not changed by the CTP.
9.	Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Can you please confirm the date of completion of the Safety Audit for the CTP phase 1 Albion Street and Winchcombe Street Junction?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	In line with best practice, each phase of the CTP has so far been subject to two pre-construction Road Safety Audits (RSA) and one post-construction RSA. The Stage 3 RSA for all of Phase 1 was undertaken on 9th February 2017.
10.	Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Looking at the accidents stats for the town centre for the last 16 years, the greatest concentrations are on Fairview road at its junctions with St Johns Avenue, Winchcombe street and North Street, yet according to the consultation documentation parts of this road are due to see traffic increases of over 100%. Can you please justify the comment in the Statement of reason, that the proposal is to "create a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists"?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>It is difficult for me to comment on this, as I am unclear as to the source of the collision data being quoted.</p> <p>The future year traffic scenario Cllr Lillywhite is referring to within the PARAMICS model, includes assumptions on the configuration of the road network, future developments and traffic growth (pre and post recession), some of which have yet to be implemented or occur, e.g. the 2026 scenario flows includes the closure of Boots Corner, which has not yet been trialled.</p> <p>Simply put, the model was designed to test a future scenario to determine if the proposed CTP changes would impact upon traffic significantly.</p> <p>As we are now into delivery of the consented elements of the CTP, GCC are undertaking monitoring to measure and compare actual traffic data both before and after the implementation of each phase. So far, this data is not showing any significant increases in traffic.</p> <p>GCC will continue to monitor the flows and any collisions and will address any issues as they arise from the previously approved mitigation fund. However, we should always be mindful of the long term objective, which is to discourage unnecessary journeys by car, particularly short ones.</p>

11.	Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	While the recent Winchcombe street accident was being investigated, the traffic in Cheltenham was severely congested and I understand there were at least two further accidents in the area during the closure, Hewlett Rd and Eldon Rd and also Hewlett Rd and London Rd, is anything being done to try and reinstate the resilience of our road network so repeats of this can be avoided. How is this resilience being monitored in the trial of the new road configuration?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>I am unclear as to the point being made, as normally, congestion results in lower speeds and therefore, lower collision impacts. Is there any substantiated proof that the incident referred to on the Albion Street/Winchcombe Street junction resulted in the two alleged collisions?</p> <p>I look forward to receiving the collision investigation outcome, so that I can share it with colleagues at GCC, as they currently have no record of the additional alleged incidents.</p> <p>In terms of the resilience issue, Cheltenham has a complex albeit historic road network and consequently, has a level of in-built resilience, as it offers a choice of alternative routes.</p> <p>The CTP improves upon this resilience, by promoting alternative modes of travel, such as public transport, walking and cycling, which reduce the current demands on the highway network.</p>
12.	Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Can you please confirm if and when the Safety Audit for the Imperial Square North and the Promenade Junction has been signed off?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The Stage 2 Road Safety Audit (RSA) for Phase 2 was undertaken on 12th July 2016. A Stage 3 RSA will be undertaken following scheme completion.
13.	Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	The pedestrian crossing at the junction of The Promenade and Imperial Sq Nth has had the island in the middle of the road removed, the traffic now approaches it from two directions instead of just one and an additional phase has currently reduced the time for pedestrians to cross to just 14 seconds out of 135. To what extent do these junction changes comply with the quoted RTRA 1984 which allows the Council to take measures under Section 1 and Section 23 for the following reasons 1(1)(a) Avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising; 1(1)(c) Facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians)?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>It's unclear what the source of the signal times quoted by the Councillor is and I am guessing that they may be from the temporary signals installed during the construction period.</p> <p>The changes to the junction as part of the Cheltenham Transport Plan, include the installation of MOVA (Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation) equipment within the traffic signal controller. MOVA is the latest traffic signal technology, which monitors and adjusts the operation of the junction in real time to manage demands. It does this within a set of parameters – at</p>

present the junction is running on previous technology, as the MOVA loop installation works are currently on-going this week. MOVA validation will be undertaken in a week or so, once some real time traffic flow data has been collected. Once validated, the overall cycle time of the junction should be reduced.

Ensuring safe and inclusive design for all users is paramount. Consequently, the designers carefully considered the effects of removing the island on Imperial Square. As set out below, removal of the island does not change the standard of the pedestrian crossing.

The length of time given to the previous pedestrian phase across the junction enabled people to cross from one side of the road to the other, regardless of the island. The amended junction arrangement still allows suitable crossing time for pedestrians to cross the carriageway safely.

The island was only used by people who felt they were physically able to take opportunities in gaps in the traffic, during the 'red man' phase. The island was not specifically designed to be a safe waiting area for pedestrians. The island that was removed was of relatively limited width and unable to accommodate more than a few pedestrians.

As the new arrangement reflects the previous 'kerb to kerb' crossing scenario, it in no way compromises the safety of pedestrians. When crossing under the 'green man' phase, pedestrians have right of way, regardless of whether the approaching vehicle is an emergency vehicle, or otherwise.

