



# CHELTENHAM

## BOROUGH COUNCIL

### Notice of a meeting of Council

**Monday, 25 March 2019**

**2.30 pm**

**Council Chamber, Municipal Offices**

<b>Membership</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Garth Barnes, Bernard Fisher (Chair), Roger Whyborn (Vice-Chair), Victoria Atherstone, Matt Babbage, Paul Baker, Dilys Barrell, Angie Boyes, Nigel Britter, Jonny Brownsteen, Flo Clucas, Chris Coleman, Mike Collins, Stephen Cooke, Iain Dobie, Wendy Flynn, Tim Harman, Steve Harvey, Rowena Hay, Alex Hegenbarth, Karl Hoble, Sandra Holliday, Martin Horwood, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Chris Mason, Paul McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Tony Oliver, Dennis Parsons, John Payne, Louis Savage, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Jo Stafford, Klara Sudbury, Simon Wheeler, Max Wilkinson, Suzanne Williams and David Willingham

### Agenda

<b>7.</b>	<b>PUBLIC QUESTIONS</b> These must be received no later than 12 noon on Tuesday 19 March 2019.	(Pages 3 - 8)
<b>8.</b>	<b>MEMBER QUESTIONS</b> These must be received no later than 12 noon on Tuesday 19 March 2019.	(Pages 9 - 14)

**Contact Officer:** Bev Thomas, Democracy Officer, 01242 264246

**Email:** [democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk)

**Pat Pratley**  
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

25 March 2019

**Public Questions (6 total)**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Question from Andrew Riley to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>Serious accidents that have occurred in the town since the commencement of phase 4 have not been considered in the decision to extend the trial even though they were on roads which have been directly affected by traffic increases, on one short stretch of All Saints Road there have been 3 accidents in as many months during phase 4, yet only 1 has reached the accident map that was considered when deciding to extend phase 4, local residents cannot previously recall any crashes on his stretch of road. So why were all 3 crashes not taken into account when deliberation was taken over this trial. How will all accidents be considered when it comes to the final consideration of the CTP.</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>Section 170 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 requires drivers involved in traffic accidents involving personal injury on the road or other public place to report the accident in person at a police station, or to a constable. All road accidents involving human death or personal injury occurring on the Highway ('road' in Scotland) and notified to the police within 30 days of occurrence, and in which one or more vehicles are involved, are to be reported.</p> <p>Severity of injury is specifically set out. A Serious injury includes (but is not limited to): fracture, internal injury, severe cuts, crushing, burns, concussion and fatalities occurring 30 or more days after the crash. Serious casualties are often (although not necessarily) detained in hospital for treatment.</p> <p>All injury collisions (as defined above) are shared with both the County Council and the Department of Transport. The County Council collect collision data following the national standard across the Country (called Stats 19 and Stats 20) which specifically excludes reporting of 'damage only' collisions.</p> <p>The up-to-date collision data available for the whole of the County is located on the following link; <a href="https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/road-safety/collision-and-camera-map/">https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/road-safety/collision-and-camera-map/</a></p> <p>The trial restriction of Boots Corner to general traffic is being undertaken by an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO). Once started, ETROs run for 18 months, to allow for changes to be made during the experiment. The current trial started on 28th June 2018 and can run until 28th December 2019.</p> <p>Due to these small sample numbers of injury collisions, the highway authority usually average over more than one year to increase the reliability of the data. Collision data will be analysed as part of the Traffic Regulation Order report at the end of the trial.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Question from Andrew Riley to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>Within 2 weeks of the completion CTP phase 2 works a young man was killed in an RTA when walking to work at the junction of Clarence street and Crescent</p>

	<p>Place. Phase 2 made the north side of imperial square 2 way, enabling a new west of town to East route into Rodney road and the Regent Arcade, a route that includes this junction. What investigation has been done into the increased traffic at this junction as a result of the phase 2 changes ? What consideration was given to this investigation prior to the implementation of phase 3 and when hailing phase 2 as being a success.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>I believe this refers to the tragic incident in April 2017 where a 34 year old woman was knocked down. The driver was subsequently charged with causing death by dangerous driving and convicted for driving without due care.</p> <p>No changes were made to the highway in the vicinity of the incident during 2017 as part of the Cheltenham Transport Plan.</p> <p>Data collected as part of the CTP monitoring is set out below.  <a href="https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/info/47/cheltenham_development_task_force/1452/boots_corner_trial_closure_data">https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/info/47/cheltenham_development_task_force/1452/boots_corner_trial_closure_data</a>  Information is also available on the Gloucestershire County Council webpages  <a href="https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/major-projects-list/cheltenham-transport-plan/">https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/major-projects-list/cheltenham-transport-plan/</a>  The GCC pages includes traffic flows  <a href="https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/major-projects-list/cheltenham-transport-plan/cheltenham-traffic-plan-traffic-data/traffic-data/">https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/major-projects-list/cheltenham-transport-plan/cheltenham-traffic-plan-traffic-data/traffic-data/</a></p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Tom Bowhill to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>It is stated in official documents that the Boots Corner one way system would be reviewed before <u>final implementation</u> (or words to that effect). Attempts to find out who, what and when this review would be performed have not been forthcoming. I am repeatedly passed between Cheltenham and Gloucestershire councils and various departments to no effect. My question is- who, what and when will this review take place and be published ? By now a full specification for this analysis should be available ? E.g. air quality was a significant quoted important factor. So where are the original measurement sites ? Weather conditions, dates etc ? Also comparable readings during and at the completion of the trial ?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The final decision concerning the Boots Corner trial rests with the GCC Traffic Regulation Order Committee.</p> <p>CBC considered the wider impacts at the Council meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2019 and the papers and minutes of that meeting are publicly available, as is access to air quality monitoring data.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Tom Bowhill to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>Similar questions must also be asked and critically analysed for footfall at Boots Corner and other affected areas of the town. The effect on small businesses and large businesses in the town. One shop has informed me of significant loss of revenues. There is also the question of what has been the effect on other areas of the town from the diverted traffic ? Previous attempts to obtain information have been met with obstruction, deflection, denial and generally 'not my job' (is it Gloucester's or Cheltenham's job and reverse). Only one department and its staff come out well, "The Freedom of</p>

	<p>Information Department". But they are only as good as the information they are given. I am not "deluded" as has been suggested but a very experienced "troubleshooter".</p>
	<p><b>Response from</b></p>
	<p>CBC appointed independent specialists to undertake before and during trial footfall counts. That data is publicly available and has been reported in the press. The data and methodology is publically available at <a href="https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/info/47/cheltenham_development_task_force/1452/boots_corner_trial_closure_data">https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/info/47/cheltenham_development_task_force/1452/boots_corner_trial_closure_data</a></p> <p>The dates for which data has been collected are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Week 1 commencing 11th June</li> <li>- Week 2 commencing 2nd July</li> <li>- Week 3 commencing 8th October</li> <li>- Week 4 commencing 14th November</li> </ul> <p>Inevitably there were events taking place during all of these weeks, that's the nature of life in Cheltenham:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Week 1: food and drink festival 15-17th June</li> <li>- Week 2: Music festival, Midsummer fiesta on 7th July,</li> <li>- Week 3: Literature festival, Promenade market on 12th October,</li> <li>- Week 4: November Races 16-18th November.</li> </ul> <p>In all cases, it's difficult to know the full impact of the events on Boots Corner at the times sampled (the hours beginning 8 a.m., 12.30 p.m. and 5 p.m.). For example, with the Literature Festival focussed on Montpelier gardens, would that lead to a positive or negative impact on the footfall around Boots Corner? There are many other 'external' factors which impact the counts, e.g. the World Cup was taking place during the second week and there is evidence of drops in footfall coinciding with England games; the weather, whilst generally good, deteriorated markedly during the last days of the third week.</p> <p>So, in order to try to provide a balanced view we commissioned surveys covering a number of weeks and averaged out post-closure data across all the weeks sampled. And that's also why we have sampled three periods during the day and looked at individual periods separately to look for inconsistencies in the data.</p> <p>Whilst the economic performance of any town centre is a function of a myriad of factors, CBC considered the wider town centre impact at their meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2019 and the papers and minutes of that meeting are publicly available.</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Adam Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>Boots Corner, Given that the 'environmental argument' failed to convince the TRO committee or the GCC Cabinet that they should allow this scheme to proceed, the Cheltenham development Taskforce has had to resort to behind the scenes intervention and a letter to plead the case to give the scheme a lifeline. Even then they only managed to get this scheme trialed, of which only one of the three options recommended to be trialed is being trialed. I think that we can safely say that the traffic removal has not been 'embraced'. How can it be possible that such an important economic factor as the development of the Municipal offices, which</p>

	<p>is recently been cited by the Civic Society as generating over £20 million pounds plus for the public purse, is not worth flagging to the public or publicly to the members of this Council who were at an extraordinary meeting called specifically to make a decision on this matter. Why was this given the highest priority of any risk in the Task Force, the body that was created principally to facilitate this scheme and yet CBC have gone to such lengths to hide this intention from the public of Cheltenham and not inform them of this world Class public space?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>I think it is important to clarify several points.</p> <p>The Task Force did engage in the GCC cabinet process, along with many members of the public and wrote in 2015 in support of the Cheltenham Transport Plan phased scheme; a copy of that letter has been provided to Mr Lillywhite so hardly 'behind the scenes'.</p> <p>The Task Force was not established principally to facilitate a Municipal Offices redevelopment scheme; its purpose was to address the work previously badged Civic Pride and critically to bring forward a host of schemes, of which Royal Well was one. The fact that the Brewery Quarter, John Lewis store, Regency Place have all been delivered and that the railway station, Quadrangle, Honeybourne Place and transport plan to name a few are all in progress would attest that there have been other priorities.</p> <p>The Civic Society is an independent body and I suggest that any reference to their analysis is posed to them, as I have seen no financial assessment to validate the statement. Interestingly the document you cite was produced after the CBC meeting held on 21st January 2019. The reason that no mention was made in the report simply reflects that there is no clear plan beyond that ambition for a world class space. The Task Force flagged that it would not be possible to comprehensively redevelop or upgrade either the Municipal Offices or Royal Well until there was clarity over the Cheltenham Transport Plan; a situation that remains at this moment as a final decision will not be taken until later this year by the GCC traffic regulation order committee.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Adam Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>Detailed traffic volume data has now been released but is not present for Old Bath Rd, Gloucester Rd, or Princess Elizabeth Way, it is not feasible to determine the impact of this scheme without understanding traffic changes on these, the three alternate trunk routes to which traffic is supposed to be disbursed. Data is unreadable for Ambrose street and many of the other permanent collection sites. Any discussion over the viability of restriction of Rodney rd should have been informed by this data, but it was not released in time despite many requests and promises. The Road most likely to suffer from this further restriction, All Saints Road, has already seen the largest traffic increase in any reported route, this is both in real and percentage terms of 25%, yet this was not presented to the Councillors for consideration. All Saints Rd was only mentioned for its 'surprising' and unexplained 15% increase Southbound which was due to be monitored, yet no information was given to the Councillors on the Northbound increase, which will be compounded by the changes agreed at that meeting.</p> <p>With regard to the pollution map, it is misleading to present this data when it is for before the changes occurred, the 2018 data will only be relevant if it is entirely</p>

	<p>post 28/6/2018, can you assure that this will be the case? The GCC Lead cabinet member did not identify any serious detrimental impacts in residential areas. Perhaps if he did not sit on the Cheltenham Development Task Force, the body which has been created principally to facilitate this scheme, despite its previous rejection by GCC in 2008 and at the two statutory consultations in the town, then his report may have been less constrained on its impact on residential areas.</p> <p>The development in question has long been completed so it is misleading to the Councillors and Public to attempt to claim that these figures are any longer dependent on the closure.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The sites used to collect traffic flow data for CTP monitoring are a combination of GCC's in-situ fixed Automatic Traffic Counters (ATCs) and additional sites on routes which were flagged as potential residential routes which may experience displacement effects.</p> <p>I am not quite sure why Mr Lillywhite has made an assertion that the information was not given to the councillors, as the traffic data is clearly presented in the Jan 21st 2019 council papers. The report provides the average hourly flow for each direction on All Saints Road and also goes on to note "The Northbound data shows reductions in the peak hours between September and November, with slight increases during the interpeak hours".</p> <p>Given that the funding for the Cheltenham Transport Plan was secured by GCC with support from CBC from the DfT Local Sustainable Transport Fund, with a Treasury Green Book analysis as the underpinning evidence, it seems entirely reasonable to make an assessment against that initial base, which was what was presented to full Council. The document was debated and endorsed by Council.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank



**Member Questions (12 total)**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Jonny Brownsteen to Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment, Councillor Coleman</b>
	<p>The litter tally from a recent litter pick in St Paul's shows 4,522 items of litter collected, of which 2,655 were cigarette butts. Many of the cigarette butts were in the surrounds of the various shops and takeaways along St Paul's Road. Is the council able to make wall-mounted ash trays a requirement for businesses in residential areas? And what can we do to make businesses responsible for keeping the area outside their premises free of litter?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>As Cabinet member for Clean and Green Environment, I would take this opportunity to place on record my appreciation for the community effort in St Paul's and other people engaged in litter picking, which sets a great example to others and in particular, those that show a disregard for our precious environment.</p> <p>I am really pleased community groups are helping keep our neighbourhoods clean. The Council is supporting Keep Britain Tidy's Spring Clean which runs from 22 March to 23 April this year and details of the litter picks arranged by community groups can be found on our website.</p> <p>Cigarette butts contain plastic and are adding to the toll on wildlife caused by unnecessary pollution, as they wash into drains, streams, rivers and ultimately the sea.</p> <p>The Council is currently reviewing its street cleansing service and we are actively engaging with the Cheltenham Business Improvement District (BID) and other organisations like Ubico, The Cheltenham Trust, Cheltenham Borough Homes and @plasticfreecheltenham, to help tackle the issue of plastic and other littering.</p> <p>Keep Britain Tidy are promoting a High Street Clean Up day and the Council will be supporting this initiative not only for our main High Street but also 'high street' areas around town. Additional government funding just announced will help support the provision of equipment for the Council and community groups.</p> <p>The feedback from all the community groups will be valuable in understanding what we need to do to improve the cleanliness of our streets and clearly the work in St Paul's demonstrates the need to look at how cigarette butts are disposed of. Our review of litter bins on streets and in parks and gardens will incorporate this issue as most of our bins already allow for the safe disposal of cigarette butts.</p> <p>Decisions about wall-mounted ash trays are ultimately a matter for individual businesses and the Council does not have the power to enforce this, but we would encourage shops and takeaways to consider what measures they can reasonably take to help tackle the issue. We would also welcome proactive co-operation from businesses in helping to keep their own frontages clear of litter, ensuring that this is disposed of responsibly.</p>

2.	<b>Question from Councillor Tim Harman to Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment, Councillor Chris Coleman</b>
	<p>Reflecting on the Motion on Climate change at the last Council meeting and my previous question, will the Cabinet Member update the Council on plans to install Electric vehicle charging points in Council owned Car Parks. Can he also outline any plans that the Council may have to convert any vehicles in its fleet to low emission energy sources.</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>You can see the current locations of charging points in Cheltenham via this link:- <a href="https://www.zap-map.com/live/">https://www.zap-map.com/live/</a></p> <p>CBC already has a total of 4 EV charging points (provided via a government grant funded scheme), in its Regent Arcade and Town Centre East car parks which are in use approximately 50% of the time. The authority does not currently charge users for the electricity consumed, which can cost up to £6 per charge for some vehicles. This is not considered to be a scalable situation and is effectively a subsidy for personal car use, which is inherently unsustainable.</p> <p>GCC also has some on-street charging points (e.g. in Montpellier) and is looking at rolling out a wider programme.</p> <p>The carbon footprint of a new car: 6 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e: <u>Citroen C1</u>, basic spec. 17 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e: <u>Ford Mondeo</u>, medium spec. 35 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e: <u>Land Rover Discovery</u>, top of the range. The carbon footprint of making a car is immensely complex. Ores have to be dug out of the ground and the metals extracted.</p> <p>Note: Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) “Carbon dioxide equivalent” or “CO<sub>2</sub>e” is a term for describing different greenhouse gases in a common unit. For any quantity and type of greenhouse gas, CO<sub>2</sub>e signifies the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> which would have the equivalent global warming impact.</p> <p>See interesting Guardian article here: <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/environment/green-living-blog/2010/sep/23/carbon-footprint-new-car">https://www.theguardian.com/environment/green-living-blog/2010/sep/23/carbon-footprint-new-car</a></p> <p>Providing support for car clubs or providing dedicated on-street spaces for communal vehicles may be the way to go in the shorter term, alongside more support for walking and cycling for shorter journeys – our consultant Systra estimates that 70% of journeys within Cheltenham are less than 2km.</p> <p>In 2017, our parking strategy consultants advised against installing more EV charging points, on the basis that battery technology and home charging arrangements would cater for much of the potential future market. The Council will actively consider the purchase of low emission or electric vehicles when replacing its own small fleet and will encourage staff, members, key partners and those in the Council’s supply chain to do the same. Whilst there may be cost and other practical considerations relating to some of these decisions, the Council recognises that it has a community leadership role in</p>

	<p>setting a best practice example to other organisations.</p> <p>Officers from GCC and CBC met recently to discuss the potential for the authorities to co-operate in the provision of electric pool cars for use by CBC and GCC staff and members on Council business. The preferable location for the vehicles and associated charging points, would be the rear of the Municipal Offices, which would involve the displacement of some existing member parking spaces, as well as the installation of associated charging points. This investment would need to take account of future accommodation options for CBC as a whole.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Chris Mason to Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor Alex Hegenbarth</b>
	<p>With regard to gas and electricity consumption. Does the Borough Council calculate the CO2 emission from its use of these energy sources? If so please confirm last year's figures for gas and electricity?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>While the Borough Council does not currently calculate CO2 emissions from its use of gas and electricity, this is something the Council will do as part of the action plan that will be developed towards making the Council carbon neutral.</p>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Chris Mason to Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor Alex Hegenbarth</b>
	<p>With regard to the climate emergency motion passed at February's Council Meeting. Could the Cabinet Member please confirm the amount of "Officer hours" and money spent on work relating to the 6 points under "Full Council calls on the Cabinet to:"?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>I have recently met with Officers and have asked them to draw up an outline plan for delivering the work brought forward as a result of the Motion, so until that is in place the officer time and money that had currently been spent on the work referenced by the Member has and will be minimal.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Chris Mason to Cabinet Member Corporate, Councillor Alex Hegenbarth</b>
	<p>What resources in terms of money and Officer hours have been allocated to achieving the target to make Cheltenham carbon neutral by 2030?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>A report will be brought to Council within the next six months setting out the actions the Council will take to address the climate emergency. This will include identifying the resources required to work towards achieving the target of making Cheltenham carbon neutral by 2030.</p> <p>As a first step towards helping us achieve that target, I would urge all Members to sign up for paperless council tax billing if they haven't done so already.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Max Wilkinson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor McKinlay</b>
	<p>The latest independent footfall figures published by the BID indicate a marked increase in footfall in the town centre. How can this be explained?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>Following access to a new footfall camera installed by national data analysts, Springboard, the BID was able to look afresh at footfall figures for the town centre.</p>

	<p>This showed that in 2018 Nov and Dec saw an increase compared to 2017 – Nov up 2% and Dec 1.8%. During the same period decreases of 5% and 5.7% respectively were recorded nationally. The Boots Corner trial with longer visitor dwell times and the new openings in the town centre were undoubtedly factors.</p> <p>Whilst Jan 2019 saw a decrease of 3% year on year, Feb 2019 saw an unprecedented 15% increase. Clearly a complex situation but the promotion work undertaken by the BID with its ‘lighting up Cheltenham’ programme which achieved 10,000 fare paying passengers on the observation wheel over 3 weeks was a major factor.</p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Max Wilkinson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>The council’s stated ambition is to create a new public square at Boots Corner, but the majority of local people I speak to think that the long-term vision for Boots Corner is fake grass, benches and a few bike racks. When will the council publish its ambitious proposals for the area? Will people be consulted on the favoured options and, if so, what consultation activities are planned?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>I share your frustration which has been impacted by the phased approach to the wider Cheltenham Transport Plan and extension to the trial. This has been a delicate balance as releasing any long term aspirations has the risk of accusations of pre-determination so we have been keen to establish greater use of the area by the public before promoting any proposed concepts. The current works at Boots Corner are temporary, and whilst I concur that ‘astroturf’ may not be to everyone’s taste, the temporary works have demonstrated that by removing through traffic and creating more public space more people are using the space and staying longer. This has been validated by independent data releases that support our efforts to “reclaim” highway for the benefit of people as dwell times have increased.</p> <p>We aim to commence engagement with the public in more detail about aspirations and options for Boots Corner in April as part of a communications exercise. Any proposed changes are, of course entirely dependent upon the approval of the GCC traffic regulation order committee to the outcome of the trial and GCC highways colleagues to the design proposals themselves, including standard road safety audits.</p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Max Wilkinson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</b></p>
	<p>The long-awaited ambition to extend the Honeybourne Line to Lansdown Road was cut out of the railway station upgrade plans due to national level budgetary difficulties, we are told. However, I understand that the council has been working hard behind the scenes to secure the completion of this project. Can the Leader provide an update to inform the cycling and walking group’s discussion in early April?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>I am pleased to report that a “solution” has been found to ensure that this crucial project is delivered. This is thanks to the tenacity of the Task Force and other stakeholders, including GCC. The first stage of the extension of the Honeybourne line sits within the area under the GWR franchise and will be constructed as part of the forecourt improvement which includes 300 extra cycle racks and 70 additional car park spaces. It will extend the route south from its current terminus</p>

	<p>to the Trimnasium building.</p> <p>The second stage which will be on land under the direct control of Network Rail has been agreed in principle and is now the subject of detailed discussion and negotiation. This will take the route from the Trimnasium building up to the Lansdown bridge. There are technical complexities, such as securing access without damaging the structural integrity of the bridge traffic barrier but colleagues at GWR, NR and GCC (highways) are committed to finding a solution.</p> <p>The prize is definitely worth the effort as this connection will not only provide safe access for cyclists from the south but also enable pedestrians to access the station via a short walk from the 94 bus service. All of which will help support our longer term aim to encourage effective sustainable transport options.</p>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor David Willingham to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</b>
	<p>Would the Leader of the council join with me in thanking the council staff and contractors who worked tirelessly during race week to keep people safe and to keep our town clean?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>Gold Cup Week involves year round preparation as well as many unsociable hours during the week itself to make sure everything runs smoothly. The event is very important to the town and I would certainly like to thank all those involved in making it a success. That covers not only CBC staff and contractors but also our partners from the racecourse, Police, Gloucestershire Highways, Solace, the BID and neighbouring district councils who help provide cover for the CBC Enforcement Team.</p>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor David Willingham to the Chair of Planning Committee, Councillor Garth Barnes</b>
	<p>Does the Chairman of the Planning Committee share my concerns that following the adoption of the JCS there is now an almost unfathomable quantity of documents that the public need to read to try to understand this council's planning policies, including, but not limited to the JCS, the Local Plan 2nd Review, - June 2006, the list of policies in the Local Plan superseded by the JCS, the NPPF, as well as various supplementary planning documents and supplementary planning guidance?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>The nature of town planning means that several individual documents are required to make up a complete development framework. The new Cheltenham Plan will form a major part of the framework once it is adopted. Officers will work on clarifying the planning policy position in due course. Members of the public are welcome to ask the council questions about specific planning issues to get the most up to date information.</p>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor David Willingham to the Chair of Planning Committee, Councillor Garth Barnes</b>
	<p>In light of the significant and potential confusion that is caused by having a partially superseded Local Plan available online, would he ask officers to urgently produce a single document detailing the Local Plan policies that are currently valid and ensure that this is available on the website so that the public can clearly see what policies are valid, and ensure that any documents that are no longer current are moved away from the Planning Policy section of the website and clearly identified as not current archive material?</p>

	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	Once the new Cheltenham Plan is adopted officers intend to produce a document which combines all extant local policies. This will also include links to relevant national level policy. This will provide a more user friendly gateway to the development framework.
<b>12.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor David Willingham to the Chair of Planning Committee, Councillor Garth Barnes</b>
	In light of the deletion of policy HS 8 (Houses of Multiple Occupation), seemingly without any adequate replacement in the JCS, and the clear harm to communities that can be caused by excessive concentrations of HMOs, would he ask officers to look at applying planning controls on HMO conversions in a much larger part of the borough?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>Policy HS8 was deleted because its function was replaced by JCS Policy SD4 which protects local amenity. Conversion of dwellings to HMOs of less than 6 beds now benefit from permitted development rights and so do not require planning permission. These rights can be removed through an Article 4 Direction. The NPPF says that “There should be a particularly strong justification for the withdrawal of permitted development rights relating to a wide area (eg those covering the entire area of a local planning authority, National Park or Area of Outstanding National Beauty).”</p> <p>There is a high bar for evidence which must be passed otherwise the Secretary of State has the power to reverse the direction. The evidence which underpins the Article 4 in St Paul’s was prepared at significant cost in officer time and resource. Similar evidence will be required for each additional ward which is covered by an Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>The Council does not currently have the evidence to prove that other wards should be subject to these restrictions.</p>