



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 19 January 2011

6.00 pm

Municipal Offices, Promenade, Cheltenham, GL50 9SA

Membership	
Councillors:	Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter (Vice-Chair), Jacky Fletcher, Rob Garnham, Penny Hall (Chair), Diane Hibbert, Sandra Holliday, Helena McCloskey, Charles Stewart and Paul Wheeldon

The Council has a substitution process and any substitutions will be announced at the meeting

Agenda

1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FORM	(Pages 1 - 2)
3.	MINUTES 24 November 2010	(Pages 3 - 12)
4.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS If any	
5.	MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE A. By Council B. By Cabinet	
6.	CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING Cabinet Member Sustainability Cabinet Member Built Environment	
7.	INTERIM BUDGET 2011/12 Report of the Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development (please refer to the budget papers)	(Pages 13 - 16)
8.	PROPOSED TRAFFIC ORDER Discussion paper of the Cabinet Member Built Environment	(Pages 17 - 20)

9.	CABINET WASTE WORKING GROUP UPDATE (IF TIME ALLOWS) Verbal update from a member of the Cabinet Waste Working Group	
10.	ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2010-2011	(Pages 21 - 24)
11.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING 02 March 2011	

Contact Officer: Saira Malin, Democracy Officer, 01242 775153

Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Public Information

Emergency Evacuation Procedure at the Municipal Offices

- (i) In the event of a fire you will hear a continuous alarm.
In the event of a bomb alert the alarm will sound in repeated short bursts.
- (ii) Members, officers and the public should leave the building promptly and in a quiet and orderly fashion using the nearest available escape routes and assemble on the Promenade footway by the War Memorial.

Attendance at Meetings - Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Meetings are open to the public and a limited amount of public seating is available. Copies of the agenda will also be available. You may be asked to leave the meeting if any "exempt" (confidential) business is considered. This will normally be shown on the agenda

Inspection of Papers - Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

We can also arrange for copies of individual decision records, reports or minutes to be supplied. If you wish to inspect minutes or reports (other than those which are exempt) relating to any item on this agenda, please contact Democratic Services. The background papers listed in a report may also be inspected. Please notify Democratic Services who will arrange with the report author for papers to be made available to you at a mutually convenient time.

All meeting information is published on the Council's Internet website at:
www.cheltenham.gov.uk.

**If you have difficulty reading this agenda please let us know
and we will do everything we can to meet your requirements.**

This page is intentionally left blank

CHELtenham BOROUGH COUNCIL
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

NAME _____

You are asked to complete this form if you intend to declare an interest in connection with any item on this agenda.

Please hand any completed form to the committee administrator at the meeting.

You are reminded that you are still required to declare your interest orally at the commencement of the committee's consideration of the matter.

Agenda item	*Personal interest	*Prejudicial Personal interest	Nature of interest

* The Council’s Code of Members Conduct explains what is a ‘Personal Interest’ and a ‘Prejudicial Interest’. The Code is set out in Part 5A of the Council’s Constitution.

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 24th November, 2010

6.02 - 8.18 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Penny Hall (Chair), Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter (Vice-Chair), Jacky Fletcher, Helena McCloskey and Lloyd Surgenor
Also in attendance:	Councillor John Rawson and Councillor Roger Whyborn

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors Wheeldon, Hibbert and Holliday had given their apologies.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FORM

None declared.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting had been circulated with the agenda.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2010 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No matters referred to committee.

6. CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING

The Cabinet Member Built Environment was in attendance and confirmed that as of Saturday (28 November 2010), Chapel Walk car park would be open to the public 7 days a week. This would cause inconvenience to the members of staff that had parked there in the past and he thanked them for their understanding. Councillors would also be losing their allocated spaces, but this was a positive move for the town centre.

The New Homes Bonus was out for consultation and would see the Council benefit financially from the first six years of council tax from new homes. The consultation was due to end on 24 December and the approach for formulating a response would be discussed later in the meeting. There was the potential for this to be seen as influencing planning decisions and as such, clear boundaries would need to be set.

Civic Pride featured on the agenda. Public consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) had been successful. The Civic Society and Police had played an important part and this would be going to Council on 13 December.

LTP3 also featured on the agenda. It was noted that initial discussions were ongoing with Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) about a shared parking strategy in an attempt to address the current issues, with regards to GCC being responsible for on-road parking in Cheltenham and CBC for off-road parking. Members would be kept informed of any developments.

Following a request from a member of the committee, the Cabinet Member Built Environment would raise the issue of member parking with Officers. Specifically, the issue of where many would park when all 40 members attend the Council meetings.

Cabinet Member Sustainability arrived at around 7.30pm with prior agreement of the Chair.

He advised members that whilst work to Leckhampton Wall had stopped for a time, it would start again soon. Natural England had been in talks with the Council about their level of stewardship. They were proposing that the Council moved from Entry Level Stewardship to Higher Level. There would be no associated cost to the Council and would include a grant from Natural England of around £10k per annum.

He confirmed that he hoped to soon be in a position to make a formal statement about the Pittville Bridge. It was hoped that the Council would be able to manage the project, which would bring costs in line with the budget. As always, members would be kept informed.

The Chair thanked both Cabinet Members for their attendance and updates.

7. BUDGET CONSULTATION

Andrew Powers an Accountant from the finance team introduced the paper as circulated with the agenda.

During summer 2010 additional budget consultation was undertaken. This consultation consisted of 21 road shows in various venues across the town.

Residents were asked to use sticky dots to identify services they thought should be 'protected', 'reduced' and 'stopped' and during this process over 21,000 sticky dots were used. Residents had found it easier to mark services to protect and reduce than they had to mark those to stop.

This was not a scientific exercise but did engage the public. The two A3 appendices showed the results from this consultation, ranked in order, one in chart form and one in a table with figures.

The following responses were given to questions from members of the committee;

- The A3 sheets summarised all services against which a vote had been cast either way.
- Groups had been set up to look at services in more detail but he had not been involved in these meetings and as such, was unable to provide any further information.

The following comments were made by members of the committee;

- During the roadshows people were not always identified as residents of the Borough.
- It was felt that the lack of detail provided at the roadshows, made it difficult for residents to make an informed decision (e.g. Strategic Planning was marked to stop, but were residents fully aware of what the service included).
- It was a good idea at the time but more thought could have gone into it. Improvements should be considered if it is done again in the future. It could be made more consumer friendly.
- Quality of services must be maintained but there was scope to deliver them differently.
- Caution was required when communicating changes and cuts, especially to those services where residents had clearly indicated that they wanted them maintained at the current level.
- The Government had recently announced that local authorities would be able to charge more for services such as planning and this was something that would need to be considered further when the draft budget was reviewed by the committee in January.
- Members should bare in mind that the environment in Cheltenham was one of its greatest assets and any reductions may impact on the attractiveness of the town.

The Chair thanked the officer for his attendance.

8. CIVIC PRIDE - ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

The Managing Director of the Cheltenham Development Task Force introduced a PowerPoint presentation which highlighted some of the progress, achievements and plans of Civic Pride over the past year, though pointed out that work had only really started in January 2010.

He then talked through the slides of a PowerPoint presentation (Appendix 1).

Some of the key points made in addition to the presentation included;

Context:

A lot of planning and consultation had been undertaken but there was perceived to be a poor delivery record. As a result of this there was scepticism, especially from the press.

The last 18 months and the recession had raised the question of whether it was the right time to take projects forward. But having missed two peaks in the economy and the fact that Cheltenham had not been affected to the same extent as other towns/cities, it was felt that now was the time.

A number of policy changes since May, would affect Gloucestershire and make successes such as the work to St. Pauls hard to replicate to the same degree.

A fresh start:

The funding partners considered a number of models and agreed to go with a fluid approach. Another success had been securing an independent Chair, Graham Garbutt, who had a wealth of experience. Partners had funded upfront and this had reduced the impact of the recession on the task force.

The Board was made up of individuals with particular skills and experience.

Business Plan Targets:

The 2010 Business Plan was agreed by the Board in April 2010 and set out the key targets for the Task Force. This was publicised on the centre page of the Echo and the resounding feedback had been 'get on with it'.

The delivery model was flexible, able to respond to changes but with clear priorities.

The focus of the last month or so had been de-risking, which would maximise any revenue outputs.

Key Outcomes to Date:

Gloucestershire County Councils contribution was to build a new traffic model, which at a cost of £100k, allowed real time testing and sequences to be changed.

Ultimately, Cheltenham was not designed for road transport. The one-way system was creating problems and resulted in a race track. Brave decisions were required and partners had assessed other authorities approaches and outcomes.

Most of the traffic came from the North of the town but most of the car parks in Cheltenham were located to the East – this needed to be addressed.

North Place and Portland Street had originally been considered for office space, but there was no interest. It was noted that Cheltenham House where Cheltenham Borough Homes were based, had been actively marketing since 1997 – it had never been at full occupancy in that time.

There was no alternative, further consultation on the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was required. Fortunately the plan had been publicised beforehand and as a result, the press were kind.

An archaeological evaluation was carried out in October 2010 by an independent company, given the sensitivity of the site. There was no archaeology and English Heritage had been appeased.

The SPD would go to Council on 13 December 2010 and if agreed, the site would be marketed in January 2011.

Royal Well and the Municipal Offices:

The hope was to get rid of the racetrack, but this would require funding. The plan was to use the capital receipt from North Place.

The Municipal Offices were already being used as a joint delivery vehicle, with HRMC now based there. Work had already started on a complete heritage assessment of the building, to better understand the assets the Council had. Again, all risks would be removed in order to increase opportunities.

Non CBC sites:

There were a number of non CBC sites which offered potential but were struggling to progress given the fact that some developers had overpaid.

Communication:

This was key, the Echo needed to be on board so as to be sympathetic to more difficult communications and promote good communications. A quarterly update would soon be issued to them.

Where from here:

North Place and Portland Street would be actively marketed. There had already been some serious interest from developers, so it could be very positive for Cheltenham.

Traffic modelling would be pursued but there were some major costs associated with this. Research showed that 14% of traffic in Cheltenham stayed within the town itself average 11% of traffic disappeared when changes were made to the modelling, as people actively change their transportation. This would require some brave decisions.

The current context was challenging and showed no signs of easing. But a solid partnership had been built, despite losing the RDA. Discussions with other groups were ongoing and current partners were happy that tangible progress was being made. Momentum needed to be maintained and given the flexibility of the plan this was achievable – where a master plan would not have been in the current climate.

The following responses were given to questions from members of the committee;

- Were North Place to be put on the market in January 2011 and sold, 300 spaces would be retained in Portland Street, the buses would be moved and capacity would be increased at the other end of town. For 3 weeks whilst the archeological evaluation was being done, 1/3 of the car park was sectioned off at any one time and yet the car park was never full. There were software issues with the current car parks which meant that only ticket sales could be monitored, rather than spaces.
- As previously stated, Cheltenham had excess car parks, so the loss of some would not impact visitors. The key was to provide adequate signage and isolate motorists to the nearest car park. If they chose not to use the nearest car park they would risk being in slower traffic.
- Cash for other projects needed to come from somewhere, but capital assets would be reused and invested elsewhere.

The Chair thanked the Managing Director of the Cheltenham Development Task Force for his attendance and a comprehensive, exciting and invigorating presentation.

9. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 - DRAFT RESPONSE

The Chair introduced herself as a member of the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) Working Group, which had included Councillors McCloskey, Fletcher, Hibbert and R Hay. It was important to note that Cabinet Member Built Environment had also attended each of the meetings.

The Working Group had produced something that, if agreed by the committee, would be submitted to Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) tomorrow (25 November 2010).

The Integrated Transport Manager introduced the report as circulated with the agenda. The report set out the recommendations of the LTP3 Working Group with regards to the proposed response of the Council, to the draft LTP3 consultation.

Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) had been granted an extension by GCC in order to allow time for a quantitative response to be drafted. Members and stakeholders had been involved in the collation of the response.

The Working Group had, had to accept that the plan was an evolving plan, which was a result of the current budget constraints and a key message had been 'localisation'.

The following comments were made by members of the committee;

- Cheltenham was one of only a few towns that did not have a bypass and already suffered from traffic issues, which would only increase in the future if nothing was done. The M5 slip road would increase traffic on the Tewkesbury Road and the worry was that businesses would relocate and people would avoid Cheltenham. The preservation of historic buildings was important but not at the expense of traffic flow in the town.
- Civic Pride highlighted the issue of traffic. The closure of Boots corner and a large development in the north-west of the town would overwhelm some already busy junctions in Cheltenham. GCC were being encouraged to consider the number of traffic lights, etc and the taskforce would continue to pursue these issues with GCC.
- Light rail was a fundamental element and it was reassuring to a reference to this had been included.
- Changes to individual junctions would cause problems in other areas and a bypass would come at a great cost.
- A north-west bypass would be contrary to Council policy and the Working Group were not able to contradict that.
- Medical evidence was clear that air quality had a direct impact on health and as such care needed to be taken when building, etc. It was pleasing to see that this had also been referenced.
- The position of many industrial estates in Cheltenham drew good vehicles into the town centre.

The committee members that had been involved in the Working Group paid specific thanks to the Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability and his team for their efforts.

Cabinet Member Built Environment had found the Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability to be very knowledgeable and took the opportunity to thank the members involved. Cabinet would be very grateful.

Industrial estates were important and all strategies needed to take consideration the use and occupation of these sites. One estate in particular, situated near to the train station suffered from a real issue with commuter parking.

The Working group saw the LTP3 as an evolving document and felt it was important that CBC continue to raise concerns with GCC.

The Chair reiterated that Officers had consulted with Members, other Officers, businesses and community groups and assured the committee that they would be updated about how the feedback had been received by GCC.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the schedule of representations be approved as Cheltenham Borough Council's formal response to LTP3 and the formal response be submitted to Gloucestershire County Council by 25 November 2010.

On a personal note, the Chair echoed comments made by other members and expressed how rewarding she had found it to work with the Officers and Members involved in the working group.

At this point Councillor Lloyd Surgenor excused himself from the meeting.

10. CABINET WASTE WORKING GROUP

Councillors Britter and Fletcher were introduced as members of the Cabinet Waste Working Group.

Councillor Britter referred members to the briefing note which had been circulated and summarised much of what the Working Group had achieved to date. Most of this had centred around the leaflets that were being produced and the issue of food waste from flats, as a solution was needed.

The literature on curb-side garden waste would be ready for the start of December and other literature would be available from early in 2011.

A member highlighted her reservations about 2 weekly collections of residual waste. Nappies and cat litter, etc, would fall into this category and would cause an offence if left for 2 weeks.

The Working Group had raised this very concern. The Cabinet Member Sustainability stressed that this was not a problem other authorities operating 2 weekly collections had encountered. His suggestion was that, if it were bagged properly there wouldn't be an issue. He confirmed that Cabinet had considered this and agreed that, where there was a particular issue (i.e. large families, etc),

a larger capacity bin would be provided. It was felt that this would address the issue.

The following responses were given by the Cabinet Member Sustainability to questions from member of the committee;

- All residents of Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC) were provided with a food waste container, but he did not have figures for how much food waste was being disposed of in residual waste, or the number of residents who were not using the food waste container. TBC however, were very happy as their recycling rates were up. He would ask for figures from TBC.
- Plastic bottle recycling would be rolled out to the (approx) 20% of homes in Cheltenham, who were not yet included in the scheme, as soon as possible. This remaining 20% were dealt with by a particular vehicle and a solution was being devised. The message being given by Officers about the implementation target of 2012 was incorrect.

The Chair thanked the committee members and the Cabinet member for their update.

11. ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2010-2011

The Chair referred members to the work plan as circulated with the agenda.

She highlighted that the next meeting of the committee (19 January 2011) was dedicated to the budget, except for a verbal update from the Cabinet Waste Working Group. Members were happy for this to be the focus of the meeting, if the Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development felt it necessary.

This had resulted in a number of items being moved from January to March and therefore there was a rather full agenda planned for this meeting. The agenda for which would be agreed on 8 February 2011.

**12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION
'New Homes Bonus' Consultation**

Cabinet Member Built Environment was requesting that the committee agree to establish a Working Group, tasked with developing a response to the consultation, which was due to close on 24 December 2010.

The scheme would be financially beneficial to the Council and the bonus paid whether affordable homes or not, though more would be paid for affordable homes.

The suggestion was that this should be open to all members given its significance and consist of 3-4 members at the most. It was highlighted that this would not need to go to Cabinet for approval. The response would be taken forward by the Cabinet Member Built Environment and would no doubt only require/allow for 1-2 meetings, given the short timescale.

Councillors Fletcher and McCloskey volunteered to form part of the Working Group and it was agreed that information would be circulated to all other

members in an attempt to secure other volunteers. It was also agreed that Cabinet Member Built Environment should be involved in any meetings.

Given the short timescale, Mike Redman – Assistant Director Built Environment and Lead Officer for the Working Group would be asked to circulate dates ASAP.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday 19 January 2011.

The Chair thanked all members and officers for their attendance and closed the meeting.

Penny Hall
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Cheltenham Borough Council

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

19 January 2011

General Fund Revenue and Capital - Revised Budget 2010/11 and Interim Budget Proposals 2011/12 for Consultation

Accountable member	Cabinet Member for Community Development and Finance, John Webster
Accountable officer	Chief Finance Officer, Mark Sheldon
Accountable scrutiny committee	all scrutiny committees
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	Yes
Executive summary	<p>The council has received notification of a 15.46% cash cut in government support in 2011/12. The funding gap for 2011/12, taking into account the provisional finance settlement, is £2.94m.</p> <p>The budget report, to which report refers, summarises the revised budget for 2010/11 and the Cabinet's interim budget proposals for bridging the funding gap 2011/12.</p>
Recommendations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The committee consider the proposals and feed back any comments on the proposals back to the Cabinet. 2. Consider and propose alternative options including the identification of the funding of any alternatives.

Financial implications	<p>See main budget report</p> <p>Contact officer: Mark Sheldon.</p> <p>E-mail: mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel no: 01242 264123</p>
Legal implications	<p>See main budget report</p> <p>Contact officer: Peter Lewis</p> <p>E-mail: peter.lewis@teWKesbury.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel no: 01684 272012</p>

<p>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</p>	<p>See main budget report</p> <p>Contact officer: Julie McCarthy</p> <p>E-mail: julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel no: 01242 264355</p>
<p>Key risks</p>	<p>See main budget report</p>
<p>Corporate and community plan Implications</p>	<p>See main budget report</p>
<p>Environmental and climate change implications</p>	<p>See main budget report</p>

1. Background

- 1.1 The Cabinet's budget strategy for 2011/12, approved at a meeting on 26th October 2010, included an estimate of £2.6m for the 2011/12 budget gap i.e. the financial gap between what the Council needs to spend to maintain services (including pay and price inflation) and the funding available assuming a 10.7% cut in government support. This was subject to the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR10) and assumed a funded council tax freeze. The council only received notification of its actual grant on 13th December 2010. The final assessment of the budget gap for 2011/12, based on the detailed budget preparation undertaken over recent months and the actual financial settlement is £2.94m.
- 1.2 The settlement was actually £245k worse than anticipated and, given the delay in its publication, has presented the Cabinet and the council's Senior Leadership Team (SLT) with an incredibly difficult task in responding to deeper and more rapid cuts in making sound recommendations in time to publish a budget allowing for a reasonable period of consultation.
- 1.3 In preparing the budget the Cabinet have, through the Bridging the Gap (BtG) programme minimised the impact on front line services as far as possible. However, given the severity of the cuts, it is inevitable that some cuts affecting services have had to be made.
- 1.4 The Cabinet are keen to receive feedback on the proposals and are would welcome any views on costed alternatives.
- 1.5 Consultation will take place with Parish Council's, the Chamber of Commerce and the Residents Focus Groups that were consulted in the period leading up to the development of the draft budget will be invited to examine the draft budget. In addition to this all Overview and Scrutiny committees will have an opportunity to look at the budget, and the cross committee Budget Scrutiny Group will meet early in the new year.
- 1.6 The attention of Overview and Scrutiny is drawn to the fact that the Government plans to cut the support it gives to the council by a further £495,000 for the financial year 2012/13. Given this settlement, the projected gap for 2011/12 is already an estimated £800,000 which has been reduced to £324,400 as a result of measures proposed in this draft budget. Suggestions to further reduce the projected gap for 2012/13 should also be considered.

2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 As outlined in the main report.

3. Reasons for recommendations

- 3.1 As outlined in the mainreport.

4. Alternative options considered

- 4.1 The Cabinet have considered many alternatives in arriving at the interim budget proposals. Opposition groups will be able to suggest alternative budget proposals for consideration by council in February 2011.

5. Performance management – monitoring and review

- 5.1 The delivery of the savings workstreams included in the interim budget proposals, if approved by full council will be monitoired via the BtG group.

Report author	Mark Sheldon, Chief Finance Officer Tel. 01242 264123; <i>e-mail address <u>mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk</u></i>
Appendices	Refer to Interim budget proposals – Cabinet papers, 21 st December 2010.
Background information	1. Provisional Finance settlement 2011/12

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee –

19 January 2011

Review the signing and rules for cycling within pedestrianised areas of Cheltenham Town Centre

This note contains the information to keep Members informed of matters relating to the work of the Committee, but where no decisions from Members are needed

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

Background

A number of years ago the Borough Council asked the County Council to look at the issue of permitting cyclists to ride in the pedestrianised areas of the town centre.

The Borough Council's view over a number of years has been that it is illogical and impractical to permit cycling in the Strand and Cambray Place but to ban it in the other pedestrianised areas. This view is shared by the police, who find the present arrangements very difficult to enforce.

For some years, the proposal to allow cycling in pedestrianised areas where it is currently banned remained on the back burner. Then, in September 2009, it was discussed at a meeting of the Multi Agency Focus Group for Cycling. This is a body on which the Borough Council is represented, along with the County Council, Gloucestershire Highways and the police.

The group decided to consider conducting an experimentation initiative through engagement, education and supported by effective enforcement.

The aim being to reduce anti-social cycling where it is evident whilst relaxing cycling restrictions around the Promenade and other identified areas in the Town Centre and Lower High Street.

2. Summary of the Issue

Gloucestershire Highways was tasked with launching a safety audit and consultation exercise in preparation for a trial scheme to be introduced.

In December 2010 Gloucestershire Highways wrote to a number of organisations in the town to inform them that they were ready to proceed with an engagement and consultation process in preparation of preparing a trail scheme.

The Multi Agency Focus Group for Cycling holds a view that a majority of cyclists behave responsibly. However, it is recognised that the safety and wellbeing of pedestrians, especially older people and disabled people, need to be taken fully into account.

3. Summary of evidence/information

Gloucestershire Highways have now started work on their safety audit to review the signing and rules for cycling within the pedestrianised areas of Cheltenham Town Centre. They will still need to carry out a consultation exercise before preparing an experiential order to allow cycling in the pedestrianised areas for a trial period.

The engagement and consultation process being undertaken by Gloucestershire Highways is with the view to allow cyclists to use the Promenade and High Street (in the permitted direction) on an experimental basis.

Gloucestershire Highways lead Officer, Mr Peter Godwin has begun to engage with a number of interested parties, which includes Cheltenham Borough Council, Police, Cycle Groups and the Civic Society all of whom have expressed an interest to participate in the engagement and consultation process.

In addition Mr Godwin has requested that the Borough Council assist in identifying other interested parties who would wish to participate in the process.

The purpose of the engagement and consultation process is to review what is currently known, what is proposed, what can be learnt from a proposed experiment and how judgement will be made on the experiment.

Gloucestershire Highways hope to arrange a meeting of the interested parties in February 2011 with a view to undertake an experiment some time in March 2011.

4. Next Steps - possible next steps for the committee to consider e.g. potential witnesses, further report, site visit etc.

The concern is that it has been several years since the issue was last discussed by the Borough Council.

It is important that the Borough Council should be involved in the consultation process, and therefore Councillor John Rawson has asked for the issue to be considered by the Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee at its next meeting.

Councillor Rawson believes the Borough Council will want to clarify a number of issues in respect of the new traffic order.

1. First of all, that the Borough Council be satisfied that a sensible assessment of risk is made before the experimentation traffic order is introduced to enable a trial scheme. This should follow a careful study of pedestrian and cyclist behaviour in the Strand, where cycling is already permitted, and other pedestrianised areas.
2. Secondly, that the Borough Council will need to be satisfied that the police can and will take action against anti-social and dangerous cyclists in the pedestrian area.

Page 19

Because cycling is permitted, that should clearly not mean that anti social behaviour by cyclists is acceptable.

3. Thirdly, that the Borough Council would want to be involved in monitoring any experimental scheme, along with the police and Gloucestershire Highways, to ensure that it is working as intended.

Background Papers

Contact Officer

Owen Parry, Head of Integrated Transport & Sustainability, 01242 77 4640,
owen.parry@cheltenham.gov.uk

Accountability

Cabinet Member Built Environment, Councillor
John Rawson

Scrutiny Function

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
Meeting Date: 19 January 2011				
Chairs Briefing: 14 December 2010				
Cabinet Waste Working Group (CWWG)	Standard item	For members of the committee to have an understanding of the issues being dealt with during the pre and post implementation of the new waste strategy	Verbal update from ENV O&S member of the CWWG	CWWG representative
Interim Budget Review	Scrutiny	Budget consultation	Discussion Paper	Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development
Proposed traffic order	Scrutiny	For members to feed into the consultation of the proposals to allow cyclist to ride on pedestrian areas	Discussion Paper	Cabinet Member Built Environment
Meeting Date: 02 March 2011				
Chairs Briefing: 01 February 2011				
Cabinet Waste Working Group (CWWG)	Standard item	For members of the committee to have an understanding of the issues being dealt with during the pre and post implementation of the new waste strategy	Verbal update from ENV O&S member of the CWWG	CWWG representative
Climate Change Working Group	Update	Details of work undertaken by the working group	Discussion Paper	Rob Bell, Assistant Director - Operations

Imperial and Montpelier Gardens Strategy	Scrutiny	Review strategy prior to agreement at Cabinet (15/03)	Report	Rob Bell, Assistant Director - Operations
Joint Waste Partnership Governance Arrangements	Scrutiny	Review arrangements prior to agreement at Cabinet (15/03)	Report	Rob Bell, Assistant Director - Operations
Review of Cheltenham Car Parking Strategy & Related Enforcement	Update	Agreed and approved Car Parking Strategy for Cheltenham	Report as appropriate	Owen Parry, Integrated Transport Manager
Street Scene Enforcing Review	Update	Feedback on effectiveness of the new working arrangements	Discussion Paper	Rob Bell, Assistant Director - Operations
Corporate Strategy	Scrutiny	Review draft action plan for 2011-12 Corporate Strategy	tbc	Richard Gibson, Policy and Partnerships Manager
Supplementary Planning Document Work Programme 2011-12	Update	Review the work programme	Discussion Paper	Tracey Crews, Spatial Planning Manager
Meeting Date: 11 May 2011				
Chairs Briefing: 11 April 2011				
Deadline for Papers: 29 April 2011				
Cabinet Waste Working Group (CWWG)	Standard Item	For members of the committee to have an understanding of the issues being dealt with during the pre and post implementation of the new waste strategy To understand the current trend in customer satisfaction with the service and action being taken, if necessary, to address major concerns with performance	Verbal update from ENV O&S member of the CWWG	CWWG representative
Street Cleansing Satisfaction	Scrutiny		Report	Rob Bell or Beth Boughton
Meeting Date: 13 July 2011				

Chairs Briefing: tbc		Deadline for Papers: 1 July 2011	
Gloucestershire Airport – Green Travel Plan 2011-2012	Scrutiny	Review the green travel plan 2011-2012	tbc
Items to be added at a future date			
Waste Strategy – post implementation	October 2011	Review the implementation of the new strategy and lessons learned	Report
Joint Core Strategy developments	Regular Update		Strategic Planning to decide
CBH - use of hard-standing for vehicles	Update	Join up policy approach	Mike Redman, Assistant Director - Built Environment
Green Travel Plan	Update	Presentation from the GCC Transport Manager re: bus/subsidized transport	tbc
Flood update *	Regular Update		Grahame Lewis, Strategic Director

This page is intentionally left blank